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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze from an organizational standpoint the National Committee for Citizens in Education. The organization is seen as an open system organized around multiple goals which are met with variable effectiveness. Following a framework adapted from Haas and Drabek, the interactions among the organization's normative, interpersonal, and resource components (called the explanatory structure), together with the organization's transactions with its environment, are shown to have consequences which alter the organization and affect its output (performance structure).

The National Committee, formed in 1973, attempted to mobilize a broad-based mass membership to represent the public interest in public education. When that effort failed, the organization was restructured to establish a network of loosely affiliated autonomous groups to which it offers its goods and services. The most viable component of the organization is its Citizens' Training Institute through which it recruits members and provides information and leadership training. Its publications and institutes are designed to stimulate and to provide skills training for parents to become active participants in educational decision making.

This study traces the growth and development of the National Committee and finds that the survival of the organization is contingent upon its ability to establish legitimacy in its environment and thus secure continuing financial support.
THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS
INTRODUCTION

Voluntary associations in a democratic society mediate between primary groups and the institutions of the society. When social institutions are perceived as being unresponsive to the needs of their relevant publics, the affected groups may become apathetic, withdraw their support, or attempt to change the institutions. In America today the relationship of public schools and their client population (students and their parents) is an uneasy one at best. Though parents are generally supportive of the schools, they are vaguely unhappy and critical of the job schools are doing. In the bureaucratic systems of today, decision making has been increasingly removed from parents, often resulting in feelings of powerlessness, or apathy, and sometimes actual withdrawal of support. But there are groups that believe parents can become active and can be reintroduced at the decision-making level.

One such group, the National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE), believes that parent groups can be mobilized to take power in the system to make the system more responsive to their felt needs. In order to become active, parents must perceive that it is in their interest to do so and must feel that it is possible to penetrate the bureaucracy. They must also be armed with sufficient information and skills and must have the support of other parents or groups.

On the national scene, three general trends can be identified which suggest that these conditions for activation of parents
are present. In educational journals and in schools of education in recent years, there has been a greater emphasis than heretofore on school-community relations and on programs directly involving parents in school education. In addition, as government programs have begun to require "maximum feasible participation" in delivery of services to the poor, legislation affecting schools has incorporated this idea and required involvement of parents in many areas. At the same time, there is a growing national trend for parents to demand more participation in decision making in public education, as evidenced by community control experiments, decentralization movements, and the proliferation of special interest pressure groups, as well as many purely local "better schools" organizations.

The NCCE is based on the belief that parents have a special interest in public education, and it has attempted to define that interest and to offer its services to parents to provide information and to train them to participate effectively. The NCCE capitalizes on both the invitation to community involvement from school administrators and the requirement of parental participation in legislated programs. It also provides a vehicle for expression of dissatisfaction and a framework for voluntary action to effect change in public education.

Because the NCCE claims to be the first national public interest group in education with a broad-based citizen membership, it is important to learn the extent to which it represents the public interest, to see how broad its membership is, and to discover whether it leads parents to a significant role in public education. This study is a descriptive analysis of the organization's growth and development, with
particular emphasis on the development of its Citizens' Training Institute.

The level of analysis is the organization itself, seen as an open system organized around multiple goals which are met with variable effectiveness. The complex interaction of the activities and processes within any organization and its exchanges with its environment have consequences which alter the organization and affect its output. Both internal and external pressures operate to deflect organizational energies and resources from its goals.

Official goals call an organization into existence—give it its reason for being, its basis for action. But in reaction to internal and external pressure the organization develops what Perrow (1961: 855) has called "operative goals." The importance of understanding this development is stated by Hall:

The operative goals serve as abstract ideas around which behavior is organized. These ideas take the form of constraints on decision making in determining where the organization's resources will be placed. The operative goals can and usually do change as a result of internal and external factors. These changes can deflect the organization quite dramatically from its original (official) purpose, reflecting a response to reality in most cases. Changes in goals can also lead to the disintegration of an organization if the new operative goals do not allow the organization to have sufficient resources brought in to ensure survival. (1972: 102)

The significant internal system actors of the NCCE are the governing board, the professional staff, and the members. They bring with them into the organization certain commitments, expectations, and skills which make use of the available resources to produce goods and services. The relevant environment of the organization, for the purpose of this study, is the population of public school parents, other consumer-oriented education-related organizations, and the population of
contributors—foundations, corporations and individual donors—addressed by the NCCE in its search for basic continuing support. (Some organizational energies are directed toward the educational establishment and toward the larger society. It could be argued that the real purpose of the NCCE is a societal one [i.e., to improve public education by introducing parental voice into the establishment], but societal goals can be fulfilled only as idealistic goals are translated into concrete actions at lower levels. It is these more concrete actions that claim our attention here.) We will try to identify the stresses and strains within the organization and in its relationships with its environment which account for its growth and development and changes that have taken place. Because the Citizens' Training Institute, which was not a part of the original activities, now commands a major portion of the resources and energies of the organization, we will attempt to see what the development of the CTI means to the continued growth and survival of the organization itself.

Hall's discussion suggests certain questions at this point. Does the CTI deflect the organization from its original purpose? What internal and external factors brought the CTI into being, and what are its consequences for the organization?

In Chapter I a brief look at the historical background of public education demonstrates that the role of parents has changed from one of direct involvement to one of peripheral importance—as taxpayers and auxiliary supporters—with little or no voice in decision making. Chapter II provides a brief history of the NCCE using information obtained from two visits to the Columbia, Maryland, office, including
interviews with staff members and access to minutes of the governing board, as well as from published materials. Drawing on these same sources, especially the year-end evaluation report of the Citizens' Training Institute, Chapter III contains a discussion of the CTI and its relationship to the overall organization.

Chapter IV examines the NCCE using a framework for analysis adapted from Haas and Drabek (1973). In keeping with the understanding of organizations as open systems organized around multiple goals which are met with variable effectiveness, the analysis of goals is placed in the context of the interaction of the major components of the organization with one another and of the organization with its relevant environment. Insights from Perrow and from Thompson and McEwen contribute to the analysis. The relationship of the CTI to the NCCE and its importance to the survival of the organization is discussed in Chapter V using the same theoretical context as the previous chapter. In the final chapter, Chapter VI, the growth and development of the organization are reviewed and comments are made concerning the outlook for the future of the NCCE.
CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A Brief Review of the Development of Public Education

and the Changing Roles of Parents

The history of public education in America can be traced from its early days of close cooperation between parents and the teachers they selected for their children to the growth of present day bureaucratic systems over which parents exercise little, if any, direct control. Public education as we know it today has developed essentially in the last hundred years.

In the early days of the country, though laws differed from one region to another, primary responsibility for education rested with the family. Schools were desired chiefly to prevent the growth of a class of unskilled, unproductive citizens and, further, to promote literacy and to instill religious values. Church leaders were often the leaders in education.

The shift to community responsibility for education took place gradually, but by the 1830s the question of control of public schools was a national one. Rapid industrialization and urbanization and successive waves of immigration caused marked changes in the social, economic, and political life of the nation. Schooling was seen to be the most effective way to transmit traditional values, to socialize the immigrants, to equalize opportunity, and to combat urban poverty. State legislatures assumed responsibility for establishing schools, deciding how they should
be financed, and determining attendance requirements. They gave local districts direct control over raising money, hiring teachers, and setting curricula.

The situation at the end of the nineteenth century has been summed up in a recent article:

As common schools spread, important decisions were no longer made by religious leaders in the community, but over time devolved on economic and political leaders. In a relatively homogeneous community, . . . these leaders could be assumed to have more or less reflected the desires and interests of the community as a whole. With increasing diversity of class and culture . . . , however, lay leadership in heterogeneous districts tended to reflect the interests of the dominant social class. The leaders of the common school movement were outspoken in their goals for education, among which were the inculcation of the values and traditions of the white, Protestant, middle and upper classes . . . .

The inherent conflict between the will of the majority and the rights of the minority has persisted throughout the history of public schools. The ultimate establishment of common schools as nonsectarian . . . and the retention of the ideology of lay control over the affairs of the local school reflect this tension. The local majority could not, in theory, use public schools to inculcate its religious views, but control was not given over either to the state or to experts.

Thus, by the close of the nineteenth century, the ideological and legal framework for governance of America's schools had been established. Education was a public function, rooted in state statute, but administered primarily by local officials.

(Guthrie, Thomason, and Craig, 1975: 91, 92)

At this time each district had a lay governing board usually well known in the community and accessible to its constituents. Since then several processes can be identified that have operated to remove educational decision making increasingly away from the parents of the children in school.

The first of these processes has been the school consolidation movement. In 1900, when there was a national population of 72,000,000, there were nearly 110,000 local school districts. An average of five members per school board (a ratio of one board member for every 138
citizens) provided an opportunity for close contact and face-to-face
discussion between citizens and those who made the decisions. In 1975,
although the population had grown to more than 210,000,000, there were
fewer than 17,000 school districts, with one school board member now
representing close to 2,470 people. (Guthrie, Thomason, and Craig,
1975: 92) The complete picture is not seen in these statistics of
course. Because of the diversity of school organization in the various
states, these averages apply only on a national basis. In the majority
of today's urban areas the ratio is much greater, creating even more
distance between the majority of public school parents and the persons
who control their schools.

A second process increasing the distance between parents and
policy-making bodies has been the movement to remove education from
politics. At the turn of the century, schools were very much involved
in the political scandals that called forth governmental reform through­
out the nation. Reformers attempted to remove schools from ward politics
by centralizing boards, making them nonpartisan, and providing them with
independent taxing power. As schools were less obviously involved in
politics they became less susceptible to change through political
processes. This may have been an advantage in that it kept schools
untarnished by politicians acting in their own interests, but it was a
disadvantage in that it kept from the schools those most interested in
the education being provided for their children.

Concurrent to these trends were the bureaucratization of school
systems and the professionalization of school administrators. Reformers
welcomed the expert manager in schools as well as in municipal govern­
ments. As school districts were being consolidated and centralized, the
population was increasing rapidly, and schooling became compulsory for more and more students. Lay school boards simply did not have the time or the expertise to handle the increasingly complex business of operating large school systems. More and more, the business matters were turned over to professional administrators. It is now common practice for the superintendent to develop and present the budget and suggest policy alternatives as well as to administer the day-to-day operations of the system. He controls the flow of information to the board and to the public. Although control is ostensibly vested in a lay board responsible to the community, board members are increasingly dependent on professional administrators. Generally, the public has accepted the premise that educators have special knowledge and therefore can be trusted to guide the educational enterprise with only limited advice from laymen.

Large school systems are staffed by specialists in both educational and administrative departments. The tendency to expect administrative efficiency and scientific management techniques in business carries over into the schools. Again, experts prevail over a public made more remote by its lack of experience and knowledge.

Another trend that has operated to discourage active participation of parents in school decisions is increasing reliance on litigation to settle school disputes. Since the 1950s, many individuals have sought redress of their grievances through the courts rather than through the legislative process. This trend has a centralizing effect in that it removes policy decisions not only from the local governing bodies, but also from state legislators. Some court decisions have brought about much needed reforms, but in the long run the direct public role is
diminished and there is the real possibility of increased alienation and apathy. This has been true especially in desegregation decisions which have, in many cases, resulted in zoning students away from their neighborhood schools.

The last centralizing process to be mentioned here is the organizing of teachers. There is debate as to whether this trend should be considered as unionization of the work force or as a manifestation of professionalization at the classroom level. Its significance in this context is that teachers are demanding and obtaining a powerful voice in the decision-making process. The competition for power is not limited to teachers and administrators but involves lay boards and the public they represent. Teacher associations unite teachers at state and national levels and there is some evidence that the locus of their influence is shifting from the local district to state legislatures and to the Congress, again removing the process further from the concerned citizen or parent.

These trends have been manifest in the national arena of education, affecting local districts differently only in degree. Throughout this period of change, there has been a general acceptance on the part of parents. For most of this time, the public has willingly paid the bills and has at least acquiesced in this removal of control from those most directly affected by policy decisions.

Traditionally parents have worked with the schools through supportive organizations such as the PTA and have held school officials in high regard. In recent years, however, these organizations have become less effective and have lost membership and interest. Local school boards have come under criticism for having been coopted by
professional administrators and for abdicating their control to increasingly powerful teacher organizations at the bargaining table. The public seems to be less satisfied that the schools are meeting the needs of their children or of the society-at-large. A generalized concern that public schools are no longer effective has found expression in various ways. Many parents are apathetic; many have withdrawn their support by sending their children to private schools or by failing to pass bond issues. Others are seeking ways to change the situation.

The perception that change is possible arises from a growing public consciousness that persistent concerted action can affect government bureaucracies, and is nurtured by calls for involvement by legislators and school administrators themselves. Minority groups, encouraged by the civil rights movement to define their interests in public affairs and to express their interests through political action, are angry that their children do not yet experience equality of opportunity in the society. They are seeking the same benefits for their children that the educational system has traditionally provided for the children of immigrants and the working class--basic skills for entry to the job market or academic preparation for higher education. Middle class parents, especially those with higher education, know what they want for their children and what experiences schools can be expected to provide. Many take the traditional benefits of schooling for granted and are more concerned with the quality of life in the schools. They feel competent to judge the school system and are frustrated by what they see as the schools' failure to teach basic skills, to provide adequate enrichment opportunities, and to maintain discipline, but they
feel alienated from the decision makers. They sometimes join together to press for specific programs or for general school reform. There are also some who join to fight the system on such highly emotional issues as busing, controversial textbooks, and sex education. Among these groups there is no consensus on the goals of education, but there is a common feeling that somehow the interests of their children are not being served, and a determination to do something about it.

Collective awareness that change is desirable is not sufficient to bring it about. There must be institutional mechanisms for effecting basic change and these means are available today. With increased dependence on federal and state funding for education, schools have had to accept increased supervision in using the funds. Many government funded or regulated programs require or encourage the active participation of parents or other community actors than those in the education establishment. Part of this is due to taxpayer demand to have greater power over the allocation of funds to urban schools which are perceived as unable to maintain discipline or to produce literate graduates. Legislation passed at state and local levels seems to respond to this combination of citizen unhappiness and loss of faith in the ability of professional educators to manage the whole enterprise efficiently or effectively. Federal legislation requiring parental involvement in school programs seems to be a part of the general tendency to mandate participation of the recipients of social services in the programs designed to deliver those services.

There now seems to be a countervailing process to those processes that removed decision making away from parents. Renewed participation is being promoted by those same forces that originally made it more
difficult. Citizen involvement required by legislation at all levels is based on the presumption that citizens have a legitimate voice in the operation of public schools; it usually takes the form of advisory groups with varying degrees of authority. Another kind of citizen participation is that encouraged by the community relations movement in school administration. Here the parent/citizen is invited by the professionals to assist and support the schools in ways indicated by the particular needs of the professionals at any given time. It can include anything from service on an advisory committee to various volunteer programs and parent-teacher conferences. At least two potentially conflicting views of citizen participation in the schools are at work at the same time: one expecting effective input into policy making by parents expressing their own (and their children's) felt needs, and the other expecting cooperation and support in meeting needs as determined by administrators (not necessarily denying effective input).

In this climate of generally diffuse public dissatisfaction, and with insistence on involvement from professional educators and legislators, parents of public school children are seeking the most effective ways by which they can influence the processes of public education to make schools more responsive to their felt needs. Within the educational establishment, there are separate local, state and national organizations for almost everyone--administrators at every level, school board members, teachers--but there has been no national organization specifically for parents of public school students. Since 1973 the National Committee for Citizens in Education has attempted to fill this need. Its success depends on its ability to establish itself as a legitimate vehicle through which parents may become informed on educational matters,
effectively express their concerns to the educational establishment, and become active to influence local schools.
CHAPTER II
HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE
FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) came into being with something of a "social movement" aura. A small group of influential people, a remnant of the National Committee for the Support of Public Schools, committed to the support of public education in America, came together with three highly knowledgeable, highly skilled professional educators who negotiated with a national foundation to provide initial funding for a nationwide mobilization of parents, citizens and students in effective advocacy of the public interest in education.

The National Committee for the Support of Public Schools (NCSPS) was founded in 1962 by a group of prominent Americans including Agnes Meyer (publisher of the Washington Post), James B. Conant, Omar Bradley, Harry S. Truman, Harold Taylor, and others. It was elitist in its membership (by invitation only) and basically concerned with one issue (federal aid to education). The members, selected from the national power structure, paid no dues, but convened, sponsored conferences and some legislation. After Mrs. Meyer's death, her funding no longer available, the organization was essentially defunct but its Board of Visitors did not disband. Although this study is not concerned with the activities of the NCSPS, an awareness of its character is essential to
an understanding of the beginnings and subsequent development of the NCCE. In fact the new committee operated under the old name initially and still borrows prestige from its influential members by explicit association with them in all of its publications and other printed matter. It has also retained all board members of the parent organization who wished to continue.

Early in 1973 the board of the NCSPS made contact with the former New Jersey State Commissioner of Education. He and two long-time friends and associates who had worked together in federal poverty programs in the 1960s conceived the idea of a mass membership organization to help parents become an effective force in public education. They prepared a proposal, which was accepted by the board of the NCSPS, and negotiated a fourteen-month, $450,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. The operation began with a professional staff of three, who continue to manage the day-to-day activities. The governing board and staff shared an overriding commitment to the right and responsibility of the public to govern public schools and to participate in improving public education. They shared a further commitment that parents from minority, poor and rural populations should be involved in these efforts.

The organization was to be a broad-based national constituency, a "Common Cause" for education, with at least three major functions: mobilization, advocacy, and information. There were to be groups organized at local and state levels with the headquarters staff providing information and technical help to mobilize the groups in dealing with school bureaucracies at each level. The governing board was to change from a self-renewing one with indefinite terms to an
elected board with limited terms of service. Although initially dependent on foundation funding, the National Committee would become financially self-sustaining through membership dues, sale of publications and individual gifts.

As might be expected, the first year was one of flexibility and experimentation. The membership campaign in the fall of 1973 was initiated with great expectations of enrolling 10,000 members by January 1974; 30,000 by June; and the first generally elected board members were to take office in July 1975. With a staff associate employed to work on publications and marketing research, a variety of approaches were used to build membership, including direct mailings and contacts with other action-oriented groups who agreed to inform their members of the new organization. Fund raising and public relations consultants were retained to help in the efforts.

To fulfill its advocacy function, the staff undertook projects on a number of different fronts, becoming involved in court cases and legislation hearings. Whenever possible, staff members appeared on radio or television and were active in forming coalitions with other organizations to address a number of education-related concerns.

To provide parents with useful information on educational matters as well as to publicize the NCCE, a newsletter, The NCCE Report, was launched and a guide for evaluating curriculum materials, Fits and Misfits: What You Should Know About Your Child's Learning Materials, was produced in collaboration with the Educational Products Informational Exchange. Both advocacy and provision of information involved extensive research in education-related issues.
Two significant efforts, in terms of energies expended and positive consequences for the organization, illustrate the variety of the NCCE undertakings in the first year. The first led to unexpected involvement in the passage of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, part of the 1974 Elementary and Secondary Education Bill, which denies federal funds to any school or college that fails to allow parents or students eighteen or older to inspect, challenge, or refuse public use of school records. The state of confidential records of school children was a prime concern of the NCCE from its beginning. *Children, Parents and School Records* (RiouxFord and Sandow, 1974), a book which contains information on the legal situation in each of the fifty states, was published and 5,000 copies were distributed in an effort to promote grassroots demand for reform. An article in *Parade* magazine (Divoky, 1974: 4, 5) mentioned the work of the NCCE. After Senator James Buckley saw the article, he contacted the NCCE; and together they and others worked for passage of the "Buckley Amendment." Portions of the NCCE handbook were read into the *Congressional Record*, and the NCCE received substantial credit when the bill became law January 4, 1975. These unintended but positive consequences of the NCCE activity resulted in increased visibility and respect for the organization. Interest in this matter continued but activity was redirected to put pressure on HEW to publish the required privacy regulations and to assist parents in exercising their rights under the new law.

The other major effort was launched in November 1973 when the NCCE convened a Commission on Educational Governance made up of fourteen people: eight board members and six other citizens from
various parts of the country selected for their interest in education. "The Commission was to develop a report and a set of recommendations on the citizens' role in the establishment of policy and in decision making in the operation of the public schools. Its task was to conduct public hearings around the country to examine issues related to the question 'Who controls the public schools?'" (NCCE, 1975c: vi) Public hearings were held in five major cities and citizen activists in four other states were invited to give testimony. Through field interviews and research prior to the hearings, the staff was able to identify recurring questions that required further analysis. A panel of consultants was established to act in both a research and advisory capacity. Each consultant provided a paper on a particular issue to guide the Commission in development of its report. These specialists met to consider all aspects of the Commission's hearings. The experts and their issues were: Mario Fantini, alternative education; James W. Guthrie, history of governing policies in American schools; Lawrence Pierce, growth of teachers' organizations; and Donald Reed, history of citizen participation.

The hearings were held from April through October 1974, and the Commission met periodically to receive interim reports and develop its own presentation of the findings. The results were published in 1975.

Before the hearings were underway the organization revised its membership hopes downward. In spite of the miniscule response to test mailings, fewer than 500 members, commitment to mass membership was
reaffirmed. At the November 1973 board meeting* the staff talked of establishing a training institute but the idea was not given high priority by the board. The staff introduced the idea again in June 1974 but still failed to get the wholehearted approval of the board. During the first year the board repeatedly expressed the need for better communication with the staff and for more direct involvement of the board in policy decisions. Eventually an executive committee was appointed to work more closely with the staff. Extensive media exposure and collaboration with other organizations were pursued as membership efforts centered on mobilization around high-impact issues, such as the privacy regulations. Another book (Apker and Sandow, 1975) was prepared in conjunction with the National Association of State Boards of Education and published by Phi Delta Kappa, and work continued on others.

In its second year (July 1974-June 1975) the NCCE obtained another fourteen-month grant from the Ford Foundation along with an admonition that Ford funding could not be expected to continue beyond October 1975 and other sources of funding must be found. Major activity still centered around the governance hearings and the privacy law and its implementation, but emphasis on the need for increased membership and financial support dominated board meetings.

The NCCE joined the National Coalition of ESEA Title 1 Parents and other organizations to sponsor a national conference "to give parents an

*References to board meetings throughout are based on notes taken on examination of unpublished minutes of the meetings, June 1973-June 1976.
opportunity to learn not only their legal rights under Title I provisions of ESEA, but to equip them with the methods they will need to become effective leaders in their school systems." (NCCE Report, Vol. 1, August-September 1974: 4) More than 650 representatives of Parent Advisory Councils (mandated by the ESEA legislation) attended. Here the NCCE was directly involved in providing consumer training to help parents take advantage of institutional means for influencing education at the local level.

Perhaps the most significant development for the NCCE as an organization was the establishment of a nationwide, toll-free "hotline" telephone service (800-NETWORK), publicized through local newspapers and by public service spot announcements of local radio stations. Overtly set up to give parents and school administrators information about the new school records legislation, the one-way hotline provided NCCE ready contact with thousands of potential members. A recorded message briefly describes the NCCE and its activities and requests that the caller give name and address and an indication of the kind of assistance needed from the NCCE. Callers are sent information packets which include membership envelopes. Cards on which to report individual experiences concerning access to school records have been included and also a car window decal (Appendix A) advertising the hotline. Publicity for the hotline and the NCCE was extended when the message on the decal was displayed on some 1000 billboards in forty-three states. This national exposure plus favorable articles in influential newspapers and magazines engendered thousands of inquiries but relatively few members.
An article in *The American School Board Journal* (Jones, 1975: 41-6) gives evidence of the membership situation at that time:

Obviously, many parents, citizens, school administrators and school board members have been willing to look at and listen to N.C.C.E.—and, of course, to benefit from its activities. But since the group was formed in mid 1973, only approximately 1,300 individuals have been willing to buy $15 pieces of the action.

N.C.C.E.'s recruitment efforts so far appear even more disappointing when the makeup of the group's current membership is examined. About 250 of the 1,300 were regained from the roster of N.C.C.E.'s predecessor citizen group, the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools. . . . Although the old committee was reconstituted as N.C.C.E. in 1973 to reflect a hoped-for transformation into a mass-membership organization, the predecessor organization had a larger membership (1,400 in 1967, for example) than N.C.C.E. does today.

To the carry-over figure of 250, add approximately 400 loyal friends of N.C.C.E.'s three principal leaders, and you have a rough estimate of how many members N.C.C.E. had acquired before it started its on-going drive to recruit parents and citizens everywhere. Perform the necessary subtraction and you're left with a figure of approximately 650 "new" members who have joined N.C.C.E. during the past 15 months or so. By sharp contrast, four years ago the ranks of Common Cause swelled to more than 100,000 dues-paying members in that group's first six months of existence. Common Cause currently claims 325,000 members.

By the end of 1974, financial survival had become a critical matter and board and staff sought new sources of funding. New strategies were devised to work with local groups not established as chapters of the NCCE. The by-laws were revised to delay the first election of board members and the following note appeared in the *NCCE Report* (Vol. 2, no. 1, December-January 1975: 8): "Because of uncertainties over future funding and membership, the Board has voted to postpone the election scheduled for July 1 until next year."

The staff now sought to persuade the board to establish a training program through which the NCCE could aid citizens at the local level without becoming directly involved in problems of governance of their organizations. The national organization and the local groups could
cooperate with each other without becoming involved in or even necessarily approving each others particular issues.

After failure of initial efforts to build a mass-membership movement the NCCE announced a new campaign (NCCE Report, Vol. 2, no. 2, Spring 1975: 1). All existing statewide and local citizen organizations seeking to improve education were invited to join the Parents' Network as affiliates. Instead of building up its own membership as such, the NCCE now offered its services as a clearinghouse for exchange of information and its resources, professional expertise, and publications as means to assist groups in their activities. (Appendix B) Excerpts from its promotional flyer (NCCE, 1975b) illustrate this change:

Parents' Network was set up to help concerned citizens educate themselves so they can break through the bureaucratic walls surrounding our schools. . . . Our goals are to make you important again in school operations and help create an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust among teachers, parents and administrators. . . . Parents' Network helps you find legal advice and participates in public hearings across the country. . . . We become involved in issues which are raised by our members. We do not, however, take on those issues which would divide parents.

As the NCCE entered its third year, two important new programs were underway. The newsletter was discontinued in favor of NETWORK: A National School-year Newspaper for Parents, and the Citizens' Training Institute was established. Billed as "the publication that tells parents what they need to know to act in the best interests of their children," the newspaper is filled with informative articles, book reviews, and reports on education-related legislation and court decisions. Consumer and advocacy oriented columns provide legal advice and answers to readers' problems as well as information concerning parent/citizen
activities in communities all over the nation. In the introductory issue (October 1975: 1) the editors proclaim:

Because you have asked for it, NETWORK has become a reality, established as the communication lifeline of the PARENTS' NETWORK. The purposes of this newspaper then are obvious: to help parents reclaim a voice with school policy-makers; to light up issues and problems that affect local schools and to put the Public back into Public Schools.

To take charge of the Citizens' Training Institute (CTI), a new staff associate was engaged as director of training. The training program had become possible as a result of a two-year, $200,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation specifically for this program. During the school year 1975-76 eight institutes were held in regional locations across the country. According to reports the locations were chosen on the basis of "ready access to existing Parents' Network member groups; a desire to reach rural areas and such special groups as Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Title 1 parents; and a return to the major cities where NCCE conducted hearings on school governance."

(Network, Vol. 1, no. 3, October 1975: 11)

In addition to these new programs, work continued on publication of citizen handbooks. Members, both individuals and groups, were sought through the use of a variety of marketing techniques. Whenever possible, staff members made public appearances in person and on radio and television. The search for stable financial support continued as proposals went to hundreds of foundations and corporations. All the while board members were active in seeking donors who could make substantial gifts on a continuing basis. There was also an effort to enlist new people to serve on the governing board. By-laws were changed to establish new procedures for selection of board members. Instead of having general
elections, the board would continue to renew itself but terms of service were limited. (See Appendix C for names; Appendix D for publications.)

Of all these activities, this study focuses on the CTI because it claims the largest share of the organization's assets, financial and personal. Although the newspaper has been very important as the "communication lifeline" of the Parents' Network, it has not yet been successful financially. The staff is doubtful it can be continued much longer in its present form unless it can be underwritten by special donations. The CTI, on the other hand, has already been funded for one more year with good prospects for funding for a third year.
CHAPTER III
THE CITIZENS' TRAINING INSTITUTE*

The original task of the NCCE was to mobilize parents to become active in the public interest to make schools more responsive to the public they are supposed to serve. Conditions in society seemed to point to the possibility of success of such a venture. In order to become active, parents must perceive it is in their interest to do so and must feel that it is possible to penetrate the bureaucracy. They must be armed with sufficient information and skills and must have the support of other parents or groups. When the NCCE's initial efforts at mobilization failed, it could be presumed either that there was no felt need for such an organization or that parents lacked the necessary incentive to become active. Convinced of the need by their own experience and the result of a survey of thirty statewide coalitions existing in 1968 (only two of which were still active in 1973), the NCCE devised new strategies for activation.

Their most successful venture has been the Citizens' Training Institute. Through a series of workshops across the nation, the NCCE has engaged in consciousness-raising, training in specific skills, and building a network of supportive groups. A major concern has been to

equalize the capacity and resources of parents/citizens with those of other interest groups which exercise influence in public education. The extent to which these institutes have resulted in significant activation of parents in local schools is difficult to measure, given the brief period of time elapsed and the paucity of reliable data at this time. The institutes have, however, been successful in recruiting new member groups into the NCCE, generating additional funding for the organization, and extending its influence through collaboration with other organizations concerned with parent participation in schools. For the purpose of this paper our interest in the CTI is to determine its significance for the life of the organization rather than to evaluate its effectiveness in reaching its stated goals, although whether it is perceived as an effective instrument for pursuing the NCCE goals is of prime importance.

The objectives of the CTI are stated in its promotional brochure as follows:

The Citizens' Training Institute was developed to provide leadership training to parents and citizens so that they could share in the decision-making in their public schools. Our objectives include our desire to:

1) Provide the information necessary for parent-citizen participation in the educational process.

2) Assure concerned parents and citizens a role in the decisions that affect them and the education of their children.

3) Work along with parent-citizen groups in the continuous development of their organizational skills.

4) Give members of parent and citizen groups the opportunity to share ideas, strategies and concerns with other groups across the country who are a part of the national Parents' Network.

5) Promote exceptional leadership skills in the Parents' Network members.
6) Strengthen and support the network of parent-citizen organizations supporting quality education for children in America.

7) Work along with other groups who share common goals in restoring the confidence of parents in public education.

8) Refer members of our Parents' Network to legal counsel, organizations, school personnel, foundations and others who can help them reach their goals.

9) Provide service to individuals who wish to establish new organizations in cities where their voices are not being heard.

10) Help parents in their relationship with teachers, school boards and administrators.

(NCCE, 1975a: 6)

From September 1975 through April 1976, eight institutes were held in selected regional locations—East Coast, Midwest, South, Appalachia, Southern California, and the California Bay Area (Appendix E). The NCCE chose the sites and selected the groups to participate, guided by previous experience and important contacts with groups and individuals. Most participants were from urban areas but some from suburban and rural areas were also included. In all, 560 individuals representing 250 parent groups and over 50,000 parents attended. The entire professional staff of the NCCE was fundamentally involved with the CTI but particular responsibility rested with the director of training. Five field representatives were engaged on a part-time basis to provide a continuing link with the NCCE for groups that attended the institutes. (These representatives also have Parents' Network responsibilities. This overlap of roles reflects one way the CTI contributes significantly to the efforts of the NCCE.) For the workshops, expert consultants and trainers were employed as needed and an institute evaluator was retained to give objectivity to the evaluation process. Although financial constraints prevented his attendance at some institutes, he was provided reports of leaders and evaluation sheets from participants.
The workshops and activities of the institutes serve three basic functions: to provide information about issues of concern to parents—how schools operate, how and where decisions are made; to offer training in community organizing techniques and leadership development skills; and to provide a framework for exchange of ideas and intergroup support. Intensive follow-up to reinforce skill development and to keep groups in touch with the NCCE and one another is integral to the CTI program. Throughout the year the director and field representatives were actively involved in the communities in which the institutes were held. Groups in these areas were asked to participate in preplanning for the institutes. Each institute was intended to be tailored to the particular needs of those who would be attending. In each region the staff involved school officials in the planning and school people attended some of the institutes as observers or participants.

There is a tone of confrontation and militancy to the institute reports, but this is tempered by stress on the importance of communication and effective cooperation with school officials. The NCCE repeatedly denies any adversarial intention, but by the very nature of its efforts to provide parents with "information that has been denied" them and to guide them to seek power where access to power is difficult, certain adversary relationships are encouraged. The NCCE recognizes this possibility and in fact builds on it as is evidenced in the statement that the NCCE "strongly believe(s) that once parents receive the same kind of information as administrators, teachers and school boards, their relationships—and their schools—get better." (NCCE, 1975a: 5) In the second year's program there will be a deliberate
effort to involve administrators more productively in the institutes with the possibility of offering training to help administrators work more effectively with parents. If this effort is successful there should be some diminution of the adversarial atmosphere.

Trainers and consultants for the CTI reflect experience in advocacy and community action programs, as do the field representatives. Of fifty trainers and consultants used in the 1975-76 institutes, thirteen are listed as professionals, twenty-two as parent leaders, and fifteen as employed in positions where they work with parent/community groups on an on-going basis. Four of the field representatives for 1975-76 had only regional responsibilities but the fifth, who is the National Coordinator for the National Coalition of ESEA Title 1 Parents, serves the NCCE as National Field Representative for Title 1 Parents.

For various reasons, participants in the institutes did not turn in evaluation sheets in great numbers, but the staff has engaged in extensive follow-up activity through letters, phone calls and visits. The general feeling of the staff is that the CTIs have been very successful and they hope to expand their outreach significantly in the next year. Eight institutes have been tentatively scheduled for 1976-77 with the possibility of a ninth being added. Although it is difficult to measure the total effectiveness of the institutes since there is insufficient objective data, the program evaluator, the field representatives, and reports from participants give evidence that they were generally well received and thought to be helpful. Continuation of the program is assured for another year and the staff is seeking
expanded financial support on the basis of the first year's institutes. The additional money is requested mainly for greater employment of field staff to be used in preplanning and follow-up activities and for more in-service training for field representatives. The budget request for field staff is more than double the present amount. Three more field representatives have already been named for 1976-77 bringing the total to eight. (Appendix F)

The importance of the CTI to the NCCE is indicated in the allocation of personnel and funds. The CTI was underwritten by a Rockefeller grant for $200,000 for one year, with $100,000 available for a second year to be matched by funds from other sources. The required matching grants have been obtained, but more funds are being sought for expansion of the program. Total expenses exceeded the Rockefeller grant considerably. Most of this was met by support from other sources but more than $10,000 was used from the NCCE operating funds. The budget for the second year includes a reallocation of $8,000 to cover the cost of monthly inserts on each CTI in the Network newspaper. This shared funding has implications for the parent organization. If the CTI is an important vehicle for recruiting new groups into membership, it is essential that there be some way to stimulate continuing enthusiasm after the one-time training session is over. The newspaper, which is already an integral part of the effort to maintain membership in the organization, is in a precarious position financially. If the CTI can help finance the newspaper, it contributes further to the survival of the NCCE itself.

The proposed locations of institutes for 1976-77 reflect an intention to cover areas not already reached, except for a return to
Appalachia to give additional help to the same groups that attended the first Appalachian Institute. A special institute to meet the needs of American Indians in California is already in the planning stage. It is hoped matching grants can be obtained from cities where parents and funding sources want institutes to be held.

Another aspect of the CTI is development of curriculum materials for its own use and to be available for others. A series of slide and tape presentations have been prepared from the CTI sessions for rent or sale to groups, especially for those who have not attended the CTI. The NCCE is now tailoring its publications to fit the needs of action groups reached through the CTI. A series of handbooks is being made available: Parents Organizing to Improve the Schools, The Development of Parent Leadership, How to Use the Media, and Parents and Collective Bargaining. The CTI sees these handbooks as a means to reinforce the skills developed during the institutes. Again there is evidence of overlapping activity with the CTI providing both raw materials and a potential market for the NCCE products. The proposed second year budget of the CTI calls for an increase of about 60 percent over the first year expenditure for curriculum development.

The CTI has been a valuable outreach program for the NCCE. It not only serves the population of major interest, the parents of school children, but also establishes relationships with other organizations similarly concerned with citizen participation in education. An on-going cooperation with the National Coalition of ESEA Title 1 Parents has been assured through formal agreements to share information
and personnel. This alliance is confirmed in proposals to both organizations' funding sources. The CTI Director also reports:

Other collaborative relationships have developed between the CTI and the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights, the Education Law Center, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the National Urban League, Operation PUSH, the Council of Great City Schools, the Joint Center for Community Studies, the National Association for Public Relations, the National Education Finance Reform Project, the Institute for Responsive Education, the National Urban Coalition, the Children's Defense Fund, the Consortium for Educational Leadership, the Institute of the Black World, the National Black Parents Association, the Native American Training Association, the National Congress of Parent Teacher Association, the National School Boards Association and the various community involvement programs mandated in school systems across the country. These relationships have involved much correspondence and dialog on issues, strategy, and cooperative endeavors in promoting more effective parent involvement. They too are likely to result in improved problem resolution in the future of an expanded CTI.

(Annual Report, 1975-76: 125)

Indications, then, are that the CTI is an invaluable means of establishing legitimacy and credibility for the NCCE as a whole. Not only does it have impact on the particular constituencies to which the NCCE has addressed itself; it also provides a highly visible program whose impact can be subjected to scrutiny and measurement for presentation to foundations, corporations and important donors. To understand the significance of the CTI for the continued growth and development of the NCCE, we must see it in the context of the overall goals of the organization. Stresses and strains within the organization and in its relationship to its environment caused a major change in its operative goals from the mobilization of a mass membership to the establishment of a network of affiliated organizations. We now turn to an analysis of the goals of the NCCE and the relationship between organizational goals and the CTI.
CHAPTER IV
GOALS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE
FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

Official goals provide one way for the organization to define and
describe itself. From the by-laws and published statements of the NCCE
we glean these official goals: (1) to promote citizen participation in
education (rekindle public interest); (2) to build effective citizen
voice (redress balance of control); and (3) to be an effective advocate
of the public interest in education. To fulfill these goals the NCCE
has engaged in attempts at mobilization of parents, dissemination of
information, leadership training and numerous advocacy efforts.

Inasmuch as the organization seeks to be rational we can expect
its activities and its outputs to reflect these official goals. Inasmuch as the organization is an interaction system responding to stress
and strain from within the organization itself and from its environment
we can expect its activities and outputs to vary. This variation
indicates the actual or "operative" goals—those tasks toward which day-
to-day activity is directed. These are determined according to their
relative importance assigned to them by the dominant actors. The
arrangement of the tasks of organizations at any point in time can be
accounted for by the interrelationships that develop as the underlying
belief systems and the available resources and the interpersonal
structures of the organization interact with one another. As the
organization produces goods and services which it sends out into its environment, it receives inputs from the environment which also may cause it to change its activities and outputs. Because of these ongoing interaction processes organizations develop multiple goals that are pursued with variable persistence.

The day-to-day activities of the NCCE generally cluster around these basic tasks: (1) securing sufficient financial support to allow the organization to survive; (2) establishing itself as a trustworthy representative of the public interest on the national education scene; (3) building membership and developing cooperative relationships with other organizations; and (4) producing goods and services desired by its relevant publics. The particular strategies and the relative application of resources and energies toward any of these basic tasks have changed from time to time and continue to change as the young organization seeks to find the most effective ways to operate.

Haas and Drabek (1973: 117-9) suggest a basic framework for analysis of organizations. In their conceptualization the normative, interpersonal and resource structures of an organization together are designated "explanatory" structures because the interaction of these components helps to explain and predict the performance structure, the actual tasks engaged in by the organization. The framework is elaborated to include environmental interactions that affect the internal functioning of the organization. Although this study does not involve the extensive collection of data required by a Haas and Drabek analysis, it does make use of their basic idea. The following chart indicates how this framework has been adapted and applied to the NCCE. The
ensuing discussion points to ways significant elements of the explanatory structures and the environment act independently or in concert to affect the performance structure.

![Diagram showing the relationships between the explanatory and performance structures, and indicating its interaction with its environment.](image)

**Normative Structure**—The norms of democratic pluralism permeate the organization. The NCCE is committed to the belief that in a democratic society the public can be trusted to have control over public institutions, and that public education is essential to the well-being of the society. The NCCE holds that the public has the right and the responsibility to govern its schools and to participate in improving public education. Furthermore, it insists that all
children should have equal access to education and that a citizen movement in the public interest must involve poor, minority, and rural populations.

Because the NCCE believes a major defect of public education is the overwhelmingly bureaucratic character of most school systems, it seeks ways to make these systems more responsive to the ultimate consumers of education, students and their parents. The founders were determined that the NCCE would reflect their anti-bureaucratic bias. They envisioned an organization that was a kind of democratic society in itself. Its staff members are designated "Associates" to indicate shared responsibility. They planned for a nationwide membership which would have input into decisions made at the national level through elected representatives and which would elect its own governing board.

Interpersonal structure—Individual staff members bring their own normative commitments to the organization and bargain with one another to promote their own particular projects, but the interpersonal bargaining most significant for survival needs is that between the staff and the governing board. The organization actually seems to be the creation of the three senior associates, having been somewhat of an idea waiting to be born until one of their number was tapped by a member of the declining NCSPS. Still it was brought into being under the aegis of the NCSPS, whose commitment was to the support of public education more than to its reforming. Thus a potential source of strain was present from the beginning as twenty-three NCSPS board members constituted the first NCCE Board. Since that time, fifteen
carry-over members have left the board and six new members have been added.

The staff is made up of highly educated professionals with a rich background of experience in education at many different levels. The three senior associates had also previously worked in the administration of federal poverty programs related to education. Both staff associates have exceptional qualifications for their particular tasks. The one whose primary responsibilities are the development of ideas and marketing has a background in educational policy research and consultation with major experience with special purpose membership organizations. The other, the director of the CTI, has had classroom and administrative experience in public schools and also extensive involvement in community action programs, minority and women's movement activities and political campaigns.

These persons are thoroughly familiar with the educational system they attempt to confront and improve. Through wide contacts made in previous positions they have access to important and influential persons in education, government, foundations and corporations. They also have ready access to leaders in other organizations and programs dealing with consumer oriented issues in education, particularly those dealing with minorities. It is from these areas the field staff has been enlisted, bringing additional experience, commitments and expectations into the interpersonal structure of the organization.

In any organization members or lower level participants make up a large part of the interpersonal structure. In voluntary associations, however, it can be fruitful to consider members as part of the resource structure.
Resource structure—Three general resource areas can be identified as contributing significantly to the internal interactions affecting the NCCE operations: financial support, resources shared through coalitions, and members as resources. The lack of an adequate ongoing financial support base for the NCCE has already been discussed. Funds are sought from varied sources in the environment to supplement those obtained from members and from the sale of publications.

Coalition building has been important to the NCCE from its beginning. On several occasions the NCCE has joined with other organizations in law suits and legislative hearings concerned with public rights in education. When it became involved in the privacy issue, according to one senior associate, "N.C.C.E. was in coalition with 38 different groups operating at state and national levels, P.T.A.'s, state chapters of the League of Women Voters, the American Friends Service Committee, the New Jersey School Boards Association, the Children's Defense Fund, and so forth." (Jones, 1975: 45) The conference for representatives of Title I Parent Advisory Committees linked the NCCE with still other groups. Two books were published in collaboration with and through the facilities of other organizations. (EPIE, 1974; Apker and Sandow, 1975) Reliance on other groups for shared resources commits an organization to certain reciprocal obligations. Independence in decision making is diminished, and to the extent these other groups pursue different goals, organizational energies may be diffused.

One of the most important resource areas for any voluntary organization is its membership list. (Perrow, 1970) According to
Perrow the voluntary organization differs from other organizations chiefly in that most of its resources, most of its raw materials, are also direct consumers of a good part of the product. In the NCCE members serve both as clients, providing a market for the information and leadership training produced by the organization, and as raw materials to be transformed into skilled activists furthering the goals of improving public schools. Perrow enlarges on the idea of members as resources showing the varying effects of names, money, manpower, and personality which members provide to the organization. If we apply his model, we see that the NCCE relies on its membership chiefly for names and money. As in most voluntary organizations there is a small core of members who do most of the work. In the NCCE this is the paid staff, members nonetheless, who provide most of the manpower and personality resources, with help from the governing board. The network of affiliated groups provides some money and many names of individuals as well as names of organizations that carry varying amounts of prestige and goodwill in themselves. Both names and money are general, storable resources that can be used more or less at the discretion of the organization. The size of the membership list is particularly important to provide legitimacy and potential power when the organization acts as a pressure group. Besides providing names and membership fees to the NCCE, many groups serve as resources by representing special interest groups (such as the poor, minorities, or handicapped children) that appeal to major contributors.

Decisions are made and goals are set by the major actors in the organization on the basis of their normative commitments constrained by
the availability of useful resources. There are also external pressures as the organizational environment responds to the activities and products of the organization and these in turn affect the decision-making processes.

**Environment**—It is important to understand that both the general and the particular environment addressed by the NCCE in turn influence the organization. The general environment in which the organization operates and to which it responds encompasses the public schools of America. Taken collectively they may be considered to comprise the educational system of the country. Within this system are organized groups representing teachers and other professionals at every level, as well as legislation and court rulings affecting public education, also at every level. The textbook industry, teacher training institutions, and the various accrediting agencies must be included. The way in which the NCCE comes into contact with and influences or is influenced by these various elements has consequences for the organization as it sets its goals and decides on its daily tasks.

Of more immediate concern is the particular environment to which the NCCE is specifically committed. This can be understood by identifying three populations of interest: parents of public school students, other lay membership organizations interested in education, and foundations, corporations and donors with money available to support educational concerns.

Thompson and McEwen (1958: 23) tell us that the goal-setting problem in organizations "is essentially determining a relationship of the organization to the larger society, which in turn becomes a
question of what the society (or elements within it) wants done or can be persuaded to support." This being the case, the survival of the organization depends in large part on its ability to understand and exploit its environment or to adjust to the requirements of the environment. These relationships develop through either competitive or cooperative strategies. While the NCCE is competing with other organizations for members and financial support, it is also collaborating with many organizations to achieve similar goals.

Cooperative strategies may involve bargaining, cooptation or coalition and the NCCE engages in all of these. Some organizations with which the NCCE has collaborated have been noted earlier. Interorganizational relationships are not consistently smooth. It has often been the experience of the NCCE staff that they receive encouragement and support from individuals in other organizations but wariness and suspicion from the organizations as entities. The national PTA at first seemed to be threatened by the NCCE, but a change in PTA leadership has brought increased communication and some cooperation. The National School Boards Association, espousing similar goals of public control over public schools, would seem to be a natural ally, but has been cautious in its exchanges with the NCCE. Its members may consider themselves adequate representatives of the public interest. The most outspoken critic of the NCCE has been Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers. He argues that parent participation in school decision making should not be increased; important educational decisions should be left to professional educators. These examples are given as illustrative of environmental realities the NCCE has to
consider and deal with as it attempts to influence citizen participa-
tion in education.

An organization can attempt to coopt other organizations and can
also be coopted by others. The NCCE is most vulnerable to cooptation
in its dependence on board members and field staff who have other
organizational commitments. These individuals exert direct influence
on organizational goal setting. Less direct, but still limiting, is
the influence of foundations, corporations, and donors. In order to
commit funds they may require particular persons to be used, locations
chosen, or issues espoused by the organization. While supporting the
same general goals, they may manipulate the organization to serve other
goals of special interest to the foundations, corporations or donors.
The NCCE on the other hand may successfully coopt other persons and
organizations to further its own goals. This is a distinct possibility
if school administrators become fully involved in the training insti-
tutes. These kinds of environmental exchanges must be understood in
order to understand the external pressures affecting the performance
structure of the organization.

Performance structure--In this analysis it is claimed that the
interrelationships which develop as the normative, interpersonal, and
resource structures interact with one another together with the
exchanges which take place between the organization and its environ-
ment determine at any point in time the goals which are set and the
activities which are undertaken to implement them. Following Perrow
we have said that the day-to-day tasks can actually be called the
operative goals of the organization. We have identified four basic
task clusters: securing funds for survival, establishing legitimacy as a representative of the public interest, recruiting members and coalition building, and producing goods and services. These are pursued with variable persistence in response to stresses and strains within the organization and between the organization and its environment. We will now attempt to relate these activities to the explanatory structures and the environment to show the effect these elements have on the performance structure of the NCCE.

It has been pointed out that the founders intended to carry out these tasks through a self-sustaining mass membership organization with a democratically elected governing board. When the mass membership failed to materialize, the staff and board responded by redirecting the organization rather than forsake the overriding purpose that brought them together. Although the official goal has not changed, a major operative goal or strategy had to be abandoned. The Parents' Network of affiliated groups was established. Democratic values are still promoted, but the organization itself is less democratic than originally intended. Studies of voluntary associations have suggested that this tendency may be inherent in such organizations. In the NCCE the underlying belief system is unchanged and still influences organizational decisions. Etzioni (1964: 11) suggests that when organizational leadership is vested in a small group, it may be that "by avoiding wasting efforts on internal strife, an oligarchy might direct the organizational membership more effectively in attaining democratic goals."
Concentration on recruitment of organized groups into a network of affiliation has both positive and negative consequences for the organization. Although the organization is less democratic, it is also relieved of problems of coordination and control. Although the membership does not vote on the issues to be addressed, the NCCE does not have to become involved in the particular issues around which local groups direct their activities. Two significant negative consequences are: the NCCE loses some degree of legitimacy in representing the public interest if it cannot mobilize a mass membership; its membership cannot provide sufficient resources, personal and financial, to make the organization self-sustaining so it becomes more dependent on the governing board and the environment. There is one important plus: the NCCE can initiate efforts toward national organizations that represent the minority, rural and poor populations it is committed to involve and through them reach local groups. In this way it can increase its own membership and satisfy the requirements of its board members and funding sources. Another advantage to the organization is that it can claim a large surrogate membership which gives the NCCE more potential clout in representing the public interest, more legitimacy in all of its advocacy activity.

To meet its commitment to promote citizen participation in education and to encourage citizen voice in decision making the NCCE must establish itself in the society as a legitimate and trusted representative of "citizens in education" as its name implies. The parents of public school children as a collectivity did not respond to initial efforts at mobilization by the NCCE. Those parents already
united in other groups do, however, seem to welcome the help of the NCCE in acquiring information and leadership skills. Instead of asking individuals to choose between a local organization and the NCCE (or to join both), the NCCE now recruits the organization, thereby gaining more members and greater support at minimal cost.

To the extent that the NCCE is dependent on its interorganizational environment, it must accept a degree of environmental control in its decision making. It must produce goods and services that are useful or acceptable to the environment in order to survive. The NCCE must be aware of existing legislation and court rulings affecting public education and alert to new developments so that it can interpret these to its membership and guide its members into meaningful action.

The professional staff of a voluntary organization can be expected to operate more or less autonomously in producing goods and services so long as its membership is satisfied that it receives benefits commensurate with the costs of membership. Boards of directors often offer only minimal guidance if the organization is operating effectively in a benign environment. But strains are present and when the environment is not readily supportive and survival is uncertain, the governing board may become more active in exercising control over the staff. As strategies have changed and fund raising has become more critical, the NCCE staff has been more constrained to pursue goals important to the governing board. That there has been disagreement is evident by the repeated requests from the board for more adequate communication between board and staff. As the organization relies more and more on the personal efforts of board members to raise funds
through donations from their friends and business contacts, it has to be more concerned with legitimizing its activities and outputs to the board.

As the board membership is changing from those carried over from the predecessor organization to include new members, some suggested by the staff itself, the board has become more active in setting policy. This can be accounted for in part by the fact the new members bring a high degree of commitment to the official goals as the basis of their service. In the first two years board members expected the staff to continue the NCSPS practice of sponsoring an annual national conference, but the conference was delayed several times because scarce resources were expended in other directions. And it took the staff two years to persuade the board to establish the training institute the staff desired. No doubt board changes were responsible for acceptance of the staff idea of establishing the training program and for abandonment of the annual conference. In 1973 there were twenty-three persons still serving on the NCSPS board; in 1976 only eight of these remain and their terms will expire in 1978. Meanwhile six new appointments have been made and a search is underway for eight more members. As the staff and board seek new members who can bring desired influence and resources to the organization, they also become vulnerable to pressures to pursue the special interests of these board members and donors.

In June 1976, in response to a request from the board, the staff prepared a suggestion for an enlarged subcommittee policy-setting structure for the board. This proposed structure would give the board more program involvement in addition to participation in fund raising
and general operating concerns. The staff has been forced to relinquish autonomy in order to retain board prestige and influence in acquiring funds, members, and other board members.

![Diagram of governing board structure]

"Fig. 2—Possible structure of governing board of the NCCE."

Within the staff more time and resources are being allocated and staff growth is occurring more in the leadership training area than in other departments. These new staff members bring with them their own commitments and expectations. The growth of the field staff especially has consequences for day-to-day decision making. The annual report of the CTI includes with the field staff evaluations requests for clarification of their roles. Appendix L of the report is a "Memorandum of Understanding" which formalizes the field staff role and makes explicit the dual responsibility with separate reporting procedures to Parents' Network and to the CTI. Bimonthly conference calls and quarterly expanded staff meetings have been instituted to enhance communication between the headquarters and field staff. It has already been noted that these field representatives come from a background of community action and association with minority causes. As their participation increases, their influence can be expected to be increasingly evident in the NCCE activities.
In the earlier chapters it was established that the CTI has become the major activity in terms of allocation of funds and energies. In the next chapter we will spotlight the CTI as the most significant element of the performance structure to see to what extent it fulfills the survival needs of the NCCE remembering Hall's statement: "Changes in goals can lead to the disintegration of an organization if the new operative goals do not allow the organization to have sufficient resources brought in to ensure survival."
CHAPTER V

RELATIONSHIP OF THE CITIZENS' TRAINING INSTITUTE

TO THE GOALS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

In the previous chapter we set forth these official goals of the NCCE as being implicit in the by-laws and published statements: (1) to promote citizen participation in education (rekindle public interest); (2) to build effective citizen voice (redress balance of control); and (3) to be an effective advocate of the public interest in education.

At its inception the staff and board of the NCCE felt that conditions in the society were right for mobilizing parents to become actively involved in the control of public education. They hoped to take advantage of current indications that school administrators would welcome community involvement and of requirements of parental participation in legislated programs. When their first efforts at mobilization failed they devised new strategies for accomplishing the same goals. Eventually the concept of a mass membership organization gave way to the establishment of a network of autonomous groups loosely affiliated under the leadership of the NCCE. In order to serve these groups most effectively and still to further the goal of citizen participation, training institutes were established. The development of the CTI has already been traced. It is now important to see to what extent the official goals of the NCCE are met through the CTI. In the previous
In this chapter we will place the CTI in the context of this framework and will try to answer questions concerning the importance of the growth and development of the CTI to the continued survival of the NCCE as an organization.

To begin with, the NCCE evidently misjudged the readiness of the majority of parents of school children to move actively to regain control of public school systems. As we have seen, direct attempts to build a mass membership failed; marketing efforts to sell the newspaper have been less than successful. Through the training institutes, however, the NCCE has experienced some success in persuading parents that they do have an interest in becoming active. In intensive workshops with the help of expert trainers and consultants they have attempted to convince parents that it is possible to penetrate school bureaucracies and have provided them with information and skills training to that end. Through the workshops and the follow-up activities of field representatives they have encouraged sharing and supportive relationships between groups.

Although each individual institute is predicated on a considerable amount of preplanning with groups and professionals in a given area, including a comprehensive needs assessment, it is clear from a reading of the CTI annual report that the NCCE set the priorities for the CTI programs. The NCCE decided that emphasis must be placed on each of
these objectives summarized here:

(1) provision of information on various aspects of the school process (including information on school budgets, school programs, policy determination, parents' rights, school law, collective bargaining, desegregation decisions, and declining enrollments; also on federal and local guidelines controlling the Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the ESEA Title I law); (2) promotion of exceptional leadership and organizing skills among parent/community leaders (developing parent confidence, assertiveness, inspiration, persistence, sensitivity, etc.; also helping groups to organize around specific projects designed to keep the group alive); (3) provision of a forum for the sharing of parent ideas, strategies, and concerns (encourages exchange of information after the workshop to further "parent development"); (4) reinforcement of skill development through intensive follow-up (seen as most vital aspect of the CTI commitment: individualized service to groups for a year after attendance at institute).

(Annual Report: 5-7)

It is easy to see that the official goals of the NCCE are closely paralleled in the CTI. But organizations have other less apparent goals that must be met. (Perrow, 1968, 1970) Organizational survival depends on maintaining the loyalty and commitment of the various people involved and on continued support from the environment, especially a market for its goods and services and, in nonprofit organizations, donation of adequate financial resources.

It has been pointed out earlier that the CTI provides both raw materials and consumers for the NCCE outputs. Parents' Network members are called on for help in laying the groundwork for regional institutes. (The actual locations, though, are chosen by the NCCE staff, no doubt on the basis of organizational needs not readily apparent in published information.) In turn groups attending the institutes and those formed as a result of the institutes have become affiliated, dues-paying members of the Parents' Network. Institute sessions are reproduced in slide-tape presentations for rent or sale. Action handbooks are prepared as curriculum materials to be used at the institutes and sold
in other markets. The most valuable product of the CTI in terms of organizational needs is activated people. It is too soon to determine the long-range effect of the CTI in this regard.

Through the CTI, the NCCE is able to work toward its commitment to help parents become an effective force in public education. Does the CTI also carry out the NCCE commitment that parents from minority, poor and rural populations should be involved in these efforts? Reference has already been made to the decision of the NCCE to become a network of loosely affiliated, autonomous groups. While the needs of these groups certainly affect decisions of the staff and governing board, policies are not set by majority vote of the membership, nor even by representatives of the member groups. Because board and staff are determined that the organization shall not serve middle-class whites only, they have purposely initiated contacts with persons and groups already serving the poor and ethnic minorities. In the CTI annual report one field representative writes:

The NCCE has moved from a national staff of four white men and one black woman to a Field Staff that includes a black man and black woman with contacts with Title 1 Parents network, a Chicano man sensitive to the needs of Spanish-speaking minorities, a black woman with academic skills, and myself, a white woman with experience with parent organizations. This diversity is critical for the development of a relevant, credible national network of parent and citizen groups. (98, 99)

Since that report the field staff has been expanded to eight, only one of whom is white and she comes from a background of community work in Appalachia. These are the people who help with the preplanning and follow-up activities of the CTI. There is the possibility of over-emphasis on serving the needs of the poor and ethnic minorities. What that might mean for the future of the NCCE is not yet clear. At present
the organization is enriched because it can collaborate with organizations already serving these groups in obtaining personnel and facilities for the regional institutes. Furthermore, it has been able to obtain some matching grants to fund the institutes from sources with money earmarked for minority educational needs.

In terms of the normative commitments, the interpersonal network and the resource bases of the NCCE examined in the previous chapter, the CTI does seem to be a logical development to serve the goals and survival needs of the organization. At present it seems to encounter a receptive environment. Future growth and development depend on how the organization takes advantage of the successes of the CTI and how it deploys its remaining resources in other directions.

Funding for the CTI is specifically for that program. Salaries of the rest of the staff, special projects of individuals, the newspaper, and continued services to Parents' Network depend on generating stable sources of income for the whole organization. The CTI may help. It serves as a means of extending the NCCE influence and establishing its legitimacy in the society. Through it the NCCE maintains a high profile as institutes held monthly in selected locations across the country generate a great deal of activity and publicity at local levels. At every regional institute the staff is able to promote the NCCE, making a pitch for membership and other services. Because the CTI employs field staff, Parents' Network also has access to their services at minimal additional cost.

The CTI serves the organization well and may become the only activity of the organization to generate sufficient resources to ensure
the survival of the NCCE. Sills (1958: 253) tells us that "Any analysis of a goal-directed organization cannot be confined to things as they are, since the future state of affairs toward which the organization's activities are oriented is very much a component of the contemporary organization. It must, in the very nature of the case, inquire into the relationship of present activities to future developments." We can only speculate on the future of the NCCE. It is certain that the original intent of the founders of the NCCE was much broader than sponsoring training institutes, though that was not precluded by any means. The fact that none of the three senior staff associates has taken direct leadership of the CTI indicates that all three are pursuing other projects significant to their objectives as an organization representing the public interest in education.

In the final chapter we will review the growth and development of the NCCE and consider its prospects for continuing as a force to improve public education through increased participation of the parents of school children.
CHAPTER VI

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

After three years of activity on the front lines of today's education arena, where does the NCCE stand and what is the prognosis for its continued existence? From an organizational viewpoint, three basic changes have taken place: (1) The NCCE does not now attempt to recruit a mass membership of individual parents and citizens but seeks instead to build a network of loosely affiliated, autonomous groups. Though individual memberships are still welcomed, the efforts of the national staff are directed toward providing services—research, information, handbooks, workshops—to the groups. (2) Although a democratically elected board is not practical without local chapters, turnover has been assured by establishment of limited terms and provision for at least a one year absence after serving two three-year terms. (3) Because it now seems impossible to become financially self-sustaining through membership fees and sales of publications, seeking support from individual donors, corporations and foundations must be a continuing major area of activity.

The NCCE created the Parents' Network, a federation of local and state groups who share an interest in improving public education, when its mass membership drive failed, and established the CTI to encourage and train parents to become involved in the schools.
At the national level there are still attempts to serve an advocacy function, but the main tasks are to build the organization through recruitment, to gain legitimacy in its environment, to provide services to members, and to assure the survival of the organization through marketing and fund raising. The services provided combine dissemination of information and leadership development. The most visible outputs are the newspaper, citizen handbooks and the training institutes.

The newspaper has been very important as the "communication lifeline" of the Parents' Network. It has effectively provided a forum for exchange of ideas and information, often presenting opposing viewpoints in keeping with the NCCE commitment to give all concerned parents a vehicle for expressing their concerns. The handbooks have been streamlined, made uniform in format, and geared to action groups. But the CTI is the activity which claims the largest share of the organization's assets, financial and personal. Through the CTI the NCCE recruits members, establishes legitimacy, provides services, and attracts considerable financial support. At present, funding for the CTI seems more stable than that for the overall organization, a matter of great concern to the staff who feel that unless the NCCE is secure, the CTI cannot survive on its own. The fact that the Ford Foundation provides the main support for the NCCE and that the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and other grants are specifically for the CTI may prove to be an insurmountable problem.

The survival of the NCCE is now, as at its inception, contingent upon its ability to extend its message to parents who want public
education to do more for their children, who are threatened by the bureaucratic administrations of large school systems, and who are willing to invest their time and energies to share in decisions that affect their children's schools. More than that, the NCCE must be able to persuade these parents that its services and products are uniquely helpful to them in their efforts and are worth the costs of organizational affiliation.

We have seen that historically parents have surrendered direct control of public schools to professional administrators and have accepted only minimal voice through small, nonpartisan school boards. The processes that have shaped present-day school systems have operated to make parents remote from educational decisions. Parents generally have been only marginally involved in their children's schools. There seem now to be some trends in the society at large of citizens becoming more active, seeking to make public institutions more responsive to individuals. Legislation, court rulings, and school administrators are encouraging parents to participate more actively in public education. There is growing dissatisfaction with public schools, made more intense by the economic difficulties facing most school systems. There seemed to the founders of the NCCE to be just the right environment for establishing a "Common Cause" kind of organization for improving public education. As we have seen popular support for such an organization failed to materialize, but the NCCE remains convinced that the need exists.

In this study we have taken the position that an organization's ability to pursue its goals is dependent upon the complex interaction
of the internal components of the organization and its exchanges with its environment. Both internal and external stresses and strains cause the organization to change and to adopt new operative goals which may or may not bring in sufficient resources to ensure survival. We have attempted to describe and analyze the NCCE showing how its present activities can be explained by an understanding of the interrelationships that develop as the underlying belief system and the available resources and the interpersonal network of the organization interact with one another, and of the reciprocal relationships between the organization and its environment. On the basis of this analysis, we can draw certain conclusions and make some predictions concerning the direction of the NCCE energies and resources in the near future.

The staff will continue to reach out, test new markets, promote the Parents' Network and its newspaper, seek new members and financial supporters among the population at large. By selecting the sites for the CTI and inviting participants with the help of interorganizational contacts, they will focus on a population that has already demonstrated some degree of commitment to involvement in public schools. Because many of those who have participated so far are from poor and minority groups who cannot themselves contribute substantial financial support, the NCCE will continue applying for funds from sources committed to helping these groups. They may also attempt to institutionalize their relationship with organizations representing these groups as they have with the national coalition of Title I parents. They must also find ways to attract more middle class parents and their organizations both as participants in the institutes and as established members of the Parents' Network.
There is certain to be continuing pressure from board members to show results in achieving goals. The new board members have tended to represent consumer and minority interests and to push the staff in a more activist direction, but a nominating committee has been established to select persons "who reflect the diversity and balance necessary to enable the National Committee to be representative of the population served by the public schools." (By-law revision, June 1976)

The persons who respond to the invitation to board membership will have great influence on the direction of the NCCE activities. They will continue to be important in attracting donors as well as encouraging interorganizational cooperation.

It will be essential for the NCCE to retain its professional staff because the organization has no mechanism for developing lay leadership. The field staff role could well take on more importance in linking the NCCE with other organizations. If the staff continues to grow, the structure of the organization will become more formalized, a development that may cause strain. Senior staff members will resist the tendency to increased bureaucracy. They may also tire of the necessity to spend more time in writing proposals to funding sources than in doing research on issues affecting education.

The books published by the NCCE will continue to be tailored to fit the needs of the CTI because the institutes develop the market for the publications. The future of the newspaper is more problematical. The proposed CTI insert in each issue has not appeared and the newspaper has issued a direct appeal to its readers for help in attracting general support revenue. The newspaper is designed to reach a much
broader readership than those who attend institutes or join the Parents' Network. If the NCCE cannot maintain the newspaper, it will further narrow its major goals. It will become even more dependent on the CTI to justify its existence.

One purpose of the newspaper has been to provide a link between the groups in the Parents' Network. In the pages of the newspaper the NCCE is able to present information on issues brought up by members. It can deal with conflicting issues and opposing viewpoints without taking an organizational position on every issue. This is important in maintaining the membership of diverse groups whose only common interest may be involvement of parents in their children's education.

Reaching a supportive environment for the NCCE goods and services is of prime importance. The organization must take advantage of trends in the society toward activation and avoid antagonizing other groups active in public education. They are most likely to meet resistance from school administrators and teacher organizations who perceive them as antagonistic and from school boards and PTAs who see them as encroaching on their territory. The NCCE will attempt to neutralize this resistance by involving representatives of these groups in the CTI both as leaders and participants. They are most likely to receive support from groups already organized around special interests. The NCCE can provide assistance to these groups by doing research and developing leadership skills, allowing them to concentrate their resources in other directions. This kind of assistance should be particularly attractive to other organizations with limited financial support from members. The NCCE would do well to establish ties with
the various Parent Union groups that are being formed in many large cities and with groups organized to promote the interests of handicapped children. These groups have demonstrated the ability to lobby effectively at the state and national levels and the determination to force local schools to be aware of their special interests.

As we have seen, the NCCE is based on the belief that parents have a special interest in public education, and it has attempted to define that interest and to offer its services to parents to provide information and to train them to participate effectively. The NCCE capitalizes on both the invitation to community involvement from school administrators and the requirement of parental participation in legislated programs. It also provides a vehicle for expression of dissatisfaction and a framework for voluntary action to effect change in public education.

Athena Theodore has written:

> In developed democratic societies where the voluntary groups mediate between the primary groups and the overall organizations of the society, they can exercise a degree of social control not present in any other type of society. It is not inconceivable that the "active society" which Etzioni describes in terms of responsiveness to its changing membership and engagement in perpetual self-transformation may develop at least in part because of the voluntary effort of its citizens.  

(Theodore, 1972: 133)

The conditions for activation are present. The success of the NCCE in effectively representing the public interest in education and in leading parents to a significant role in decision making in public schools rests on its ability to take maximum advantage of its normative, interpersonal, and resource structures in arranging its organizational
activities and on its skill in understanding and dealing with its relevant environments.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

CAR WINDOW DECAL

Call Toll Free 800-NET-WORK
When your child's school system is more system than school.
APPENDIX B

THE PARENTS' NETWORK

Local and statewide citizen-parent groups can work with NCCE by joining The Parents' Network. Membership—Participating groups automatically receive all names of callers in their area from 800-NET-WORK, NCCE's nationwide toll-free telephone hotline. By dialing 800-NET-WORK parents and citizens anywhere in the continental United States (except in Maryland) can get information about The Parents' Network. Research—With the help of The Parents' Network, NCCE prepares and distributes materials to help parents. NCCE's first handbook, Children, Parents and School Records, has already helped thousands of parents and citizens. Information—NCCE is publishing a joint newspaper with The Parents' Network, featuring news of local groups and exchanging information.

The cost for group affiliation ranges from $15-$50 per year, depending upon the size of the local group and pro-rated at 10¢ per paying member.

SERVICES OF NCCE AND THE PARENTS' NETWORK

• Referral: Concerned parents to legal counsel; organizations to other organizations; individuals to organizations; parent groups to appropriate educators; legislative inquiries to appropriate sources of information.
• Materials: Produce manuals, pamphlets and research documents useful to citizens in dealing with their schools and useful to parents in understanding the educational system.
• Research: Prepare background information for the press and for legislators who request it.
• Public information: Clarify school issues and provide information to the national press.
• Representation: Act as a national clearinghouse and when asked will on occasion act as spokesman for local parent organizations.
• Legal: Join as a "friend of the court" in lawsuits that have national consequences for the rights of students and parents.
• Service to individuals: Support services to groups and individuals to establish new organizations in cities where no parent-citizen voice currently is heard.

—from Fund Raising By Parent/Citizen Groups: 51
APPENDIX C

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION
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Carl L. Marburger
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APPENDIX D

PUBLICATIONS OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION

FUND RAISING BY PARENT/CITIZEN GROUPS--A fundamental, step-by-step guide to fund raising activities. Takes you through the basics, from identifying sources of support to the development of a fund raising plan, how to handle follow-up, how to cultivate donors. This information-packed publication includes sample proposals, suggestions on how to form a tax-exempt organization and tips on how to report back to donors. If your group is to have the treasury it needs to accomplish the things it wants to accomplish, then your group needs this book.--(52 pages, $1.75—single copy free to members.)

PARENTS ORGANIZING TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS--Step-by-step guide to organizing and running a parent group in your children's school that can act effectively to upgrade the quality of education and the educational environment.--(52 pages; $1.50—single copy free to members.) Available in Spanish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS--The focus is on citizens, whose frustration with the school system has grown especially deep; teachers, whose organizational strength and bargaining power is gaining rapidly; state legislators, who are increasingly abandoning a reactive posture in favor of a more assertive role in decisions affecting education. Testimony in five major cities was taken from individuals and organizations, representing a cross section of educators, legislators, students, parents and others concerned with the public schools. McCutchan Publishing Corporation--(paperback, 271 pages; $5.00—reduced cost of $3 to members.)

VIOLENCE IN OUR SCHOOLS: WHAT TO KNOW ABOUT IT—WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT—The booklet includes regional surveys of school crime; do's and don'ts for children's safety; recent Supreme Court decisions on student rights, state legislation dealing with the problem; alternatives in public education; how to conduct a survey to determine the level of security the community will support and sources of additional help and information.--(52 pages; $1.25—single copy free to members.)

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION: CHALLENGES TO STATE BOARD LEADERSHIP—The shifting centers of power and responsibility in American education and their consequences for state politics in education.--(94 pages; $3.50—single copy free to members.)
FITS AND MISFITS: WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT YOUR CHILD'S LEARNING MATERIALS—Booklet produced in cooperation with the Educational Products Information Exchange. Contains answers to some questions about the selection of materials used in the schools, i.e. Who chooses those materials? On what basis? Through what procedures?—(117 pages; $1.25—single copy free to members.)

NETWORK—A national school-year newspaper for parents. (Subscriptions $8.00 a year, free to members.)

—from Fund Raising By Parent/Citizen Groups: 53
APPENDIX E.

CITIZENS' TRAINING INSTITUTES, 1975-1977

1975-1976

September Columbia, Maryland
October Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
November Chicago, Illinois
December New Orleans, Louisiana
January New York, New York
February Los Angeles, California
March Harpers Ferry, West Virginia
April San Francisco, California

1976-1977

September North American Indian Institute
October The Pacific Northwest
December New England
January The South
February Appalachia
March Detroit, Michigan
April Southwestern States
May The Breadbasket Midwest
June Open
APPENDIX F

1976-1977 FIELD REPRESENTATIVES

National (for Title I Parents): William Anderson, National Coordinator for the National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents.

Southern Region: Patricia Daly, Coordinator of the Education Resources Unit, Institute of the Black World, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

Midwestern Region: Cheryl Francis, resident of Chicago, member of several community boards, has served as consultant for parent involvement projects.

Southwestern Region: Carmen Goodman, has served as a legislative analyst for the Institute of Child Advocacy in Los Angeles.

Northwestern Region: Carol Harris, community organizer in Oakland, California.

Appalachia: Kathleen Kennedy, has worked in infant and pre-school programs and with community groups in Eastern Kentucky and other parts of Appalachia.

East Coast: David Spencer, community organizer and trainer in New York and New Jersey.

Native Americans: Greg Villegas, with the Native American Training Associates Institute, Sacramento, California.
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