For the reader who wants to know in general terms about the current status of citizen participation in educational decision-making, a descriptive account of a national survey and a summary of the findings are presented. A section containing the results of an opinion portion of the survey should also be of interest to the general readers. Two directory sections are included: one lists school districts reporting citizen participation activity, and one lists active citizen organizations. The participant groups are divided into two categories: Category 1 organizations are those whose role in educational decision-making is defined by the school district; Category 2 groups are private, nonprofit organizations not formally associated with the school system, but concerned with educational policy and practice in a local school district. While there is evidence of quantitative increase—more groups and more activity—the survey has produced nothing that would indicate any important shift in the way that schools are governed. Much of what was learned about the participation of citizens in educational decision-making does, however, offer some cause for hope for the future. (Author/IRT)
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PREFACE

Soon after it began in the fall of 1973, the Institute for Responsive Education recognized the need for a clearer picture of the nationwide status of citizen participation in educational decision-making. There is widespread confusion about what is actually happening; what constitutes the true picture is largely a matter of opinion. Some observers assert there is little interest by parents and citizens, and others claim increased concern and activity. Many good sources exist for those who want to know more about lay involvement in school governance, but much of what is available is theoretical.\(^1\)

To the best of our knowledge there has been no attempt to survey nationwide activity at the local level and to determine the characteristics of that activity. No one has attempted a systematic, district by district, nationwide poll. This is what we have endeavored to do: we set out to find the trees in the forest of participation.

We have met with only limited success in this effort. To conduct a national survey when staff, time, and money are in short supply is ambitious indeed. The shortcomings of the results are, in large part, traceable to the limits of the method of data gathering. The primary problem we encountered is one which plagues all mail surveys—the return was small.

We cannot be sure whether the picture we present would have been markedly different if we had received data from the thousands of superintendents who failed to respond. We suspect that those who did not respond had little to report, but we can't be sure. In addition, there were problems of ambiguity in both the questionnaires and the responses. Many terms, even when defined in the instruments, were variously interpreted or understood.

Quantitative and qualitative problems notwithstanding, we believe that what we have found will be of use in supplying specific information about a number of relevant activities and in providing something of the flavor of the role of parents and citizens in educational decision-making.

The report has been organized to serve two functions. For the reader who wants to know in general terms about the current status of citizen participation in educational decision-making we have rendered a descriptive account of the conduct of the survey and summarized the findings. A section containing the results of an opinion portion of the survey should

also be of interest to the general reader. For those who want to know
where citizen participation mechanisms exist, two directory sections
which list groups of school districts reporting some activity and of
citizen organizations are included.

The survey was conducted by the staff of the Institute for Responsive
Education, under the direction of Mary Ellen Stanwick. We gratefully
acknowledge the thousands of hours of volunteer time contributed by
men and women in 25 cities across the country. The institutions and
organizations that coordinated the volunteer data gathering effort
are listed on page 70.

Don Davies
Director
Institute for Responsive Education
The democratic tradition of institutional reform is through public accountability. Americans as citizens and consumers usually rise in protest when institutions lose their connection to the public. Public accountability in education is at the heart of the American public school system. The concept of public is particularly pertinent because it reveals what should be the basic nature of our major educational institutions - openness and responsiveness to the citizenry.

Under a public system of education, laymen determine the goals of education and the policies calculated to achieve them. Professional educators are the specialists to whom responsibility for implementation of these policies is delegated by the laymen. The public then reserves for itself the role of accountant to assess whether these goals are being achieved. The public's right to assess and to hold publicly employed officials responsible is fundamental.
This survey of citizen participation in educational decision-making comes at a time when public confidence in institutions is at one of the lowest points in the nation's history, and distrust is at an all time high. While a lack of confidence may be a negative factor in the outlook for citizen participation in education, there are counter- 
vailing positive signs. Many citizens express a growing willingness to become a part of the solution to the many problems confronting contemporary society. The public recognizes with dismay that they have allowed both public and private institutions to escape their grasp. They understand too, that to reverse this situation citizens must act. For this reason, government, business and industry will be allowed less and less to conduct their affairs without a thought to public scrutiny. Consumer awareness and action are becoming an integral part of American life. Public education is a focal point for much of the current criticism. Parents and citizens demand that educators become more responsive to the needs of those they serve.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION: AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

Few civic activities are more congruent with the principles of American life and government than the many forms of citizen participation in education. While federal, state and local governments are representative democracies, in earlier times local governments were in many cases participatory democracies. It is in the governance of public schools that the vestiges of participatory democracy are clearest. Few towns, and certainly none of our great cities, still have an annual town meeting to vote on the budget and debate pressing issues. The nonpartisan caucus to nominate candidates for the school board is perhaps the heartiest descendent of the town meeting. But some observers question the democracy and openness of this process. Unfortunately, there is some basis for their skepticism.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION: CITIZENS

There has been an unmistakable shift in educational authority, but many Americans still believe that the primary responsibility for education should be at the local level. Of all the debates concerning the appropriate level of responsibility for the provision of social services, certainly the most heated concern is over education.

Earlier in the nation's history parents held nearly absolute control over the educational lives of their children. Until the advent of compulsory education, parents could decide whether or not their children would attend school at all. For many the question was moot; harsh economic realities would not admit the luxury of schooling. For others however, education was the necessary first step along the road of advancement in America.
Communities too had greater control. Teachers were hired by the towns and served at the pleasure of the residents. No tenure existed to protect the teacher who fell from favor. As communities dispersed geographically the common practice was to establish schools in the geographic "districts" of the town. Brubacher has commented on the result of this practice: "Started as a social convenience, in the course of time the school district became an institution of no little political importance. Being the smallest unit of local self-government it became the 'paladium' of popular liberty...."

CONTROL OF EDUCATION: PROFESSIONALS

Since the beginning of the century there has been steady erosion of the power of parents and citizens in education. Widespread opinion holds that parents are no longer interested in education. Indeed, in the fifth annual Gallup Poll of public attitudes toward education, lack of parent interest is ranked as the eighth most serious problem facing education today. The reasons for a lack of citizen interest in education are complex. The educational system is a microcosm of American society and the mistrust and dissatisfaction which psychologists and sociologists see pervading American society are reflected in the educational system. The root causes of alienation from the educational system are the same as those for other institutions. As specialization and professionalization have increased dramatically, people have become more reluctant to voice opinions in areas in which they have no expertise. Some people seem to believe that they have no right to contradict or question a professional. One citizen in responding to the survey told us she believed "there is a definite limit to what citizens can do because education is a profession and a science."

Even among the professionals themselves there is a tendency to avoid contradicting the educational dogma of the moment. The curriculum of teacher training institutions is essentially standard across the country. Students preparing for teaching careers are not likely to find much diversity and soon accept the standards of the profession and become a part of its dominant "culture." The national professional organizations continue where the colleges leave off, assuring professional cohesiveness and homogeneity.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION: GOVERNMENT

As parents have lost ground so have local boards of education. Boards do not have anything approaching the autonomous control they once held. Part of the reason for the shifting of authority can be explained by money. More money comes to the school districts from state and federal government. It is a well known fact of life that "who pays the piper calls the tune." Federal money to supplement local revenues for
schooling the educationally disadvantaged are accompanied by programs from the federal level. Locally initiated programs must be approved by federal reviewers. It is too early to know what the full impact will be on litigation and court decisions challenging unequal expenditures of funds within states. But many educational scholars believe that changes in governance will be forthcoming. The courts, although slow, play an increasingly important role in the determination of educational policy. The fact that disgruntled parents turn to the courts is only one of many indicators of the lack of responsiveness of school board and administrators.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION: THE FUTURE

If professionals and state and local governments have come to play an increasingly dominant role in the determination of educational policy, are there signs that the public is ready to recoup lost power? The answer to this question is not a simple yes or no. We began this study with the belief that in recent years there has been a ground swell of citizen action in education. Data does suggest that increasing numbers of individuals are involved in some group, committee, or council for the participation of citizens in educational decision-making. We are not sure that the actual functions assigned to these groups are making inroads on the professional domination of policy determination.

Very little about the future of educational governance is clear except that major attention will be given to the problems involved at the local, state, and federal levels. New relationships will be developed between institutions and the public they serve. Attempts to forecast and influence the future can be greatly aided by a thoughtful understanding of both the past and the present. At the very least, the findings in this study can contribute to a more informed debate and development of more promising alternatives.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Citizen participation is valuable as...
A means of mobilizing and utilizing resources—a source of productivity and labor not otherwise tapped;
A source of knowledge—both corrective and creative—a means of securing feedback regarding policy and programs and a source of new, inventive and innovative approaches;
An end in itself—an affirmation of democracy and the elimination of alienation and withdrawal, of destructiveness, hostility and lack of faith in relying on people.

Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett
Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change
GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

Having concluded this study, we think there is more rhetoric about the reform of school governance than action. It is clear that there are thousands of new "mechanisms"—school councils, advisory committees, parent advisory groups required by federal education programs, and since 1965, organizations attempting to influence schools. There is a quantitative increase of parent and citizen action in the cities. It is not as clear that there has been a similar increase in smaller towns and suburbs. This survey provides no evidence of ground swell there.

While there is evidence of quantitative increase, more groups and more activity, the survey has produced nothing that would indicate any important shift in the way that schools are governed. We see no reason to believe that parents and citizens have more power in decision-making in the schools. We found few programs or mechanisms which are seriously challenging the professional domination of decision-making and establishing genuine school-community collaboration. We do believe, however, that much of what we have found out about the current activity of citizen participation in educational decision-making offers some cause for hope for the future.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

1. **Administrative Decentralization of Some Kind Has Been Adopted in 14 of the 25 Cities We Surveyed, and in 279 of the School Districts Which Responded to the Mail Questionnaire.**

   While administrative decentralization does not necessarily result in increased community involvement, there are indications that it may encourage increased local involvement. The motivation to become involved arises at the school where an issue or problem involving a parent's own child occurs. If the parent is told by the principal that the real decisions are made in the central office, the thought of working through bureaucratic channels puts a premature damper on involvement. In some larger districts, it can take weeks to gain an appointment with the third level central office administrator. As decisions are decentralized, more problems can be resolved expeditiously.

2. **School Councils for All or Some of the Schools in the Districts Have Been Established in 11 of the 25 Cities.**

   Many of these councils seem to have limited roles, but they represent a mechanism for community participation that is most important in the life of a school. Many of these groups, particularly in larger cities such as New York, Los Angeles, and Miami, appear to be increasing their roles in decisions about goals, personnel, budget, and curriculum.
3. ADVISORY GROUPS ARE MORE COMMON THAN POLICY GROUPS: OF THE 574 GROUPS IDENTIFIED IN THE SURVEY, ONLY 88 WERE REPORTED TO HAVE A DIRECT ROLE IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

We believe that many of the groups reported to have policy making power are boards of education, even though we asked that local boards not be reported in the survey. This may be the reason for the lack of policy groups. In written comments, many superintendents noted that in their interpretation of law only the school board can legally make policy.

4. FOR GROUPS WITH FORMAL RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS, PARENT INITIATIVE IS REPORTED AS THE CAUSE OF THEIR ESTABLISHMENT.

While it should be kept in mind that school personnel provided the information, all groups reported that parent and citizen initiative played a significant role in the establishment of only an average of 15 percent of the groups.

5. MEMBERS OF GROUPS ARE ELECTED MORE FREQUENTLY IN CITIES THAN IN SMALLER DISTRICTS.

For all groups, an average of 18 percent of the members are elected. But in the 25 cities surveyed an average of 50 percent of the members are elected. The method of membership selection is perhaps one of the most crucial factors in the groups' potential success. Elected members are more likely to be sensitive to the concerns of those they represent. In addition, elected groups are likely to have greater credibility and influence with school officials.

6. MOST GROUPS WITH A FORMAL RELATIONSHIP TO A SCHOOL SYSTEM ARE OF RECENT ORIGIN. OVER 50 PERCENT WERE ESTABLISHED AFTER 1970; MOST GROUPS ARE SMALL, NUMBERING BETWEEN TEN AND TWENTY MEMBERS; PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF ALL GROUPS.

While none of these facts are particularly surprising, it is important to know that some of our hunches about the characteristics of parents and citizens' groups are true.

7. A SUBSTANTIAL MAJORITY OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS ATTEMPTING TO INFLUENCE SCHOOL POLICY ARE WOMEN.

Voluntary citizen action in education, as in many other fields, continues to be propelled by woman power. Some observers report a decline in the availability of female volunteer because of increased desire to be compensated for their work and/or to seek full-time careers.
8. THERE IS STRONG AGREEMENT THAT THERE IS TOO LITTLE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING.

69 percent of the 1,489 respondents to the opinion questions believe there is too little citizen participation in the schools. Less than 2 percent believe there is too much.

9. APATHY IS THE MOST COMMONLY CITED EXPLANATION FOR "TOO LITTLE PARTICIPATION."

Most respondents believe that citizen apathy explains the lack of citizen participation, but the causes and meaning of apathy remain in dispute. Some people blame school administrators and teachers for discouraging participation; others blame parents and citizens for lack of interest. Some attribute apathy to a feeling of powerlessness on the part of individuals attempting to influence the schools.

10. THERE IS STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE PREDICTION THAT CITIZEN PARTICIPATION WILL INCREASE IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS.

More than 78 percent of the respondents predict an increase in participation. Only 15 percent predict a decrease, and 7 percent were uncertain of the future level of activity.

11. MOST PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT INCREASED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION WILL HAVE POSITIVE RESULTS.

High percentages of respondents believe that the results of increased citizen participation will be positive in terms of improved pupil achievement in the basic skills, increased community support for the schools, higher teacher morale, better teacher performance, and innovations in curriculum and teaching.

12. THERE IS STRONG, GENERAL SUPPORT FOR THE IDEA OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION.

There is strong support by professionals and the public for citizen participation in educational decision making. Advocates of increased participation, including the Institute for Responsive Education, can be heartened by the strong support for the general principle. This strong positive agreement would decrease when the phrase "citizen participation" is defined in specific, operational terms and when the general principle is translated into specific proposals which involve different allocations of power and authority.

STATE ROLE

While this survey did not deal with the state role in citizen participation, it is clear that local activities are being influenced by state guidelines and legislation. For this reason, we make the following observation on the
state role.

Safran, in State Education Agencies and Parent Involvement, lists 21 states which report legislation or state department of education guidelines requiring or encouraging citizen participation in some aspect of educational decision making. These states are: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. Analysis of the response to the initial inquiry for this study does not indicate any significant relationship between the existence of directives for participation and responses from these states.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PARTICIPATION IN FLORIDA

There is one case which is worthy of special comment. While most of the state level legislation and guidelines call for citizen involvement in specific areas (e.g., vocational education, bilingual education, special education and programs for the educationally disadvantaged), only Florida has legislation which requires parent involvement in a broad range of policies and programs. The highest percentage of responses were received from Florida, and the greatest percentages indicating the existence of groups came from Florida. Because of the uniqueness of the legislation and the high positive response from that state, we describe the legislative mandate below.

Florida yielded the highest rate of response in the survey (47%). Florida has adopted the strongest legislative mandate for a citizen participation. The mandate is contained in Laws of Florida, Chapter 73-338, Section 230.33, sub-section (b):

The school board shall establish a school advisory committee or committees but such school advisory committees shall not have any of the powers and duties now reserved by law to the school board. The school board shall develop a plan for establishing each school advisory committee, which shall include parents and students, and be broadly representative of the community served by the school. The functions of each school advisory committee, including rules and regulations for its functioning, shall be prescribed by the school board, provided each school advisory committee shall participate with appropriate school personnel in the development of the annual report of school progress as may otherwise be provided by law. Each school board shall make an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of each committee established and shall submit its plan and a report of the evaluation to the state department of education. The department shall review
the reports of annual evaluation to provide to the state board of education and the legislature an annual appraisal as to the effectiveness of school advisory committees and any other information deemed by the department to be appropriate.

This law differs from those in other states in that it requires participation in a full range of school programs and policies. The requirement of the advisory committees to be involved in the development of the school's annual report is the primary means for insuring wide ranging involvement. The contents of the annual report are also spelled out in the statutes. The reason for the requirement is expressed thus: "It is the intent of the legislature that the individual school should be the basic unit of accountability in Florida. It is further the intent of the legislature to insure that each parent or guardian be informed of the educational progress of the school and becomes aware of areas in need of further improvement." The statute indicates that communications between the home and school should be more than public relations in which the school reassures the parent that "everything is just fine." Topics to be covered in the annual report include enrollment data, budget, assessment of testing, effectiveness in achieving goals, programs for professional improvement, and use of the school for community purposes, and use of community facilities for school purposes. Three additional items required in the report are perhaps the most important for a total involvement of citizens. For each annual report there must be a summary of the "attitudes toward the school held by students, teachers, administrators and parents."
When a social problem persists (as they tend to) longer than a few days, those who call attention to its continued presence are viewed as "going too far" and "causing the pendulum to swing the other way." We can make war on poverty but shrink from the extensive readjustments required to stop breeding it. Once a law is passed, a commission set up, a study made, a report written, the problem is expected to have been "wiped out" or "mopped up."

Philip Slater
The Pursuit of Loneliness
ORGANIZATIONS TO BE SURVEYED

The range of organizations which may be grouped in the general category of citizen participation in education is wide and various. Boards of education, tutors, volunteers in the school library, and parents who accompany children on field trips are all non-professionals involved in education. The definition of this survey as one of the citizen participation in educational decision making provided a focus by which we could eliminate many groups of a more general scope. We noted that of the groups which try to influence educational policy and practice, only some have a defined relationship to the school system. This distinction served as a basis for our definition of two categories of groups involved in educational decision making.

In many school districts there are policy and advisory groups which serve for the entire district, as well as those for individual schools. These groups have a prescribed relationship to the school system, and we have labeled them category I. The second category includes civic and service organizations which have no formal relationship to the school system but are concerned and involved in local educational issues. Many of these groups have national affiliations. In many communities like-minded citizens have joined together and taken names such as "Better Schools Committee" or "Citizens for Education." These are also included in category II.

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

We determined to locate as many category I and category II groups as possible in all school districts with more than 1,000 students. The large number of districts this size limited the possible methods of data collection. For a majority of the districts, a mailed questionnaire was the only practical option. Because we believed there would be more participation in urban areas, we supplemented the questionnaires with interviews by data gatherers in 25 cities. Additional information about data collection is provided in the sections summarizing the results of the survey.

DATA GATHERING IN SOME LARGER DISTRICTS

An attempt was made to find volunteer data gatherers in all cities with more than 30,000 pupils. Among the organizations contacted in these cities were Voluntary Action Centers, League of Women Voters, and the Urban League. In some cities individuals agreed to assist us. When an organization or individual could not be recruited, a personal letter
was sent to the superintendent requesting that the mail questionnaire be completed. The following is a list of cities in which the data was obtained through data gatherers, and the name of the person who coordinated each project.

1. Atlanta, Georgia
2. Baltimore, Maryland
3. Boston, Massachusetts
4. Chicago, Illinois
5. Columbus, Ohio
6. Des Moines, Iowa
7. Detroit, Michigan
8. Gary, Indiana
9. Huntsville, Alabama
10. Kansas City, Missouri
11. Los Angeles, California
12. Miami, Florida
13. Minneapolis, Minnesota
14. New Orleans, Louisiana
15. Newport News, Virginia
17. Oakland, California
18. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
19. Saint Louis, Missouri
20. San Francisco, California
21. Shreveport, Louisiana
22. Tampa, Florida
23. Torrance, California

Ann Curry, League of Women Voters
Frances Johnson, League of Women Voters
William S. Reid and Constance V. Krell, Voluntary Action Center
Judith Ditkowsky, League of Women Voters
James Bird, National Program for Educational Leadership
Elaine Newman, Voluntary Action Center
DeLois Robinson, Education Task Force
Merrilene Burks, Urban League Northwest Indiana, Inc.
Shirley Leberte, Voluntary Action Center
Daniel U. Levine, University of Missouri-Kansas City
Phyllis Summers and Ralph Wright, Voluntary Action Center
George Braddock
Maxine Nathanson, Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education
Phyllis Friedman, Innovative Education Coalition
Elsie W. Meehan, Voluntary Action Center
Bernice Maxman, Bank Street College
Barbara Morse and Robert Fortenbaugh, Volunteer Bureau of Alameda County
Gail Raznov
Fratline Couch, Individual Volunteer
Beth Milwid and Robert E. Scott, San Francisco Service Center for Public Education
Sally Robinson, Junior League of Shreveport
Donald Lantz, University of South Florida
Joan Santaella, Volunteer Bureau South Bay-Harbor
24. Washington, D.C.  
   Alvis Adair, School of Social Work, Howard University

25. Wichita, Kansas  
   Virginia McDonald, Association for Children with Learning Disabilities

The instrument used for interviews with the superintendent, or a person designated by the superintendent, was essentially the same as the mail questionnaire. There were additional questions, however, about the legal status of the groups and district support, both financial and service.
PARTICIPATORY GROUPS "INSIDE" THE SYSTEM

Know the sources of power and the way in which it is used in the system you wish to effect... Be careful about succumbing to some romantic illusion about how the system "ought to work." What you have to deal with is how it really does work.

Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner
The School Book
A FURTHER DEFINITION OF CATEGORY I GROUPS

Category I organizations are those groups whose role in educational decision making is defined by the school district. Further clarification among groups of this kind was made to narrow our focus. While fully recognizing that the basic form of citizen participation is through local boards of education, we decided to exclude them from the survey. The primary reason for doing so was because we already knew that nearly all school districts have a school board. In addition, there have been numerous studies documenting the legal responsibilities of boards, their operations, and characteristics of members. For the same reason, we decided to exclude the local affiliates of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Groups to influence a single issue or areas such as special education, vocational, or bilingual education were also excluded from the survey. Finally, we decided that advisory groups mandated as requirements for federally funded programs would not be included. Their specific responsibilities and membership are nationally consistent and can be determined from federal guidelines. We thus defined more clearly the kinds of groups we did want to know about. The following three characteristics defined the category I groups:

- formal recognition by the school district
- definite membership
- ongoing activity
- concern with multiple aspects of school policies and programs

Within category I we then identified four sub-groups. The distinguishing elements were the role of the group as either policy or advisory, and whether it included the entire school district. We defined policy as "having a direct role in the decision making process," and advisory as "making recommendations to those who make decisions."

CONTACTING THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Superintendents in school districts with more than 1,000 pupils (except those 25 cities where data gatherers would make personal contact) received a letter which described the Institute for Responsive Education, outlined the purpose of the survey, and inquired about participation in the district. A response form enclosed in the letter provided three options for reply:

1. This school district does have policy or advisory groups for the involvement of citizens in educational decision making.
2. This school district does not have policy or advisory groups for the involvement of citizens in educational decision making.

3. I would be willing to complete a questionnaire describing the group(s) in the district.

RESPONSE BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Of the 7,413 superintendents receiving the initial letter of inquiry or those to whom a follow-up letter was sent, 1,378 replied. This response constitutes 19 percent of the school districts with more than 1,000 pupils. All those respondents indicating a willingness to complete the questionnaire were sent the instrument, and in some cases a follow-up questionnaire was necessary.

QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

450 respondents to the original inquiry agreed to complete the questionnaire. The actual number of questionnaires returned was 309, 69 percent of the percent of the persons who said they would complete the questionnaire do so. The total number of questionnaires received equals 6 percent of the 7,413 school districts contacted.

RESPONSES BY STATE

Figure 1 shows the number of school districts with more than 1,000 pupils in each state, the number and percentage of reply forms received, and the number and percentage of questionnaires returned. In each case the percentage equals the number of forms or questionnaires, divided by the number of districts in the state. This is to provide a basis of comparison among the states which vary widely in the number of school districts.
FIGURE 1
RESPONSES RECEIVED, BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of School Districts Over 1,000</th>
<th>Responses Received Number</th>
<th>Responses Received Percent</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned Number</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interview conducted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of School Districts Over 1,000</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total              | 7,410                                | 1,435  | 409     |
TYPES OF GROUPS REPORTED

The questionnaire and interview instrument for category I groups were designed to gather three kinds of information: (1) descriptive information about the school district; (2) characteristics of participatory groups; and (3) opinion about citizen participation. A listing of school districts reporting participatory activities and citizen groups is presented in the directory which follows. The opinions gathered from the questionnaire, through interviews and by the category II questionnaire, are presented in the final section of this report.

Four types of category I group were distinguished: Type A—policy group for the entire district; Type B—advisory group for the entire district; Type C—policy group for one or more individual schools; Type D—advisory group for one or more individual schools. The number of districts reporting one or more of each type of group:

- policy group for the entire district: 49
- advisory group for the entire district: 274
- policy group for one or more individual schools: 39
- advisory group for one or more individual schools: 212

Figure 2 gives the percentages of the districts reporting groups of each type.

FIGURE 2

Percentages of Districts Indicating Participatory Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Policy</th>
<th>District Advisory</th>
<th>School Policy</th>
<th>School Advisory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REASON FOR AND DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT

For all types of groups, school district initiative was most commonly reported as the reason for the establishment of the group. The percentage
of groups reported as established for school district initiative is higher for advisory groups than for policy groups. The latter are more often established because of a legal requirement. For 40 percent of both the district-wide and school policy groups, legal requirement is the cause of establishment. According to our respondents, parent and citizen initiative is the least common reason for bringing a group into action. For each type of group, it was reported that parent and citizen efforts accounted for establishment in only 15 percent of the group.

Most of the groups are of recent origin: over 50 percent have been established since 1970, and the majority since 1972. For all types of groups, less than 19 percent were reported as being established prior to 1965. This finding substantiates our assumption that participatory activity is a relatively new phenomenon.

MEMBERSHIP SELECTION.

There are significant differences in the methods of membership selection reported for the cities and in the questionnaire districts. For district-wide groups mail questionnaire respondents reported that appointment by the board of education or the superintendent was the most common method of selecting members. In the cities none of the district-wide policy groups were appointed by the board or superintendent, and less than half (43%) of the members of district advisory groups were appointed. In both the cities and questionnaire districts, principals appoint more members to groups functioning at the individual school. The greatest difference between the cities and the questionnaire districts is the percentages of members reported to be elected, and the percentages reported to be voluntary members. For all types of groups, an average of 18 percent of the questionnaire districts report elected members, but in cities elected members amounts to 50 percent. Conversely, greater percentages of members in the questionnaire districts are reported as self-selected, voluntary members. Figures 3 and 4 show the percentages of the responses given for each method of membership selection. If you assume a positive relationship between election of members and autonomy of the group, it can be inferred that the groups in the cities are more independent than those in smaller districts.
FIGURE 3

Membership Selection Reported in Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>District Policy</th>
<th>District Advisory</th>
<th>School Policy</th>
<th>School Advisory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appointed by board or super</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed by principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4

Membership Selection Reported in Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>District Policy</th>
<th>District Advisory</th>
<th>School Policy</th>
<th>School Advisory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appointed by board or super</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed by principal</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF MEMBERS

Most groups of all types reported to have been ten and twenty members. The largest groups are found among the district-wide types.
16 percent of the questionnaire district policy groups reported to have over 50 members and in cities, 25 percent of the district advisory groups number over 50 members. The smallest groups are the school policy groups. In the questionnaire districts 45 percent, and in cities 33 percent of these groups are reported to have fewer than ten members. Individual school advisory groups are smaller in the cities than in the questionnaire districts. In the cities, 25 percent of the school advisory groups have over 20 members, and in the questionnaire districts 54 percent of the groups are larger than 20 members.

CATEGORIES OF MEMBERS

For all types of groups, parents of children in school constitute the majority of the membership. Parents are most predominant on individual school policy groups: 86 percent are reported to have over 50 percent parent membership. Less than ten percent of the groups have fewer than ten percent parents. Citizens, other than the parents of children in school or school personnel, represent a small proportion of the membership in all types of groups. The highest percentage of members in this category are reported for the district-wide advisory groups. 9 percent are reported to have between 25 and 34.9 percent citizen members. Citizens other than parents are least often reported as members of individual school advisory groups; 96 percent of them have less than 25 percent citizen members.

School administrators do not numerically dominate the membership of any of the types. Among the four types, most groups have less than 25 percent of the membership composed of administrators. Less than one percent have a majority of administrators. Higher percentages of administrators are reported as members of advisory groups. Teachers are also more frequently reported as members of advisory groups, but on the whole there are higher percentages of teacher members than administrators.

An average 75 percent of all types of groups are reported to have no paraprofessional or non-professional representation, while an average of 11 percent are reported to have between 10 and 24.9 percent paraprofessional membership. Over 60 percent of all types are reported to have no student members. Students are most commonly members of advisory boards, when present at all. Of the district-wide advisory groups, 31 percent have between 10 and 24.9 percent student members, and 32 percent of individual school advisory groups have the same proportion of student members.
AREAS OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING

Both the questionnaire and interview instrument included a list of 14 areas in which citizens might have a role in decision making. We asked the respondents to indicate the areas in which the groups in their district played a role. In attempting to determine the meaningfulness of the involvement, simple, crude indicators were used. We asked the respondents to indicate the degree of influence--major, some, or none--exerted by the groups in each area.

Figure 5 shows the 14 areas listed in the questionnaire and interview instrument. It gives the rank order of areas in which the groups are reported to have major influence.

**FIGURE 5**

Rank Order* of Areas of Major Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>District Policy</th>
<th>District Advisory</th>
<th>School Policy</th>
<th>School Advisory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identifying goals, priorities and needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting budget priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deciding about facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selecting principals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating principals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selecting teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating extracurricular programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approving new school programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving community support for schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raising money for schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigating student or parent problems or complaints</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helping in schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranks of the same order for more than one area are a result of areas being reported as major with the same frequency.
For all four types of groups the areas in which the highest percentages were reported to have major influence were "identifying goals, priorities and needs" and "improving community support for schools." With an average of 49.9 percent of the groups reported to have major influence, the former ranks first as an area of major influence and the later ranks second with an average of 48.9 percent of the groups having major influence. These areas are those in which fewest groups were reported to have no influence for all types of groups. The average percentage of reporting major influence (39%) is considerably lower than for the first and second ranking areas.

The percentages of groups reporting major influence in other areas fall sharply. For district policy groups two areas ranked in fourth place, "setting budget priorities" and "deciding about facilities." 37 percent of both the groups were reported to have major influence in these areas. For the district advisory groups, the fourth ranking area of major influence, "evaluating curriculum," is reported as major for only 21 percent of the groups. For the school policy groups, 28 percent of the groups have major influence in the area that ranks fourth, "approving new school programs." The fourth ranking area, "helping in schools," is major for only 24 percent of school advisory groups.

Figure 6 shows the percentages of the degrees of influence exerted by each of the types of groups for each of the areas listed in the questionnaire and interview instrument. The very low percentages of groups reporting major influence, is easily seen. There is, however, one interesting finding--the district policy groups consistently are reported to have higher percentages of major influence. We can offer at least one explanation. As has been noted above, although certain groups were not to be included in answering the questionnaire, the superintendent did not always comply with this directive. In a number of cases we have evidence which suggests that boards of education are included among the groups reported as district-wide policy groups. Because boards have legal responsibility for virtually all decisions about schools, the percentages for areas of major influence are naturally higher for them. For all groups and all areas, 25 percent of the groups reported to have major influence in decisions. The average for the district policy groups, however, is 35%. The average for the other three types is 22 percent.
## FIGURE 6
Percentages of Each Type of Group by Degrees of Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Policy (n=49)</th>
<th>District Advisory (n=274)</th>
<th>School Policy (n=39)</th>
<th>School Advisory (n=212)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>identifying goals, priorities and needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>setting budget priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deciding about facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>selecting principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>evaluating principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>selecting teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Policy (n=49)</th>
<th>District Advisory (n=274)</th>
<th>School Policy (n=39)</th>
<th>School Advisory (n=212)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>evaluating teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>evaluating curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>evaluating extra-curricular programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>approving new school programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>improving community support for schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>raising money for schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFYING GOALS, PRIORITIES AND NEEDS

Identifying goals, priorities and needs is a high ranking area of major influence for all types of groups; it ranks first as the area most commonly considered of major influence. Very low percentages (two and one percent for the district-wide policy and advisory groups respectively, and none of the groups for individual schools) are reported to have no activity in this area. Slightly higher percentages of the advisory groups have some influence. Advisory groups are also more frequently reported to have major influence in this area.

SETTING BUDGET PRIORITIES

While setting budget priorities ranks relatively high as an area of major influence for all types of groups, it is more commonly reported as an area of some influence. Policy groups are slightly more likely to exert major influence in this area than advisory groups. For individual school groups, both policy and advisory, 60 and 65 percent are reported to have some influence in decisions about budget priorities.

DECIDING ABOUT FACILITIES (BUILDING SITES, BUILDING DESIGN, REHABILITATION)

As for setting budget priorities, deciding about facilities is most often reported as an area of some influence. Policy groups are reported to have
major influence in this area at a slightly higher percentage than advisory groups. Individual school policy and advisory groups are more commonly reported to have some influence in this area than groups operating district-wide, but at the same time these groups more frequently have no influence.

SELECTING AND EVALUATING PRINCIPALS

Selecting principals ranked near the median, in seventh place, in areas of influence for all types of groups. Slightly higher percentages of the individual school groups are reported to exert some influence in selecting principals. Evaluating principals is more often reported as an area of major influence; for all types of groups it ranks third as an area of major influence. Over 40 percent of each type of group are reported to have major influence in this area. The district-wide groups more frequently have major influence in evaluation.

SELECTING AND EVALUATING TEACHERS

Selecting and evaluating teachers ranks very low among the areas of major influence for each type of group. As an area of major influence it ranks highest, in tenth place, for district-wide policy groups. With the exception of the district policy groups, over 50 percent of the groups in each type report to have no influence in selecting teachers. In general, all types of groups have greater influence in evaluating teachers than in selecting them. For all types of groups, an average of 30 percent have some influence in evaluation of teachers. The advisory groups for individual schools and those operating district-wide reported more often to have some influence in this area.

EVALUATING CURRICULUM

With the exception of the district-wide policy groups for which it ranks ninth, evaluating curriculum ranks around the median for all types of group. High percentages of the individual school policy groups (59%) and advisory groups (65%) have some influence in this area. Higher percentages of the groups operating district-wide reported to have no responsibility in evaluating curriculum.

EVALUATING EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS

As an area of major influence, evaluating extracurricular programs ranks near the median for district-wide policy groups and lower for others. With the exception of the district-wide policy groups, for which 33 percent are reported to have major influence in this area, less than 13 percent of the groups have major influence. As an area of some influence, there are higher percentages reported for the policy type groups.
APPROVING NEW SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Ranking near the median of areas of major influence, approving new school programs is most commonly reported as an area of some influence for all types of groups. Individual school policy groups have the greatest involvement, and none reported to have no influence. District-wide policy groups most frequently have major influence in this area. Very high percentages of the groups operating in individual schools reported to have some influence in approving programs. All of the school policy groups have some or major influence.

IMPROVING COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS

For all types of groups, less than ten percent are reported to have no influence in this area. Among district advisory groups it ranks first as the most commonly reported area of major influence. It ranks second for all others. Slightly higher percentages of groups operating district-wide report this as an area of major influence, and fewer of these types report no involvement in improving community support.

INVESTIGATING STUDENT OR PARENT PROBLEMS OR COMPLAINTS

The fourth place ranking for this area, as one of major influence for the district-wide policy groups, is substantially higher than its ranking for all other types. 37 percent of all types of groups reported to have some influence. Among the groups having some influence in this area, the percentages are slightly higher for advisory groups than for policy groups.

RAISING MONEY FOR SCHOOLS

Of all the areas listed, raising money for schools resulted in the greatest numbers of groups of all types reporting no involvement. With the exception of the district-wide policy groups, over half of all other types reported to have no influence. Both types of district-wide groups reported a more major influence in this area than groups for individual schools.

HELPING IN SCHOOLS (TUTORING, MONITORING LUNCHROOM, AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES)

Groups in individual schools reported to help more frequently than either type of district-wide group. On the whole, this area ranks very low for district-wide groups: over half of the district groups reported no involvement in this area. High percentages slightly over one third of the groups in individual schools also reported no involvement.
A COMPOSITE PICTURE OF CATEGORY I MECHANISMS FOR INVOLVING PARENTS AND CITIZENS IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

Each of the school district mechanisms for involving parents and citizens in educational decision making is, of course, unique. From the information provided through the interview instruments, it is impossible to make an assessment of the viability and effectiveness of the groups identified. Rather than detailing all of the information gathered through the interviews in each city, what may be useful is a composite description of the four types of groups identified.

District-wide Policy Group

The group is of recent origin, established in 1971 because of school district initiative. Legally the group draws its authority from a mandate by the district board of education. The group has 17 elected members, and nearly three-fourths are parents of children in school. Other categories of members: community residents ten percent, school administrators four percent, teachers ten percent, paraprofessional, secretarial, maintenance staff four percent, and students ten percent. Major activities of the group include identifying school district goals, priorities and needs, and setting budget priorities. The group also plays a major role in determining about school facilities and building sites, and in approving new school programs. An additional major responsibility of the group is to assist in investigating parent and student problems or complaints. The school district allocates approximately $15,000 a year to support the activities of the group. Other forms of assistance offered by the school district include provision of staff for coordination, orientation sessions and training workshops, consultant help, assistance in preparing publication and assistance in evaluations.

District-wide Advisory Group

The district-wide advisory groups were established in different years for different purposes. In some cases school district initiative was the reason, in others parent interest was the motivation. The first district-wide group, Title I Parent Advisory Committee, was established in 1971 under provision of federal guidelines. Most of the groups, however, were created by the district school board. The average number of members is between 21 and 50 and they may be appointed by the district school board or superintendent. Interested persons may also volunteer to be members. Parents of children in school comprise most of the membership of all groups. Many of the groups focus on single issues such as ethnic studies, sexism, special education. The major function for all is to identify goals, priorities and needs. Another major role of these groups is to improve community support for schools. Although the school district does not provide a specific amount of money for support of the groups' activities, other services are provided, as needed, by the administration. Such support services include staff assistance, orientation and training.
workshops, consultant help, assistance in preparing publications, and evaluation of projects.

**Individual School Policy Group**

A convergence of interest among school board members, administrators, and citizens led to the establishment of individual school policy groups in the late '60s and early '70s. These groups are permitted to operate by both state and local board of education guidelines. Most of the groups are small. For each school, ten or fewer members are appointed by principals or are elected. 90 percent of the members are parents of children in school. Of the remaining ten percent, half are other community residents and half are school administrators. Although the activities of the individual groups vary, virtually all have major involvement in identifying goals, priorities, and approving new school programs. Other activities which many of the groups participate in are evaluation of curriculum, evaluation of extra-curricular programs, improvement of community support for schools, and investigation of student or parent complaints. The school district budget provides no financial support for these groups, but a small amount of school staff assistance, some orientation, occasional training workshops and consultant help are provided.

**Individual School Advisory Group**

Individual school advisory groups have been established during the past five years. Both school district initiative and citizen interest were responsible for their development. Authority is derived from school district policy, but the existence of a group at every school is not mandated, and each principal may use personal discretion in forming a group. The average number of members is between ten and twenty, and are either appointed by the principal or elected. 70 percent of the members are parents of children in school. Other members include: community residents three percent, school administrators three percent, teachers twenty percent, paraprofessional, secretarial and maintenance staff two percent, students two percent. For all groups, major functions are to identify school goals, priorities, and to improve community support for schools. Individual groups may have involvement in areas such as setting budget priorities, selecting principals, evaluating curriculum, evaluating extracurricular programs, approving new school programs, raising money for schools, and investigating student or parent complaints. The board of education does not provide financial support for these groups. School administrators, however, help to coordinate group activities and central office staff provide consultant assistance.
The following directory contains an entry for each school district which completed and returned a questionnaire for category I groups. The types of participatory groups operating in each district are noted. Definitions used were:

Policy: having a direct role in the decision making process

Advisory: making recommendations to those who make decisions

The entries are arranged in alphabetical order by state and district names.
ALABAMA

Huntsville City Schools
Huntsville 35804
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Mobile City County School District
P.O. Box 1327
Mobile 36601
.district-wide advisory group

ARIZONA

Holbrook School District No. 3
Box 640
Holbrook 86025
.district-wide policy group

Miami Area School District
P.O. Box 1327
Miami 85539
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group

Amphitheater School District
125 East Prince Road
Tucson 85705
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

ARKANSAS

Harmony Grove School District
Route 3, Box 217
Camden 71701
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group

CALIFORNIA

Alameda Unified School District
400 Grand Street
Alameda 94501
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Apple Valley School District
22974 Bear Valley Road
Apple Valley 92307
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Barstow Unified School District
551 South H Street
Barstow 92311
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Carlsbad Unified School District
801 Pine Avenue
Carlsbad 92008
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Castro Valley Unified School District
P.O. Box 2146
Castro Valley 94546
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group

Chula Vista City School District
P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista 92012
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Clovis Unified School District
914 Fourth Street
Clovis 93612
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Colton Joint Unified School District
1212 Valencia Drive
Colton 92324
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Round Valley Unified School District
Box 276, Howard Street
Coveo 95428
.district-wide advisory group
CALIFORNIA (continued)

Culver City Unified School District
4034 Irving Place
Culver City 90230

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Davis Joint Unified School District
23 Russell Boulevard
Davis 95616

district-wide policy group
individual school advisory group

Cajon Valley Union School District
189 Roanoke Road
El Cajon 92022

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Elk Grove Unified School District
Elk Grove Boulevard
Elk Grove 95624

district-wide advisory group

Folsom Cordova Unified School District
1901 Coloma
Folsom 95630

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Fresno Unified School District
2348 Mariposa Street
Fresno 93721

individual school advisory group

Healdsburg Union High School District
304 Center Street
Healdsburg 95448

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Lancaster School District
44711 North Cedar Avenue, P.O. Box 1750
Lancaster 93534

district-wide advisory group
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group

Grossmont Union High School District
P.O. Box 1043
La Mesa 92031

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Hacienda La Puente Unified School District
15959 East Cale Avenue, P.O. Box 1219
La Puente 91749

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Los Angeles Unified School District
450 North Grand Avenue
Los Angeles 90012

district-wide policy group
district-wide advisory group

Merced City School District
444 West 23rd Street
Merced 95340

district-wide advisory group

Needles Unified School District
P.O. Box 307
Needles 92363

district-wide advisory group

Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland 94606

district-wide policy group
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Orcutt Union School District
P.O. Box 2310
Orcutt 93454

district-wide advisory group
CALIFORNIA (continued)

Piedmont Unified School District
760 Magnolia Avenue
Piedmont 94611
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Hueneme School District
354 North Third Street
Port Hueneme 93041
   individual school advisory group

Sequoia Union High School District
480 James Avenue
Redwood City 94063
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Sacramento City Unified School District
1619 N Street, P.O. Box 2271
Sacramento 95810
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

San Diego Unified School District
4100 Normal Street
San Diego 92130
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco 94102
   district-wide policy group
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco 94102
   district-wide policy group
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

San Gabriel School District
102 East Broadway, P.O. Box 940
San Gabriel 91778
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District
2930 Gay Avenue
San Jose 95127
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

San Mateo Union High School District
650 North Delaware
San Mateo 94010
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school policy group
   individual school advisory group

Torrance Unified School District
2335 Plaza del Amo
Torrance 90509
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Tracy School District
315 East 11th Street
Tracy 95376
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Travis Unified School District
De Ronde Drive
Travis Air Force Base 94535
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group

Tahoe Truckee Unified School District
P.O. Box 458
Truckee 95574
   district-wide advisory group

Vacaville Unified School District
751 School Street
Vacaville 95688
   district-wide advisory group

West Covina Unified School District
1717 West Merced
West Covina 91790
   district-wide advisory group

Yuba City Unified School District
243 Colusa Avenue
Yuba City 95991
   district-wide advisory group
   individual school advisory group
COLORADO

Fremont School District RE-1
1104 Royel Gorge Boulevard
Canon City 81212
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Douglas County School District RE-1
P.O. Box Q
Castle Rock 80104
.district-wide advisory group

Delta County Joint School District 50
Route 1, Box 127
Delta 81416
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Poudre School District R-1
2407 Laporte Avenue
Fort Collins 80521
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

East Otero School District R-1
P.O. Box 439
La Junta 81050
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group
.individual school and advisory group

Lamar School District RE-2
210 West Pearl Street
Lamar 81052
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

St. Vrain Valley School District
395 South Pratt Parkway
Longmont 80501
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Thompson School District R2-J
201 South Lincoln Avenue
Loveland 80537
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

School District No. 70
24951 East Highway 50
Pueblo 81006
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Salida School District R-32-J
P.O. Box 70
Salida 81201
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Valley School District RE-1
119 North Third Avenue, P.O. Box 910
Sterling 80751
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

CONNECTICUT

Bethel School District
241 Greenwood Avenue
Bethel 06801
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Branford Public School District
33 Laurel Street
Branford 06405
.individual school advisory group

Cromwell Public School District
Mann Memorial Drive
Cromwell 06416
.individual school advisory group

New Fairfield School District
24 Gillotti Road
New Fairfield 06810
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Newington School District
90 Welles Drive North
Newington 06111
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group
CONNECTICUT (continued)

Southington School District
49 Beecher Street
Southington  06489

district-wide advisory group

Windsor School District
P.O. Box 10
Windsor  06095

individual school advisory group

Regional School District No. 7
Central Avenue Exit
Winsted  06098

district-wide advisory group

DELAWARE

Appoquinimink School District
Fourth and Main Street
Odessa  19730

district-wide advisory group

Alfred I. DuPont School District
4 Mount Lebanon Road
Wilmington  19803

district-wide advisory group

Stanton School District
1800 Limestone Road
Wilmington  19808

district-wide advisory group

Wilmington School District
1400 Washington Street
Wilmington  19801

district-wide advisory group

FLORIDA

Sumter County School District
P.O. Box 428
Bushnell  33513

district-wide advisory group

Alachua County School District
1817 East University Avenue
Gainesville  32601

district-wide advisory group

Hendry County School District
P.O. Box 787
LaBelle  33935

district-wide advisory group

Columbia County School District
P.O. Box 1148
Lake City  32055

district-wide advisory group

Dade County Public Schools
1410 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami  33132

district-wide advisory group

Santa Rosa County School District
P.O. Box 271
Milton  32570

district-wide advisory group

Jefferson County School District
P.O. Box 499
Monticello  32344

district-wide advisory group

Orange County School District
434 North Tampa Avenue
Orlando  32805

district-wide advisory group

Sarasota County School District
2418 Hatton Street
Sarasota  33577

district-wide advisory group

Hillsborough County School District
Tampa  33601

district-wide advisory group
FLORIDA (continued)

Brevard County School District
3205 South Washington Avenue
Titusville 32780
.individual school advisory group

GEORGIA

Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta 30303
.individual school advisory group

Bibb County Public School District
2064 Vineville Avenue
Macon 31204
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Coweta County School District
55 Savannah Street, Box 280
Newnan 30263
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

HAWAII

Hawaii School District
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu 96804
.district-wide advisory group

IDAHO

Boise City School District
1207 Fort Street
Boise 83702
.district-wide advisory group

Bonnier County School District No. 82
McFarland Building
Sandpoint 83864
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

ILLINOIS

Community High School District No. 218
5933 West 115th Street
Alsip 60442
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

West Aurora School District No. 129
80 South River Street
Aurora 60507
.individual school advisory group

City of Chicago School District
Chicago 60601
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Community High School District No. 155
45 West Franklin Street
Crystal Lake 60014
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

School District No. 47
174 North Oak Street
Crystal Lake 60014
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

DeKalb Community Unit School District No. 428
145 Fisk Avenue
DeKalb 60115
.district-wide advisory group

Geneva Community School District Unit 304
638 Logan Street
Geneva 60134
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Glencoe Public School District
999 Green Bay Road
Glencoe 60022
.district-wide advisory group
ILLINOIS (continued)

Highland Park Deerfield School District
1040 Park Avenue
Highland Park 60035
.district-wide advisory group

Lincoln Elementary School District
No. 27
100 South Maple Street
Lincoln 62656
.district-wide advisory group

Marquardt School District No. 15
21 West 364 Belden Street
Lombard 60148
.individual school advisory group

Madison School District No. 12
1707 Fourth Street
Madison 62060
.district-wide policy group

River Trails School District No. 26
1900 East Kensington Road
Mount Prospect 60056
.district-wide advisory group

Mundelein Elementary School District
200 West Maple Street
Mundelein 60060
.district-wide advisory group

East Maine School District
8320 Ballard Road
Niles 60648
.district-wide advisory group

North Chicago School District
1717, - 17th Street
North Chicago 60064
.individual school advisory group

Oak Park School District
970 Madison Street
Oak Park 60302
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Plano Unit School District No. 88
708 Hale Street
Plano 60545
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Steger Public School District No. 194
33rd and Emerald Street
Steger 60475
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Sundoer-Beverly Manor School District No. 50
304 East Almond Drive
Washington 61571
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Avoca School District No. 37
2921 Illinois Road
Wilmette 60091
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Woodridge Elementary School District No. 68
2525 Mitchell Drive
Woodridge 60515
.district-wide advisory group

INDIANA

Rensselaer Central School District
College and Grove Street
Rensselaer 47978
.district-wide advisory group

Clark-Pleasant Community School District
250 Main Street
Whiteland 46184
.individual school advisory group
IOWA

Ames Community School District
120 South Kellogg Street
Ames 50010

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Des Moines Public Schools
1800 Grand
Des Moines 50307

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

KANSAS

Shawnee Mission Unified District No. 512
7235 Antioch Street
Shawnee Mission 66204

district-wide advisory group

Wichita School District
Wichita 67202

district-wide advisory group
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group

KENTUCKY

Hazard Independent School District
511 Broadway Street
Hazard 41701

district-wide advisory group

Lynch Independent School District
East Main Street
Lynch 40855

district-wide policy group

Owensboro Independent School District
1335 West 11th Street, P.O. Box 746
Owensboro 42301

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

MARYLAND

Anne Arundel County Public School District
188 Green Street
Annapolis 21401

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

MAINE

School Administrative District No. 51
Cumberland Center 04021

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

School Administrative District No. 54
Route 2
Skowhegan 04976

district-wide advisory group

School Administrative District No. 24
90 Main Street
Van Buren 04785

district-wide policy group
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

LOUISIANA

St. Bernard Parish School District
East Chalmette Circle
Chalmette 70043

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Lasalle Parish School District
P.O. Drawer 90
Jena 71342

district-wide advisory group

New Orleans Public Schools
703 Carondelet
New Orleans 70130

district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Caddo Parish School Board
1961 Midway
Shreveport 71130

district-wide advisory group
MARYLAND (continued)

Baltimore City Public Schools
3 East 25th Street
Baltimore  21218
.district-wide advisory group

Board of Education of Harford
County School District
45 East Gordon Street
Bel Air  21014
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Calvert County School District
Prince Frederick  20678
.district-wide advisory group

Board of Education of Baltimore
County School District
6901 Charles Street
Towson  21204
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Public Schools
11 Beacon Street
Boston  02108
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Braintree Public School District
10 Tremont Street
Braintree  02184
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Brookline School District
33 Washington Street
Brookline  02146
.district-wide advisory group

Greenfield Public School District
197 Federal Street
Greenfield  01301
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Hamilton Wenham Regional High School
District
775 Bay Road
Hamilton  01936
.district-wide advisory group

Harwich Public School District
Oak Street
Harwich  02645
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Supervisory Union 64 - Wachusett
Regional School District
1411 Main Street
Holden  01520
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Holyoke School District
98 Suffolk Street
Holyoke  01040
.individual school advisory group

Hull School District
814 Nantasket Avenue
Hull  02045
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Shrewsbury School District
100 Maple Avenue
Shrewsbury  01545
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Supervisory Union 39
Feeding Hills Road, P.O. Box 26
Southwick  10077
.individual school advisory group

Supervisory Union 11
Route 28, Professional Building
South Yarmouth  02664
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
MASSACHUSETTS (continued)

Springfield Public School District
195 State Street
Springfield 01103
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Sudbury Public School District
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury 01776
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Watertown Public School District
30 Common Street
Watertown 02172
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Wayland Public School District
Wayland 01778
district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Wellesley School District
12 Seaward Road
Wellesley Hills 02181
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Worcester Public School District
20 Irving Street
Worcester 01609
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Berkley School District
3127 Bacon Street
Berkley 48072
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Birmingham School District
550 West Merrill Street
Birmingham 48012
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward Avenue
Detroit 48202
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Edwardsburg Public School District
435 South Section Street
Edwardsburg 49112
.district-wide advisory group

Beecher School District
1020 West Coldwater Road
Flint 48505
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Howell Public School District
408 West Grand River
Howell 48843
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Jenison Public School District
8375 - 20th Street
Jenison 49428
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Lansing School District
519 East Kalamazoo Street
Lansing 48933
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

MICHIGAN

Allen Park School District
18805 Wick Road
Allen Park 48101
district-wide advisory group

Almont Community School District
401 Church Street
Almont 48003
district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
Michigan (continued)

Waverly School District
5217 Lansing Road
Lansing 48917
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Monroe School District
1275 Macomb Street
Monroe 48161
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Mayville Community School District
6250 Fulton Street
Mayville 48744
.district-wide advisory group

Port Huron Area School District
509 Stanton Street
Port Huron 48060
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Saginaw Township Community School District
3465 North Center Street
Saginaw 48603
.district-wide policy group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Springport Public School District
West Main Street
Springport 49284
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Utica Community School District
52188 Van Dyke Street
Utica 48094
.district-wide advisory group

Minnesota

Edina Public School District
4660 West 77th Street
Edina 55435
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Independent School District No. 454
115 South Park Street
Fairmont 56031
.district-wide advisory group

Independent School District No. 200
Hastings 55033
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Minneapolis Special District No. 1
807 N.E. Broadway
Minneapolis 55413
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

St. Paul Independent School District No. 625
360 Colborne Street
St. Paul 55102
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Independent School District No. 47
901 South First Street
Sauk Rapids 56379
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Independent School District No. 624
709 Bloom Avenue
White Bear Lake 55110
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Missouri

Clayton Public School District
7530 Maryland Avenue
Clayton 63011
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Excelsior Springs School District No. 40
P.O. Box 248
Excelsior Springs 64024
.individual school advisory group
MISSOURI (continued)

Center School District No. 58
8701 Holmes
Kansas City 64131
district-wide advisory group

Kansas City Public Schools
1200 McGee
Kansas City 64106
district-wide advisory group

Lindbergh School District
4900 South Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis 63126
district-wide policy group
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Normandy School District
7837 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis 63121
district-wide advisory group

St. Louis City Public Schools
911 Locust
St. Louis 63101
district-wide advisory group

Sullivan Consolidated School District
East Vine
Sullivan 63080
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group

Washington School District
11th and Sunnyside Street
Washington 63090
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

MONTANA

Hardin School District
522 Center Avenue
Hardin 59034
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group

Custer County Unified School District
421 Tenth Street
Miles City 59301
district-wide advisory group

NEBRASKA

Lincoln Public School District
720 South 22nd Street
Lincoln 68510
district-wide advisory group
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group

McCook City School District No. 17
700 West Seventh Street
McCook 69001
individual school advisory group

Minden Public School District R-3
520 West Third Street
Minden 68959
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

NEW JERSEY

North Hunterdon Regional High School District
Route 31
Annandale 08801
district-wide advisory group

East Orange School District
21 Winans Street
East Orange 07017
district-wide advisory group
individual school advisory group

Glassboro Public School District
Joseph Bowe Boulevard
Glassboro 08028
individual school policy group
individual school advisory group
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NEW JERSEY (continued)

Glen Ridge School District
10 High Street
Glen Ridge 07028
- district-wide advisory group
  - individual school advisory group

Lakewood Township School District
100 Linden Street
Lakewood 08701
- district-wide advisory group

Midland Park School District
31 Highland Avenue
Midland Park 07432
- district-wide advisory group

Newton Public School District
57 Trinity Street
Newton 07860
- district-wide policy group
  - individual school advisory group

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque Public School District
P.O. Box 25704
Albuquerque 87125
- district-wide advisory group
  - individual school advisory group

Espanola Municipal School District
P.O. Box 249
Espanola 87532
- district-wide policy group
  - individual school advisory group

Las Vegas City School District
901 Douglas Street
Las Vegas 87701
- district-wide advisory group
  - individual school advisory group

NEW YORK

Batavia City School District
39 Washington Avenue
Batavia 14020
- district-wide advisory group
  - individual school policy group
  - individual school advisory group

Binghamton City School District
98 Oak Street
Binghamton 13905
- district-wide policy group
  - district-wide advisory group
  - individual school advisory group

Cheektowaga Central School District
Education Center
Central Valley 10917
- district-wide advisory group

Cornwall Central School District
Main Street
Cornwall 12518
- district-wide policy group
  - individual school advisory group

Dobbs Ferry Union Free School District
Broadway
Dobbs Ferry 10522
- individual school advisory group

Dryden Central School District
Dryden 13053
- district-wide policy group
  - district-wide advisory group
  - individual school policy group
NEW YORK (continued)

East Aurora Union Free School District
450 Main Street
East Aurora 14052
.district-wide advisory group

Union-Endicott Central School District
300 Lincoln Avenue
Endicott 13760
.district-wide advisory group

Frewsburg Central School District
Institute Street
Frewsburg 14738
.district-wide advisory group

Great Neck Public School District
345 Lakeville Road
Great Neck 11020
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Homer Central School District
80 West Road
Homer 13077
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Horseheads Central School District
Board of Education
Horseheads 14845
.district-wide advisory group

Jamestown School District
200 East Fourth Street
Jamestown 14701
.district-wide advisory group

Liverpool Central School District
Hickory at Fourth Street
Liverpool 13088
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Manhasset Union Free School District
1 Memorial Place
Manhasset 11030
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Bellmore Merrick Central High School District
1691 Meadowbrook Road
Merrick 11566
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Bedford Central School District
P.O. Box 180
Mount Kisco 10549
.district-wide advisory group

New York City Schools
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 11201
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Wayne Central School District
Ontario Center 14520
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Oswego City School District
233 West Utica Street
Oswego 13126
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Oyster Bay-East Norwich Central School District
McCoun's Lane
Oyster Bay 11771
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Pearl River School District
137 Franklin Avenue
Pearl River 10965
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
NEW YORK (continued)

Portville Central School District
Portville 14770
.district-wide advisory group

Niagara Wheatfield Central School District
2292 Saunders Settlement Road
Sanborn 14132
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Schoharie Central School District
Main Street
Schoharie 12157
.district-wide advisory group

North Shore School District
112 Franklin Avenue
Sea Cliff 11579
.district-wide advisory group

Cassadaga Valley School District
Sinclairville 14782
.district-wide advisory group

Sodus Central School District
2 East Main Street, P.O. Box 220
Sodus 14551
.individual school advisory group

Spencer-Van Central School District
Dartt Crossroad
Spencer 14883
.district-wide advisory group

Troy City School District
1950 Burdett Avenue
Troy 12180
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Uniondale Union Free School District
Goodrich Street
Uniondale 11553
.district-wide policy group

White Plains School District
5 Homeside Lane
White Plains 10605
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

NORTH CAROLINA

Randolph County School District
173 Worth Street
Asheboro 27203
.individual school advisory group

Watauga County School District
P.O. Box 112
Boone 28607
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Durham City School District
P.O. Box 2246
Durham 27702
.district-wide advisory group

Fayetteville City School District
P.O. Box 5326
Fayetteville 28303
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Alamance County School District
P.O. Box 110
Graham 27253
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Craven County School District
P.O. Box 969
New Bern 28560
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Wake County School District
P.O. Box 6526
Raleigh 27608
.district-wide advisory group
NORTH CAROLINA (continued)

Bertie County School District
P.O. Box 10
Windsor 27983
.individual school advisory group

Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School District
Gramille Drive
Winston-Salem 27101
.individual school advisory group

NORTH DAKOTA

Dickinson Public School District No. 1
P.O. Box 1057
Dickinson 58601
.individual school advisory group

Independent School District No. 1
Administrative Offices
Grand Forks 58201
.individual school advisory group

OHIO

Rolling Hills Local School District
Route 1
Byesville 43723
.individual school policy group

Chillicothe City School District
455 Yoctangee Parkway
Chillicothe 45601
.individual school policy group

Cincinnati Public School District
230 East Ninth Street
Cincinnati 45202
.individual school advisory group

Mariemont City School District
3900 Plainville Road
Cincinnati 45227
.individual school advisory group

Sycamore Community School District
4881 Cooper Road
Cincinnati 45242
.individual school advisory group

Columbus Public Schools
270 East State Street
Columbus 43215
.individual school advisory group

Northridge Local School District
5120 North Dixie Drive
Dayton 45414
.individual school advisory group

Girard City School District
117 North Highland Street
Girard 44420
.individual school advisory group

Buckeye Local School District
Route 1
Mingo Junction 43938
.individual school advisory group

Jackson-Milton Local School District
Mahoning Avenue
North Jackson 44451
.individual school advisory group

North Ridgeville City School District
35895 Center Ridge Road
North Ridge 44039
.individual school advisory group
OH (continued)

Firelands Local School District  
405 North Pleasant Street  
Oberlin  44074
.district-wide advisory group
.Oberlin City School District  
65 North Pleasant Street  
Oberlin  44074
.individual school advisory group
.Paulding Exempted Village School District  
405 North Water Street  
Paulding  45879
.district-wide advisory group
.Portsmouth City School District  
Fourth and Court Streets  
Portsmouth  45662
.district-wide advisory group
.Ravenna School District  
507 East Main Street  
Ravenna  44266
.district-wide advisory group
.Garaway Local School District  
P.O. Box 338  
Sugarcreek  44681
.district-wide advisory group
.Sylvania City School District  
6801 Maplewood Avenue  
Sylvania  43560
.district-wide advisory group
.Urbana City School District  
500 Washington Avenue  
Urbana  43078
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
.Warren City School District  
261 Monroe Street, N.W.  
Warren  44481
.district-wide advisory group

Westlake City School District  
2282 Dover Road  
Westlake  44145
.district-wide advisory group
.Beavercreek Local School District  
2940 Dayton-Xenia Road  
Xenia  45385
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

OKLAHOMA

Bartlesville Independent School District  
I-30  
1100 South Jennings Street  
Bartlesville  74003
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
.Broken Arrow School District I-3  
601 South Main Street  
Broken Arrow  74012
.individual school advisory group

OREGON

Lane County School District 4J  
200 North Monroe Street  
Eugene  97405
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
.South Umpqua School District No. 19  
P.O. Box 649  
Myrtle Creek  97457
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.Nyssa School District No. 26  
Nyssa  97913
.district-wide advisory group
.Rockwood School District No. 27  
740 S.E. 182nd Avenue  
Portland  97233
.district-wide advisory group
OREGON (continued)

Reynolds School District No. 7
Route 2, P.O. Box 496
Troutdale 97060
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

PENNSYLVANIA

North Schuylkill School District
North Ninth Street
Ashland 17921
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Bethel Park School District
301 Church Road
Bethel Park 15102
.district-wide policy group
.individual school advisory group

Bristol Township School District
800 Coates Avenue
Bristol 19007
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Shade-Central City School District
McGregor Avenue
Cairnbrook 15924
.district-wide advisory group

Glendale School District
Flinton 16640
.individual school advisory group

Palisades School District
RD 1
Kintnersville 18930
.district-wide advisory group

Manheim Township School District
P.O. Box 5134
Lancaster 17601
.district-wide advisory group

Gateway School District
Moss Side Boulevard
Monroeville 15146
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Springfield Township School District
1901 East Paper Mill Road
Oreland 19075
.individual school advisory group

Oxford Area School District
430 Broad Street
Oxford 19363
.individual school advisory group

School District of Philadelphia
21st and Benjamin Franklin Parkway
Philadelphia 19103
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Sharon City School District
Forker Boulevard
Sharon 16146
.district-wide advisory group

Highlands School District
Ninth Avenue at Corbet Street
Tarentum 15084
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Avon Grove School District
20 Prospect Avenue
West Grove 19390
.individual school advisory group

Bald Eagle Area School District
P.O. Box 4
Wingate 16880
.district-wide advisory group
RHODE ISLAND

Coventry Public School District
Flat River Road
Coventry 02816
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Warwick School District
34 Warwick Lake Avenue
Warwick 02889
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

SOUTH CAROLINA

Johnsonville-Florence County School District No. 5
Drawer 98
Johnsonville 29555
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group

Orangeburg County School District No. 5
578 Ellis Avenue
Orangeburg 29115
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lead-Deadwood School District No. 106
P.O. Box 879
Lead 57754
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Rapid City Independent School District
809 South Street
Rapid City 57701
.individual school advisory group

TENNESSEE

Jackson City School District
City Hall
Jackson 38301
.district-wide advisory group

Roane County School District
P.O. Box 690
Kingston 37763
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lead-Deadwood School District No. 106
P.O. Box 879
Lead 57754
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Rapid City Independent School District
809 South Street
Rapid City 57701
.individual school advisory group

TEXAS

Austin Independent School District
6100 Guadalupe Street
Austin 78752
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Crosby Independent School District
P.O. Drawer C
Crosby 77532
.district-wide advisory group

Wilmer-Hutchins Independent School District
3820 East Illinois Street
Dallas 75216
.district-wide advisory group

Denison Independent School District
800 South Mirick Street
Denison 75020
.district-wide policy group

Fairfield Independent School District
P.O. Box 758
Fairfield 75840
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
TEXAS (continued)

Point Isabel Independent School District
Drawer AH
Port Isabel 75878
.district-wide policy group

Post Independent School District
201 West Sixth Street
Post 79356
.district-wide advisory group

VERMONT

Mount Anthony Union High School District No. 14
604 Main Street
Bennington 05201
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

VIRGINIA

Clarke County Public School District
309 West Main Street
Berryville 22611
.district-wide advisory group

Montgomery County School District
P.O. Box 29
Christiansbury 24073
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Alleghany County School District
330 North Court Avenue
Covington 24426
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Northampton County Public School District
Eastville 23347
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

King William-West Point School District
King William 23086
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Rockbridge County School District
417 Morningside Drive
Lexington 24450
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group

Norton City School District
P.O. Box 498
Norton 24273
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Shenandoah County School District
Woodstock 22664
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

WASHINGTON

Camas School District
2028 N.E. Garfield Street
Camas 98607
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Hoquiam School District No. 28
312 Simpson Avenue
Hoquiam 98550
.district-wide policy group
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

Kent School District No. 415
12033 South East 256th Street
Kent 98031
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
WASHINGTON (continued)

North Thurston School District No. 3
6202 Pacific Avenue
Lacey 98503
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Highline School District No. 401
15675 Ambaum Boulevard, S.W.
Seattle 98166
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Spokane School District No. 81
West 825 Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane 99201
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

Clover Park School District No. 400
5214 Steilacoom Boulevard S.W.
Tacoma 98498
.individual school advisory group

Evergreen School District
7000 N.E. 117th Avenue
Vancouver 98662
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school policy group
.individual school advisory group

WEST VIRGINIA

Grant County School District
Jefferson Avenue
Petersburg 26847
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group

WISCONSIN

Nicolet High School District
670 North Jean Nicolet Road
Glendale 53217
.district-wide advisory group
.individual school advisory group
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE CATEGORY II MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

CATEGORY II GROUPS

Category II groups are private, non-profit organizations which are not formally associated with the school system, but are concerned with educational policy and practice in a local school district. Numerous types of groups might be included in this category. Affiliates of national organizations, city-wide, and neighborhood groups may undertake projects in education. Without providing further specificity, we decided to identify as many organizations as possible within the loose definition.

RESPONSE TO THE MAIL SURVEY: CATEGORY II

On the response forms returned by the superintendents, 718 category II organizations were identified. Questionnaires were sent to 567 of these groups. Some of the groups reported by the superintendents were not sent the questionnaire because their names indicated that the groups were not within our definition of category II. Of the 151 groups excluded most were PTA, Title I advisory groups, and athletic booster clubs.

QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED

The questionnaire sent to category II groups is reproduced in Appendix B. Seventy-eight (16 percent) of the organizations to whom questionnaires were sent completed and returned them. Examination of the returned questionnaires indicated that not all of the groups were within our definition of category II. Twenty-four of the questionnaires were completed by school personnel about category I groups. In addition, among the valid category II groups we saw significant differences and concluded that some distinction should be made among them. Most of the category II groups returning questionnaires (24) were those with an affiliation to a national organization. Most of these were League of Women Voters chapters. The second grouping within category II was of local organizations whose single concern was education, generally in a single school district. There were 14 of these groups, and most incorporate the designation citizen in the title. A few examples are "Citizens for Quality Education," "Citizens Committee for the Public Schools," "Citizens Council for Better Schools," and "Concerned Citizens for Education." Also returning 14 questionnaires were organizations which serve community service functions. Examples of organizations in this grouping include the Erie County Drug Council, Cheyenne Mountain Enrichment Program, Mexican American Citizens for Success, and a group called Women-In-Action for the Prevention of Violence and Its Causes, Inc.
We received a small number of questionnaires (4) from groups whose single concern is some specific educational issue. One such group formed to press for an "open school board," and another similarly took the name "Non-Partisan Citizens Nominating Committee for the Members of the Great Neck Board of Education." One of these groups is focused on bilingual education and another lobbies to heighten community awareness of the need for a new school.

LEGAL STATUS AND DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT

The greatest number of category II groups have reported themselves as private, non-profit organizations or units of national or state organizations with similar legal status. The total in this category is highest because the largest number of respondents, those with national affiliations, report this status most frequently (in 19 of the 24 cases). Those organizations with community service functions also predominantly have private, non-profit legal status. Two specified that they are public non-profit. Category II groups for which the primary concern is education in a single district are most commonly unincorporated voluntary groups. Of the 18 reporting in this grouping, 6 were private non-profit and 12 were unincorporated voluntary. A greater percentage of local groups with a specific and single educational concern report that they are unincorporated voluntary groups.

The time of establishment for groups with national affiliations is much earlier than for local groups concerned with education alone; most of the former were established well before 1970, and most of the latter in 1973. The range of years over which the groups with national affiliations were established is much wider than of local groups.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND MEMBERSHIP SELECTION

The smallest groups are those which focus on a single educational issue. One of these groups reports 75 members, but the others report an average of 30. Groups with national affiliations are, on the average, larger than local groups with a general educational purpose. The average membership for nationally affiliated groups is 133, for local groups, 62. Again, the range of number of members is larger for the national affiliation groups, from 12 to 650 for a Chamber of Commerce. The largest of the general education groups has 150 members.

For nearly all category II groups membership is voluntary. None of the members of the special focus education groups reported elected members, and 9 of the 14 general education groups report voluntary membership. A substantial majority of the nationally affiliated groups (19 of the 24) report that membership is voluntary. Three of the community service groups report elected members, and the remaining are voluntary member organizations.
CATEGORIES OF MEMBERS

Women constitute a majority of the membership on all of the category II groups. All but ten of the groups have over 50 percent women. Among the ten organizations reporting less than 50 percent women, the average percentage of women is low, five percent. This low percentage is due to the fact that among the national affiliations group, the greatest number with less than 50 percent women have none or few women members. These are groups such as the Rotary and Civitan Clubs, and Chamber of Commerce. The remaining groups with national affiliation have very high percentages of women members; many are League of Women Voters chapters numbering nearly 100 percent women.

Most of the members of all category II groups are parents of children in school. Parents are predominant on groups with general education purpose. The average percentage of members who are parents of children in school for these groups is 89 percent. The groups reporting the fewest members as parents of children in school are the groups with community service functions, but even these have over half (56%) of the membership are parents. The groups with national affiliation and those with specific educational concerns report 67 percent and 63 percent, respectively, for percentage of membership of parents of children in school. Most of the nationally affiliated groups report members in the category "other community residents." The average percentage of this category of member for the nationally affiliated groups is 27 percent. Of the local groups, fewer report members in the "other community residents" category and for the groups with general educational concerns the average percentage of members in this category is 14 percent, the average for the specific focus groups is 38 percent. Nearly all of the community service organizations report citizen members and the average percentage is 30 percent. Slightly less than half of the groups with national affiliation report school administrators as members and the percentages are small, the average administrator membership for these groups is 11 percent. Only five of all the local education groups, both general and specific, report administrators as members and the average is very low, eight percent. Less than half of the community service groups have administrators members and for those which do, the average percentage is six percent. For the national affiliated groups, about the same number report teachers as members as report administrators and the average percentage reported is also about the same, at 12 percent. Few of the local education groups report teachers as members and the percentages reported are low, all less than ten percent. One-third of the community service organizations report teacher members and the average percentage reported is 12 percent. Very few of all of the category II groups have reported student members. Students are most frequently represented as members of the community service organizations; five of the fourteen reported an average 31 percent student members. Very few other groups reported student members and all reported substantially less than ten percent in this category.
SOURCES OF SUPPORT

For the nationally affiliated groups the largest source of support is membership dues. Nearly all of these groups reported this as a source of support, and the average percentage of funds raised from this source is nearly 50 percent. Very few of these groups report revenue derived from the sale of publications. Two groups reported that two and five percent of funds come from publication sales. Special fund raising activities are sponsored by most of the nationally affiliated groups, and the average percentage of the budget raised in this way is 38 percent. One group of this type reported that five percent of the budget came from foundation support and another reported that two percent was received by grant or contract from a federal agency. Business contributions were another important source of support for the groups with national affiliations; half of the groups reported contributions which averaged 44 percent of the budgets. None of these groups, however, reported money from their national organizations. For the local groups in education most of the budget comes from membership dues and special fund raising activities. Of the local groups, only those with general education concerns report other sources of support. One reports 56 percent of the budget is a grant from a private foundation, and another reports 44 percent from the contract or grant of a federal agency. Three of the local general education groups report business contributions, two report that 100 percent of the budget derives from this source, and a third is 50 percent. The community service organizations report the most varied sources of support. These groups raise money through membership dues and special fund raising activities, and are the only groups reporting support from Community Chest of United Appeal. One of these groups reports that 90 percent of their funds are from a state or national organization. Nearly half of these groups report obtaining money from grants and contracts from federal agencies and from business, corporate, or private contributions. The average from the former source is a high 75 percent and for the latter, the average is 25 percent.

STAFFING

Only a small proportion of the category II groups have staff. The community service organizations most frequently report staff and have the largest number of staff members: half of these groups have full-time professional, secretarial and clerical staff. Most groups appear to operate primarily with volunteers and with a few part-time paid staff members.

ACTIVITIES

Figure 7 gives the areas of activity listed in the questionnaire and percentages of category II groups reporting some or major involvement in each.
FIGURE 7
Major Activities Among Category II Groups

1. Encourages participation in and provides information about elections for the school board or local school councils.
2. Supports or opposes school district budget requests, bond issues, tax levies.
3. Sponsors forums, conferences, workshops to inform and/or stimulate constituents.
4. Monitors school district or school programs and practices.
5. Issues studies of school problems or programs.
6. Takes positions on Federal legislation or budgets affecting schools.
7. Evaluates school district or school programs.
8. Issues newsletters.
9. Issues position papers.
10. Analyzes reports on policy issues.
8. Provides orientation or training for parents or citizens about school issues and problems.
8. Provides information or assistance to school board or officials.
9. Reviews, analyzes, comments on district or individual school budget.
9. Uses media to comment on school matters.
9. Supports or opposes candidates for school board.
10. Supports or opposes candidates for superintendent.
11. Provides information or assistance to school councils or neighborhood school boards.
12. Supports or opposes candidates for municipal offices.
12. Supports or opposes local candidates for local or subdistrict boards and councils.
13. Provides orientation for administrators or teachers.
14. Supports or opposes candidates for school principal.
The local groups with general interest in education are involved in the widest range of activities. Nearly half of these groups report some or major activities in all the areas listed on the questionnaire. Of the activities said to be of major involvement for these groups, "encourages participation in and provides information about elections for the school board or local school councils" ranks first. "Supports/opposes school district budget requests, bond issues, tax levies" ranked second among those reported as major. Taking positions on federal legislation or budgets affecting schools, and supporting or opposing candidates for municipal office, are not frequently reported as major activities. None of the general education local groups reports that supporting or opposing candidates for school principal is a major activity, and none are involved in providing orientation for teachers or administrators.

The groups with national affiliation are also engaged in a wide range of activities. Nearly half of these groups report some activity in all the areas listed on the questionnaire. Smaller percentages report areas of major activity. The most commonly reported major activity for these groups is the same as for the general education groups, "encourages participation in and provides information about elections for school board of education or local school councils." Support for opposition to budget requests, bond issues, and tax levies also ranks second. Of all activities, the most common was some involvement in providing information to the school board or officials.

None of the groups with national affiliation reported any involvement in supporting or opposing candidates for superintendent or principal.

The number of activities reported by the community services groups is large. The most commonly reported for these groups is "sponsors conferences, workshops to inform and/or stimulate constituents." Providing information or assistance to the school board or officials is another common area.

Space does not permit us to include detailed information about all of the category II organizations identified in the survey. We do believe that it would be useful to provide a few thumbnail sketches of organizations with diverse and apparently significant programs.
Service Center for Public Education  
1095 Market Street, room 818  
San Francisco, California 94103

Established in 1973, the Service Center for Public Education is a private, non-profit organization. Although the total membership was not reported, the respondent indicated that a 15-member advisory board is voluntary. Half of the advisory board members are parents of children in school and half are other community residents; of these 32 percent are school administrators or teachers. Over half, 66 percent, of the members are women. The Service Center is funded entirely through grants from private foundations. The Center has three full-time paid employees and reports that two and one-half are professional. In addition there are two part-time volunteer secretarial/clerical staff. The major activities of the group include: (1) review, analyze and comment on the district school budget; (2) monitor school district or school programs and practices; (3) sponsor forums, conferences, workshops to inform and stimulate constituents; (4) encourage participation in and provide information about elections for the school board or local school councils; (5) provide orientation or training for parents or citizens about school issues and problems; (6) provide information or assistance to school councils or neighborhood school boards; issue newsletters; issue studies of school problems or programs. The respondent described the position of the organization as primarily neutral, providing information and analysis, but notes that it is "moving toward an adversarial" position. The policies and practices of the Center are largely independent of the school board, and school officials. Providing information and analysis are the groups primary roles. The respondent indicated that the image of the organization in the community was a balance between middle and working class, and politically liberal. Major accomplishments in the past year were "gaining credibility as a service available to the community" and issuing report "Access to the Schools: A Citizens Guide to the San Francisco Budget." Major problems for the Center are a lack of staff and balancing ongoing research activities which provide information needed immediately.

Sunset Parkside Education and Action Committee  
1329 Seventh Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94122

This group was organized in 1959 as a private, non-profit organization and today has 300 voluntary members. Most of the members (61 percent) are reported to be other community residents, 30 percent are parents of children in school, and the remaining 10 percent are administrators, teachers, and students. The major portion of the budget (84 percent) comes from private foundations. Other sources of financial support include membership dues (5%), special fund-raising activities (3%), contracts from state agencies (5%), and private contributions (3%). The organization
has three full-time and one part-time paid professional staff members and one full-time paid secretarial/clerical staff person. Major activities are: (1) analyze reports on policy issues; (2) monitor school district or school programs and practices; (3) sponsor forums, conferences, workshops to inform and stimulate constituents; (4) provide orientation or training for parents and citizens about school issues and problems; (5) use media to comment on school matters; (6) provides information or assistance to school councils or neighborhood school boards; (7) issues newsletters; (8) issues position papers; (9) issues studies of school policies and programs. The respondent says that the position of the group varies sometimes supporting and sometimes opposing school officials. The policies and practices of the group are largely independent of the school board and school officials. The primary role of the group is equally divided among lobbying and influencing providing information and analysis. The members are middle class and professional and liberal politically. Major accomplishments during the past year were (1) "getting Board approval to implement a community education center" and (2) "researching and developing a community statement of policy on San Francisco schools." A major problem was not getting staff hired for the community education center.

Lake View Citizens Council
3410 Sheffield Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60657

This private, non-profit organization with about 1,400 voluntary members was established in 1952. Over 50 percent of the members are women. The largest proportion of the budget, 50 percent, comes from business, corporate, or private contributions. Other sources of financial support are: membership dues (14%), special fund raising activities (5%), grants from private foundations (21%). The organization has one professional and one secretarial full-time paid staff members as well as a part-time paid secretarial person. Major activities include: (1) monitor school district or school programs and practices; (2) provides orientation or training for parents and citizens about school issues and problems; (3) provides information or assistance to school councils or neighborhood school boards. According to the respondent, depending on the issue, the position of the organization can be either supporting, neutral, or adversarial with respect to school district policies and programs. The policies and practices of the group are "completely" independent of the school board and school officials. The Citizens Council is a lobbying and influencing group which also provides information and analysis. Its members are a balance of middle and working class and politically liberal. Major accomplishments of the past year were: (1) participation in revision of guidelines for principal selection; (2) provided impetus for Ford Foundation Grant to a local school; (3) made some progress in opening up the process of selecting district superintendent. A major problem was described as getting individual parents to participate.
Community Action Responsive to Education
1106 Nunez Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70114

This incorporated voluntary association was established in 1973 and currently has 91 voluntary members. About 50 percent of the members are women. All of the budget is raised through the collection of membership dues. There is no staff employed. At the present time the major activity of the group is to sponsor forums, conferences and workshops to inform or stimulate constituents. The respondent noted that much time was spent "getting people in the area to work together and form an organization to work for better schools." The policies and practices of the group are independent of the school board and school officials and at the present time are primarily neutral, providing information and analysis. The respondent described the role of the organization as "to get the parents and community people involved in the schools. To promote communication and cooperation." Members of the group are a balance of middle class and working class and neutral politically.

Lake Area Public School Improvement Association
1700 Pratt Drive, room 102
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

This non-profit organization is in the process of becoming incorporated. The 200 members are voluntary. A clear majority of the members, 88 percent, are parents of children in school. Other community residents and school administrators form about one percent each of the membership and ten percent are teachers. Half the members are women. Membership dues account for one percent of the budget and the remainder is derived from grants from private foundations. Although none of the staff are paid many people serve in professional and in secretarial/clerical capacities as well as one paid part-time secretarial/clerical. Major activities include analyzing reports on policy issues; supporting or opposing school district budget requests; bond issues and tax levies; evaluating school district or school programs; sponsors forums, conferences and workshops; encouraging participation in and providing information; supporting or opposing municipal offices, school board, superintendent, principals; issuing newsletters. The position of the organization is primarily neutral providing information and analysis. In certain cases the practices of the group are controlled by the school board, but in others they are independent. Members of the organization are drawn from virtually all socio-economic levels and political persuasions. The respondent described the major accomplishments of the group this way: "Begging to open the doors of the schools to community involvement stopped some of the negativism and rumors and started people thinking and working in a more positive direction. Made people more informed concerning schools. Gained honest and good relationships with the school superintendent and his administration."
University Area Public School Development Association, Inc.
5712 South Claiborne Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70125

This private, non-profit organization was established in 1972 and has 200 general members and 10 school or parent groups. General membership is voluntary and members school and parent groups elect members. Eighty-five percent of the members are parents of children in school and five percent each are other community residents, school administrators, and teachers. Seventy-five percent of the members are women. The largest portion of the budget, 70 percent, derives from private foundation grants. Other sources of support are grants and contracts from federal agencies, 28 percent, and membership dues, two percent. Two full-time paid professionals, two full-time paid paraprofessionals and one full-time paid secretary staff the organization. In addition, there are nine part-time paid paraprofessionals. Major activities of the group are monitoring school district or school programs and practices and evaluating programs. The group also sponsors forums, conferences and workshops, provides orientation and training for parents and citizens about school problems and issues and gives assistance and information to the school board and school officials. The group has also been active in soliciting grants for new school programs and sponsoring and developing a long-range regional plan. Describing the organization's position with respect to the school board the respondent indicated "When consulted we generally are supportive. If we are left out, we bitch." The policies and practices of the group are largely independent of the school board and school officials and their primary role of the group is lobbying and influencing. The group is a balance of middle and working class and liberal politically. The respondent described the group's major accomplishment during the past year as "Applying for and receiving a federal grant to assist in conversion of a junior high school to a middle school. Initiated a planning process that led up to redistributing proposals that community had a chance to participate in, and in process get involved in planning of a new high school. Sponsored trips to observe what other school districts were doing vis-a-vis middle schools and community involvement. Hiring of school/community liaison workers."

City-Wide Educational Coalition
112 Arlington Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Twelve hundred voluntary members belong to this private, non-profit organization established in 1972. Categories of members are 50 percent parents of children in schools, 30 percent other community residents, 2 percent administrators, 12 percent teachers, and 6 percent teachers. Sixty-five percent of the members are women. Most of the group's financial support comes from state organization, 30 percent comes from federal grants and contracts, 5 percent form private foundations, 3 percent from business corporation or private contributions and 2 percent from special fund raising activities. There are four full-time paid professional staff members and
three full-time paid secretaries. These are assisted by ten part-time volunteer professionals and six secretarial part-time volunteers. Major activities include analyzing reports on policy issues; monitoring school district programs and practices; evaluating school district programs; sponsoring forums, conferences and workshops to inform and stimulate constituents; using media to comment on school matters; encouraging participation in and providing information about school board elections; providing orientation and training for parents and citizens about school issues and problems; providing information and assistance to school boards and officials. Depending on the issue, the group may be supportive, adversarial or neutral about school issues. Policies and practices are largely independent of the school board and officials. The group lobbies and influences, provides information and analysis. Members are primarily middle and working class and politically liberal. Major achievements of the past year were: vast increase in membership; development of model legislation on school governance; preparation of groundwork for peaceful implementation of desegregation in Boston; structure of a grassroots city-wide citizen's reform organization.

D. C. Citizens for Better Public Education, Inc.
95 M Street
Washington, D.C. 20024
(202) 484-7030

One of the best known and most successful urban citizen's groups devoted to educational improvement, the D.C. group was formed in 1968. They have an active history of constructive work. They initiated the Reading is Fundamental Program in the district, organized a school volunteer program, played an important role in the work that led to the establishment of the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute. They provide summaries and analyses of major studies, court decisions, policy statements, and school budgets. They sponsor meetings and forums and assign committees to work on topical problems and issues and provide information and technical assistance to individuals and organizations seeking help. In addition to a director (about 4/5 time) the committee has a part-time secretary and clerk. They depend on a large amount of volunteer service. Their budget comes from foundation grants, membership dues and the Washington Area United Givers Fund. They also have received grants and contracts from Federal agencies for special projects.

Massachusetts Advocacy Center
2 Park Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

This private, non-profit organization was established in 1971. Thirty-three percent of the 25 member Board of Directors are women. All budget
comes from private foundation grants. Of 12 full-time professional staff members four are paid and eight volunteers. Two paid professionals work part-time. There are two full-time paid secretarial staff. Major activities include analyzing reports on policy issues; using media to comment on school matters; providing orientation or training for parents and citizens about school issues and problems; issuing studies of school problems and programs. The respondent described the group as politically liberal. Major accomplishments during the past year were development of a handbook on parent and student educational rights and regulations governing student records.

People's Action in Cambridge Education
Willard Street Court
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

This unincorporated voluntary association was formed in 1971. There is a steering committee of 15 members and 250 people are on the mailing list. Seventy-five percent of the members are parents of children in school and 25 percent are other community residents. Eighty percent of the members are women. All of the budget is raised through special activities. The organization has no staff. Major activities include monitoring school district and school programs; encouraging participation in and providing information about school board elections; supports or opposes candidates for municipal offices and school board and superintendent. The group issues a newsletter. Primarily the group is adversarial, opposing school district policies and programs and its own policies and practices are independent of the school board and school officials. The respondent described the image of the group as middle class professional and primarily radical politically. Major accomplishments during the past year were that the group "created leadership that led to two members entering political race for school committee and one was successful. Since inception, this organization has been a prime mover in obtaining a new superintendent of schools."

Citizens Committee for Lexington Public Schools
176 Grove Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

This unincorporated voluntary association established in 1966 has over 100 dues paying members, 20 active board members and a mailing list of 600. All membership is voluntary and virtually all are parents of children in school, one percent are other community residents and one percent teachers. All of the budget comes from membership dues. The organization has no staff. Major activities of the group include sponsoring forums, conferences and workshops to inform and stimulate members; encouraging participation in and providing information about school elections for the school board. The Citizen's Committee issues a newsletter. Depending on the issue the group may take supportive, adversarial or neutral
positions. In all cases policies and practices are totally independent of the school board. As most of the community, the members are primarily middle class and professional and politically the group is neutral. As major accomplishments during the past year the organization was to provide information on several important local issues and to pressure for greater citizen participation on several specific school committees.

Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education
84 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota  55402

Established in 1934 this private, non-profit organization has 200 individual members and 200 organizations. Members are elected. About 30 percent members are parents of children in school, 70 percent other community residents and of these 40 percent are women. The greatest portion of the budget, 90 percent, is provided through business, corporation, or private contributions and 10 percent is raised through membership dues. There is one professional full-time paid staff member and one full-time paid secretary. The organization has a very wide-ranging and active program and includes as major activities: reviewing, analyzing and commenting in district budget; analyzing reports on policy issues; supporting or opposing school district budgets and revenue requests; taking positions on federal budgets and legislation; monitoring and evaluating school district programs and practices; sponsoring forums, conferences, and workshops; supporting or opposing candidates for superintendent and principalships; providing orientation and training about school issues and problems; providing assistance and information for district school board and officials and local school councils; issuing newsletter, position papers and studies of school programs or problems. The respondent described the organization as supportive of district policies, programs, and financial needs, but indicated that policies and practices were independent of the school board and officials. The group's primary roles are to provide information and analysis. Members are predominantly middle class professionals and as a group primarily neutral politically. A major accomplishment of the past year was that the Citizens Committee "Studied school management and urged development of goals and objectives for the schools."

1st Central Board Community Organization
301 Independence Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri

Approximately 150 persons are voluntarily active in this unincorporated voluntary association established in 1969. Ninety percent of the members are parents of children in school, 5 percent other community residents, 2 percent school administrators, and 3 percent students. Almost all members, 90 percent, are women. Ninety-nine percent of the budget comes from federal grants and contracts and the rest from business or private contributions. Although the respondent did not indicate the number, it was
indicated that the organization has full-time paid professional and secretarial staff and part-time volunteers. Major activities are to take positions on federal legislation and budgets; to support or oppose candidates for superintendent; to provide orientation and training for parents and citizens about school issues and problems; to provide information and assistance to the school board and officials as well as school councils. In general, the group is supportive of school district policies, programs and financial needs and the primary role is as a lobbying and influencing group. Most members are working class. During the past year the group has established a 7th grade junior high learning center.

Creative Education
3664 Arsenal
St. Louis, Missouri 63116

Established in 1971 this private, non-profit organization has 15 board members who volunteer as representatives of other organizations. Fifty percent of the members are parents of children in school, 42 percent are other community residents and 7 percent are teachers. Slightly less than half, 45 percent, of the members are women. All of the budget comes from private foundation grants. Two part-time, paid professionals staff the organization. Major activities include reviewing, analyzing and commenting on district budgets; monitoring school district or school programs and practices; and sponsoring forums, conferences and workshops. Another principle activity is to train parent volunteers to work in the schools. Depending on the issue the organization may support, oppose or be neutral about school district policies, programs and practices. The group's program is largely independent of the school board and officials. Although increasing emphasis is being placed on lobbying, the current role is, primarily, to provide information. The members are primarily middle class professional. Major accomplishment during the past year was the training of volunteers to work in schools.

Children's Lobby
100 Franklin Street
Boston, Ma. 02110

Organized in 1972 to coordinate efforts, the Children's Lobby operates with one paid staff person, assisted by interns, work study students and volunteers. Funding comes from individuals and groups and from various fund-raising events. The 44-member Board represents citizens and professionals with a expertise in a range of areas related to children's services as well as special interests in political effectiveness. The most recent Annual Conference included workshop reflecting general areas of concern: state legislation for Special Education, Day Care, Juvenile Justice, and Integrated Public Education.
Central Massachusetts Citizens Involved in Education
271 West Boylston Street
West Boylston, Ma.  01583

This non-profit corporation, established in 1973, aims to help laymen shape educational programs in their communities. Functioning with two part-time staff members and volunteers CMCIE serves 83 communities and is supported by funds from local industry, small private foundations, and individual interested citizens. There is no formal membership structure and the 28-member Board includes a cross-section of school committee members, superintendents, teachers and community members. The staff catalogues and disseminates information on educational issues such as goals and assessment of results, collective bargaining, personal practices, and open education. Besides maintaining files on exemplary programs and resources, the staff produces a newsletter, operates a drop-in library and sets up workshops both at the center and at local sites in areas such as school/community collaboration and liaison training.

SHARE of Wareham, Inc.
c/o Ms. Margaret Buttiette
Burgess Point
Wareham, Ma.  02571

Initiated in 1972, with the 11-member Board and 200 members, this citizen group relies on volunteer services and fund-raising events to maintain a newsletter and a range of service programs. Besides sponsoring candidates' nights for school committee elections and providing volunteers for school programs, the group has developed enrichment programs in each of the eight schools bringing local residents to the classroom to share their skills as well as a professional theater company for the 1200 elementary school children. Workshops for parents and teachers have focused on subjects such as open education and on home activities to support children's academic development.

A listing of other category II organizations identified in this survey follow.
ALABAMA

Auburn
Alabama Coalition for Better Education
134 Norwood Avenue (36830)

Huntsville
Association for Childhood Education
4510 Panorama Drive (35801)
205-534-8464

Association of Huntsville Area Companies
Suite 693, Central Bank Building
(35801)
205-538-8174 or 534-0233

Du-Mide Woman's Club
5713 Tannahill Drive, S.E. (35802)

Chamber of Commerce
Huntsville-Madison County
305 Church Street, S.W. (35801)
205-538-2171

League of Women Voters
P.O. Box 644 (35803)
205-881-7171

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
P.O. Box 3237 (35807)
205-876-3918

CALIFORNIA

Alameda
Alameda Jaycees
P.O. Box 2411 (94501)

Concerned People of Alameda
P.O. Box 1772 (94501)

Arcadia
League of Women Voters
16 Ontare Road (91006)

El Cerrito
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
East Bay Area Chapter
926 Arlington Boulevard (94530)
415-525-5915

Los Angeles
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
Southern California
633 Shatto Place (90005)

American Jewish Committee
590 North Vermont (90004)
213-663-2185

Anti-Defamation League
590 North Vermont (90004)
213-662-8151

Asian-American Education Commission
450 North Grand (91012)
213-687-4353

Black Education Commission
Box 3307 (90054)
213-687-4335

Chicano Educational Committee
c/o UTLA
234 Loma Drive (90026)
213-868-1935

Community Relations Conference of Southern California
4034 Buckingham Road (90008)
213-295-2607

Crenshaw Neighbors
4034 Buckingham Road (90008)
213-296-2298

East Central Area Welfare Planning Council
Region V
621 South Virgil (90005)

Greater Los Angeles Consortium
California State University
5151 State University Drive (90012)
213-224-0111

Jewish Federation Council
590 North Vermont (90004)
213-663-8484

Mexican-American Education Commission
450 North Grand (90012)
Los Angeles (continued)
National Council of Jewish Women
543 North Fairfax (90036)
213-651-2780

National Organization for Women (NOW)
743 South Grandview (90057)
213-383-1347

Parents for Equity in Education
6363 Wilshire Boulevard (90048)
213-939-4821

Urban Coalition
7815 South Vermont (90044)
213-753-3321

Urban League
2107 West Washington (90008)
213-731-8851

Women in Community Service (WICS)
10920 South Central (90048)
213-939-4821

East Bay Asians for Community Action
211 - 12th Street (94607)
415-444-4949

East Bay Spanish Speaking Citizens
Foundation
1924 Fruitvale Avenue (94601)
415-261-7839

East Oakland-Fruitvale Planning Council
9500 East 14th Street (94603)
415-632-6955

Filipino-American Political Association
516 - 62nd Street (94609)
415-465-8686

Filipino Community of the East Bay
1305 Franklin Street (94612)
415-465-8686

Filipinos for Affirmative Action
2155 - 47th Avenue (94601)
415-465-9876

Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance
of the Greater East Bay
C/O Rev. Frank Pinkard
5324 Lawton Avenue (94618)
415-658-0262

Japanese-American Citizens League
277 - 8th Street (94606)
415-836-4066

Jewish Community Relations Council of
Alameda and Contra Costa Counties
3245 Sheffield Avenue (94602)
415-533-7462

Junior League of Oakland-East Bay
1980 Mountain Boulevard (94611)
415-339-8276

La Raza Educators Association
172 Glendora Avenue (94602)
415-530-8596
Oakland (continued)
League of Women Voters
Box 7176, Fruitvale Station (94601)
415-532-5499
Lincoln Children's Center
314 East 10th Street (94606)
415-465-4867
Men of Tomorrow
P.O. Box 1566 (94612)
415-652-6666
National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People
663 -35th Street (94609)
415-652-2986
New Oakland Committee
1939 Harrison Street (94612)
415-893-9660
Oakland Chinese Community Council
257 -8th Street (94607)
415-839-2022
Philipino Youth Development Council
561 -16th Street (94612)
415-893-2739
Spanish Speaking Unity Council of
Alameda County
1248 - 35th Avenue (94601)
415-534-7764
Pasadena
League of Women Voters
1393 East Washington Boulevard (91104)
San Francisco
Afro-American Historical and
Cultural Society
680 McAllister Street (94102)
415-864-1010
San Francisco Alliance for Education
465 California Street (94104)
415-788-4772
American Civil Liberties Union
593 Market Street, Suite 227 (94105)
415-433-2750
American Friends Service Committee
High School Project
2160 Lake Street (94121)
415-752-7766
American G.I. Forum
Box 5200
415-431-3268
Bay Area Radical Teachers' Organizing
Collective
388 Sanchez (94114)
415-863-5686
Chamber of Commerce
465 California Street (94104)
415-392-4511
Chinese for Affirmative Action
250 Columbus Avenue (94133)
415-398-8218
Coalition for Effective Schools
1855 Folsom (94103)
415-863-9117
Common Cause
2152 Union Street (94123)
415-346-7600
Communities of the Outer Mission
Organization
601 Tompkins Street (94110)
415-648-5605
Educational Advocate Complex
2143 Keith Street (94124)
415-822-9330
Educational Auxiliary
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 208 (94102)
415-863-4680, extension 386-7; 864-4224
Human Rights Commission
1095 Market Street, Suite 500 (94103)
415-558-4901
Japanese-American Citizens League
22 Peace Plaza (94115)
415-563-3202
Joint Strategy and Action Commission
83 McAllister Street (94102)
415-861-4726
San Francisco (continued)

La Raza Information Center
3174 - 24th Street (94110)
415-826-5855

Lawyers' Committee for Urban Affairs
483 Mills Building
220 Montgomery Street (94104)
415-989-9444

League of United Latin American Citizens
2183 Mission Street (94110)
415-864-0206; 864-0562

League of Women Voters
12 Geary Street, Suite 605 (94108)
415-968-0480

Mission Rebels Organization
674 South Van Ness Avenue (94102)
415-431-2224

Multi-Culture Institute
693 Mission Street (94105)
415-495-5750

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
2006 Sutter Street (94108)
415-922-0650

National Organization for Women (NOW)
P.O. Box 1267
415-626-8197

Ocean View, Merced Heights, Ingleside Community Association
205 Granada Street (94112)
415-584-8188

Portrero Hill Neighborhood House
953 De Haro Street (94107)
415-826-8080

Public Advocates
433 Turk Street (94102)
415-441-8850

San Francisco Consortium
593 Market Street (94105)
415-392-3502

San Francisco Council of Churches
942 Market Street, Fifth Floor (94102)
415-982-4163

San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation
1095 Market Street, Third Floor (94103)
415-626-3811

Service Center for Public Education
1095 Market Street, Room 818 (94103)
415-626-8427

Sunset Parkside Education and Action Committee
1329 Seventh Avenue (94122)
415-731-0123

Urban League
2400 Sutter Street, P.O. Box 15338 (94119)
415-922-5050

Youth for Service
25 - 14th Street (94103)
415-621-5555

Youth Law Center
795 Turk Street (94102)
415-474-5865

Redondo Beach

Torrance Coordinating Council
205 Vista del Sol (90277)
213-378-3247

Torrance

Education Council of Torrance
4305 Torrance Boulevard (90503)
213-371-5541

Junior Women's Club
1422 Engracia Avenue (90501)
213-320-9916

League of Women Voters
4617 Road (90505)
213-378-4567

Masons
20324 Wayne Avenue (90503)
213-376-8377

Torrance Family Young Men's Christian Association
P.O. Box 3306 (90510)
213-325-5885

Torrance Ministerial Association
700 Maple Avenue (90503)
213-328-9080
Visalia
The Friends of SCICON
P.O. Box 3614 (93277)

COLORADO
Colorado Springs
Cheyenne Mountain Enrichment Program
4 Penrose Boulevard (80906)

Denver
Metropolitan Denver Citizens Committee
for Support of Public Schools
1400 Lafayette Street (80218)

Fort Collins
Citizens Committee for the Public Schools
Poudre R-1 Administration Building (80521)

CONNECTICUT
Bridgeport
Citizens for Better Schools
540 Brooklawn Avenue (06604)

Madison
Madison Educational Forum
96 Winding Road (06443)

DELWARE
Wilmington
Bilingual Coalition of Delaware
204 West 7th Street (19801)

United Forces for Public Education
7 Kathlyn Count, Heritage Park (19808)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
American National Red Cross
17th and D Streets, N.W. (20006)

Dairy Council of Washington, D.C.
1511 K Street, N.W. (20005)
202-737-1150

D.C. Citizens for Better Public Education
95 M Street, S.W. (20024)
202-484-7030

D.C. Lung Association
1714 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. (20006)
202-785-2444

East Central College Consortium
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. (20006)
202-659-4112

Federal City College
916 G. Street, N.W.
202-727-2343

Future Homemakers of America
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. (20006)
202-833-1925

Gallaudet College - Model Secondary School for the Deaf
Kendall Green (20002)
202-447-0469

Help for Retarded Children
405 Riggs Road, N.E. (20011)
202-529-0070

Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington
1330 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. (20005)
202-347-4628

League of Women Voters
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. (20006)
202-785-2616

Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association
1225 K Street, N.W. (20005)
202-737-3700

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
1533 - 9th Street, N.W. (20001)
202-667-1700

National Student Association
2115 S Street, N.W. (20008)
202-265-9890

Oblate College
391 Michigan Avenue, N.E. (20017)
202-529-5244
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (continued)

Office of Consumer Affairs
1407 L Street, N.W. (20005)
202-629-2617

Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington
1109 M Street, N.W. (20005)
202-387-4711

Prevention of Blindness Society of Metropolitan Washington
917 - 15th Street, N.W. (20005)
202-737-0377

Social Hygiene Society
927 -15th Street, N.W. (20005)
202-638-1458

Supplemental Food Program
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. (20009)
202-629-5321

Upper Northeast Coordinating Council

Urban League
1424 - 16th Street, N.W. (20036)
202-265-8200

Washington Psychoanalytic Society
4925 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W. (20007)
202-338-5433

FLORIDA

Coral Gables

Girl Scouts of Tropical Florida
3001 Ponce de Leon Boulevard (33134)
305-444-6554

Homestead

Organized Migrants in Community Action
278 Krome Avenue (33030)
305-248-4711

Miami

American Jewish Committee
4200 Biscayne Boulevard (33137)
305-576-4240

American Red Cross
5020 Biscayne Boulevard (33137)
305-576-4600

Anti-Defamation League of B' nai B'rith
Seybold Building
36 N.E. First (33132)
305-373-6306; 379-4838

Boy Scouts of America
2960 Coral Way (33145)
305-446-8431

Christian Community Service Agency
3637 N.E. First Avenue (33137)
305-377-8601

Community Action Agency
395 N.W. First Street (33128)
305-377-8601

Greater Miami Jewish Federation
4200 Biscayne Boulevard (33137)
305-576-4000

Jewish Community Center of South Florida
Young Men and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Greater Miami
8500 S.W. 8th Street (33144)
305-264-8000

League of Women Voters
10 Biscayne Boulevard (33132)
305-373-5970

National Conference of Christians and Jews
906 DuPont Plaza Boulevard (33131)
305-373-7658

United Farm Workers of America
2206 N.W. 27th Avenue (33142)
305-633-7071

United Way
955 S.W. Second Avenue (33130)
305-854-8311

Urban League of Greater Miami
7790 N.W. 7th Avenue (33150)
305-693-5070
Miami (continued)
Young Men's Christian Association
40 N.E. Third Avenue (33132)
Young Women's Christian Association
100 S.E. Fourth Street (33133)

Tampa
American Cancer Society
1001 South Mac Dill Avenue (33609)
813-253-0541
American Red Cross
201 Tampa (33602)
813-229-7702
Chamber of Commerce of Greater Tampa
801 East Kennedy (33602)
813-228-7777
Children's Home
10909 Memorial Highway (33615)
813-877-1185
Children's Home Society of Florida
3621 Henderson Boulevard (33609)
813-877-1185
Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults
2401 East Henry Avenue (33610)
813-236-5589
Girls Clubs of Tampa
5444 Bay Center Drive (33609)
813-872-7841
Girl Scouts of America
3710 Jetton Avenue (33609)
813-253-0891
League of Women Voters
10246 Vala Drive (33612)
813-932-0422
Mental Health Association for Hillsborough County
305 North Morgan (33602)
813-253-0621
Salvation Army
209 South Franklin (33602)
813-228-7804

Young Men's Christian Association
314 East Zack (33502)
813-229-6517
Young Women's Christian Association
625 Twiggs (33602)
813-233-5647

GEORGIA
Atlanta
American Association of University Women
4601 North Peachtree Road (30341)
404-451-3852
American Civil Liberties Union
52 Fairlie Street, Suite 355 (30303)
404-523-2721
American Friends Service Committee
52 Fairlie Street (30303)
404-523-6628
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
805 Peachtree, N.E. (30308)
404-523-3391
Atlanta Frontiers Club
1308 Oakcrest Drive, S.W. (30311)
404-659-6252
Atlanta Housing Authority--Family and Community Service
739 West Peachtree (30308)
404-524-5881
Atlanta Legal Aid
153 Pryor Street, S.W. (30303)
404-524-5811
Atlanta University Center for School and Community Services
223 Chestnut, S.W. (30314)
404-681-0251
Central Atlanta Progress
First National Bank Building (30399)
404-658-1877
Chamber of Commerce
1300 Commerce Building (30303)
404-521-0845
Atlanta (continued)

Christian Council of Metropolitan Atlanta
167 Walton Street, N.W. (30303)
404-675-8396

Community Relations Commission
68 Mitchell Street, S.W. (30303)
404-659-0274

Consumer Credit Counseling Service
1105 West Peachtree (30399)
404-975-8396

Economic Opportunity
75 Marietta Street (30303)
404-523-7561

Emmaus House
1017 Capitol Avenue, S.E. (30315)
404-525-5948; 523-2856

Federation of South West Clubs
487 Lyndale Valley Road, S.W. (30311)
404-696-6022

Institute of the Black World
87 Chestnut Street, S.W. (30314)

Junior League of Atlanta
3154 Northside Parkway (30327)
404-261-7799

League of Women Voters
1182 West Peachtree Street, N.W. (30309)
404-873-2044

Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Social Change
671 Beckwith Street, S.W. (30314)
404-524-1956

Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Leadership Conference
201 Ashby Street, N.W. (30314)
404-525-2761

Morningside/C.W. Hill Group
1692 N. Pelham Road
404-874-7917

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
895 1/2 Hunter Street (30312)
404-524-3422

National Council of Christians and Jews
1022 First Federal Building (30303)
404-688-7510

Research Atlanta
52 Fairlie Street, N.W. (30303)
404-688-5965; 688-5963

Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy
240 Chestnut Street, S.W. (30314)
404-522-8770

Southern Regional Council
52 Fairlie Street (30303)
404-522-8764

South West Community Groups
696 Flamingo Drive, S.W. (30311)
404-753-7346

The Guardians
C/o Mrs. Ferrell Thomas
3240 Valleydale Drive, S.W. (30311)
404-523-7805

Urban League
75 Piedmont Avenue, Suite 310 (30303)
404-695-1150

IDAHO

Pocatello
Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 647 (83201)

ILLINOIS

Chicago
Aspira, Inc. of Illinois
767 North Milwaukee Avenue (60622)
312-243-1630

Business and Professional People for the Public Interest
109 North Dearborn, Room 1001 (60602)

Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry
130 South Michigan (60603)
312-786-0111
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Chicago (continued)

Chicago Region PTA
127 North Dearborn (60602)

Citizens Schools Committee
32 West Randolph Street (60601)
312-726-4678

Civic Federation
29 East Madison Street (60602)
312-263-3237

Lake View Citizens Council
3410 Sheffield Avenue, North (60657)
312-472-4050

League of Women Voters
67 East Madison (60603)
312-236-0315

Mexican-American Council on Education
1300 South Wabash (60605)
312-427-4552

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
407 South Dearborn Street (60605)
312-939-5365

Madison

Student Advisory Committee
Madison Senior High School (62060)

Oak Forest

Citizens Advisory Committee
5172 Deerpath (60452)

Plano

Citizen Advisory Committee of Plano
Route 1, Jack Road (60545)

KANSAS

Wichita

American Cancer Society
705 North St Francis (67214)
316-262-8496

Kansas State Federation of Labor
3830 South Meridian (67217)

League of Women Voters
644 Holyoke (67218)
316-684-3863

Lutheran Social Service
1855 North Hillside (67214)
316-686-6645

National Conference of Christians and Jews
212 North Market (67202)
316-264-0356

Soroptimist Club of Wichita
3754 East Douglas (67208)
316-686-1711

Urban League
1405 North Minneapolis (67214)
316-262-2463

Wichita Council of Churches
216 East Second Street (67217)
316-264-9303

LOUISIANA

New Orleans

Anchor\Out Reach Program
916 Felicity Street (70130)
504-524-4484

Central City Economic Organization
Jackson Avenue
504-524-3484

Community Action Responsive to Education
1106 Nunez Street (70114)
New Orleans (continued)
Cooperative School Clubs
2141 Brigade Drive (70043)
504-279-5428

Friends of Public Education
1814 Art (70114)
504-944-7792

Gateway II Council on Options for Public Education
3601 Came Street (70115)
504-895-4807

Greater New Orleans Pre-School Association
3239 Nashville (70125)
504-822-2540

Goals to Grow - Goals Foundation
1029 Maritime Building (70130)
504-865-6355

Innovative Education Coalition
1130 North Rampart (70116)
504-524-3888

Innovative School Parent Community Association
730 St. Phelp (70113)
504-524-7253

Kingsley House
914 Richard Street (70123)
504-523-6221

Lake Area Public School Improvement Association
1700 Pratt Drive, Room 103 (70122)

League of Women Voters
1636 Toledano (70115)
504-895-2062

Teacher Resource Service
904 Orange (70130)
504-522-5205

Total Community Action
P.O. Box 30428 (70190)
504-524-2688

Shreveport
Caddo Parish School Board
1951 Midway Avenue (71108)
318-636-0210

Community Action Program (CAP Medical Arts Building (71101)
318-424-8315

League of Women Voters
70F Rand Avenue (71101)
318-24-8315

United Fund
1702 Irving Place (71101)
318-221-0561

MARYLAND
Baltimore
Alpha Kappa Alpha
5313 Wabash Avenue (21218)
301-542-1145

American Indian Study Center
211 South Broadway (21231)
301-732-6714

Arlington Street Tutorial
c/o Brown Memorial Church
1316 Park (21217)
301-523-8784

Baltimore Council on Alcoholism
2305 North Charles (21218)
301-296-5545

Baltimore Environmental Center
25th Street
301-366-2070

Baltimore Museum of Art
Charles and 31st (21210)
301-338-0671

Baltimore Symphony Association
Mount Royal Avenue (21201)
301-727-7300

Baltimore Women's Liberation
101 East 25th Avenue (21218)
301-366-6475
Baltimore (continued)
Barkley-Brent Educational Corporation
c/o Loretta Cole
2520 North Calvert Street (21218)
301-235-6706

Center Stage
c/o Notre Dame College
North Charles and Belvedere (21210)
301-685-5020

Children's Theatre Association
225 West 25th Street (21211)
301-889-1234

Delta Sigma Theta
2808 Chelsea Terrace (21216)

Greater Homewood Community Corporation
210 West 28th Street (21211)
301-889-7927

Green Circle
c/o American Friends Service Committee
319 East 25th Street (21218)
301-532-7050

Hampden Woodberry Community Council
1329 1/2 West 41st Street (21211)
301-547-8000

Harbel Organization
5540 Harford Road (21214)
301-426-5668

Johns Hopkins University Tutorial Program
c/o Chaplins Office
North Charles Street (21210)
301-366-3000

Junior League of Baltimore
4803 Roland Avenue (21210)
301-467-0260

League of Women Voters
2318 North Charles Street (21218)
301-889-5353

McCormick Spice Company
414 Light Street (21202)
301-539-6460

Metropolitan Mental Health
22 East 25th Street (21218)

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
1300 W. North Avenue (21217)
301-523-8503

Planned Parenthood of Maryland
517 North Charles Street (21201)
301-752-0131

South East Community Organization
10 South Wolf Street (21231)
301-327-1626

Urban League
1150 Mondawmin Concourse (21215)
301-523-8150

Voluntary Action Center
The Rotunda, Suite 328 (21211)
301-467-1600

Cockeysville
4 H
9811 Ban Burn Lane (21030)
301-666-1025

Hagerstown
League of Women Voters
(21740)

Indian Head
League of Women Voters
Route 1, Box 161 R (20640)

Landover
Safeway Stores
6700 Columbia Park Road (20785)
301-772-6900

Lutherville
Lung Association
3 Lar Lea Drive (21023)
301-252-3091

Phoenix
FISH
Box 10 (21131)
301-666-8777
Westminster
UNICEF
121 Smith Avenue (21157)
301-876-1615; 727-8284

MASSACHUSETTS
Amherst
League of Women Voters
25 Cherry Lane (01002)

Boston
City-Wide Educational Coalition
112 Arlington Street (02116)
617-542-2835

Education Renewal, Inc.
16 Arlington Street (02116)
617-267-5930

Massachusetts Advisory Council
on Education
182 Tremont Street (02111)
617-727-5056

Massachusetts Advocacy Center
2 Park Square (02116)
617-357-8431

Cambridge
People's Action in Cambridge Education
Willard Street (02138)

East Brookfield
People Interested in Education
01515

Lexington
Citizens Committee for Lexington
Public Schools (CCLPS)
c/o Friedman
176 Grove Street (02173)

Seekonk
Helpmate
396 Newman Avenue (02771)

Provisional League of Women Voters
10 Sanders Avenue (02771)

West Boylston
Central Massachusetts Citizens Involved in Education
271 West Boylston Street (01583)
617-835-6056

MICHIGAN
Detroit
Citizens Research Council of Michigan
1526 David Stott Building (48226)
313-961-5377

New Detroit
1515 Detroit Bank and Trust (48226)
313-961-9160

Urban League
208 Mack Avenue (48201)
313-832-4600

Niles
Niles Service League
P.O. Box 704 (49120)

MINNESOTA
Eden Prairie
Chamber of Commerce
13410 Research Road (55343)

Minneapolis
American Association of University Women
2115 Stevens Avenue (55404)
612-870-1661

Citizens League
84 South Sixth Street (55402)
612-338-0791

Council of Community Councils
319 - 15th Avenue, S.E. (55455)
612-373-3170

Education Exploration Center
3104 - 16th Avenue South (55407)
612-722-6612

Junior League of Minneapolis
100 East 22nd Street
612-870-0202
Minneapolis (continued)
League of Women Voters
1200 South Second Avenue (55403)
612-333-6319

Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education
84 South Sixth Street (55402)
612-336-3669

Model City
2649 Park Avenue South (55404)

National Council of Jewish Women
4330 South Cedar Lake Road (55416)
612-377-7700

Service Employees International Union
636 East Minnehaha Parkway (55417)
612-827-2492

Urban League
1121 - 12th Avenue, North (55411)
612-377-0011

Mound
Rotary Club
P.O. Box 264 (55364)

St. Paul
Minnesota Citizens Committee on Public Education
632 South Warwick (55116)

Stillwater
League of Women Voters
14181 St. Croix Terrace North (55082)

White Bear Lake
League of Women Voters
2338 South Shore Boulevard (55110)

MISSOURI
Kansas City
Citizens Association of Kansas City
127 West 10th (64106)
816-221-1118

East Central Board Community Organization
2301 Independence Avenue (64124)
816-231-5211

49-63 Neighborhood Coalition
5541 Forest (64110)
816-333-3161

Malbourosr Organization
7406 Troost (64131)

Metropolitan Inter-Church Agency (MICA)
3501 Campbell (64109)
816-756-1422

Model Cities Resident Education Board
911 Walnut (64130)

Neighborhood and Coalition
920 Argile Building (64106)

Southern Christian Leadership Conference
3000 East Gregory (64132)
816-361-9514

West Port Council
106 West 14th (64105)

St. Louis
Bring Out Learning Deficiencies
5342 Quincy (63109)
314-752-8822

St. Louis County White House Conference on Education
5600 Oakland Avenue, Room F-326 (63110)
314-644-5035

Walnut Park Patrons Alliance
5214 Goodfellow (63136)
314-381-0481

NEBRASKA
Mindem
Citizen Advisory Committee
520 West Third Street (68959)
NEW HAMPSHIRE

Manchester
New Hampshire Council for Better Schools
Box 724 (93102)
603-622-5711

NEW JERSEY

Middletown
Committee for Establishing School Priorities
5 Melody Lane (07748)

Millington
Advocates for Education
123 Cross Hill Road (07946)
201-647-2210

Parsippany
American Association of University Women
38 Winfield Drive (07054)

League of Women Voters
31 Haddonfield Drive (07054)

Passaic
League of Women Voters
145 Mineral Spring Avenue (07055)

Spotswood
Spotswood Taxpayers Association
19 Gaskin Avenue (08884)

NEW YORK

Binghamton
League of Women Voters of Broome County
8 Pine Street (13901)

Bronx
United Brox Parents
810 East 152nd Street (10455)

Brooklyn
Central Board of Education
110 Livingston Street (11201)

Corfu
Concerned Parents
698 Main Road (14036)

Far Rockaway
Allied Parents Association of the Rockaway
143-16 Cronston Avenue (11694)

Kings Park
Citizens for An Open School Board
640 Meadow Road (11754)

New York City
Career Opportunity
2050 Second Avenue

Community School Board District #3
164 West 97th Street (10025)

Community School Board District #5
433 West 133rd Street (10027)

Community Service Society
105 East 22nd Street (10010)
212-254-8900

Harlem Parents Union
514 West 126th Street

New York Association for Brain Injured Children
95 Madison Avenue (10016)

Public Education Association
20 West 40th Street (10018)
212-354-6100

Patchogue
Parents Interested in Education
146 Ketchan Avenue (11772)

Poughkeepsie
Hudson Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center.
54 North Hamilton Street (10977)

Queens
Southwest Queens Alliance
151-31 88 Howard Beach (11414)
Spring Valley
Citizens Council for Better Schools of East Ramapo
14 Brockton Road (10977)

Staten Island
Staten Island Federation of Parent Teacher Association
174 Shafter Avenue (10308)

Tarrytown
Suburban Action Institute
150 White Plains Road (19598)

Thiells
League of Women Voters of North Rockland
P.O. Box 702 (10923)

NORTH CAROLINA
Boone
League of Women Voters
221 1/2 East King Street (28607)

Bryson City
Citizens Committee for New School
P.O. Box 579 (28713)

Durham
Women-In-Action for the Prevention of Violence and Its Causes
213 North Mangum Street (27701)

Thomasville
Chamber of Commerce
6 West Main Street (27360)

OHIO
Cincinnati
Cincinnati School Foundation
2212 Victory Parkway (44144)
513-241-1177

Cleveland
The PACE Association
518 The Arcade (44114)

North Jackson
Kiwanis Club
P.O. Box 188 (44451)

Portsmouth
League of Women Voters
3261 Indian Drive (45667)

Springfield
Citizens for Better Schools
1414 Bowman Road (45502)

Toledo
Washington Local Schools Parent Council
4447 Talmadge Green (43623)

PENNSYLVANIA
Ambler
Concerned Citizens for Education
143 Tennis Avenue (19002)

Conshohocken
Cooperative Neighborhood Council
612 Fayette Street (19428)

Erie
Erie County Drug Council
10 East 12th Street (16501)

Philadelphia
Americans for Democratic Action
145 South 13th Street (19107)
215-923-6865

Citizens Committee on Public Education
1218 Chestnut Street (19107)
215-546-7600

Fellowship Commission
Education and Policy Planning Committee
260 South 15th Street (19102)
215-546-7600

League of Women Voters
8th and Market Streets (19107)
215-922-4499
Philadelphia (continued)

Parents for Neighborhood Schools
1227 Calpine Road (19154)
215-637-8414

Parents Union for Public Schools in Philadelphia
3600 Haverford Avenue (19104)
215-322-6505

Philadelphia Congress on Public Education
1512 Walnut Street (19102)

Philadelphia Home and School Council Administration Building, Room 408
21st and Parkway (19193)
215-563-4144

Powelton-Mantua Cooperative Educational Fund
3828 Spring Garden (19104)
215-387-3711

Urban Coalition Education Task Force
1512 Walnut Street (19102)
215-735-9401

Urban League Child Advocacy Project
4089 Lancaster (19104)
215-387-2801

Pittsburgh Pittsburgh Council on Public Education
5661 Fair Oaks Street (15217)
412-521-2290

Tarentum Allegheny Valley Family and Children Service
326 East 7th Street (15984)

Highlands Community Action Committee
208 Corbet Street (15065)

SOUTH CAROLINA
Bennettsville Marlboro County Improvement Committee
P.O. Box 991 (29512)

Columbia
American Friends Service Committee
South Carolina Community Relations Program
401 Columbia Building (29201)
803-253-5316

TENNESSEE
Memphis
Memphis Better Schools Committee
P.O. Box 4012 (38104)

Nashville
Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools
P.O. Box 12441 (37212)

Signal Mountain
Citizens Committee for Better Schools
214 Green Gorge Road (37377)

TEXAS
Abilene
Mexican-American Citizens for Success
P.O. Box 1717 (79601)

Dallas
League for Educational Advancement in Dallas
6944 Wakefield Street (75231)

Houston
Citizens for Good Schools
3400 Montrose, Room 802 (77006)
713-524-9483

San Antonio
Madonna Neighborhood Centers
1906-Castroville Street (78237)
512-432-2374

Texans for Educational Excellence
115 Glenview Drive West, Suite 118 (78228)
512-222-1836
Western people are very mixed up about social change. They tend to believe that it only takes place through conscious public policy, when in fact the changes that really matter are happening by tiny increments... As a result one simultaneously hears, excited pronouncements that change is perpetual and accelerating, and discouraged complaints that nothing changes at all.

Philip Slater
Earthwalk
A series of opinion questions were included in both mail questionnaires and in the interviews in 25 cities. Telephone interviews consisting of only the opinion questions were conducted in 25 cities; data gatherers were asked to interview persons identified by title or position. These persons included members of the board of education, principals, teachers, student leaders, PTA members, parents, clergymen, Chamber of Commerce presidents, and citizens selected at random from the telephone directory. The questions asked for opinions about the current level of citizen participation in the district, projected levels of involvement, and the potential outcomes of increased participation. A total of 1,489 opinion portions of the survey were completed.

A clear majority of the respondents indicated they believed that there was too little participation in their district. A substantial number (32%) thought that there was an appropriate amount of participation, and only two percent thought there was too much. The belief that there is too little was held most strongly by the student council presidents interviewed. Although no question in the survey asked whether parent and citizen involvement was more common at the elementary or secondary level, a number of unsolicited comments from respondents noted that there is more activity at the elementary school level. To explain this fact, a few persons noted that some high school students are likely to discourage their parents from becoming involved in their schools. The "personal experience" of some readers will, no doubt, confirm this suggestion. While the student leaders queried may not be representative of all students, it is interesting that they think there is too little participation. It is possible they think their parents should be more concerned about the educational lives of younger siblings.

Sixty-nine percent of all respondents to the category II, and the same percentage of parents, think that there is too little participation. A slightly lower, but still large, percentage of PTA members also think there is little involvement. This finding might be expected: many persons most immediately involved might understandably believe that others should share their commitment. One possible explanation for the slightly lower percentage of parent respondents is that while they are vitally interested in the education of their children, many competing demands for their time and energy may make active involvement impossible. Thus, these individuals may be sympathetic to the inability of large numbers of persons to participate, and believe current levels of participation are all that can reasonably be expected.

Fifty-five percent of the principals and 48 percent of the teachers said that there was too little participation. Less than one percent of the
school personnel believes there is too much participation, and about half think there is an appropriate amount. Presidents of Chambers of Commerce were the respondents in the cities who least frequently reported that they thought there was too little participation, and most (70%) said there was an appropriate amount.

Most of the respondents who thought there was too little participation said that the reason was citizen apathy. While we cannot dispute the existence of apathy, we believe that it might be useful to look at the underlying causes of its widespread occurrence. Apathy may be a self-fulfilling prophecy in many cases. Except for public relations efforts aimed at gaining uncritical support for schools, many school officials have not encouraged or supported efforts to increase citizen participation in decision-making. Some respondents to the survey have suggested that school personnel actively discourage parent and citizen involvement.

One citizen respondent who agreed that lack of participation suggested apathy offered the following comment:

If there was more citizen participation allowed, then apathy would go out. Most parents here are apathetic because they have been frustrated. They begin when their child enters first grade as great school workers, by the time their first child enters grade six they lose interest because their attempts to better schools have been thwarted by school administration. PTA and County Council are not accepted by our county school officials, including the superintendent of schools. He, in particular, says that PTA does not represent the citizens. In our county PTA is a group that works its heart out for the schools and children and it is not accepted by the powers that be. This nonacceptance is because the group is not a 'yes' group to the superintendent and his staff. They question and the superintendent does not like that.

Sentiments similar to this are sprinkled liberally through the reports on the interviews in the 25 cities.

While many citizens have lost interest or been frustrated in their efforts to change schools, there are other explanations for apathy. Many respondents indicated that parents have little time to devote to school district-wide committees. In low income families where both parents work, or where the husband works two jobs and the wife cannot afford to hire a babysitter, there is in fact no real opportunity to participate. Some respondents noted the effect of the feminist movement on parental involvement. As more mothers enter the working force, fewer have time to spend on school activities. Some more militant women reject outright the traditional female role as PTA member and room-mother.
Efforts can be made by school administrators to better accommodate the schedules of more citizens. In New York City the meetings of one important citizens' group are held during the day. This serves to make participation impossible for many persons. Attending one meeting of this group, the writer noticed that at least a few of the members present were what might be called "professional parents." These are generally women whose children are grown and away from home, and who have the time and interest to serve on many committees. It is not our intention to devalue the contribution of such individuals, but rather to suggest that persons who cannot so easily adjust their schedules to meet the convenience of school administrators should have an equal opportunity to be involved.

Another factor which contributes to a lack of citizen involvement may be more difficult to overcome because more than a rescheduling of meetings is involved. From many different sources we have heard that parents are intimidated by school personnel. Although many parents and citizens called attention to this fact, it was more often mentioned by principals and teachers. In its most extreme expression, the point is made that many adults feel like children again when they walk through the doors of a school. The underlying causes of the feelings of fear are numerous and complex. One of the causes may have to do with the high degree of professionalism among educators. Claims of excessive use of jargon by educators may be exaggerated, but it is likely that the unnecessary use of "educationese" is disturbing to many parents. Well-educated persons who are not educators may be as confused and troubled as persons who have less formal education.

The nature of schooling itself may be part of the reason for the fear of schools. For many people, school is a place where one listens, follows directions, and does not question authority figures.

Although the environment of some classrooms is changing, and many teachers are less authoritarian than in the past, it is still difficult to challenge teacher prerogatives. It is difficult to make a transition to the idea that one may make suggestions to teachers or principals or comment critically on their work. A related factor which may sometimes inhibit parent involvement is fear of reprisals. Parents worry that if they are characterized as "trouble-makers" by school personnel, their children will be treated differently by teachers and administrators. This different treatment could be positive or negative, but neither is desirable. One survey participant who was very active in district-wide school affairs said that she made special efforts to insure that her active role was not widely publicized among her children's teachers.
Among all respondents, opposition of the superintendent and other administrators was the second most commonly noted cause of lack of participation. In cities, school board members were the group for which the highest percentage (22%) of the respondents thought superintendents and administrators were to blame for the lack of participation. Nearly as many PTA members thought much of the parent and citizen apathy could be traced to the opposition of superintendents and administrators. As might be expected, respondents to the category I questionnaire, most of whom were superintendents, were those who least frequently thought that opposition of superintendents and administrators was part of the reason for too little participation. Principals in the cities did not believe that opposition of administrators was a significant factor contributing to parent and citizen non-involvement. About twice as many teachers (12%) thought it was. Administrators, on the other hand, were not more likely than teachers to respond that opposition of teachers' organizations was one of the causes of lack of participation. For both groups, about six percent of the respondents said that teachers' organizations were opposed. About ten percent of the citizens, parents, and PTA members thought opposition of teachers' organizations played a role in lack of participation. Board of education members were twice as likely to report the same. A surprisingly large percentage of board members (13%) thought that their fellow board members were opposed to citizen participation. About 15 percent of all respondents thought that board opposition contributed to lack of participation. Teachers reported opposition of the board at a higher rate than administrators. None of the Chamber of Commerce presidents responding thought that boards' opposition was to blame for the lack of participation.

Nearly half said they thought that citizen participation would increase in the next two years. Thirty-nine percent of all respondents thought that participation would remain at the same level, and 13 percent thought it would decrease. PTA members were more optimistic than the total respondents about the prospects for participation; 68 percent thought involvement would increase, 24 percent thought it would remain at the same level and 9 percent said it would decrease. A very high percentage (74%) of the category I questionnaire respondents thought that participation would increase.

Few of the category I questionnaire respondents believed there would be serious negative effects resulting from increased participation. On most questions, opinions were evenly split between those that were positive and those that thought there would be no change. Perhaps the oddest responses from the administrators concerned teachers. Only 25 percent of thought that teacher morale would improve as a result of increased participation, but 42 percent thought teacher performance would improve.
The responses of all others were more positive. With the exception of the ability to attract good administrators, for which only 28 percent thought it would be easier, over half gave the most positive response to all other questions. Seventy-five percent through that community support for schools would improve, and only three percent said it would decrease. Perhaps the most interesting finding among the responses is that 68 percent said they thought pupil achievement in basic skills would improve if there was more citizen participation. Percentages of responses of all respondents are given below.

FIGURE 8
Percentages of Respondents, By Predicted Impact of Increased Participation (n=1,489)

If citizen participation increased, the results would be:
1. Community support for schools would
   75 Increase  22 Remain the same  3 Decrease
2. Teacher morale would
   60 Improve  23 Remain the same  16 Decrease
3. Ability to attract administrators would
   28 Be easier  43 Remain the same  29 Be more difficult
4. Teacher performance would
   63 Improve  31 Remain the same  6 Decline
5. Community discontent with schools would
   12 Increase  17 Remain the same  71 Decrease
6. Pupil achievement in basic skills would
   68 Improve  28 Remain the same  4 Decline
7. Innovations in curriculum and modes of instruction would
   58 Be more frequent  28 Remain the same  20 Be less frequent
   97
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