

Administrative

Leadership

ABILITY GROUPING

by

**CROSS
PASSOW
HOBSON
HANSEN**

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Volume V

February 1969

Number 1

INTRODUCTION

*I*f there is one thing that has become apparent to educators during the past two decades, it is that the public schools are not islands, isolated from the rest of society. The stresses in American society are increasingly being reflected in the schools, and, indeed, the schools have often become the focal point for clashes over social and political issues. So it was with de jure segregation in the South. So it is with the problem of the urban ghetto.

*W*hile educational decisions related to great social issues have originated from a variety of sources, two of the most far reaching of these decisions have been made by the judiciary. The best known of the two, Brown v Board of Education in 1954, was aimed primarily at southern school districts. The other, Hobson v Hansen, which is less than two years old, may eventually have an impact on school districts throughout the nation. The plaintiff in this case, Julius W. Hobson, a Negro, charged the then Superintendent of Washington, D.C. schools, Carl F. Hansen, and the Board of Education of that district with discrimination

against Negro pupils and poor pupils. Judge J. Skelly Wright decided in favor of the plaintiff and, in doing so, declared that accidental segregation is fully as unconstitutional as deliberate segregation. In handing down his decision, Judge Wright extended the Supreme Court's desegregation doctrine to include de facto segregation resulting from "unintentional" administrative practices. He also introduced a prohibition against unequal education for the poor, regardless of race. Specifically, he decreed a more equitable distribution of resources among the Washington, D.C. schools and the abolition of the district's track system of ability grouping, which he found to discriminate against Negroes and the poor.

*H*obson v Hansen has already attracted considerable attention from legal scholars, social critics, and educators. The American Association of School Administrators, seeing what it believed to be undue interference by the judiciary in the internal affairs of a school district, has filed an amicus curiae on behalf of the Washington, D.C. schools. The National Education Association has filed an amicus on behalf of the plaintiff, Hobson. The case may eventually come before the Supreme Court.

*I*t was against this background that the planning committee selected one aspect of the case, ability grouping, as the focus for Schoolmen's Day, 1968. This issue of Administrative Leadership includes the major presentations of that day. In the

articles which follow, Harry Passow, a widely respected scholar, and the two principals in the case, Julius Hobson and Carl F. Hansen, air the issues from different perspectives.

*P*rofessor Passow discusses the question of ability grouping from a technical point of view. His interest is in the efficacy of ability grouping as an organization for instruction. His article is a systematic review of the issues involved in ability grouping and the research literature bearing on the issues.

*M*r. Hobson addresses himself to the question of equality of educational opportunity. He challenges the notion that equal educational opportunity can exist under a track system such as the one abolished by the Wright decision.

*M*r. Hansen, like Passow, is interested in ability grouping as an organization for instruction. His primary concern, however, is for what he considers undue court interference in the operation of school systems.

*T*he issues involved and the views of the authors in this edition of Administrative Leadership illustrate the complexity of the educational enterprise. The major questions of education are debated here. Who shall be given what kind of education? How shall students be grouped? How shall resources be allocated in education? And, above all, who shall decide these questions? These are questions which are central to education, and to education's role in society.

Ray Cross

ABILITY GROUPING: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ?

by

A. Harry Passow
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

As recently as October 1968, the NEA Research Bulletin began still another article on ability grouping by noting that, although studies have been conducted for more than four decades, the topic is still controversial. Today's program suggests that most of us would concur. The Bulletin points out -- somewhat wistfully -- that: "Considering the amount and duration of interest in ability grouping, it might be thought the issue would be settled now, either adopted as a successful measure or discarded as ineffective."¹ But the issue is far from settled despite the fact that national surveys indicate that grouping is probably a more widespread practice now than it was a decade or so ago. Perhaps Della-Dora was right when he observed: "Two major conclusions which can be drawn from these attempts to

1. "Ability Grouping," NEA Research Bulletin, 46:74-76, October, 1968.

account for individual differences through grouping are that: (a) We know at least 1000 things that do not work, and (b) We have been asking the wrong questions most of the time."¹

Since the early 1920's, there has been a steady flow of reports of studies accompanied by acrimonious debate. The NEA Research Bulletin summarized findings and conclusions from 50 research studies published since 1960 alone. Rather than resolving the issues, for a variety of reasons, attempts at synthesizing and interpreting research seem to harden positions already taken. After four decades, ability grouping continues to be controversial on philosophical, psychological and educational grounds and now we have added moral and legal bases as well.

Part of the problem is that ability grouping is not a procedure but a variety of organizational procedures involving an entire student body or a few students for all or part of a day, for some courses or an entire program, with selection criteria varying from IQ scores to complex assessment techniques. It is difficult to reconcile research studies that have such different designs and whole populations may range from a single small group to several thousand students. Beyond this, we are always dismayed when what seems like conventional wisdom

1. Della-Dora, Delmo, "One Hundred Years of Grouping Practices," Unpublished Paper, 1961.

(i.e., our own pet biases) are not confirmed nor supported. To a good many educators and laymen alike, narrowing the ability range in a classroom should make it easier for the teacher to arrange more appropriate learning tasks and gear instruction to the "level" of the group so that all pupils benefit. It should, but it does not always occur. Consequently, we tend to ignore research and rely instead on argument and exhortation.

Those who support ability grouping maintain that when the purposes of grouping are clearly understood and the selection of students is made in terms of these purposes, teachers can plan experiences for a narrower range of differences and individual needs of students can be met more effectively. They argue that both pupils and teachers are more comfortable -- the pupils because they can work on a level and at a rate commensurate with their ability and motivation and the teachers because they can individualize instruction without having "to teach to the lowest common denominator." Proponents believe that ability grouping enables the student to develop a realistic concept of his own strengths and weaknesses since he "competes" with others of like potential. In a mass education system, some basis for organizing is needed other than simply chronological-age grouping; students can be grouped more effectively on the basis of aptitude, achievement, interests, maturity or other criteria. Finally, teachers can be trained to work with special groups and more appropriate materials and activities can be arranged.

On the other side, opponents of ability grouping argue that special classes of any kind are inherently undemocratic in that they do not provide equal opportunity. Singling out students with special abilities tends to produce excessive competition, undue pressures and heavy demands which may lower aspiration levels. Critics of ability grouping maintain that the stimulation which comes from interaction of children with diverse behavior patterns is curtailed with detrimental effects on the effort, aspirations, and quality of learning for all students.

As Kenneth Clark points out, "Probably the chief argument against homogeneous groupings is the fact that children so segregated lose their individuality in the education situation Homogeneous groupings tend to require that children be seen in terms of group characteristics rather than in terms of their own individual characteristics."¹ Even more telling is the argument that ability grouping is simply a means of making respectable the procedures whereby pupils from lower socioeconomic and racial or ethnic minority groups are relegated to the "slower" and "nonacademic" programs and provided with a basically inferior education. Observers of racially mixed schools frequently find that ability groupings is the means by which pupils are re-segregated within the school.

1. Clark, Kenneth B., "Educational Stimulation of Racially Disadvantaged Children," in Education in Depressed Areas, edited by A. Harry Passow, New York: Teachers College Press, 1963. pp. 151-152.

The Inconclusiveness of Research

These arguments pro- and con- have been stated and restated for more than a half century, with increasingly firm conviction but with ever diminishing success in converting those with contrary views. Because it is inconclusive, research evidence is disappointing in its inconclusiveness. For instance, Ruth Eckstrom reviewed experimental studies and found that they sorted themselves into three groups:

(a) thirteen studies found differences, having or approaching significance, favoring homogeneous grouping, (b) fifteen studies which found no difference in achievement in homogeneous or heterogeneous groups, or which found homogeneous grouping detrimental, and (c) five studies which gave mixed results, partially favorable and partially unfavorable to homogeneous grouping. The differences in number of favorable and unfavorable studies should not be considered too seriously since these studies differ widely in quality, purpose, and significance. The studies covered grade levels from elementary school through college and dealt with a wide range of subject matter, some treating a single topic and some achievement in several topics No consistent pattern for the effectiveness of homogeneous grouping was found related to age, ability level, course content or method of instruction.¹

1. Ekstrom, Ruth B., "Experimental Studies of Homogeneous Grouping: A Review of the Literature," Princeton: Educational Testing Service, April 1959. Multilithed Report. P. i.

Obviously a clear majority vote does not emerge from that survey any more than it has from others and yet research offers leads, especially if we look at literature other than those traditionally lumped under the rubric of homogeneous vs. heterogeneous studies. More than thirty years ago, Ethel Cornell surveyed the findings of published studies and concluded that:

The results of ability grouping seem to depend less upon the fact of grouping itself than upon the philosophy behind the grouping, the accuracy with which the grouping is made for the purposes intended, the differentiations in content, method, and speed, and the techniques of the teacher as well as upon more general environmental influences.¹

Our own large-scale study -- 2,200 pupils; 86 fifth-grade classes; 45 elementary schools; 15 narrow-, medium-, and broad-range grouping patterns kept intact for two years barring normal mobility -- tested three general hypotheses concerning the presence or absence of gifted and slow pupils, the consequences of narrowing the ability range, and the relative position of any ability level within the range. Five major variables were tested: (a) academic achievement, (b) attitudes toward self, (c) interests and attitudes toward school, (d) assessment of more and less able peers, and (e) teacher ratings. Our major conclusions:

1. Cornell, Ethel L., "Effects of Ability Grouping Determinable from Published Studies," in The Grouping of Pupils, Thirty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: The Society, 1936. pp. 161-172.

1. Simply narrowing the ability range in the classroom does not necessarily result in a greater differentiation of content or method and is not associated with greater academic achievement for any ability level.
2. Narrowing the range of ability (on the basis of group intelligence tests) per se, without specifically designed variations in program for the several ability levels, does not result in consistently greater academic achievement for any group of pupils.
3. The findings cast strong doubt on the contention that grouping will have negative effects on the self - attitudes, the social perceptions, and the interests of pupils. Self - attitudes seemed to be rather more sensitive to grouping than were the other nonacademic variables, but the effects of narrowing the range or separating the extreme levels were to raise the self-assessments of slow pupils, lower the initially - high self-rating of the gifted, and leave the intermediate levels largely unaffected.
4. Narrowing the ability range on the basis of some measure of general academic aptitude will, by itself, in the absence of carefully planned adaptations of content and method, produce little positive change in the academic achievement of pupils at any ability level.
5. No support was found for the contention that narrow-range classes are associated with negative effects on self-concepts, aspirations, interests, attitudes toward school, and other nonintellective factors.

6. Ability grouping is inherently neither good nor bad. It is neutral. Its value depends upon the way in which it is used. Where it is used without close examination of the specific learning needs of various pupils and without recognition of the specific learning needs of various pupils and without recognition that it must follow the demands of carefully planned variations in curriculum, grouping can be, at best, ineffective, at worst, harmful.¹

Walter Borg's study, involving over 2,500 pupils in grades 4, 6, 7, and 9 the first year and 4,000+ the second, maintained curricula for both districts similar for most subject areas and at most grade levels. Many of the same materials were used -- in one district to adjust the presentation and in the other to enrich instruction. In general, Borg found that the grouping patterns had no consistent general effects on achievement. On the basis of achievement data, there was little to choose between ability grouping with acceleration and heterogeneous grouping with enrichment. As for self-concepts, scores were consistently lower in the ability-grouped samples. Neither ability- nor random-grouping had differential effects on the aspiration levels or value achievements or feelings of inferiority or superiority. Borg's study dealt with two curriculum treatments associated with random and ability-groupings.²

1. Goldberg, M.L., Passow, A.H., and Justman, J., The Effects of Ability Grouping, New York: Teachers College Press, 1966. pp. 150-169.

2. Borg, Walter R., Ability Grouping in the Public Schools, Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc., 1966.

Drews' study of 432 ninth graders with each teacher teaching one homogeneous and one heterogeneously selected English class indicated that homogeneous classes did not significantly alter the achievement progress of any ability group.¹ Drews concluded that the homogeneous classes appeared to have little advantage for the average students as judged by teacher, peer, and self-ratings. In heterogeneous classes, superior students felt a lack of challenge and stimulation.

Other Studies Also Provide Insights

Some other studies in which grouping has been a component part provide additional insights into the consequences of grouping. For instance, Douglas' comprehensive study of ability and attainment in English primary schools. This study involved more than 5,000 born the first week of March 1946, examining their educational development through the 11+. In general, Douglas found that once streaming is done, the children perform as expected and the forecasts by teachers are self-fulfilling. He observes:

Children who come from well-kept homes and who are themselves clean, well clothed and shod, stand a greater chance of being put in upper streams than their measured ability would seem to justify. Once there they are likely to stay and to improve performance in succeeding years. This is in striking

1. Drews, E.M., Student Abilities, Grouping Patterns, and Classroom Attainments, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963. Mimeographed Report.

contrast to the deterioration noticed in those children of similar initial measured ability who were placed in lower streams. In this way the validity of the initial selection appears to be confirmed by the subsequent performance of the children, and an element of rigidity is introduced early into the primary school system.¹

The effects of social stratification and of segregation on the academic attainment of both elementary and secondary school students have been studied by Wilson.² In a study of ten high schools, he found that school climate affected pupils' educational attainment and vocational aspirations. For instance, the proportion of students from similar family backgrounds who aspired to college varied with their high schools and the prevailing modes at those schools. In their median grades as well, boys from comparable backgrounds tended toward the mode of the school. What Wilson found, in this and a comparable study at the elementary level, is that the school has a homogenizing effect caused, in part, by the lateral transmission of values and attitudes among students and the normalization of differing achievement standards by teachers. Thus, in effect, Wilson seems to be saying that there is a grouping by schools: "The de facto segregation brought about by concentrations of social classes in cities results in

1. Douglas, J.W.B., The Home and the School: A Study of Ability and Attainment in the Primary Schools, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964. P. 118.

2. Wilson, Alan B., "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24: 836-845, 1959.

schools with unequal moral climates which likewise effect the motivation of the child, not necessarily by inculcating a sense of inferiority, but rather by providing a different method in which to perceive values." Social processes within the school reinforce and sustain different levels of achievement and aspiration.

A recently reported study entitled Pygmalion in the Classroom¹ by Rosenthal and Jacobson, dealt with the question of whether, in one year or less, children of whom greater intellectual growth is expected will show greater intellectual growth than a matched group of children from whom not as much is expected. Rosenthal and Jacobson were concerned with interpersonal self-fulfilling prophecies: "how one person's behavior can unwittingly become a more accurate prediction simple for its having been made." A significant expectancy advantage was found at the end of one year, especially in the first and second grades. Children in medium tracks showed greatest gains: the average child of a lower-class school benefitted most from teachers' enhanced expectations; Mexican children showed greater expectancy advantages than did non-Mexicans; differences between boys and girls were not dramatic. That teacher expectancies had definite consequences on students' performances seems quite clear although the process is not as clear. Rosenthal and Jacobson speculate:

1. Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobson, Lenore, Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development, New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968. pp. 1-240.

. . . by what she said, by how and when she said, it, by her facial expressions, postures, and perhaps by her touch, the teacher may have communicated to the children of the experimental group that she expected improved intellectual performance. Such communications together with possible changes in teaching techniques may have helped the children learn by changing his self-concept, his expectations of his own behavior, and his motivation as well as his cognitive style and skills.¹

This study, carefully designed and implemented in an educational context, adds hard data to findings concerning the operation of self-fulfilling prophecies from psychological laboratory studies. It follows an earlier experiment by Rosenthal and Lawson in which experimenters were assigned allegedly dull rats to observe their learning their way through Skinner boxes. Forty-seven percent of the experimenters assigned "dull rats" thought them to be uneducable; only 5 percent assigned "bright rats" were equally pessimistic about educability of their subjects. Thus, Rosenthal wonders "about the beliefs created in school teachers when they are told a child is educable but slow, deserving but disadvantaged."²

1. Rosenthal and Jacobson, op. cit., P. 180.

2. Rosenthal, Robert and Lawson, R., "A Longitudinal Study of the Efforts of Experimenter Bias on the Operant Learning of Laboratory Rats," Journal of Psychiatric Research, 2: 61-72, 1964.

The massive study entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity (the Coleman Report) pointed out that one of the most significant school correlates of achievement test scores was the social class and racial composition of the student body.¹ Student personality variables were surprisingly strong independent correlates of test performance. The dynamics of processes within the school and within the classroom were not the same for all pupils, however. For instance, for white middle - class students, the " academic self-concept " was significantly strong; for the Negro student, it was the strength of his sense of "fate control" which was most strong. The data concerning school-related factors vis-a-vis nonschool-related factors have caused some analysts to ask what it is that the school can do. In fact, it seems fairly clear that lower-class Negro pupils are most likely to profit from good teachers, good instruction, and good resources and these are more important for them than for their white, middle class counterparts.

The Coleman Report also raised some provocative questions about the efficacy and effectiveness of school procedures. "Traching" and "Movement between Tracks" were two of the items studied at sixth,

1. United States Office of Education, Equality of Educational Opportunity, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

ninth and twelfth grades and found to have no correlation with pupil achievement. While it is possible that the questionnaire was faulty in the way the data were gathered, the correlations between pupil achievement and grouping were generally nonfunctional (i.e., about at random level). The data tell us nothing about how teachers organize their instruction or how particular pupils learn under various conditions of grouping or nongrouping. Herbert Thelen's studies of what he calls "teachability grouping" provides many new insights into these dimensions of learning and teaching which have not been dealt with in conventional studies.¹

What Have We Learned?

The NEA Research Bulletin referred to earlier summarized its survey with these generalizations:

Despite all the diversity in evaluation, opinion, and practice with regard to ability grouping, there appear to be three major areas of agreement.

1. Ability grouping per se has yet to prove itself as an administrative device to meet both effectively and efficiently the individual needs of all pupils in most areas of educational concern. Teachers, however, tend to prefer ability grouping.

1. Thelen, Herbert A., Classroom Grouping for Teachability, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

2. More and better research studies which account for or control a larger number of variables involved are needed.
3. Objectives, materials, curriculum and teaching methods should also change to fit each of the homogeneous groups at different ability levels.

While it is always safe to suggest that "more research is needed," we already have a good deal of research which has meaning for practice. We should have learned that there is no such thing as a homogeneous group. It is possible to narrow the range with respect to a few variables but the range will still be great on other characteristics. For instance, even though a group of children may be selected as "gifted" on the basis of an IQ of 140 or higher, the range of differences with respect to specific aptitudes, interests, aspirations and other variables may be as great or greater than one would find in a heterogeneous group. Homogeneity is restricted to the relatively few criteria used in organization and such criteria are usually based on static measurement devices. Thus we can narrow the range for certain specific instructional purposes, using criteria related to these purposes.

We have learned that grouping is a method of organization and not a method of instruction. Yet, since each learner brings into the classroom with him certain potentials, values, attitudes, aspirations, perceptions, and emotions which color what and how he will learn, his

interaction with other students, teachers, adults, the modes of instruction, the classroom and school milieu are significant determinants of learning. If the organization (group, class, or school) institutionalizes expectancies by classifying and labeling pupils; freezes into molds and structures; condemns some while encouraging and aiding others -- it is an inappropriate practice, educationally and morally. Grouping should facilitate learning and teaching -- intellectual and attitudinal -- or chance organizations have as much value.

We should have learned that learning is not uni-dimensional: fast, average, or slow. As Frazier has noted:

How fast or how slow a learner performs is no more indicative to us of his power than many other qualities -- his capacity for insight, his ability to relate what he learns to what he already knows, his skill in bringing new knowledge to bear on new problems, his willingness to confront the unfamiliar and stay with it long enough to make sense out of it.¹

The use of a single criterion for placement in groups and the notion that " ability " is measured by a single test of intelligence are questionable. Consequently, what is needed are diagnostic procedures which will provide insight into individual differences which make a difference so that appropriate conditions for teaching and learning

1. Frazier, Alexander, "Needed: A New Vocabulary for Individual Differences," Unpublished Paper. 1960.

can be provided. As Wilhelms and Westby-Gibson suggest, as we become less preoccupied with types of individuals and deal with individuals, we will jettison "closed, rigid, formal stratifications and narrow subdivisions of people or subject matter, in favor of open, 'roomy arrangements with a premium on flexibility."¹

Aside from the mechanics of classroom method, differences in styles of teachers affect individual learning. For instance, the University of Chicago Grouping Project has found that students seem to have "different approaches to learning, different ways of using social relationships, different kinds of facilitative rewards and punishment, different degrees to which any learning experiences had centrality within their needs system."² Thus, when attacking the same problem, some students worked best along, others in small groups of two or three, and still others in a formal classroom group. Some seemed to react best to lecture methods, others to discussions or committee planned projects, still others to independent activity. Different kinds of groups, selected on different basis, aimed at attaining different behavioral goals -- these should be the focus of planning rather than refining ways of achieving "homogeneity."

1. Wilhelms, Fred and Westby-Gibson, Dorothy, "Groupings: Research Offers Leads," Educational Leadership, 18: 410-413, April 1961.

2. Thelen, Herbert A., "Grouping Project: The Course of the Investigation and its Present Status," Mimeographed Paper. 1959.

We should have learned that our efforts should be directed toward greater flexibility in arranging the conditions for learning, including staff, resources, time, space, in order to provide for individuals. A national survey in 1932 identified homogeneous grouping, special classes and unit assignments as "core elements in a typically successful program to provide for individual differences. These three form a kind of trinity, a sort of three-in-one answer of the Nation's outstanding schools to provide for individual differences."¹ In the intervening years, we have learned that the core elements are not quite so simple and individualization of instruction does not flow readily from procedures which are organizational alone.

In short, what we have learned is that we would do well to stop beating the dead horse of ability grouping. The issue is not one of homogeneous vs. heterogeneous grouping, of tracking or not tracking. Instead the questions we should be asking should deal with diagnosis of individual differences, flexible arrangements, optimum conditions for learning, resources and personnel that will open doors for learning. Simplistic debates on obsolete issues concerning grouping seem irrelevant after a half century of concern with ability grouping.

1. Billett, Roy O., Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion, Bulletin 1932, No. 17: National Survey of Education Monograph No. 13. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933.

The TRACK SYSTEM — A
FAILURE in Public Schools

by

Julius W. Hobson

Board of Education

District of Columbia Public Schools

I am happy to have the opportunity to come all the way to your city from Washington, D.C. We have a problem in the District of Columbia, not only educational, but also we have all of the social problems in our community that are crying for solutions which you apparently have in this big city and probably every other big city in the United States. From the point of view of a parent like myself who has never had a day of education,¹ we have utilized what some people might call common sense and grocery store arithmetic and look what is happening in public education in Washington, D.C. I am to talk about the fact that the track system has failed but I am going to have to confine my discussion to the District of Columbia since I know absolutely nothing about ability grouping. The terms that were used this

¹Referring here to education courses. The speaker holds a Master's degree in economics.

morning by the educators were confounding and confusing to me, and impressive, but I have concerned myself with the problem in the District of Columbia. It was on the basis of our concern in that community that we filed what is now the landmark decision dealing with public education in our community.

First let me say that those of us in the community who believe as I do, believe that up to now the public schools of the District of Columbia were condemning the poor and the black children in that community to the social and economic junk heap. These schools had a program and that program was called "Program to Retardation." Little children who came to the public schools in the first grade expecting it to be a window on the world found it to be a door slammed in their faces. It is this that concerned us. While the educators discussed homogeneous, heterogeneous grouping and other high sounding concepts, the children that were lost today could not be picked up tomorrow.

We thought that the best way to deal with this whole question of education was not in technical terms or worrying about whether or not there was rank and linear correlation between the concept of what the poor child distribution might be, whether it was heterogeneous or whether it was homogeneous, what we were concerned about was Johnny learning to read. Could he read or count? When he came out of public education in 1970 or 1975 was he going to thrive in that world or was he going to barely be able to survive? We believe that the data showed that he was going to hardly be able to survive. We were very much

concerned that in the Washington community over a five-year period, as we looked at the data, it showed that 54 percent of our children were dropping out of public education, that the primary concerns of the bureaucracy in the public schools was discipline. They did not know that if they had made education interesting that part of the problems of discipline might have disappeared. Discipline was defined in terms of rule of the gun, the policeman patrolling the hall, and a segregation of children on the basis of the way they looked and on the basis of the economic level of the neighborhood they lived in.

Now I have brought with me some great big charts which you cannot see from back there. I am sorry that you cannot because pictures are worth a thousand words, but, still I will refer to these charts and try not to bore you with statistics. I just want to set the framework within which we charged that the track system in the District of Columbia is unconstitutional. The United States District Court has called it unconstitutional. The House of Representatives has said that it should be removed and that it is a failure. It has been attacked by every educator that we know that has studied and looked into the problem. The track system has been completely discredited in this community, so we are not discussing its merits. As far as we are concerned, it would be like discussing the merits of the law of gravity. It is a fact that it is unconstitutional and that it has been removed from our school system. The world is round and we do not intend to

return to the good old days of education in the District of Columbia when steak was a dime a pound because there are too many of us that remember when you had to work all day to get a dime.

Now I would like to point to, for example, a chart which I have back here which you can't see. I am not going to dwell on this, but this is a chart showing median family income for pupil placement in the D.C. senior high schools in the school year 1963-64. In the community where the median family income was \$3,872 a year, 90 percent of the children were in what was called the basic or the general track, and those tracks had curriculum which did not lead to college education. There is a star at the top of this chart which you can't see and this mark on the left show that there were no "honors" track in that community. In other words, the administrators of this track system assumed that because these children were poor, there was not even a single poor child in that community who could go into an "honors" track, so there was no "honors" track. If you look at this section on the chart, you will see that as the median family income increased, the percent of children in the basic and general track decreased so that when you examine the districts where the median family income was \$10,000 a year, 88 percent of the pupils were in the honors and regular track leading to college education. These two little stars show that there was no basic and general track because this was a neighborhood where the parents rode herd on the public schools, and they would not stand for the systematic destruction of their children.

I have another chart here that is quite interesting. There is a top bar and a bottom bar. The top bar shows that 70 percent of the white children in the District of Columbia public school system in the year 1965-66 were in schools that offered honors curriculum. They could get an honors or regular curriculum while the bottom bar shows that 84 percent of the black children in the District of Columbia public schools were in schools that did not offer honors curriculum and which did not offer regular educational processes. Now there are 145,000 children in the District of Columbia or approximately that many. Ninety percent of the poor black children were in the general and basic track. I think now the black school population in the District of Columbia is just about 97 percent. These children were put into these basic tracks without testing. They were placed on the basis of the way they looked, on the basis of their race, and on the basis of their socio-economic position. I am not going to ask you to take my word for it.

If you bear with me, I have taken some clips from the Washington Post which are very interesting. They deal with the question, which was raised in court before Judge Skelly Wright, of how these students were placed in the basic track and the results of a testing program which was instituted after the case began. These tests showed that two-thirds of the students in the basic and general tracks actually were incorrectly placed. The superintendent of schools at that time himself admitted the error and instituted a crash testing program

to save those children whom he had predetermined to social and economic doom. "Blue-collar children," he called them. That was what they called the basic tract, and this was what was being done to the children in the District of Columbia.

Within the framework of this same school system not only was the track system distributed on the basis of race and the children grouped on the basis of race and economics but the teachers were assigned on the basis of race and economics. In the District of Columbia public school system we have two kinds of teachers -- temporary teachers and permanent teachers, and according to the school administration at that time there were three kinds of temporary teachers. There was a teacher who was teaching on a temporary job; there was a teacher who was teaching on a teacher's job who was on leave; and there were temporary teachers who had not, or could not, pass the examination to become permanent. Seventy-eight percent of those teachers were in the last category. They could not or had not passed the examination to become permanent. Now how were they distributed? They were distributed in the neighborhoods on the basis of economics, and I have another chart. I won't dwell on this chart but you can see the high bar. It shows that in the neighborhood where the median family income was \$3,999 a year that something like 46 percent of the teachers were temporary, while over in the extreme neighborhood where the median family income was \$10,000 and primarily white, about 23 percent of the teachers were temporary, and as the median family income went up and the color of the neighborhood changed, there were fewer temporary teachers. Now I

am not here to pass any judgment on teachers. I am not an educator, and I would not know a good teacher if he rose up and hit me in the eye, but I am suspicious of the fact that all of the temporary teachers were located in the poor black community. I raised this question in the United States District Court based on this chart and the court agreed that there was teacher segregation and that these temporary teachers were not as good by the administration's, not my definition, as the permanent teachers who had tenure, time, more education, theoretically made more money, and, therefore, were theoretically better teachers.

Within the framework of this same school system atmosphere, how did they spend the money, what was the distribution of the expenditure per pupil? Was it, too, distributed on the basis of race? Was it, too, distributed on the basis of economic level of the neighborhood? Indeed it was, and I have another chart. This chart simply shows that where the median family income was low, the expenditure per pupil was low and the expenditure -- and this was in the school year 1965 -- where it was \$3,999 a year, it was \$309. When it got over to where the median family income was \$11,000 a year, the expenditure per pupil was \$438. In fact, the United States District Court showed that as the family median went up, the neighborhood got whiter; that the expenditure per pupil on the average was \$100 more per pupil in those schools

than in the poor center-city schools. In some schools we had situations where west of Rock Creek Park, which we call west of the "cellophane curtain," where the median family income was very high and the population was white, they had schools with expenditure per pupil as high as \$725 per child, while in the center city in the poor schools they had expenditures per pupil that equaled \$211 per child.

It is within the framework of this kind of education system that we went to see Judge Skelly Wright and the United States District Court about the systematic destruction of our children and "Programmed Retardation." Now what is the result? We don't know anything about education. We don't care about "heterogeneous" and "homogeneous" or "correlation." All that we know is that our children are failing. Statistics were recently published on the District of Columbia Public School reading score. At the fourth grade level, 62 percent of the children were reading below the national norm, and by the time they got to the sixth grade level, 80 percent were reading below the national norm. They were being de-educated. We charged in the United States District Court that it was incarceration, not education, to take a child at nine o'clock and sit him down and hold him until three o'clock and not fulfill the function of teaching in public education. We were angry about this and we took it to the United States District Court and the Court declared that this method of homogeneous ability grouping was unconstitutional because it was based on race, because it was based on economic level of the neighborhood.

We found another very important fact about public education in our city -- distribution of books and supplies. West of Rock Creek Park, behind the "cellophane curtain," in the high income neighborhood, there were five books per child. In the center city there was one book for every six children and they were old books published in 1956. This is what we found. We found that west of Rock Creek Park there was not a single school without a library while in the center city over half the elementary schools did not have libraries. There were no libraries.

We found that west of Rock Creek Park the schools were in fairly good condition and had been kept up. Now I don't blame the parents west of the Park. They rode herd on the administration in our city and made them give them good schools. Some of us who have been victims of oppression for a long time and don't know the necessity of riding herd, depend on the democratic system to give us our due, and we are finding out that we can't get it that way. If you have to be a gadfly, if you have to raise hell, then you have to be a thorn in the side of this bureaucratic school administration which exists in our city. This we have set out to be.

Now I have concerned myself with education as a lay person. We did a study of public education in 1964 in my community. We laid the foundation for this school case that we filed. Mr. John Sessions, who is now a member of the Board of Education and an educator in his own

right, and I got together and he did the education part and I did the economics part. We came up with discrimination based on economics and race. We sent this finding to the Superintendent of Schools and we got nowhere with it. I then decided to call a school boycott, and I would have been successful if it had not been for what I called a few pasteurized colored leaders in the community who were afraid to come out and deal with this problem. So the boycott failed and the Superintendent and I got together and talked. I saved face by announcing that there was going to be change, but there was no change and I knew that there would be no change, except that I, too, was a pasteurized demagogic civil rights leader looking for a newspaper victory.

So in 1965 I went to the House Committee on Education and Labor and said, "Will you hold hearings on public education and enable us to get our hands on the data which we need to go to the United States District Court and deal with this dastardly track system which is spoiling our children?" The House Committee on Education and Labor held a hearing and they condemned the public schools in a report by Mr. Roman Pucinski, who is the representative from Illinois and who is chairman of the subcommittee. He recommended then before the court decree that the schools should eliminate and do away with the track system because it was destroying our poor and black children. By the way, in order to obtain that hearing, I had to go around again to the

pasteurized leaders. We had to create interest in the community; we had to get the community angered by what was going on. Three other mountebanks, including myself, got together and decided that we would seize the Board of Education. I went up on the platform while the Board was meeting and sat down in the chair and declared myself Superintendent. Another demagogue or mountebank declared himself to be the chairman of the board. Another claimed to be vice chairman. The Board of Education rose to the occasion and acted exactly as we hoped they would act. They resisted us, they got confused among themselves as we sat there and smiled. Needless to say that we were carted off to jail and tried and convicted for unlawful entry, but it succeeded in arousing the community. The effrontery of this mountebank group coming to a dignified institution of education and pulling off such an ungainly stunt! But it made the community mad. We got the hearings and we filed the case and we won it.

It is now before the United States Court of Appeals. I don't know what the decision is going to be, but if they change a comma I am going to take it on to the Supreme Court.¹

¹On January 21, 1969, the United States Court of Appeals rendered a decision upholding Judge J. Skelly Wright's ruling. Judge Wright's decree was upheld on every major point.

Now, finally, we were concerned with the School Board in our community also. Because here was a School Board which in the end was primarily black in appearance but which was systematically voting on behalf of the destruction of black children. Here were the "middle-class Negroes" who were trying to do what they thought the white community wanted done. So they voted systematically and without fail against the children in the community. Therefore, I filed a suit in the United States Court of Appeals, sued all of the judges at the United States District Court level; charged them with conflict of interest because they appointed the school board. I said you can't sit on the case because you have some stake in upholding your judgment, so they were eliminated. We went before the Court of Appeals, and we argued the case and we lost it on a split decision, and it was at the Supreme Court when Congress passed this lousy law giving us an elected school board.¹ I am sorry about that because we were asking for the right to float bonds; we were asking for the right to collect taxes, and we were asking for complete autonomy as a Board of Education. This new board to which I am elected is a helpless group of people who will still have to look to Congress for appropriations and for money.

¹Hobson was elected last November to the new School Board (the first not to be appointed), winning the largest vote of any candidate.

We have what is known as a line item budget which, anybody knows who is familiar with budgeting, went out with the kerosene lamp. I don't know what kind of change we are going to be able to bring about, but one thing that I can say about the District of Columbia and public education is that the track system which was outlawed by the United States District Court and which was systematically destroying children is dead. It will never come back.

There are those of us on the Board of Education now who are not so much of a gentleman or so much of a lady that we will go along with business-as-usual in education. I think the winds are blowing in that direction of change. I am told by a majority of the elected Board members that I may be elected chairman. I am not a politician. I am not a diplomat. I don't know how many people I am going to make angry between now and the time for that election, and if I can keep quiet and stay out of town maybe by the time this election comes off, I will be Board Chairman. Now I have sounded angry and I have sounded negative and indeed I am angry. It is very easy to criticize; it is very easy to say what isn't working. I am now faced with the question of what are you going to do to change it. It is a big question, and I am glad that I had the opportunity to come here today to be with you. I will be asking all kinds of people questions which may seem ridiculous, but all I am trying to do is get information to make the District of Columbia Public Schools a better school district.

THE WRIGHT DECISION—A COURT'S
DEFINITION OF EQUALITY IN
EDUCATION

by

Carl F. Hansen, former Superintendent
District of Columbia Public Schools

The workshop theme is ability grouping--educational, social, and legal perspectives. By inference, the statement implies that the three aspects of the problem are independent of each other. The suggestion is that ability grouping could be educationally sound, but at the same time socially or legally unacceptable. Clearly, an educationally sound program could not at the same time be socially unsound. Paradoxically, events have shown that ability grouping methods that are both educationally and socially necessary may be judged by the courts to be legally improper.

Because of the interrelationship of the three factors, educational, social, and legal, the organizers of this workshop must have expected that each speaker, though he would have something to say about the three aspects of ability grouping, would dwell upon one as a point of major emphasis.

Although the focus of this discussion is on the legal aspects, I intend also to make clear-cut statements of position on the educational and social significance of ability grouping. It will be necessary

for me to do this to give support to my views on the Wright decision which made the use of the track system--and any other system of ability grouping--illegal in the nation's capital.

First, no matter what hope may be held out for complete individualization of instruction, the major part of the school effort will continue to require group instruction.

Second, group instruction requires a careful placement of pupils according to their characteristics and needs. For example, pupils with severe orthopedic handicaps may require special school and class placements if their needs are to be met. The same principle applies to academically gifted pupils, to the educable and trainable mentally handicapped, to the blind and deaf and those with less severe sight and hearing handicaps, and to those talented in music, art and athletics.

Group instruction, and therefore grouping for instruction, are here to stay. No matter how one may yearn for total individualization of instruction where for each pupil there is a personalized curriculum and program of instruction, he ought to accept as a reality that education of this kind is impossible in the public schools--and possibly, even quite undesirable.

To move briefly to the social meaning of ability grouping, my view is that what is necessary automatically becomes socially desirable. An illustration from industry will clarify this point. A paper mill, for example, may discharge pollutants into the river, causing it to be useless for recreational purposes. Controls, however, may be

set up to prevent the socially harmful pollution of the stream. The manufacture of paper is a necessity that cannot be avoided in modern society. The socially harmful aspects of the operation, however, can be controlled and perhaps eliminated.

My position then is that ability grouping, as in the case of other forms of grouping, is an educational necessity. If any elements of the practice of grouping are socially destructive, these elements should be corrected. The problem is not going to be solved by closing down the factory, as in the case of the paper mill. It will be corrected by adjusting the methodology. Grouping for instruction is both educationally and socially necessary although the manner of the use of the technique rather than its substance may require study and modification.

Let us move on, then, to a consideration of that form of grouping known as ability grouping. In most states, legislative provisions, backed up by funds and appropriations are made for special education. Very early, state legislation provided for the blind and the deaf. In more recent years, state legislatures have encouraged the establishment within local schools of special programs for the mentally handicapped. In many states funds are allocated for special education departments and services. The purpose is to stimulate local school districts to set up special classes and services for the mentally retarded pupils. In addition to action taken by state legislatures to provide for and encourage development of programs for children who need special grouping, most school boards throughout the country have

established special education programs on their own authority. I know of no major school system anywhere that does not offer special opportunities for children with mental handicaps. Similarly most school systems have organized special opportunities for the academically gifted. It is important to note that no legislative body with the exception of the Washington, D. C. Board of Education has prohibited the setting up of special curriculum offerings for the slow and the advanced students.

Using their legislative authority, state legislatures and boards of education have generally taken action to set up ability grouping programs. Such action is clearly within the constitutional authority granted these two bodies. Within the power reserved to them by the Federal Constitution, they may properly set up systems of organization for teaching.

In summary of this point, constitutionally supported legislative bodies have always determined whether or not there should be any form of ability grouping. The conclusion to be stressed is that they are not mandated to supply special grouping, but they, and they alone, determine the policy in this respect.

Now comes upon the scene the Wright decision in Hobson v. Hansen ordering the Board of Education in the District of Columbia to abolish the track system. The decision offered no reservations, no alternatives. It simply and dogmatically dictated that the track system be abandoned. Nothing was said about what it is that is being abandoned,

except inferentially, that the definition in my book on the subject, which was entered as part of the record in the trial, would apply.¹

For the first time in the history of American jurisprudence a court has declared in-school ability grouping unconstitutional. For the first time a court has imposed upon a board of education its views as to grouping for instruction. In doing this, it clearly usurped a legislative function properly belonging to boards of education and the state legislatures which create them. The heart of the matter is that the court is making law rather than interpreting it, thus destroying, in this instance, the checks and balances which serve to protect the people against the tyranny of government.

The action has made of Judge Wright, a super school superintendent, and of the court itself, a board of education. As though the court recognized its lack of expertise, it arrogantly assumed the right to second guess the bodies legally responsible for school management.

The action of the court in respect to ability grouping is only one phase of its interference with the operation of public education. It deals also with social behavior in such scope as to defy imagination.

¹ Hansen, Carl F. Four Track Curriculum for Today's High Schools. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1964.

In my book, Danger in Washington, I introduce the chapter on the Wright decision in this manner: "The people who say that God is dead are wrong. He is currently sitting on the Federal bench in Washington D. C. His name is J. Skelly Wright. In the case of Hobson v. Hansen he issued a de facto school segregation opinion that, if allowed to stand unchallenged, will touch the lives of every citizen in this country."

The major premise of the court ruling is that socially and racially homogeneous schools damage the minds and spirits of all children--black, white, rich or poor--and prevent the accomplishment of democratic education whether the segregation occurs by law or fact. In a measure, this conclusion forms the rationale for the edict against ability grouping. It supports the conclusion that school systems must assume the responsibility for bringing about racial and economic balance in their classrooms and in their schools. If they fail to do that, they deny children the equal opportunity secured for them by the Constitution. Not only must school authorities bus children, gerrymander boundary lines, build educational parks, pair contiguous schools to bring about racial and economic mix, but they must also put them in classrooms together along the same lines.

The decision clearly goes far beyond the simple act of abolishing the tract system. But on this score alone it invokes prohibitions upon the Washington Board of Education that have unbelievable implications. As the opinion becomes ruling case law it will eventually restrict in the same manner all public school boards of education throughout the country.

The actual effect of the abolition order upon the District of Columbia Board of Education and the operation of its school system deserves concrete description.

1. The local school board may not, under the court edict, maintain an honors curriculum. The honors sequence beginning at the eighth grade level, requiring 18 Carnegie units for completion, cannot now or anytime in the future be offered upon the will of the board of education alone. Unless, that is, the Wright decision is reversed.

The selective character of the honor sequence is also prohibited. By implication the school cannot on its own authority deny admission to any course no matter how unprepared the student may be for it. The effect is that total heterogeneity must replace the effort to bring gifted children together for the advantage of specialized, challenging, peer-related instruction. As a part of the track system the honors program is now forbidden in Washington by court order.

2. When the court ordered the elimination of the track system, it effectively foreclosed the board of education's right to offer a college preparatory curriculum. As a part of the track program, the college preparatory sequence offered nothing that most school systems have not provided for almost as long as they have been in existence. Generally, admission to college preparatory classes is selective. The student has to show promise of ability to do algebra, English, mathematics and science at a college preparatory level of difficulty. Under court order, now, neither the college preparatory sequence nor the selective counseling that goes along with admission of pupils to

college preparatory subjects is permitted in the District of Columbia. Standards for admission to any class and for teaching in that class are now non-existent. Full equality now means that all pupils will be taught alike, follow the same curriculum, do as much as they can or want to, following the easiest route to the high school diploma. The concept of equality of educational opportunity as something related to need and ability has now given way to an undifferentiated curriculum attempting to be all things to all people. As it has always happened where the single track curriculum is being used, teachers make their own adjustments, do their own grouping, and do as much as they can with the unteachable pupils assigned to them. An illustration points up what is done. A mother described how the non-ability grouping system works. Formerly in an honors group, her daughter is now enjoying the benefits of association with slow learners. "The teacher," the mother said, "apparently teaches the five or six bright children in the class. She forgets the rest." Then she added, "My daughter said that everyone knows what is happening now. The bright are being taught; the not so bright are being forgotten so long as they behave in class."

What the court failed to understand, and what most civil rights militants can't be expected to know, is that teachers have always done their own ability grouping. The way they teach and their methods of grading, differentiate success levels within each class. In classes with wide ranges of ability, neglect of one group or another always occurs, simply because teachers cannot plan individual curriculums for each pupil in their classes.

3. The general curriculum, an integral part of the track system, is also abolished--or presumably so, if the court order is being followed. In the general curriculum, common in most secondary schools, $7\frac{1}{2}$ units are defined, and $8\frac{1}{2}$ are elective. Now, unless the Washington school principals are ignoring the meaning of the court order, each pupil's program is developed without reference to requirements, except as to the total units required for graduation.

4. The basic track called the special academic curriculum was organized for severely retarded pupils. Since 1906 the Washington public schools have provided special grouping for children with severe learning difficulties. Offered particularly at the elementary level, special classes were provided for the so-called atypical children. In the development of the track system, special opportunity was offered pupils into and through high school, with an increasing number of trained teachers being developed, with small classes and appropriate curriculum content being made available. With the abolition of the track system by court order there can be no special grouping for academically retarded pupils. It appears that the school system in the nation's capital is frantically trying to find ways to group for the needs of children with exceptional learning difficulties without openly defying the court. Ostensibly, the track system with its honors, college preparatory, general, and special programs has been dutifully interred. Like the ghost of Banquo, however, it stalks about, and my hunch is that it is far more alive than dead. Its demise has been a

semantic one, and its resurrection for all to see awaits only a change in climate, including a removal of the heavy atmosphere caused by court interference into school management. I get the impression now that even the court is content not to inquire too specifically into the manner in which the Washington school staff is executing its orders. Perhaps the saving element in the farcical effort of a court to stipulate how classes should be organized for instruction is its total inability to enforce its ruling.

I do not want particularly here to develop my customary defense of ability grouping. My main concern has been, and this is my primary reason for giving up my job to appeal the Wright decision, the denial to a board of education of its constitutional authority to make such decisions for itself. If a school board cannot organize on ability lines how far will the restrictions placed upon it ultimately go? If, as an example, a school system cannot organize a curriculum to which only the academically gifted are admitted, can it set up special schools for science and the performing arts, for vocational and technical training? Can it screen out untalented aspirants from membership on its athletic teams or its musical organizations?

If a school board cannot set up a special curriculum for the educable mentally retarded, can it provide special classes for the severely mentally retarded, for the blind, the deaf, the physically handicapped? How long will it be before special classes for the socially maladjusted will be frowned upon by the courts as in violation of the equal rights doctrine? How long will it be before testing for

achievement, for mental ability, for musical promise, will be ruled as unconstitutional, if they have not, in fact, already been so judged in the Wright opinion? If testing for school placement is unconstitutional, how long will it be before college admissions tests are ruled out? Civil service examinations? Examinations for admission to the practice of law and medicine?

So far I have concentrated mainly on the Wright decision in relation to the Board's right to handle fundamental educational problems. An even more far reaching aspect of the decision is the imposition upon a board of education of an affirmative responsibility to achieve racial balance by faculty assignment, and to bring about, by all means available to it, an effective mixing by race and economic class.

After a series of at least eight court actions dealing with the issue, this is the first time a judicial ruling has declared that de facto segregation by race, and not only by race, but by social or income level, is unconstitutional. You've got to look around a bit to find anything more far reaching than this, or more impossible to carry out without resorting to totalitarian tactics. The court has said to the board of education in the nation's capital, "Use every means at hand to integrate, and report to me what your plans are."

In my judgement there are six main reasons for rejecting the Wright decision:

- "1. It is a bad thing to use children to achieve social reforms that adults to date have been unwilling to accomplish.

2. It is the purpose of the schools to educate the young for adult decision making rather than to reconstruct society in the image of Washington's utopian dreamers.

3. The system of local control of public education has proved to be the surest guarantee of liberty, and court decrees that improperly vitiate such local control endanger American democracy.

4. From the utilitarian point of view, the court has arrived at a constitutional conclusion that cannot be enforced, because it treats a symptom rather than a cause and is, in addition, so clothed in vagueness that no board of education can carry out the mandate without producing public chaos.

5. All-embracing judicial decisions, as in the case of the Wright opinion, which circumscribe local control of education ought to be fully evaluated by the appellate courts, including the Supreme Court, before they become the law in any jurisdiction.

6. The Wright decision proposes a continuing exercise of control upon the D.C. Board of Education, and by citation to other jurisdictions, that is limitless in time and scope, and hence a threat to free public education, not only in Washington, but throughout the country and not only now but forever."¹

¹ Hansen, Carl F. *Danger in Washington*. Parker Publishing Co., West Nyack, N. Y. 1968. p. 105

EDITORIAL BOARD

Administrative Leadership is now under the direction of an editorial board composed of students and staff members in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota. Current members of the editorial board are

William M. Ammentorp

W. Ray Cross

Harold F. Janneck

Marjorie L. Niehart

Harry L. Summerfield

TAPES OF
SCHOOLMEN'S DAY
LECTURES
available

PLEASE WRITE THE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
203 Burton Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

MK
7/15/69

Administrative

Leadership

Metropolitan Planning

by

JANNECK

DAVIS

MAAS

MUELLER

The seal of the University of Minnesota is visible behind the author names. It features a circular design with the text 'UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA' around the perimeter and a central emblem.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Volume V

May 1969

Number 2

introduction

Today, more than ever before in history, the American people are being assailed by the media with news of impending doom in the "sick, sick cities" of this country. Pictures appear on the glossy surface of the front covers of popular magazines depicting the pollution of the air above these centers in which millions of people live. Governors' committees are being formed to study the effects of water pollution on the continuing urbanization of our population. Mass transit has become the topic of the day in many of the major cities.

Somewhere in all this scuffling of human thought and effort there is emerging a voice involved not with material things like streets, bridges, industry, and transit systems, but one expressing concern with the human element -- with the children of the city. Note now that consideration is not given to the children from the so-called "core city" alone, but those in the fringe areas as well, those that

live in the suburbs as well as those in the ghettos. Basic to much of this activity and voice is the concern perhaps best expressed in that cliché "equality of educational opportunity". Parallel to this, is a thought and goal of more recent origin -- expressed as "equality of educational responsibility".

It is to this latter type of metropolitanism that this issue of Administrative Leadership is addressed: Metropolitanism in Education. In this instance, the term "metropolitanism" is defined as "a process of action and planning," action and planning incorporating the coordinated efforts of people and organizations from within and from outside the educational establishment.

The three authors who have contributed to this issue collate, as well as add to, the body of knowledge currently available regarding this rather broad subject. Each of them has been chosen for the unique effort and contribution made in this new area of educational activity. This issue of Administrative Leadership is designed to focus attention, even here in a relatively rural state, on the growing needs of the metropolitan areas throughout this country.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H.P. Janneck". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Mr. Harold Janneck is a member of the Editorial Board of Administrative Leadership and a graduate student in the Department of Educational Administration who will receive the degree of Doctor of Education at the June graduation.

**A METROPOLITAN REGIONAL
SCHOOL DISTRICT — A PROPOSAL**

by

DONALD E. DAVIS
Associate Professor,
University of Minnesota

The purpose of this article is to propose, in detail, the creation, structure and operation of a regional school district to serve the seven-county Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

The rationale for the proposal is reflected in the bibliographical references and is not developed herein. The intent of the proposal is to provide a basis for thorough and informed discussion of this issue which for some time has been alluded to, but not directly joined. There is no presumption that this proposal should be adopted as is, but rather that realistic consideration be given by all relevant parties to this significant issue in the development of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Governance of the Metropolitan Regional School District

The governing body of the Metropolitan Regional School District shall be a nine-member Metropolitan Education Commission.

Members shall be elected from the seven counties on a ratio corresponding to the Minnesota legislative districts now in existence.

B. Educational Policies

The Metropolitan Education Commission shall establish general educational policy for the governance of all public educational programs in the seven-county area of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington. The Commission shall be the sole authority for policies germane to its operational and coordinative functions. Local boards of education shall develop policies, for approval by the Commission, for those instructional areas and related services for which they have responsibility.

C. Educational Planning

The Commission shall have total responsibility for developing, implementing and coordinating all educational planning in the seven-county area. This planning will include, but not be limited to continuous population research, projection and population mobility patterns.

D. Local District Boundaries

Boundaries of Local School Districts and Attendance Areas Within Districts -- to assure the effective utilization of available school facilities and provide access to appropriate educational programs, the Metropolitan Education Authority shall be empowered to alter local school district boundaries, eliminate ineffective districts and to adjust attendance areas within districts. The Commission shall establish procedures for public hearings prior to deci-

sions on such change. Alterations in local school district boundaries and/or attendance areas may be initiated by the Commission, by local school boards or by citizens in any community.

E. Educational Program Research and Evaluation

The Commission shall establish and finance a complete program of educational research covering all aspects of programs under its jurisdiction.

F. Inter-governmental Relations

The Commission shall be required to develop relations with all Federal, State, Metropolitan and Local governmental units for the effective coordination between educational programs and other public services.

G. Relations with Other Agencies

The Commission shall establish coordination with any agency, public or private, educational or other where such coordination will enhance the educational programs of either body. The Commission shall be responsible for the determination that private educational programs are at least equivalent in quality of such programs in public schools and shall provide for sharing of Commission services, programs and facilities to students attending private schools at no cost to the student or the private agency.

H. Relationship With the Minnesota State Department of Education

In all aspects the relationship between the Commission and the Minnesota State Department shall be the same as the current relationship between the State Department and an Independent School District.

I. Purchasing

The Commission shall provide centralized purchasing, receipt, storage inventory and distribution of all educational supplies and materials.

J. Administrative and Management Service Requirements of the Metropolitan Education Commission

Financial accounting and audit--The Commission shall provide all fiscal accounting services and shall provide local school districts with budget control information.

II. TAXING POWERS AND FINANCIAL AID DISTRIBUTION

A. Taxing Authority

The Commission shall be empowered to levy all local property taxes in the seven-county metropolitan area for the support of schools. Local school districts shall have no taxing authority for any purpose.

B. Property Assessment

Authority shall be empowered to establish equal property assessment practices on a metropolitan-wide basis.

D. State and Federal Support

The Metropolitan Education Commission shall be the sole public school authority empowered to receive state aid and federal funds for the support of public schools in the seven-county metropolitan area.

E. Distribution of Funds

The Metropolitan Education Commission shall establish procedures for the development of annual educational budgets by local school districts. Such budgets shall be based on educational needs. The Metropolitan Education Commission shall approve such budgets individually and in aggregate and shall administer such budgets.

III. EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

A. Educational Facilities Planning

The Commission shall have the responsibility for planning all educational facilities for the programs under its jurisdiction. Adequate coordination between the Commission and local districts affected shall be required.

B. Location of Educational Facilities

The Commission shall be responsible for the site selection and acquisition for all educational facilities in relation to the total educational needs of the seven-county area.

C. School Construction

The Commission shall be empowered to construct such educational facilities as are required for operation and conduct of all educational programs under its jurisdiction. Such powers shall pertain to new construction, remodeling, renovation, and replacement of school facilities.

D. Bonding Authority

The Commission shall be empowered with such bonding authority as is required to provide adequate educational facilities and levy such taxes as are required for the retirement of such bonds. Upon establishment, the Commission shall assume all outstanding bonded indebtedness of the local school districts in the seven-county metropolitan area.

E. Use of Educational Facilities

The Commission shall be required to provide for the utilization of school facilities by all community agencies. The Commission shall be empowered to lease, rent or otherwise provide for such facilities utilization.

F. Maintenance of Educational Facilities

The Commission shall be responsible for all maintenance and repair of educational facilities.

G. Custodial Services

The local district shall be responsible for custodial services in educational facilities in the district.

IV. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Primary responsibility and authority for the development and implementation of instructional programs shall reside with the Board of Education of local school districts. General policies shall be established by the Metropolitan Education Commission. Authority reserved to the Metropolitan Education Commission on matters closely associated with instructional programs are delineated in the Tables of Powers and Responsibilities.

Instructional Programs to be Carried Out by the Metropolitan Education

Commission Special Education -- The Commission shall develop, establish and operate all special education programs within the seven-county metropolitan area. The Commission shall be required to provide full educational services to all handicapped children ages one through twenty-one regardless of the nature of the handicap. The sole intent of such programs shall be the movement of handicapped students into regular school programs as early as educationally advisable.

Vocational Education Programs at a Level Sufficient to Meet the Needs of All Pupils in the Seven-County Area

The Commission shall be required to develop, establish and operate two-year, post-high school vocational-technical education programs, based on educational and social needs and shall provide adequate facilities for such programs.

TABLE OF POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Metropolitan Education Commission andLocal School Districts

Responsibility	Locus of Authority	
	Metropolitan Education Commission	Local School District
I. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES		
A. Budget Preparation	X	X
B. Budget Approval	X	X
C. Budget Control	X	
D. Fiscal Accounting	X	
E. Audit	X	
F. Payroll	X	
G. Purchasing	X	
H. Data Processing	X	
II. TAXING POWERS AND FINANCIAL AID DISTRIBUTION		
A. Taxing Authority	X	
B. Property Assessment	X	
C. Other Taxing Powers	X	
D. State and Federal Support	X	
E. Distribution of Funds	X	
III. EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES		
A. Educational Facilities Planning	X	
B. Location of Education Facilities	X	
C. School Construction	X	
D. Bonding Authority	X	
E. Use of Educational Facilities	X	
F. Maintenance of Educational Facilities	X	
G. Custodial Services		X

TABLE OF POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Metropolitan Education Commission and
Local School Districts

Responsibility	Locus of Authority	
	Metropolitan Education Commission	Local School District
IV. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS		
A. Instructional Staff		
1. Personnel Policies	X	
2. Salary scales and fringe benefits	X	
3. Recruitment	X	X
4. Selection	policy	X
5. Placement	policy	X
6. Evaluation	policy	X
7. Transfer	policy	X
8. Dismissal	policy	X
9. Professional Development	X	X
10. Supervision of Instruction	policy	X
11. Collective Bargaining	X	X
B. Instructional Supplies		
Library books	policy	X
Textbooks	policy	X
Classroom supplies	policy	X
Equipment	policy	X
Instructional Materials Centers	X	X
C. Curriculum & Courses of Study		
Teaching Methods	policy	X
Experimentation	policy	X
Extra-Curricular	policy	X
Courses of study		X
D. Ancillary services		
Non Prof. Pers. Policies	X	
Secretarial	policy	X
Teacher Aides	policy	X
Radio and T.V.	X	
E. Pupil Personnel		
Guidance	policy	X
Attendance	policy	X
Health Services	X	
Food Services	X	
Transportation	X	
F. Special Education	X	
G. Vocational-Technical Education		
In-high school vocational programs	policy	X
Post high school vocational-technical programs	X	

SELECTED READINGS

Alkin, Marvin C. Revenues For Education in Metropolitan Areas (Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, The Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Cunningham, Luvern L. Organization of Education in Metropolitan Areas (Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, The Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Davis, Donald E. et al. Problems and Issues in Governing Education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (An Analysis of Alternatives in the Formulation of a Metropolitan Education Authority for the Twin Cities Area by a Graduate Seminar in Educational Administration) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Administration, 1967.

Hooker, Clifford P., Mueller, Van D., and Davis, Donald E. Cooperation Among School Districts in a Metropolitan Area: A Case Study (Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, The Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Minar, David W. Interactions of School and Local Non-School Governments (Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education, The Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

**METROPOLITAN SCHOOL
DISTRICT REORGANIZATION: A
QUESTION FOR EDUCATION ?**

by
JOHN M. MAAS
Assistant Professor
University of Wisconsin

Reorganization is a word which has been used in recent years with reference to small school districts in more rural areas. Usually the reorganization was aimed at developing a more educationally functional and an economically more efficient unit. While much remains to be done on this level, administrators, teachers, parents and students are becoming increasingly aware that even within metropolitan areas there are problems which may require new organizational patterns and ultimately a new definition of the school district. The genesis of the problem, though by no means the major portion of it, lies in the city.

Cities have traditionally been unique dwelling places. Usually they have housed many divergent societal groups. This divergence has created several opportunities for man to develop himself. C.A. Doxiadis expressed it this way:

"Since the beginning of his history man has been striving to live in more than one scale; he formed families, tribes, villages, cities, nations, and leagues of all these, and he always tried to create larger social and physical scales within which he could develop even better. In this process he never eliminated the scales and levels of

a lower order - he always enriched his space and never impoverished it. Our era is the first during which the opposite is happening."¹

The modern city represents at once the extremes of our society. It houses within its environs our collections of culture and heritage. Here we find the museums, symphonies, universities, and seats of government, as well as the major economic institutions including banks, warehouses, retail centers, and manufacturing plants. In our cities we find the concentrations of the economically deprived and the socially outcast as well as many of the economically enriched and the socially prominent. In yet another dimension within our cities, we find the organized crime and graft which preys on the economically deprived and uses the legitimate institutions to invest and develop its excess capital. What the city contains as well as extremes is a middle; at least in the social sense. In recent years the middle has softened and begun to melt away in order to seek opportunities away from some of the extremes of the city. The suburban community was primarily a "middle phenomena" which may have sought to avoid some of the political, social duress and control exerted by the extremes of the city community. The early suburban community was attached essentially in an economic manner to the city since its members tended to commute there for employment.

The metropolitan phenomena, that is the integration of the city and its surrounding units, not only economically but culturally and socially also, has raised anew the question of the integrated society.

1. C. A. Doxiadis, "Man and the Space Around Him," Saturday Review, December 14, 1968, pp. 21 - 23.

The Bureau of Census recognized this by "defining the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) as a city of 50,000 or more with its county and any contiguous county that is economically and socially integrated with the central county. A number of SMSAs contain two or more cities, such as Minneapolis - St. Paul, Philadelphia - Camden, and San Francisco - Oakland - Berkeley - Richmond."²

The metropolitan unit, to the writer's view, can be essentially described by the characteristic of interdependence. At the base level, this implies that single units cannot exist independently of other units. This is most easily illustrated through the examination of things rather than people.

Highways, our major means of transportation, extend throughout a metropolitan area. Their creation and existence depend on the interdependence and cooperation of many units, in this case governmental, which have jurisdiction of the highways which pass through them. Significantly, major transportation arteries come together in the city where the major economic and social base is concentrated.

Waste systems, particularly sewage, are another common link in most metropolitan areas.

Work forces, at one time passing primarily from the suburb to the city are beginning increasingly, to pass in both directions or in some cases around and through the center of the metropolitan area to work points outside the city.

Finally, taxing units in the form of county and school district cross or incorporate other governmental units within their boundaries.

2. Robert J. Havighurst, "Education in Metropolitan Areas." (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), p. 32.

These examples illustrate only a few of the complexities facing the residents of metropolitan areas. There are others, of course; urban renewal of the central city, control of the deterioration of housing beginning in some of the suburban communities, the increasing social and educational problems of all parts of the metropolitan area, and finally the previous question of interdependence among individuals, groups and governmental units within the ever-expanding metropolitan area.

The question facing administrators, school board members, the public and teachers is, what do these factors have to do with the functioning of a school district?

While one cannot expect to answer such a question thoroughly, let us explore it. For purposes of this exploration there are two basic assumptions:

1. The resources available to any school district are limited and subject to competition from governmental, business, and personal units.
2. The social, economic, and governmental forces at work in a metropolitan area affect all units in that area to some degree and add seriously to the complexity of the decision-making process at all institutional levels including education.

Alan Campbell makes this point rather succinctly: "All of the socio-economic characteristics as well as the governmental systems of metropolitan areas carry implications for the cost, the willingness to

support, and the kinds of educational service required. Growth and decline in population, the changing residence patterns, regional location, income levels and distribution, and occupational and educational patterns may have an effect on expenditures, revenues, and the resulting quality of education in metropolitan areas."³

It must be acknowledged that not all of the problems in establishing and developing education are the exclusive result of metropolitanism. Many of them could be present in any situation but these factors are compounded by the metropolitan phenomena.

Some of the factors that may be considered in the complex metropolitan question are population, mobility, income, services, income and education costs.

Population

The 1960 Census indicated that 63% of the total population resided in what it designated as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Within the SMSA's 50% of the population resided in the central cities and 50% outside in 1960. Central Cities, when annexation of other territory is excluded, remained nearly constant in the ten year period 1950-60.⁴

Population Mobility

Total population mobility, measured, as the difference between those living in the same dwelling in 1960 as compared with 1955,

3. Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, "Socioeconomic and Governmental Characteristics Related to Education," National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1968), p. 13.

4. Ibid., pp. 15 - 17.

reveal a turnover of approximately 50%. This figure was comparable to that of the suburban areas. It would be safe to predict that with more urban renewal and with the major influxes of people from other areas of the country, most cities and suburbs will show an increase in mobility patterns.

These two factors would tend to indicate that schools and school systems will be faced with a major problem in maintaining continuity of educational program for children. In addition to the continuity of program there is the underlying question of the equality of educational opportunity for students in a metropolitan area.

Income

Metropolitan areas had a higher median family income in 1959 than non-metropolitan areas. This was also true of per capita income. Within metropolitan areas there are differences between the relative poverty of the central city and that of the surrounding area based on the size of the metropolitan unit. The differences between income levels of the central city and outlying areas of smaller SMSA's (250,000 or less) is not as great as in the larger SMSA's (3,000,000+). Income differences are significant for education, not only for the amount of resources available for education but also as an indicator of people's willingness and ability to pay for education.⁵ Further, family income level is an indication of children's motivation and achievement level according to Patricia Kayo Serton's "Education and

5. Ibid., pp. 20 - 22.

Income". This income factor can be easily recognized as producing important effects on school systems in a metropolitan area. Such a factor cannot be considered unique to the central city for there are many fast growing suburban communities with little industrial or retail tax base and relatively low average individual incomes that are faced with much the same problem as a central city school system or that of a declining suburban community.

Public Service

The demand for public service has risen in all areas but particularly in the metropolitan complex. The major impact of growth coupled with the public's demand for more and better roads, garbage collection and disposal, parks, playgrounds, and recreational areas, more and better police and fire protection, as well as better social services including hospitals and schools has produced increasing demands on the tax dollar. This factor has caused increased competition for the public service dollar between various governmental units and the school district. To further complicate matters, state and federal units are also expanding services at an ever increasing rate and cost.

Educational Costs

Educational costs have begun soaring in recent years. While the most recent cause in the increasing educational expenditure has been teachers' salaries, this does not give a true picture of what has happened in the larger area of total educational expenditure.

First, the growth factor in most parts of the metropolitan area outside the central city has caused a need for

- a) New buildings and equipment
- b) Sites for present buildings and short range future growth
- c) More teachers at all levels
- d) The addition of special services as increasing numbers needing these services have been identified.
- e) A wider range of course offerings and specialized administrative and other support personnel.

Second, the new technological society we are living in has caused increased need for the schools to emphasize further education and more specialized courses at the secondary level either for entry into college or entry into the working world.

Third, the public demand for higher quality education for students has resulted in the adoption and use of new organizational forms and new programs.

Fourth, technological obsolescence as well as age have forced the remodeling or replacement of present buildings both in the central city or the older, more well established suburban communities.

Fifth, costs of contracted services and costs of non-professional personnel have also risen.

In terms of costs, the individual citizen pays for all of them including the interest on the bonds used to raise money for the building program and equipment in these new buildings. Though there are

certainly other costs involved in school district operation, those related to wages of all personnel and facilities loom the largest. Relatively small amounts are expended outside of salaries for the instructional program.

Metropolitan Development

Many of the preceding factors may be lumped into the category of metropolitan development. However, a closer examination of this process leads to some common sense conclusions.

1. In most cases, growth in an area does not occur by chance. There is planning involved and the placement of certain facilities encourages or discourages the development of housing, shopping, industrial or other areas.
2. Growth in a metropolitan area may be encouraged or discouraged totally or in specific areas by local or other government unit policy.
3. Planned growth may result in a more efficient use of limited resources.
4. Resources are limited by:
 - a) Kind of resources available
 - b) Amount of resources available
 - c) Cost of resources available
5. Resources available to residents of a metropolitan area are also limited by economic, social, legal, and governmental unit restraints. (Some governmental units are overlapping or cut across other governmental units).

6. Resources are not equally available to all residents of a metropolitan area.

The question of the availability and use of limited resources has major import for school districts in the metropolitan areas. Metropolitan planning units and governmental units are seriously considering new organizational form. The primary impetus for such forms is the growth factor. Many school districts are faced with similar problems on an individual basis in a metropolitan area. An example is the Minneapolis - St. Paul Metropolitan Area. It's Joint Program predicted 4,000,000 people for the year 2000. On the basis of enrollment growth they predicted a need for an additional 25,000 classrooms by 2000. "This means that twice as many classrooms will be built in the next thirty-three years as have been built in the past one hundred years. For comparative purposes the area now contains approximately 12,000 classrooms. Building classrooms, employing trained staff and providing high quality programs to three times as many school age children in the next 33 years makes current fiscal problems appear negligible."⁶

Obviously this growth will not be uniform. Some districts will gain and others may lose student population. A question to be faced is that of utilizing buildings and staffs properly when faced with the growth or decline of a school district. Can such events be handled on a single district basis without affecting or being affected by other school districts in the metropolitan area? Perhaps, but probably not.

6. Donald E. Davis and Associates, Problems and Issues in Governing Education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. (Minneapolis: Department of Educational Administration, May, 1967), p. 4.

The question of a school district's ability to respond to a community has been clearly stated by the Ocean Hill Brownsville controversy. In essence, control over schools, to some degree is control of the destiny of one's children. As metropolitan areas continue to grow the question of responsiveness to "communities" and the optimum working educational district will become an increasing problem.

Underlying the preceding point is the basic question of equality of educational opportunity. All of us are born inherently different in terms of physical, mental and socioeconomic status and characteristics. The question is the ability of various school and other units in a metropolitan area to respond to people to insure full measure of educational development given the other factors and influences in the educational situation. In essence, can school districts respond in metropolitan areas to allow individuals with inherently different needs a maximum of personal choice in the future?

It would seem that if school districts are to serve their students and citizens in a metropolitan setting that they must be willing to consider the short- and long-range needs of the student and total community. If school districts are to meet those needs then it would seem that an appropriate question is that of reorganization, both internally and externally. Such a question allows a school district to consider the many facets of its responsibility to the students and citizens within its metropolitan community and to the nation and world for which we share ultimate responsibility.

THE ROLE of ELEMENTARY and
SECONDARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS in
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL PLANNING

by

VAN D. MUELLER
Associate Professor
University of Minnesota

This article is intended to serve as a case study or a descriptive appraisal of the initial planning efforts by forces affected by and affecting elementary and secondary education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (Minneapolis-St. Paul). Current efforts to implement the development of alternative long-range educational plans through a cooperative, multi-functional planning model are described. Distinction is drawn between several types of planning; i.e. cooperative, management, and regulatory. The potential effectiveness of each type of planning is briefly sketched with emphasis given to the obstacles and constraints which might inhibit metropolitan-wide educational planning. The possible advantages of integrating research and development functions in long-range educational planning are considered.

Perhaps the most recurring statements by speakers and writers of the day reflect efforts to come to grips with the basic domestic problems of the last 30 years of this century through fundamental efforts to rebuild and strengthen institutions of government. The whole of the traditional structure is now undergoing reappraisal. Educators are currently faced with complex and increasingly severe

*This article is a copy of a paper which Dr. Mueller presented to the American Educational Research Association meeting at Los Angeles in February 1969.

problems brought about in part by intra-metropolitan disparities--fiscal, program, economic, and social--and by on-going federal and state activities that perpetuate these gaps. Continued fear of area-wide units and the dominant position of local school districts add to the complexity of the problems. The schema developed here will attempt to avoid two "myths": (1) that more money is a cure-all solution to educational problems; and (2) that planning is an adequate substitute for structural governmental changes.

There is, as yet, no general model or set of models which describe, explain, or predict the major components of the educational function. Planning for education can utilize statistical methods from demography and economics. In this context Davis¹ describes how the skills and knowledges of numerous disciplines; i.e., psychology, economics, sociology, political science, etc., are involved in productive educational planning. The current problem of planning for education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, therefore, is centered on organization for planning. The task of this paper is to describe how educators in the TCMA are currently engaged in what Hansen describes as the two fundamental steps in organizing for planning: "(1) creation of awareness of the need for change, and (2) establishment of specific planning mechanisms and sequences."²

What is Planning?

The problem of organizing for planning requires the development of mutual understanding of the language of the planning process by educators and planners. In order to establish some boundaries for the discussion

of planning needs and possible activities several definitions have evolved which best suit the purposes, experiences, and prejudices of Twin Citians. The kind of planning considered is shaped in part by the emphases placed on these definitions.³

Planning should bring to the aid of policy-makers and executives at all levels of education, a long term comprehensive, point of view and a realistic knowledge of the probabilities and possibilities connected with the problems on which they work. By previewing important problems, by continuous systematic study, by appraisal of conditions and means, and by periodic evaluation of the extent to which action is effective, planning guides the development and execution of decisions necessary to achieve established objectives and goals. In essence, planning gives the educators the necessary information on which to develop the best possible or probable means of achieving specific objectives and is defined as follows:

Planning is a continuous process, based upon the nature of the goals desired and the existing conditions within the society as they are determined by the planners and the community, which seeks to develop alternatives of action for the achievement of goal-related objectives.

This definition of planning provides a framework for defining and explaining five additional terms which provide the dimensions of the planning process:

1. Goals - Goals are ideals established by the community which gives general directions to the planning. Realistically, ideals are never reached but serve as reference points for the ultimate achievement. An ideal educational goal might

be that educational planning provide all information relevant to metropolitan educational problems.

2. Objectives - Objectives are stages in planning and development programs related to reaching goals. An objective related to the goal previously stated would be to determine the kinds of information necessary to provide all relevant information on metropolitan educational problems.
3. Policies - Policies are statements describing the authorizations and limits of programs and actions to be taken toward goal achievement. A policy might be that the planning of a metropolitan or regional educational planning authority be coordinated with the state-wide educational planning.
4. Long-Range Planning - Long-range planning refers to the time beyond the present generation; i.e., twenty years or more.
5. Evaluation - Evaluation is the process of facing problems in light of existing objectives and policies with the desire to measure the effectiveness of these objectives and policies and redevelop them so that amelioration of the problems may occur.

While the preceding definitions and explanations provide a brief overview of the general educational planning framework assumed in TCIA activities they tend to be consistent with the characteristics of rational planning procedures described by Coombs,⁴ Beeby,⁵ Huefner⁶ and others. Yet neither the agreement on definitions or a common understanding of the process bring about planning. There must be organization, for a major purpose in planning is to attempt to assure

the implementation of plans.

Types of Planning Strategies

The achievement of desirable metropolitan objectives depends upon the logical and coherent use of metropolitan planning obligations. The interplay of planning obligations, organization, and process must be fused and ignited through appropriate planning strategies. Approaches which are prescribed and in use in effecting change in educational organizations are numerous. Chin suggests that, "we are in a primitive stage in creating a body of knowledge for effecting change that is relevant to the existing conditions and problems . . ." ⁷ He proposes three general change strategies that appear to have relevance to educational organizations: (1) the empirical-rational types, based on reason and utilitarianism; (2) the normative-reevaluative types, based on attitude change; and (3) the power types, based on compliance. ⁸

Since the basis for effecting changes in education can and should be built into certain aspects of the organization and process for planning, multiple planning strategies must be considered. Approaching metropolitan planning in this manner requires full consideration of the consequences which are brought about through predictable constraints of certain planning models and strategies. For example, three types of organizational patterns for TCIA educational planning are being considered: (1) Cooperative (Political) Planning - the type commonly used in community health and welfare planning. It has no power except persuasion and is often dominated by the funding agent. Evidence strongly indicates that cooperative planning is most effective in developing plans, filling gaps in programs and services,

but does not eliminate organizational overlap and is not effective in dealing with conflict; (2) Management Planning - this planning model is commonly used in government and industry and assumes that the planning agency has control over resource allocation; and (3) Regulatory (3rd Party) Planning - typically the use of this strategy for educational planning is limited to state or federal education agencies. Accreditations and licensing procedures as well as fiscal controls provide the planning agency with power to assure action in regard to desired changes.

All three planning strategies described by Chin are likely to be used in regulatory and management planning but not necessarily in similarly ordered fashions. However, use of the cooperative approach to educational planning in metropolitan areas seems essential even in the face of its limitations in dealing with questions of resources, power, and multiple-educational governments. It remains the single organizational pattern which can facilitate understanding and acceptance of change with minimal application of coercive implementation procedures.

While completely effective planning is an appropriate goal, there are other general constraints in addition to re-organization and structural ones which act upon the planning process: first, the resources provided for planning may act as a constraint; second, the goal objectives and policies will certainly direct the planning in specific directions and exclude it from other directions; third, the scope of the planning process related to the goals, objectives and policies will act as a constraint; fourth, the conditions within the community, metropolitan area and region in terms of economic, social, political, cultural, and

physical factors may act as constraints; fifth, the perceptions of planners, educators, residents, the governing bodies of the metropolitan area will act as constraints and will be determined in part by the communication linkage among these groups; sixth, the mobility of the population and attending social and educational problems will act as a constraint; seventh, the time available for planning will act as a constraint to the process; finally, the process of action producing reaction within the planning process will act as a constraint since a sequence of planning is the need for re-planning or continuous planning.

It is not enough just to suggest that several planning models are available to education and that each has numerous limitations and constraints; planning to plan requires development of new planning organizations which can make effective and integrative the joint efforts of school districts and other agencies, public and private.

Cooperative Metropolitan and Regional Education Planning

"In a highly urbanized nation such as the United States, the areal unit in which large numbers of persons interact with and are interdependent on one another is the metropolitan area."⁹ For the most part cities and metropolitan areas have grown in a largely unplanned manner. The absence of planning has resulted in a "formless urbanization".¹⁰ Suburban development has created a large, low-density ring around the older sections of the typical metropolitan area. Nature, history and land-development decisions of the private economy--which tend to ignore political boundaries--have distributed the demands for educational services and available tax resources unevenly. Levine predicts that:

Unless educational or other major social services are organized and provided in a manner congruent with the patterns and according to which people live and the problems and goals of the populations they serve, education can hardly be carried out with the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy needed to maintain the viability of a complex industrial society.¹¹

What is needed, he suggests is ". . . implementation of area-wide solutions to problems which are area-wide in scope."¹² But something beyond this is involved. The problem can be seen increasingly as the need for a formal, official, representative mechanism through which metropolitan areas can conduct planning, make decisions, and implement desired programs of change.

The federal government is utilizing a variety of incentives and pressures to encourage comprehensive planning on a metropolitan area-wide level. Most of this planning is carried out on functional lines and has tended to emphasize economic development, transportation, housing, land use, and water resources.¹³ It is not by chance, of course, that this initial activity toward metropolitan planning has centered on functions which transcend governmental boundaries, are highly visible, and which tend to be clearly metropolitan in nature.¹⁴

It seems obvious that many functional processes need to be planned and executed in a coordinated manner throughout metropolitan areas.

Levine and Clavner noted that:

Education is one of the major social activities which could become an important component in comprehensive area-wide planning. . . there is no question but that developments regarding the educational system are intimately related to what happens in other functional systems in the metropolitan area.¹⁵

It has been contended that education has been neglected in comprehensive metropolitan-wide planning activities. How active have educators and

planning agencies been in multi-jurisdictional planning activities which interrelate education in an integral fashion with other social, political and economic problems? Based on the analysis of data from 70 planning commissions and councils of government, Levine and Clavner point out that "school districts are only occasionally and peripheral participants . . . education more often than not is ignored."¹⁶ In addition, it is pointed out that several obstacles make it difficult for multi-jurisdictional metropolitan agencies to include schools in comprehensive area-wide planning. Cited as major obstacles were: "the historical autonomy of school districts . . . tradition of individualism with frequently explicit aversion to cooperative activity for common good . . . a shortage of resources for initiating activities in directions other than those which currently preoccupy planners. . ."¹⁷ It seems unlikely that deeper involvement of educators and schools in metropolitan planning and action can be achieved without recognition and remediation of these constraints. The many social-educational problems which must be seen and treated in their full metropolitan dimensions remain. As a former U.S. Commissioner of Education pointed out in speaking of the need for rebuilding the environment in our cities and towns: "The schools must be part of such a program. They cannot be considered apart from metropolitan planning, or from housing developments or from transportation."¹⁸

This increased involvement of education in metropolitan planning and, by the same token, increased involvement of metropolitan planning agencies in educational planning is viewed as essential to the solution of the serious social-educational problems of the Twin Cities. Comprehensive, area-wide planning and action in which schools play a major role

points up a necessity for establishing new institutionalized arrangements for cooperation and coordination. This is the primary goal of present "planning-to-plan" activities.

Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Planning-To-Plan - A Case Study

This section is more than a condensed report of the status of educational planning in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. It is an attempt to present the need for inclusion of education in the present physically-oriented planning activity. Thus, rather than stress the demographic characteristics of the area which validate it as a metropolitan area, the emphasis is placed on outlining the preliminary objectives of the coordinated planning approach, using descriptions only to point out specific proposals and problems. The organization for planning presented herein is conceivably politically attainable.

1. General Needs for Metropolitan Planning

The Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Guide, completed in April of 1968, contains as the first paragraph of its introduction the following:

"With the publication of this Metropolitan Development Guide, this phase of the Joint Program for Land Use-Transportation Planning is concluded. Five years ago, in 1962, the Program began as a joint effort of the area's major planning and engineering agencies to produce a comprehensive area-wide plan. As a statement of the best current thinking of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the Commissioner of Highways, and the staff of the 13 Joint Program

agencies, this report is submitted to the area and its responsible officials with the recommendation that it be adopted as the official Metropolitan Development Guide."¹⁹

It is most difficult to believe that five years of comprehensive area-wide planning has taken place as a "joint effort of the area's major planning and engineering agencies" without involving a single educational organization!

Some solace can be taken in the fact that the Guide is a "proposed" Guide which must be adopted by the Metropolitan Council after public hearings. But more reassuring is the emphasis within the Guide on the need for total development. Referring to the physical elements in the TCMA the Guide states, "None of the elements grow in isolation. The development of one affects, and is affected by, the development of each of the others."²⁰

This statement, though not a formal invitation, is quite definite evidence of an awareness of the necessary involvement of the many elements or sub-systems in total area-wide metropolitan planning. The elementary and secondary schools of the area, a most significant element in function served and in the number of clients they affect, have not been involved in metropolitan planning, and are not, at the present time, sufficiently coordinated and cohesive to be an effective element in total planning. The purpose of preliminary efforts has been to cite--though belatedly--the need for cooperative area-wide planning by the elementary and secondary schools to meet future educational needs.

There can be little question but that this phase of education should be one of the very important elements of total planning for the area.

2. The Need for Coordination and Long-Range Planning Among All School Districts of the TCMA

Without functional coordination between school districts, participation by education in the Twin Cities metropolitan planning would require a minimum of one representative from each school district. This would not be possible but even if it were, the representatives could not combine in their objectives because critical shortages and needs of the school districts, in the absence of a cooperatively constructed long-range plan for the education of elementary and secondary children throughout the metropolitan area, would (and do) vary considerably. In short, without functional coordination the educational element will be guilty of fragmentation and overlapping.

Existing Inequities

Student population among the school districts in the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area vary enormously. A study made of 41 of the school districts reveals that the average daily attendance (K-12) in 1967-68 varied from a low of 652 to a high of 65,131 with a median of 3,414.²¹ It seems obvious that educational programs and services offered in school districts of such a size difference cannot be equally broad and diverse. The smaller schools are necessarily limited in the number and variety of educational programs offered.

The same study indicates that economic resources among the districts are most inequitably distributed. Using the equalized property valua-

tion measure of adjusted assessed valuation on a per pupil unit basis, a variation is found from a low of \$2,386 to a high of \$15,367²² per pupil unit, a difference of more than seven-to-one. Although the state aid formula attempts to make up for this difference, it is vastly inadequate in its effort.

Measuring local effort in terms of mills levied on the same equalized property valuation measure (adjusted assessed valuation), the study finds a difference between school districts of from 35.98 to 241.64 mills²³--and this local effort variation applies only to the net current expenditures made by the district. It does not include expenditures made for capital outlay on which there is no state aid, thus no equalization.

Differences in actual disbursements per pupil unit for net current expenditures show in the same study a low of \$432.55 and a high of \$654.88,²⁴ a difference of \$222.35 or over 50 percent.

A staffing study of the same 41 Twin Cities metropolitan area school districts in 1967-68 shows similar differences. The number of professional staff members per 1,000 students (numerical staffing adequacy) ranged from a low of 39.22 to a high of 63.79,²⁵ a difference of 24.57 or 63 percent.

Integration to date has presented problems only in the core cities of this metropolitan area. The core cities have their own long-range plans for dealing with it but it seems highly unlikely that most of the surrounding suburban schools share in these plans. Minority group problems should, must, and will be an area-wide concern.

3. Recognition of the Need

The school districts of the TCMA have made better than average progress in uniting their efforts and resources in cooperative projects. The Minnesota School Districts' Data Processing Joint Board, the Glen Lake Cooperative Rehabilitation Center, the Suburban School Services Joint Board, Hennepin County Area Vocational-Technical Joint Board, and the Educational Research and Development Council are all examples of successful and beneficial cooperative projects.²⁶ Each of these is limited in functions and none represents all schools in the area. Yet the need for cooperative effort is quite obviously recognized and the several lively joint projects serve to encourage this proposal.

The federal government has directed that preference be given to problems which deal with the national interest and lists as particular concerns two problems which are directly relevant to this planning project. They are: (1) improving educational opportunities, (2) planning for metropolitan areas.²⁷

The Minnesota State Department of Education has recognized long-range planning as a most important need. This can be evidenced by its recent major study, Education 1967. This study, financed with ESEA Title V funds, was made for the purpose of the development of needed state-wide long-range planning.²⁸ The Department's study will be most valuable as a reference for Twin Cities area-wide planning. However, this study does not contain a detailed analysis of the unique problems of this seven-county area which, within a very few years, will contain a majority of the state's population.

The state legislature has made no reference to education in its recognition of need for metropolitan planning. It has, however, created a Mosquito Control District, the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Metropolitan Transit Commission. Further evidence of recognition of the need is the establishment by the 1967 Minnesota Legislature of the Metropolitan Council.²⁹ Pending action by the 1969 Legislature the Council was given certain limited powers to direct and coordinate developments in the Twin Cities area: (a) To it were transferred all the powers of the predecessor Metropolitan Planning Commission, to make plans for the orderly physical, social and economic growth of the Twin Cities area; (b) The Council was authorized to review those plans and projects of the local units substantially area-wide in character, and to make the comments (concerning compatibility with overall plans) on applications of the local units for federal aid, required under Section 204 of the Model Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966; (c) The Council was authorized --in the event it found them inconsistent with its own planning for the development of the area--to suspend the plans of the special districts operating within the area. To increase its knowledge of the activities of these agencies, the Council was authorized to appoint a non-voting member to serve with these special districts.

The Act created a Council with 14 districts (each made up by the combination of two state Senate districts). Within each new district a member was selected by the Governor, after consultation with the six legislators representing the area at large. The Council was chosen and came into existence in August 1967.

4. Immediate Goals of Planning-To-Plan

It has been noted that there is at present no cooperative long-range plan for educational development for the TCHA. Coordination and cooperative planning has been limited to groups of school districts for single purposes and there has been no coordination of educational planning with that of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Joint Program for Land Use-Transportation Planning. The Land Use-Transportation Planning Program has been in the making for more than five years and has already selected a Concellation Cities pattern of development for the TCHA.³⁰ This pattern presents some limitations to the spectrum of alternatives available to meet metropolitan area-wide school planning. The planning of the Joint Program will now require the approval of the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Council, according to the Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Development Guide, "has the ability to control the location and timing of certain public capital investments through its power over comprehensive plans of independent agencies."³¹ The Recommended Policy Number One of the Guide is to "Enlarge the powers of the Metropolitan Council to make it a multi-functional organization."³²

In short, the development of the Twin Cities metropolitan area is now being planned and the impact of this planning can and will have significant effects on school populations, manpower needs, and financial support in the area. The schools must make a choice of participating in future decisions that affect education in the area or of standing by and suffering the effects of these decisions by others

who might well have little understanding or concern for education.

Thus, the first goal to be met by cooperative planning is the cooperative development of alternative long-range educational plans which can be used as a basis of intelligent and effective participation with other agencies and governmental units in multi-functional total development planning. The ultimate goal will be to optimize the contribution of education toward the achievement of the total development goals for the Twin Cities area.

5. Initial Planning Objectives

The tentative objectives of our planning-to plan program are:

- a. To initiate alternative cooperative long-range plans and guidelines for the development of public and non-public elementary and secondary education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (TCMA).
- b. To coordinate the development of flexible guidelines for public and non-public education in the TCMA with the guidelines and policies followed by the Metropolitan Council.
- c. To coordinate the development of public and non-public education in the TCMA with other public and private institutions.
- d. To provide more nearly equal educational opportunities and services for students of schools in the TCMA.
- e. To coordinate the development of public institutions and private enterprise in the TCMA.
- f. To introduce a better social and economic integration for all people residing in the TCMA.
- g. To design and plan for the establishment of a new organizational entity to provide for continuous cooperative planning among the schools, and for continuous coordination of education with the many other elements of total area-wide planning.

These general objectives stem directly from the needs described earlier in this paper. To deal effectively with these area-wide needs a number of problems are in critical need of solution:

- a. Projections and Forecasts - Much projecting and forecasting has been done for the area by the Joint Program but with the absence of educational representation. Problems involving changing valuations of properties resulting from condemnation for public land use, future locations of industry, etc., have important implications for education in terms of financial ability and student populations. The rate and extent of migration of families to the suburbs should be known. Will these population movements have the effect of overcrowding facilities in some areas while other facilities are used at only partial capacity? Could the various trends that are inherent in growth be controlled by public policy to avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities and programs?

Possible methods of amelioration of problems of change can be most intelligently considered only if, on the basis of forecasts, a variety of possible alternative plans are carefully and competently drawn for the consideration of educational leaders and citizens of the area. Such alternative plans, accompanied by facts and estimates of their probable effects, are vitally needed.

- b. Financing for the Future - Differences in financing ability have been presented earlier. Present sources of revenue tend

to be concentrated within limited areas and an increasing concentration of these sources is suggested by the Joint Program in its Twin Cities Metropolitan Area Guide.

The equalization effort of the state aid law received a devastating reversal with the method selected for the distribution of sales tax receipts. These developments promise to increase rather than decrease the fiscal disparities among school districts.

Efforts to equalize the ability to finance education throughout the area will be difficult--perhaps impossible. Those districts now enjoying comparatively low taxes for education will not be anxious to share their resources. On the other hand, no effort to equalize ability other than the state foundation aid program has been made in the area. The development of resource allocation plans must include a high priority consideration for the erasing of fiscal disparities among school districts of the area.

- c. Educational Advantages of Cooperative Organizations - The equalizing of ability of finance education among the school districts does not imply that the same curricular offerings and services should be provided in every school district regardless of the needs of its children. Long-range cooperative plans must capitalize on the natural advantages that occur through better coordination and communication among school districts. Appropriate curricular opportunities would be :

planned for all pupils including those who might not fit the pattern of the traditional school. Special education facilities could be vastly improved and strategically located to educate and/or train the handicapped while avoiding unnecessary duplication. Special pupil services (health, psychological, social) would be planned so that they might be available to all who need them.

The cooperative planning would not overlook the advantages of experimental programs, research and evaluation services, instructional materials centers, library services, educational television, and other curricular and instruction services that could be vastly improved through cooperation of all school districts.

- d. Needed Skills of the Area's Graduates - A major problem in today's rapidly changing technologically advanced society is that of providing the correct skill requirements for current and future needs of business and industry. A common criticism of schools and other preparation institutions is that they do not adapt their training programs fast enough to fill changing demands. Even more serious is the accusation that the training which is presently taking place is for outdated skills.

Would the schools of the Twin Cities area, through the flexibility provided by coordination and cooperation, be in a better position to respond more instantly and with greater accuracy to the needed skills of business and industry in this area?

- e. School District Organization - The present organization of area schools in district varying in student population from 652 to 65,131 and in adjusted assessed valuation per pupil unit from \$2,386 to \$15,367 has served admirably. Strains are now appearing, however, which make it necessary for long-range cooperative planning to include school district reorganization among its alternatives for the providing of better and more economically efficient schools.
6. Research and Development Requirements

Clarification of the general planning objectives and their translation into operational terms will continue to provide the major challenge to Twin Cities educators and planners. This implies, of course, that it will be necessary to develop a major research and development support mechanism in order to ensure that all relevant data are canvassed and that maximum flexibility is built into the planning and administrative policies evolving from that planning. The research and development component must recognize that assessment and projection can only be dealt with as elements of a dynamic system. As such, any useful Research and Development approach must have the potential of: (a) assessing the nature of change; (b) determining the constraints within which change must take place; and (c) structuring conditions to ensure that change occurs within the dimensions considered desirable.

Typical research methods applied in education do not possess the required potential.

Such statistical research procedures tend to require isolation of limited dependent and independent variables in a static environment. Extensive efforts are usually made to control or neutralize all other influences. Such research methodology does not seem to be adequate to the requirement for determining the interaction of elements in a dynamic system. It is suggested, therefore, that any significant progress in developing strategies and tactics for meeting the planning objective listed previously calls for application of systems research techniques. Such techniques, specifically dealing with dynamic systems, will allow the determination of probabilities of occurrences under varying conditions as well as the forecasting of the quality of outcomes. Unless such techniques can be applied, achievement of the planning objectives will be unlikely.

7. Organization for Planning

The generally piecemeal development of education in the Twin Cities metropolitan area has resulted in a pattern of education which has little consistency to its general fiber. While this "individuality" is often taken as a result of local school board policy, administrative practice and teacher expertise, it is also a result of forces within a community which are not always identified or active in the school environment. The location and type of industry, concentration of people, levels of income, to name a few such forces, are also active in determining the nature of the educational fiber. Therefore, in recognition of these forces, it is necessary for educators in this metropolitan area to assess these forces and to project their impact

on education in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. To recognize these factors and the implications of them will enable public and non-public educators to develop policies and guidelines which will minimize the process of fragmentation in education and, as such, provide "better" educational opportunities for the future student residing in this metropolitan area. Since the only existing mechanism for involvement of school districts, public and non-public on an area-wide basis is the Educational Research and Development Council, it is proposed that this organization represent education in the initial planning mechanism to be created.

The existence of the Metropolitan Council with its current proposed guidelines and policies offers an unique opportunity for this integration of educational planning with total development efforts. The present guidelines must be used in coordinating the development of the metropolitan area school district alternative plans. In addition, the Metropolitan Council offers a communication link and a source of opportunity to act as a shaping force in the development of the metropolitan area which is open to education at this time. Important, too, is the availability of professional skills which can enhance the interdisciplinary nature required of the planning team. Since the coordination of educational institutions with other social institutions becomes more important as population expands and concentrates, and as resources become scarcer, the inclusion of the Metropolitan Council as a partner in the initial planning organization is essential to a multi-functional approach.

To assure that the planning activities of the metropolitan area remain consistent with state-level planning efforts, it is proposed that the third member of the planning triumvirate be the Minnesota State Department of Education, represented by its newly established Office of Planning and Development. It is assumed that this involvement will also assure coordination with the State Planning Agency which is concerned with planning at all levels of government.

The problems involved in setting up, funding, and staffing such a three-partner mechanism have not been resolved. However, the capacity for cooperative approaches to planning among local, metropolitan-wide and state units has been demonstrated by a similar effort in hospital and health planning. The planning organization includes hospitals (represented by their voluntary association); the Metropolitan Council, and the State Health Department. Despite the organizational problems, as yet unresolved, there is clearly a need for a new planning mechanism if educational planning efforts are to be effectively integrated.

During the 1968-69 school year the broad question of how to complete the organization of the area-wide mechanism for educational planning is being discussed by a range of public and private groups interested in education. These include the Metropolitan Section of the Minnesota League of Municipalities, the Metropolitan Inter-County Council, the Citizen's League, the Metropolitan Council, the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs-University of Minnesota, Joint Staff-St. Paul and

Minneapolis Metropolitan Hospital Planning Council, State Department of Education, State Planning Agency, Catholic Bureau of Education, individual metropolitan-area school districts, and others. There has been emerging out of this discussion a fairly strong realization of the need for integrating educational planning with total development planning, as well as recognition of the need for a new planning organization to meet these needs.

It seems clear, therefore, that the recognized social problems of the metropolitan area cannot be solved by independent action of the various public and private organizations in TCMA. If there is to be equality of opportunity for all people residing in the TCMA, then organizations need common guidelines and principles. The sharing of educational opportunities through cooperation will aid in the achievement of social and economic integration in our society.

In Summary

The focus of this paper has been upon examining the process, elements, and attitudes required to plan and develop a cooperative, multi-functional planning model for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area in which education is an integral part. It has been suggested that the metropolitan region is the accepted and appropriate unit for the application of planning procedures that are tailored to effectively guide the physical, economic, social, and educational development of the Twin Cities urban complex. Educational planning at the metropolitan level must deal with ways of guiding and controlling the use and development of physical and other resources in ways which reduce the conflict between planning and democracy.

The cooperative planning strategy is identified as most appropriately oriented to meeting this requirement .

Emphasis has been given to organization for planning through the dual activities of creating awareness of the need for change and the establishment of a specific planning mechanism. A new planning body representing state, regional, and local interests is recommended to devise and appraise alternate long-range plans and guidelines which will provide the basis for organized and intelligent participation by Education in the total planning for the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

The planning objectives and proposed organizations which have been described offer a rational basis for the consideration of a highly complex problem. First, they seek to bring together both public and non-public education. Second, they seek to include other public institutions to provide for communication and the consideration of multi-institutional approaches in the planning process. Third, education as a function of the state and its people is included by the representatives of the State Department of Education, school board members and metropolitan legislators. Fourth, the Metropolitan Council has been established as a central authority for land use and transportation in the TCM. Fifth, the objective and conduct of the program accept the need for the solution of social and economic problems facing the metropolitan area, combining the efforts of private and public institutions. An earlier statement regarding the Metropolitan Council which pointed out its responsibility to make multi-functional decisions reinforces the logic of this process.

No attempt has been made to describe in detail the other alternative organizational patterns which are, of course, available. One alterna-

tive is to ask the State Department of Education to proceed with this study. However, its responsibilities are to the entire state, not a single area. The resources it has available are quite limited and as a single unit it does not embody the characteristics necessary to conduct a study of this nature. A second alternative would be to ask the Metropolitan Council to undertake the study. This agency is primarily concerned with land-use and transportation. While the information it has available will be of great value, its staff is not large enough to give adequate attention to this problem nor do they possess skills in program evaluation or the experience in education necessary to the conduct of the study. Finally, the size and complexity of the study demand funds which are not available through existing sources. A third alternative might be that public districts band together to do the study, utilizing their powers under the joint board provision.

Rather, it is proposed that a cooperative effort including all related parts of the problem be launched. The emphasis would be placed on cooperative, coordinated effort with a staff combining educational and planning expertise. Emphasis would be placed on cooperation between public institutions and private enterprises. This approach, which utilizes flexibility within a specialized planning structure, can hopefully lead educators toward a new level of involvement in the politics of metropolitan change.

FOOTNOTES

1. Russell C. Davis, Planning Human Resource Development: Educational Models and Schemata(Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966).
2. Kenneth H. Hansen, "Planning and Change: Design, Decision, Action", Cooperative Planning for Education in 1980 (Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, February, 1968), p. 59.
3. The general definitions were adapted from Reginald R. Issac's lecture, "Goals for 2012", given at the School of Architecture, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 6, 1962.
4. P. H. Coombs, What is Educational Planning? (Unesco: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967).
5. C. E. Beeby, Planning and the Educational Administrator (Unesco: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967).
6. Robert P. Huefner, "Strategies and Procedures in State and Local Planning", Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education (Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, July, 1967).
7. See Robert Chin, "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Changes", Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education (Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, July, 1967), p. 56.
8. Ibid. pp. 39-57.
9. Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst, Emerging Urban Problems and Their Significance for School District Reorganization in the Great Plains States (Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1968), p. 1.
10. Lewis Mumford, The Urban Prospect (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 112.
11. Op. cit. Levine and Havighurst, p.1.
12. Daniel U. Levine, Major Problems in the Metropolitan Society of the United States (Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1968), p. 30.
13. "Areawide Planning", Nation's Cities, June, 1966, p. 15.
14. The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964).

15. Daniel U. Levine and Jerry B. Clavner, Multi-jurisdictional Metropolitan Agencies and Education: A Study of the Involvement of Education in the Work of Planning Commissions and Councils of Government, Summer, 1967, (Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1968), p. 3.
16. Ibid. p. 78.
17. Ibid. pp. 78-79.
18. Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 48-49.
19. The Joint Program, Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Development Guide, St. Paul, Minnesota: The Joint Program, 1968), p. 2.
20. Ibid. p. 3.
21. The Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., Financing Schools in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, (Minneapolis: The Council, 1968), p. 1.
22. Ibid. p. 5.
23. Ibid. p. 15.
24. Ibid. p. 15.
25. The Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., Staffing Schools in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, (Minneapolis: The Council, 1968), p. 22.
26. Clifford P. Hooker, Donald E. Davis and Van D. Mueller, "Cooperation Among School Districts in a Metropolitan Area: A Case Study", in Robert J. Havighurst (ed.), Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1968, v. 11), pp. 328-351.
27. United States Office of Education, A Manual for Project Applicants - Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, May, 1967), p. 2.
28. Bureau of Field Studies and Surveys, Education 1967 - A Statewide Study of Elementary, Secondary and Area Vocational-Technical Education in Minnesota, (Minneapolis: The Bureau, 1967), p. 2.
29. Chapter 896, Minnesota 1967 Laws (St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota State Legislature, 1967)..
30. The Joint Program, Selecting Policies for Metropolitan Growth, (St. Paul, Minnesota: The Joint Program, 1967).
31. Op. cit., The Joint Program, Twin Cities Area Metropolitan Development Guide, p. 7.
32. Ibid. p. 3.