

This paper details the structural weaknesses of contemporary educational programming in the urban setting. It is argued that the separate disciplinary approach to what are seen as multi-disciplinary problems is dysfunctional and that the lack of systematic evaluation procedures leads inevitably to the frustration of desired program goals. Two programs are analyzed to illustrate this position (Head Start and Youth Service Bureaus). Special focus is given to (a) the school as an institution disposing both legitimate and illegitimate status, (b) ways in which the educational arena must be adapted to accommodate contemporary pluralistic society, (c) the interface between education and other critical arenas that make up the urban milieu and (d) a procedure for citizen participation in educational decision making.

WILLIAM T. PINK*

Education and the Urban Community: An Examination of the Essential Components of Planned Change

The recent ascent of Jimmy Carter to the Presidency notwithstanding, we see around the United States evidence of decaying cities (fiscally, socially, and culturally), poor management in government, widespread unemployment and heated battles over educational issues. Recent events in cities such as New York, Detroit, and Boston are examples of such problems. Some argue that these urban problems are largely a direct function of those living there.¹ Others argue that these problems are a result of the inability or an unwillingness of an advanced technological society to bring its collective expertise to bear on urban problem solving.²

While there have been many attempts, both actual and theoretical, to help the deviant/disadvantaged/poor and save the cities (although these are not necessarily seen as one and the same thing) they have in a very large part failed to have a significant impact, for two major reasons. The first reason for this low success rate has been the singular inability of programmers to look beyond their own disciplinary specific boundaries for solutions. In brief, solutions to contemporary urban problems are for the most part seen as disciplinary unique. That is to say, 'experts' in criminal justice claim to have the solution to delinquency, 'experts' in school administration claim to have the solution to low achievement and youthful anomie, 'experts' in urban planning claim to have the solution to the lack of community in low income housing, and so on. Un-

*William T. Pink is Chairperson and Associate Professor of the Department of Educational Foundations and Urban Education, University of Nebraska — Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska 68101, U.S.A. He is currently a Research Associate with the National Institute of Education in Washington, D.C.

¹See, for example, the logic and argument extended by such writers as R. Herrnstein, "I.Q.," *Atlantic Monthly*, (September, 1971), 45-64; A. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 39 (1969), 1-123; W. Shockley, "Models, Mathematics and the Moral Obligation to Diagnose the Origin of Negro I.Q. Deficits", *Review of Educational Research*, (October, 1971), 369-377.

²D. T. Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments", *American Psychologist*, 24 (April 1969), 402-429; J. K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society* (New York: Mentor Books, 1958); M. Harrington, *The Other America* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962); I. Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); A. Pearl, *The Atrocity of Education* (St. Louis: New Critics Press, 1972); A. Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970).

fortunately, their claims have proved largely unfounded. Such division, reinforcing as it does disciplinary rigid separation of problem and solution, is totally dysfunctional in a highly complex interdependent society.³

We have found, through all too painful practice, that problems associated with crime, drug addiction, housing, and education cannot be solved by using single disciplinary models. The time has come to squarely face the truth. Contemporary problems are not only extremely complex but will only be solved when they are met head on with holistic models that take into account how the various critical elements of society are inter-related (e.g., the world of work, school, and the political arena) and how change can and must be orchestrated between them. We have long recognized the simple concept of the ripple effect, the initiation of a single change also impacting on adjacent areas but inexplicitly ignore it in much programmatic planning.⁴ Blunting, ministering to the parts and not the whole is a sure-fire strategy for failure.⁵ Such piece-meal tinkering is not only costly (fiscally, socially, and practically) but is in both the long and short term frustrated. Regrettably, turning around this disciplinary specific approach to problem solving will be no easy task.⁶ The question, however, is not should interdisciplinary planning be undertaken, but rather how can it be facilitated in the shortest possible time.⁷

The second major reason for the high failure rate of programs is the lack of systematic well conducted evaluation. Small programs might well be excused if limited funds are withheld from full-scale evaluation (although even this practice is highly questionable in times of limited fiscal resources and competing programs), but many heavily funded federal programs have produced little or no data that could be used to support a decision regarding continuance. The importance of this statement should be self evident. The lack of adequate evaluation leaves us at the conclusion of a program with nothing on which to base a statement regarding effectiveness other than our intuition or 'gut' feelings. More particularly, we are unable to say authoritatively after the expenditure of much time, energy and money whether program A is better than program B, or even if program A or B has any impact what-so-ever. All too regrettably, this disastrous state of affairs is not a new issue. The need for rigorous routine

³J. Ellul, *The Technological Society* (New York: Vantage Books, 1964); M. Sherif and C. Sherif, *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: Aldine Publishers, 1969); Toffler, *Future Shock* (1970).

⁴H. G. Barnett, *Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Changes* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1953); S. N. Eisenstadt (ed.), *Comparative Perspective on Social Change* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968).

⁵Much has been written on the need to do extensive impact planning in several disciplines (e.g., industrial and highway zoning) but it appears sadly lacking in educational circles. Several sources are worthy of pursuit: D. T. Campbell, "Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-Scale Model of Omniscience," in M. Sherif and C. Sherif (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969); W. Grigsby, and L. Rosenburg, *Urban Housing Policy* (New York: ADS Publications, 1975); A. Hirshen and R. LeGates, "Neglected Dimensions in Low Income Housing and Development Programs", *Urban Law Annual*, 9 (1975), 3-32; M. Ravitz, "Effects of Urban Renewal on Community Racial Patterns", *Journal of Social Issues*, 13 (1957), 38-49.

⁶Sherif and Sherif, (1969).

⁷Interdisciplinary efforts along these lines seem to be possible when the mission is getting a man on the moon, a scientific craft on Mars, or a new model car from the drawing board to the showroom. There seems to be greater difficulty pooling similar talent and effort when the mission is designing a socially oriented program. The need, then, is to bring social and educational programming into the twentieth century.

⁸C. Tavis, "The Experimenting Society: To Find Programs That Work The Government Must Measure Its Failures", *Psychology Today*, 47 (1975), 50-56.

evaluation has often been detailed even in the more popular journals.⁸ There have also been considerable efforts made to refine both the logic and the tools of evaluation research.⁹ Such a lack of systematic evaluation essentially leaves us unable to throw out the ineffective programs and build on those that demonstrate an impact. Campbell, in a well reasoned paper, stated that:

The United States and other modern nations should be ready for an experimental approach to social reform, an approach in which we try out new programs designed to cure specific social problems, in which we learn whether or not these programs are effective, and in which we retain, imitate, modify, or discard them on the basis of apparent effectiveness on the multiple imperfect criteria available.¹⁰

To counter this trend we need to rethink both teacher training and inservice needs. Educators must become proficient in interpreting research results and in conducting well formulated research efforts mounted in schools.

PROGRAMMED FOR FAILURE

While this call for interdisciplinary collaboration in problem solving and evaluation may sound somewhat at odds with the historical development of professions in this country, a glance at the development of higher education is a fine case in point, it is nevertheless seen as essential if we want to meaningfully address our current urban ills. Perhaps a few well chosen examples will serve to dramatically illustrate why this action is indeed such an important prerequisite to programmatic survival.

Headstart is a well know Federally funded program designed to better equip youth identified as 'disadvantaged' to compete more equitably in the educational arena. Minority children were the principal beneficiaries of the program. Headstart is a pre-school enrichment program. While the program had admirable goals (e.g., providing equal educational opportunity, maximizing the potential of 'disadvantaged' youth, etc.), they failed to fully realize these goals in part because of poor planning and because of problems facing the student's interaction with the world outside of the rarified and oftentimes overprotective world of the specific program environs.

The data from numerous Headstart programs, where useable, generally indicate significant initial gains in student performance, but a subsequent decline in performance in succeeding school years at school.¹¹ Headstart programs thus failed to have the significant equalizing impact their advocates claimed they would. Some argue, predictably, that the minorities and the poor are inherently inferior with respect to intelligence as measured by I.Q. tests and can therefore be expected to do poorly in school.¹² The initial gains in performance being seen as a function of transitory "over achievement", or due to errors in either

⁸A few examples will serve to illustrate the efforts in this field. Several papers by: D. T. Campbell, "From Description to Experimentation: Interpreting Trends as Quasi-Experiments", in C. Harris (ed.), *Problems in Measuring Change* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963); "Reforms as Experiments", *American Psychologist*, 24 (April 1969), 409-429; "Methods for the Experimenting Society", Unpublished Manuscript, Northwestern University (1971); D. T. Campbell and J. C. Stanley, "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching", in N. Cage (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963); A. Etzioni, "Shortcuts to Social Change", *Public Interest*, 12 (1968), 40-51; D. Michael, *The Unprepared Society: Planning for a Precarious Future* (New York: Basic Books, 1968); H. Riecken and R. Boruch (eds.), *Social Experimentation: A Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); R. Rosenthal, *Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research* (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts 1966).

¹⁰Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments" . . . p. 409.

¹¹J. Hunt, "Has Compensatory Education Failed? Has it been Attempted?" *Harvard Educational Review*, (1969). 130-152; A. Pearl (1972).

¹²H. Eysenck, *The I.Q. Argument* (New York: Library Press, 1971); Herrnstein (1971).

methodology and/or measurement. Others argue that the performance gains are an indication of potential and that the subsequent decline in measured performance is a direct function of a racist school system and other negative situational factors such as a hostile learning environment.¹³ The first position would suggest a social policy of "do nothing", the second, concerted efforts to eradicate racism in schools and the society, the establishment of an equitable occupational arena, and the provision of decent housing together with accessible social services. Because such evaluation data are so important for subsequent social policy decisions, what is urgently needed is a thorough interdisciplinary examination of Headstart and the implementation of several sound projects that are systematically evaluated. It must be recognized, however, that for Headstart to succeed as an intervention strategy the program must be fully orchestrated with necessary changes in several critical interfacing arenas. Sadly, the evaluation failures of the Headstart program are not restricted to Headstart programs.

The history of youth service bureaus and the increased use of pre-adjudication diversion programs for juvenile offenders is another fine case in point. There is a mounting body of evidence which suggests that the very creation of an agency to process negatively labeled youth oftentimes serves merely to further institutionalize differences, thereby creating more problems than solutions for the youth so processed.¹⁴ While the concept of diverting youth from the known perils of adjudication in the juvenile justice system is admirable, it is evident that little consideration is generally given in the planning stage of diversion programs, to the joint problems of identity management and subsequent societal mobility. To date, the weight of evidence seems to suggest that students processed in diversion programs as traditionally conceived are just as likely to perceive themselves in negative terms, and furthermore to be viewed by others, just as negatively as their peers in residential programs.¹⁵ It follows, then, that both types of youth are going to experience difficulties when attempting to re-enter mainstream institutions without penalty. In short, the objectives of the diversion strategy, namely removal of stigmatizing experiences from first or status offenders, have been subverted because of a lack of articulation between the program and other critical arenas.¹⁶

These two examples (Headstart and Youth Service Bureaus) have served to demonstrate that conceptually sound and much needed intervention strategies have proved less than viable because of the shortsightedness of planners in failing to recognize and plan for the wider implications of their efforts. Widespread systematic program evaluation is largely non-existent. Such planning is not only essential but it must begin by drawing together a multidisciplinary group to analyze contemporary problems and establish the impact of proposed programs. It is only through such a pooling of diverse orientations that disciplinary specific knowledge concerning a common problem can be exchanged and evaluated. Logically, strategies for change proposed by such a group would

¹³M. Fantini and G. Weinstein, *The Disadvantaged* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); A. Pearl (1972); W. Pink, "The Public School in the Seventies: An Alternative Strategy", *Education*, 95 (1975) 251-257, 260.

¹⁴E. Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Spoiled Identity* [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963]; E. Lemert, *Social Pathology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951); W. Pink and M. White, "Delinquency Prevention: The State of the Art", in M. Klein (ed.), *The Juvenile Justice System* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976); E. Schur, *Radical Nonintervention* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973).

¹⁵A. Weeks, *Youthful Offenders at Highfields* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958); L. Empey and S. Lubeck, *The Silverlake Experiment* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1971).

¹⁶Pink and White (1976).

be thoroughly field tested and evaluated. Effective programs could be further tested under differing conditions and subsequently refined, while those not effective discarded. It is only in this way that the present practice of no, or at best hit and miss experimentation, can be effectively laid to rest, and replaced by a system that is firmly built on scientific objectivity.¹⁷ Teachers, administrators, schoolboard members and the community must become more sophisticated in interpreting the results of research efforts.

A NEW LOOK FOR SCHOOLS

The question we must ask here is: what needs to be done in Teacher Education to counter these shortcomings? Clearly, we need to produce teachers who are more than classroom technicians.¹⁸ We need to produce teachers who are sensitive to human needs, who are culturally aware, who are conversant with the language of other disciplines and especially research, who can plan and develop learning materials, who are creative, et cetera.¹⁹ Just as important, however, is the recognition that we must also work to create learning environments in schools that permit teachers to act in this way. Moreover, as the clientele alter their demands on the school, the school must be able to adapt. Consequently, teacher training should be flexible enough to shape its requirements to meet these ever changing demands.

With this much said, it would be profitable to consider the troubled school and to offer some specific prescriptive suggestions that should be seriously examined in the months ahead. What follows then are nine proposals focused on the school that will have an impact on the quality of education. Some may be familiar. However, I am suggesting here, that they be adopted together, as a package. We have found that tinkering is ineffective, what is needed are bold more fundamental changes in the way we organize our schools. We as educators must recognize the far reaching societal implications of the process we call schooling and move rapidly on a coordinated front to systematically remove practices that have negative consequences for students and staff. It is in this spirit that the nine proposals are offered.

First, we must provide tax supported alternative schools together with an open enrollment process. Schools must become schools of choice, in which the administration, the community, and students can collectively develop a stake in both the accountability process and quality of education issues. There is a mounting body of evidence which points to the importance of schools in the life career of students, and especially the importance of the quality of interpersonal relationships between student and teacher.²⁰ More effort must be expended by researchers working both in and with the schools in matching teaching and learning styles. Tax supported alternative schools would facilitate the need to cultivate differing learning environments.

Second, the concept of teacher education programs should be radically rethought. Presently, far too many people are in the classroom and in adminis-

¹⁷See Campbell, "Ethnocentrism of Disciplines . . ." (1969) and "Methods for the Experimental Society" (1971).

¹⁸C. A. Bowers, *Cultural Literacy for Freedom* (Eugene: Elan Publishers Inc., 1972).

¹⁹A good statement underscoring the need for such individuals in education is made by J. Kozel, *Death at an Early Age* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967).

²⁰Bowers (1972); M. Edelman, "Winson and Davie Hudson's Dream, *Harvard Educational Review* 45 (1975), 417-450; D. Hargreaves, *Social Relations in A Secondary School* (New York: Humanities Press, 1967); D. Kelly and W. Pink, "School Commitment and Student Career Flows", *Youth and Society* 3 (December 1971), 225-236; Kozol (1967); Pearl (1972); Pink (1975); W. Schafer and C. Olexa, *Tracking and Opportunity* (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Co., 1971); A. Stinchcombe, *Rebellion in a High School* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

trative positions who are engaged in little but the systematic destruction of young minds and feelings.²¹ Many people are teaching who do not like children. Emphasis in certification programs should be placed on the development of humanistic qualities in prospective teachers and on the retraining or elimination of individuals who relate poorly with students.²² Learning is too important to be left in the hands of incompetent or insensitive individuals. Experimental teacher education programs should not only be encouraged, but also widely funded in a concerted effort to break down traditionally biased recruitment practices and the lockstep, unimaginative courses of study which presently often disenchant the interested and creative student.

Third, abolish the use of tracking systems in favor of heterogeneous grouping. There is a surfeit of evidence which highlights both the initial stigmatizing effect of track placement, and the long term negative outcomes of assignment to such locations as 'basic' or 'vocational' track.²³ Abolition of tracking would obviously require the reorganization of the teaching/learning model, but practices such as (a) self-paced instruction, (b) tutorial activities, and (c) expanded teacher aide/intern assignment are envisioned as assisting the teacher organize within the heterogeneously structured environment.

Four, abolish the use of letter grades as the major device for reporting student performance. Letter grades both objectify the individual and place the learning process into a dysfunctional competitive model. A more meaningful, and in the long run rewarding system of providing feedback from the school to the parents and students, must be developed that directly involves the parent in the learning process on a continual basis. Activities that would negate the need for impersonal letter grades might be (a) regular conferences between the teacher and the parent, (b) exercises that involve the student and the parent working in cooperation in settings other than the school building, (c) weekend and/or daytime events that involve all three interested parties, and (d) activities coordinated by the school, beyond the usual social events, that involve parents in the dynamics of learning and discovery with their children. In short, we must develop a legitimate ongoing vehicle for activity involving parents in the education of their offspring. In this way feedback would be both a continuous and natural part of a joint learning process, rather than an impersonal and meaningless letter grade that arrives periodically throughout the year.

Five, the school should recognize the educational value of learning gained outside the walls of the institution for credit towards graduation. Presently, educators operate as if they commanded all access to valued learning.²⁴ Consequently, only learning gained directly in the classroom, laboratory, shop, and gymnasium carries credit towards graduation. This practice flies in the face of much research concerning the long term utility of experience gained in the real world.²⁵

²¹Kozol (1967): C. Nordstrum, *Society's Children: A Study of Ressentiment in the Secondary School* (New York: Random House, 1967); D. Schreiber, *Profile of the School Dropout* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967); A. Sillitoe, *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner* (New York: Signet Books, 1959).

²²Bowers (1972).

²³Edelman (1975): J. Jones, E. Erickson and R. Crowell "Increasing the Gap Between Whites and Blacks", *Education and Urban Society*, 4 (May 1972), 339-349; D. Kelly, "Track Position and Delinquent Involvement", *Sociology and Social Research*, 58 (1974), 380-386; D. Kirp, "Schools as Sorters: The Constitutional and Policy Implications of Student Classifications", *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 121 (1973); Pearl (1972): Schafer and Olexa (1971).

²⁴M. Carnoy, *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (New York: David McKay, 1974); P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Vintage Books, 1956); Illich (1970).

²⁵M. Carter, *Into Work* (Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1966); E. Friedenberg, *Coming of Age in America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963); P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971).

Recognition of such learning would certainly change the present teacher/student relationship. But it would be a change that would benefit both parties. The concept of credit by examination or performance might profitably be explored as a means of recognizing skills learned via non-traditional means.

Six, requires all students to engage in a planned social service experience in the community prior to graduation. Such a practicum has a two fold thrust: (a) students would gain a firsthand working experience in the community in a people-helping role, and (b) community members could see young people contributing in a positive way to the well being of the community in particular, and the quality of life in general. While it may be regarded in many educational quarters as facile to analyze adolescence as a low status, meaningless, transitional state, nevertheless it is a compelling argument.²⁶ Students, as a consequence of that lowly status, suffer a constant manipulation of the self-concept so that in the majority of cases they never fully develop a sense of competence, usefulness, belongingness, or personal power.²⁷ Placing students in significant helping roles within the community would negate the need for this manipulation, the likely outcome being positive, mutually rewarding interaction. In short, both youth and society lose by the practice of regarding the former as insignificant. Permitting youth to function successfully in the helping services will go a long way to restoring to youth a much needed sense of competence, usefulness, belongingness, and personal power.

Seven, establish a viable governance system in the school. This requires a commitment by school officials to full, rather than token, student involvement in the internal affairs of the school. Clearly, to the extent that education is something provided for students, rather than something designed with students, students are going to feel alienated from the process. A governance system would involve the students firsthand in the management of the school. They would, in effect, become partners in the educational enterprise. Decisions concerning program, scheduling, hiring and firing, and finances effect the lives of students just as much as faculty and administrators. A viable governance structure would involve both students and school personnel working cooperatively in decision making in areas such as these. Such a change would of course, make them equally accountable for those decisions. Without meaningful involvement and representation one cannot expect students to take a responsible stance toward the educational enterprise. To expect more is to delude ourselves.

Eight, establish work release programs for all youth that include at the very least credit toward graduation, and wherever possible, pay. The work program would go far beyond the scope of present vocational education programs inasmuch as all youth would be permitted to chose their work experience and subsequently gain on-the-job knowledge in more than one area. Such a program would (a) break down the traditional barriers between school and the real world, (b) give students several work experiences, allowing them much needed insight into several occupational areas, (c) provide personal growth experiences which cannot be reproduced in the school (e.g., interpersonal relationships involving people of different ages, professions, skills, philosophies, etc.), and (d) provide an experiential base upon which to build knowledge concerning how society operates and is governed. In addition, it would provide a more realistic bridge between school based learning and skills needed in the job world, as well

²⁶Goodman (1956): Pink (1975): K. Polk and S. Kobria "Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development", Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Youth Development of Delinquency Prevention Administration (1972).

²⁷Pearl (1972).

as permit a better match up between personal skills and desires with occupational demands.

Nine, construct an inventory of school and community resources that would be available for utilization in an expanded school program. Using such a compilation, expertise in the community could be systematically tapped to augment the resources of the school. Such a cooperative plan would bring the community directly into the teaching/learning situation. This would in effect, make the total community a classroom. The question of accountability would take on a very different hue with the community acting as a full partner in the learning process.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL ACTION

For these proposals to be effective it is essential that planning and evaluation be undertaken on an interdisciplinary basis. Educators can no longer regard education as solely their domain. Without such research based planning much of what we try in schools is likely to be subverted.

The first proposal outlined above, that of tax supported alternative schools, requires the collaborative involvement of decision makers at several levels. It needs the political support of both local and federal officials inasmuch as the proposed alternatives needs both ideological as well as fiscal commitment — a voucher plan, for example, would be one way to provide educational choice for all families. Coordinated planning in the area of urban mass transportation systems, for example, would facilitate the movement of students to schools of their choice, as well as alleviate the need for large and in many cases unnecessary expenditures on school busses which sit idle the majority of the day. Commitment from the community is required to make all alternatives equally viable with respect to the acceptability of the diploma. A similar kind of commitment is required from media to report on, and disseminate information about, the different programs that are available in the community.

The second proposal, revitalized teacher education programs, is a highly political issue. To be successful it requires the cooperative planning of state departments of education, institutions preparing teachers for certification and school districts who will recruit the new product. The relative merits of alternative preparation programs will need initial evaluation and constant monitoring by several sectors of the community. This presupposes considerable programmatic and evaluation commitment by all concerned.

While proposals three, four, seven, and nine are all largely confined to internal reorganization within the school setting, there are still significant implications contained in the proposals for other arenas. A change in reporting practices, for example, might well involve parents obtaining regular release time from jobs to attend organized activities involving them with their child in the school. A move to heterogenous grouping would certainly require an extensive research commitment to better delineate learning/teaching styles and possibly an expansion of the concept of the paraprofessional.²⁸ The implementation of a governance system would involve a significant shift in the way an adolescent is presently viewed by both school people and the community.

The fifth proposal, credit for outside learning, while placing emphasis on individual initiative to gain knowledge via non-traditional means, also suggests the need for creating a myriad of such opportunities in the community for youth as well as a clearly articulated means of evaluating such learning.

²⁸A. Pearl and A. Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor* (New York: The Free Press, (1965).

Required social service, the sixth proposal, necessarily involves the coordination of choices of youth with existant human service agencies. New job descriptions are needed that permit youth to assume a responsible, meaningful helping role in the community. A national advocacy system for youth needs development, a system that supports youth in their efforts to achieve a sense of competence, usefulness, belongingness, and power and one which activity pursues the creation of opportunities for purposeful youth involvement in the community.

Finally, work release programs, the eighth proposal, requires a partial reorganization of contemporary work roles, the modification of outdated union practices, and the realization (a) that youth urgently need such experiences, and (b) that youth can function successfully as productive members of the work force. Clearly, however, to the extent that the Federal Government accepts rates of unemployment of upwards of eight percent and the unions remain largely unresponsive to calls for innovation, such a proposal is unlikely to gain the immediate measure of support it deserves.

What all this indicates is the need for a revision of the lock-step disciplinary specific process of problem solving existant in contemporary America, and the mobilization of a mechanism which facilitates systematic interdisciplinary planning and evaluation on a local, regional, and national level.

A final note on the strategy for planned change is in order. While it is certainly true that the public are both suspicious of research and generally lack the knowledge to be discriminating of published research findings, nevertheless it is vital that the process of systematic program planning and evaluation outlined above be implemented immediately.²⁹ Efforts advocating broad-based involvements in both the logic and process of evaluation, such as Partnership in Research (PIR) and Integrated Community Education System (ICES) are certainly highly desirable efforts in the right direction.³⁰ For, certainly, it is only through such concerted efforts, based both in the schools and reaching out into the community, that the widespread public distrust of statistics in general and researchers in particular can be turned into a positive embracing of the methods of social science validation. In truth, however, while these types of programs are highly desirable, they do not go far enough quickly enough. To promote change in the emotionally charged educational arena we need a mechanism that will mobilize immediately all interested parties in the cooperative planning and evaluation of the logic and process of schooling in America.³¹ It is only when coming as a result of such a pooling of concern and expertise that programs like PIR and ICES can gain the widespread support they so richly deserve. It is because change in the school usually comes at such glacial speed and because educational decisions are all too frequently made by professional educators for the lay schoolboards, that a cooperative multidisciplinary group should be mobilized in every community to facilitate decisions concerning education. Such a body might comprise representatives from several areas (e.g., superintendent, schoolboard, mayor, students, community, and 'experts') while their major concerns would be (a) to focus interdisciplinary effort on problem solving, and (b) to plan and monitor the proposed programatic solutions to current problems.

²⁹Campbell, "Ethnocentrism of Disciplines. . .": E. Wenk, "Schools and the Community: A Model for Participatory Problem Solving", *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 2 (1975), 303-314.

³⁰Wenk (1975).

³¹A good place to begin this joint exercise might well be with an evaluation of two recent books both leaning heavily on statistical evaluation: S. Bowles and H. Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, (New York: Basic Books, 1976): C. Jencks et al., *Inequality* (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

In this way, not only would input be solicited from all sectors of the community, but systematic evaluation would become an automatic part of community planning and program development. Community involvement in decision making would be guaranteed in such a strategy, while at the same time responsibility for the success of social programming is shifted from the 'experts' back to the community where it belongs. Perhaps the mayor's office could facilitate such a group, or perhaps some new non-affiliated office needs to be created to spearhead this mobilization for planned change. Whatever organizational structure is chosen, however, it is self-evident that we need to gear-up quickly if we are ever going to make the schools safe and hospitable learning environments for all our children.

RESUME

Cette étude énumère les faiblesses structurales des programmes d'éducation dans les milieux urbains. Nous soutenons que la méthode d'isoler les disciplines lorsque les problèmes s'adressent à des disciplines multiples mène à l'échec et que le manque de procédés systématiques d'évaluation empêche inévitablement d'atteindre les buts des programmes.

Plusieurs programmes ont été analysés afin d'illustrer notre point de vue: e.g. Head Start, Upward Bound, Free Schools, Youth Service Bureaus. Nous avons porté une attention particulière aux points suivants: a) l'école comme institution qui agit dans ou hors les cadres des lois, b) comment le système d'éducation doit être adapté à la société pluraliste contemporaine, c) les bornes communes entre les systèmes d'éducation et certains autres milieux d'activités qui se heurtent sur la scène urbaine, et d) aux moyens qui pourraient permettre aux citoyens de participer dans des décisions sur l'éducation.