INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

KEEPING A FACE ON POLICY: A REFLECTIVE CASE STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

BY

WILLIAM MAURICE PATTERSON

M.S., Illinois State University, 1994
B.A., Columbia College Chicago, 1990

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000

Urbana, Illinois

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

JANUARY 2000
(date)

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

WILLIAM MAURICE PATTERSON

ENTITLED KEEPING A FACE ON POLICY: A REFLECTIVE CASE STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Director of Thesis Research

Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

Chairperson

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

O-517

KEEPING A FACE ON POLICY: A REFLECTIVE CASE STUDY ON COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

William Maurice Patterson, Ph.D.
College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000
Laurence Parker, Advisor

This research was a qualitative case study designed (a) to examine the relationship between two higher education organizations and an Urban League affiliate that came together in response to a National Urban League, Inc. resolution to improve the educational performance of African-American students in two public school districts; (b) to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaboration using the stakeholders perspectives; and (c) to assess the views of social service, public school, university, and community college officials on the potential of this type of collaboration to help improve the academic performance of African-American students in the public schools. Moreover, this study may help us understand what roles each organization should play for effective collaboration and develop guidelines to help education and advocacy organizations such as Urban League affiliates establish collaborative or partnership relationships to address the need of low income and minority students in local public school districts.

The outcome of the research revealed that collaborative education policy plays a significant role in supporting academic and social development of youth. However, appropriate policy must be developed in a manner that acknowledges the implications of race and power on organizational cultural conflict in the policy development process. Particularly, as it relates to collaborative education policy designed to serve underachieving minority students, particularly, African-Americans.

ABSTRACT

This research was a qualitative case study designed (a) to examine the relationship between two higher education organizations and an Urban League affiliate that came together in response to a National Urban League, Inc. resolution to improve the educational performance of African-American students in two public school districts; (b) to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaboration using the stakeholders perspectives; and (c) to assess the views of social service, public school, university, and community college officials on the potential of this type of collaboration to help improve the academic performance of African-American students in the public schools. Moreover, this study may help us understand what roles each organization should play for effective collaboration and develop guidelines to help education and advocacy organizations such as Urban League affiliates establish collaborative or partnership relationships to address the need of low income and minority students in local public school districts.

The outcome of the research revealed that collaborative education policy plays a significant role in supporting academic and social development of youth. However, appropriate policy must be developed in a manner that acknowledges the implications of race and power on organizational cultural conflict in the policy development process. Particularly, as it relates to collaborative education policy designed to serve underachieving minority students, particularly, African-Americans.

DEDICATION

Lori Patterson, you have been a constant companion and best friend since we have been together. We've come a long way in a short period of time, and its exciting to know that we still have so much to do and you share the driving. I will testify on the highest mountain that true love is finding someone that can stand you more than you can stand yourself. You are my friend and I dedicate this document to you as a testament of perseverance.

To my oldest child, Maya, you have brought awe into my life, because at such a young age, you have experienced so much. Through those experiences, you have demonstrated wisdom beyond your six years of age. You help me realize that there is a practical and simple explanation for most things in life. I love you.

To my son, William Jordan, your birth has helped me to better understand me. So many people say that I was a lot like you when I was your age. However, I have a son that is compassionate and affectionate and has shown me how to unlock those emotions with great joy. Thank you, son, for helping me recapture a side of me that has been tucked away for a long time.

To my unborn child. I have not yet met you, but given the love and nurturing of our family, I am sure that you will be a combination of love, knowledge, sensitivity, and patience. I look forward to meeting you and accepting the gifts that you bring into our world.

To my sister, Dr. Nina Patterson. Girl, we have come a long way from the days that water used to seep through the floor on Wascher Drive in Urbana and when our cousins called us Head and Legs. I have always been very proud of my big sister because you have always been an achiever. I think about how you have often been the only African-American

in your class or organization. But you never let that stop you from enriching your life educationally, socially, or professionally. Moreover, you have always brought me along. Thank you for encouraging me to attend graduate school. Sometimes your presence in class and during our study sessions was the only thing that helped me get through. Likewise, those long distance California calls also served as a great inspiration when you were out getting yours.

Fannie Taylor, you are my foundation. I had no idea that watching your struggles and learning about your victories that one day I would grow up and be just like my Mama. Thank you for believing in me, particularly, during those adolescent years. You lived your life making certain Nina and I had everything we needed. I dedicate my life to making you proud. I love you.

To my father and stepmother, Willivry and Bobbie Patterson. The two of you have created an environment that is my family's second home. Thank you providing the constant support that all families should have. A family that stays together, stays together. This could not have been done without you.

Thanks, Ronna Jones. Chapter 4 was a monster, and your support throughout this process has been constant. Your meals, coffee, and conversation must not stop!

To the current and future Patterson and James family members. I did this because ... . academic achievement matters. Peace!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge the power of God Almighty for helping me through this process and for giving me the support I needed to stay on task during those rough revision periods. I would also like to recognize the diligent effort and commitment of my dissertation committee: Dr. Laurence Parker, Dr. Lizanne DeStefano, Dr. Ralph Page, and Dr. Thomas McGreal. A special thanks to Dr. Parker and Dr. DeStefano for helping me gain the necessary vision to meet the demands of the completion process. Those off-peak hours of one-on-one helped set me straight many times☺.

I also thank you Dr. Fred Coombs for assisting me in understanding the importance of community-university collaboration and how politics and policy play a crucial role in each effort. Thanks, Dr. Stake, for introducing me to the world of qualitative case study research. You have been a constant wall for me to bounce the notions and concepts of the craft during my research. And finally, thanks to Dr. Anderson and Dr. Trent. You both have served as a silent inspiration and support during this process.

Thank you, Tracy Parsons and the Urban League family for providing the support during this process. Being part of the Urban League really helped me stay focused and learned how to bridge higher education and social service initiatives that make a difference in our community. One of the biggest rewards of this process has been serving my community and learning how to use research to address the issues relative to families and individuals that I grew up with.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

CHAPTER

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The crisis of academic underachievement in the African-American community continues to be an area of concern for the leadership in this country. In 1983, when the report A Nation at Risk documented the inequities of educational experience between black and white students in the United States, educators, governmental officials, and community activists became alarmed at the disparity (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Concerned about the nation's future work force, policymakers increasingly called for high achievement in education. Report after report recommended that even non-college-bound young people must develop strong academic proficiencies in order for the United States to remain a world leader (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989; National Research Council, 1989).

Recognizing that poor children and children of color will form a significant percentage of the future work force, policymakers have increasingly vocalized the need to improve the education of "disadvantaged" youth. However, some people warn that proposed reforms aimed at achieving educational "excellence" often do not provide a coherent plan for effectively educating students at risk (McCollum & Walker, 1992; Swift, 1986). Raising standards without providing adequate support to schools may increase academic failure and dropout rates.

The personal, economic, and social costs of academic underachievement are high. The 1987 U.S. Department of Labor's Workforce 2000 report indicated that the fastest

growing occupations would require some post-secondary training. A young person who leaves school with inadequate skills will be increasingly at a disadvantage in the job market (Berlin & Sum, 1988; Reich, 1990). These same trends continue to emerge as we move into a new millennium. The Condition of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 1998) report implies that black children are more likely than white children to live in poverty, to live in single-parent households, and to live in urban areas. Moreover, these are some of the same factors that tend to cause black students to have difficulty achieving in school. The report also noted that in 1995, one out of every five children lived in poverty. During that same period, it was noted that 42% of black children live in poverty as compared to the 11% of their white counterparts (U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Urban areas tend to harbor a cesspool of factors that lead to academic underachievement for minority students. According to an Education Week (1998) Special Report, students who attend school in urban areas are more likely to encounter problems that hinder achievement and positive academic performance. Teachers suggest that the lack of parental involvement, alcoholism, drug abuse by parents, student apathy, poor nutrition among students, absenteeism, classroom discipline, weapons possession, and teenage pregnancy are strong factors that lead to academic deprivation as well as social decay. These issues extend beyond the public schools' ability to address them alone. Therefore, the need to learn how to support collaborations and or partnerships between local school districts, universities, colleges, and social service agencies has been at the forefront of educational reform arguments.

Collaborations have been in existence since Harvard College was founded in 1636 (C. Webb, 1993). Literature regarding collaborations and partnerships between schools and

universities suggests that both sides are benefitting from the effort (Braskamp & Wergin, n.d.; Harkavy, 1996; Harkavy & Puckett, 1991). Gray (1989); Kagan, Rivera, and Parker, (1990); and Crowson and Boyd (1992) indicate that the need for organizations to collaborate around educational issues is steadily increasing. Schools have begun to reach out to the community to forge relationships with businesses, universities, colleges, and social service agencies to gain support to meet their educational goals. Adler and Gardner (1994) suggest that linking schools and social services has become an international trend. In defining these relationships, Adler notes that they are as diverse as the unions themselves, but there are some common elements when engaging families in the educational process:

- Families and children ought to be able to access all necessary services at a center located at a local school or some other facility in their neighborhood;
- A wide variety of services should be available such as health, mental health, recreation, job development, child development and care, education, and housing; The service providers should work collaboratively to meet all of the needs of children and families in a holistic way;
- The services should stress community development and family support that prevents problems rather than being crisis driven;
- Planning to meet the needs of the community should empower both families and the line workers who provide direct services;
- Organizations that provide community and family services will have to develop new ways of working together;
- More flexibility must be created in how categorical funding can be used; or, ideally, new blended, funding streams should be created to support collaborative services on an ongoing basis;
- Professionals who work in community and family services will need training to develop new skills, and the preparation of professionals also needs to be changed; and
- To achieve these goals system-wide changes will be necessary. (p. 1)

Partnerships, cooperatives, and compacts between universities and colleges, public schools, and community agencies seem most facilitative between organizations responsible for and interested in human development. This research constituted a descriptive case study

of one collaborative effort between a state university, a community college, and a social service organization that was forged to improve the educational performance of African-American students in the public schools through an advocacy based mandate by the National Urban League, Inc. The work of writers such as Weiss (1982), Rist (1994), Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) were used to analyze the findings in order to provide a better understanding of the influences that lead to the Leagues resolution on public education. They were also used to analyze the formation of the policy termed the Educational Initiative, barriers towards its implementation and accountability. And finally, how alliances might be created to have greater impact on their stated objectives.

Ascher (1988) states:

> A critical impetus to the growth of school partnerships has been an agreement among educators and the general public that the schools have not been successful in educating students for the complicated and changing needs of our society. Although many educators would argue that social changes, such as the loss of values and decreased family cohesion, have made the task of educating students much harder, high dropout rates and the low level of student literacy have been as worrisome to business and social leaders as to educators. (p. 2)

As a New York State Education Department report (1987) points out, "while the responsibility for improvements rests most directly with educators, we all share responsibility for providing the environment and resources necessary to achieve this goal" (p. 111).

Public schools, universities, colleges, and social service organizations are vastly different, particularly in their operative and independent cultures due to their use of exclusive dialects and how they approach their missions (Meyer & Rowan, 1983; Perrow, 1986). In The Politics of Linking Schools and Social Services, Adler and Gardner (1994) talk about how service divisions such as social, health, education, and juvenile justice operate within their own institutional networks, sometimes making it more difficult for groups from

different institutional networks to form collaborations or partnerships with each other. For example, as joint relationships are established between organizations, such as public schools and social service organizations, the administrators within these organizations must manage the process of establishing and maintaining effective communication among the various entities. An effective strategy for building trust and open communication skills is primary in fostering the desired results of the independent and collective missions. When social service organizations are added to the mix of joint relationships between higher education organizations such as colleges, universities, and public schools, the tension and confusion can become magnified while organizational roles and expectations become cloudy.

Purpose of the Study

In 1985, the National Delegate Assembly of the National Urban League Inc. passed a resolution on public education that stated:

> WHEREAS more than 60% of all black public school students in the country attend school in a community served by an Urban League affiliate, and WHEREAS, the Urban League Movement has gathered to celebrate 75 years of service it is fitting that it pause to develop and support a movement-wide program that will involve every Urban League affiliate in an all out effort to improve educational achievement among black public school students.
>
> THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that:
> - An initiative be implemented in every Urban League city by September 1986;
> - Said initiative will respect the diversity which exists among Urban League affiliates;
> - A Plan of Action be developed over the coming year which will focus on public school students in grades pre K-12;
> - Advocacy to improve the delivery of service from Public School Systems to increase the achievement levels of all black students will continue to be the lynch-pin of educational activities throughout the Movement.

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- In addition every Urban League will provide supplemental educational services to a specifically targeted group of students;
- Such services be designed and implemented so that after a five year period there will be significant, measurable results;
- The National Urban League and each of its 113 affiliates pledge to use their human and fiscal resources to this effort.

BY THIS ACTION, LET IT BE KNOWN that this thrust reaffirms our recognition that a basic strength of the Urban League Movement lies in its ability to mobilize people to demonstrate concern for people.

FURTHERMORE, this is a call to all black people to assume far greater responsibility for the educational destinies of black youth. (National Urban League Inc., 1985, n.p.)

The purpose of this study was (a) to examine the relationship between two higher education organizations and an Urban League affiliate that came together in response to this resolution to improve the educational performance of African-American students in a local school district; (b) to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaboration using the stakeholders perspectives; (c) to assess the views of social service, public school, university, and community college officials on the potential of this type of collaboration to help improve the academic performance of African-American students in the public schools. Moreover, this study may help us to understand what roles each organization should play for effective collaboration, and develop guidelines to help Urban League affiliates establish collaborative or partnership relationships to address the needs of low-income and minority students in local public school districts.

Background of the Study

For the past four and a half years, I have attempted to gain an understanding of how

to get people from higher education organizations, public schools, and community-based organizations to work together to address the educational needs of underachieving students in the local public school districts. My position at the Urban League, as an advocate for underprivileged children and families, has placed me in various conference rooms and offices of the business, academic, civic, and neighborhood communities. I have dialogued and worked with world-class professors, working-class poor and welfare-dependent families, politicians, religious leaders, community activists, teachers, principals, public school superintendents, and assistant superintendents to learn about their needs and how to create linkages between the various entities to improve the condition of African-American students in the public schools.

The National Urban League Inc. formed a policy to respond to the resolution called the Education Initiative. The League postulated that there were many educated African-Americans who could educate black children after school, so they encouraged each affiliate to conduct a needs assessment in their community to discover the academic needs of black students in their local public schools and provide services to address those needs. The assessment by the Urban League of Township, Illinois (a fictitious name created to protect the identity of those involved in the inquiry) reflected a lack of academic-based, after-school programs to serve students from at-risk backgrounds at the kindergarten through third grade levels. Hence, the STARS after-school-tutoring program was created at the local level in response to the National Urban League mandate for affiliates to "implement a program in support of the Education Initiative." The coalition between Urban League affiliates and higher education organizations was only one way to respond to the mandate. (Gilpin State University and Land Community College were the other members of the Urban League of

Township, Illinois' collective effort.) Other responses included integrating information into the hands of various people for community mobilization efforts and training personnel.

Defining and Understanding the Terms Stakeholder, Collaboration, and Coalition

Beaumont and Hallmark (1998) state:

> School-university partnerships are institution-to-institution agreements, delineating the resources that the university will provide and collaborative activities to be carried out. The type of activities and the degree of collaboration are frequently determined by the participants, by the resources available, and by the direction from which resources flow. (p. 649)

Stefkovich and Guba's (1994) definition of the term "stakeholder" describes anyone who has a stake in the outcome of a program or initiative. The authors, particularly apply it to internal stakeholders, such as those in this case where a grass-roots organization, the National Urban League Inc., utilized coalitions to describe the linking of stakeholders such as parents, schools, and various community groups. The goal was to facilitate the provision of technical and human resources to ensure responsiveness to students educational needs in the local public schools.

March and Olson (1980) and Weick (1976) imply that because education organizations operate as non rational open systems, the shift of roles, expectations, policies and procedures do not occur in an orderly fashion. Therefore, tension, contradiction, and conflict often arise when dialogue ensues around power, process, and responsibility. Those sorts of tensions exist when additional stakeholders are added to the mix of educational reform structures that are framed within school-community agency cooperation and

collaboration for the purpose of enhancing pupil achievement. Wood and Gray (1991) further comment that there is collaboration when various stakeholders come together under a problem domain to engage in a dialogue of shared rules, norms, and structures to address an issue relative to that particular problem domain. Keeping these comments in mind, I utilized the various perspectives to assist in my presentation of the relationships between the various organizations.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

G. L. R. Slater (1991); Gray (1989); Kagan, Rivera, and Parker (1990); Crowson and Boyd (1992); Beaumont and Hallmark (1998); and many others have identified the need for organizations to collaborate around educational issues. Beaumont and Hallmark (1998) suggest that these forms of collaboration are necessary in order for schools to increase society's pool of competent and constructive citizens.

The literature review begins with a blend of Ascher (1988) and R. D. Webb's (1972) frameworks for laying out the various aspects of collaborative relationships, these include History of Cooperation, Motives for Collaborating, Types of Collaboratives, Multi-Institutional Collaboratives, and Coordinating Organizations for Collaboratives. The literature review concludes with a synopsis of the areas mentioned, and lists the similarities of each compact to help demonstrate the various ways to coordinate and structure collaborative relationships between organizations that address the issues of academic underachievement of low-income and minority students.

History of Cooperation

Inter-institutional cooperation dates back as early as the 1600s. Hackney (1986) in his report on university-community collaborations described how more than 250 years ago, Benjamin Franklin, founded the University of Pennsylvania on the principles of collaborative efforts in order to apply knowledge for the betterment of mankind. Ben Franklin and William

Smith, Provost of Penn College, collaborated to create a nonsectarian college that educated youth for careers that extended beyond ministry. The outcome of their collaboration was the emergence of the first medical school in America in 1765. When they extended their collaborative effort to link the college and medical school, the first university in America, University of Pennsylvania, was formed.

In 1934, Sanford's study, Inter-institutional Agreements in Higher Education, identified 115 written agreements involving 230 college and universities throughout the United States. He concluded that increasingly universities and colleges were coming together to enhance their ability to offer additional services and courses. In 1959, the Illinois Commission of Higher Education appointed a committee to study inter-institutional cooperation among the higher education organizations within the State of Illinois. The committee concluded that there was an abundant number of collaborative efforts occurring throughout the State and with other states, but also between public and private institutions. Moreover, the report titled "Inter-institutional Cooperation Among Colleges and Universities in Illinois" (Illinois Commission of Higher Education, 1960) reflected that over 28 of 59 institutions were collaborating at the undergraduate level. The commission indicated that cooperative efforts were increasing at the graduate level. In fact, the 1970s reflected an effort in the Quad Cities region where colleges were coming together to provide additional graduate course offerings for graduate students in the area. This effort was eventually recognized as The Quad City Graduate Study Center which later provided the framework for the State of Illinois Higher Education Cooperation Act (Illinois State Board of Higher Education, 1974; hereinafter referred to as ISBE).

Motives for Collaborating

In the wake of the 1980s there were significant cutbacks on educational spending. The 1990s have become the era of slimmer government budgets, corporate downsizing, and the restructuring of states' funding in the form of community block grants. Thus, it has become necessary for organizations to pool their resources to meet social needs. African-American youth enter schools with a host of issues that range from dysfunctional families and drug-infested neighborhoods to chronic unemployment and a diminished economic infrastructure. Cantor (1997) posits six reasons for collaborative relationships:

1. A need for educated workers and citizens who can meet the challenges of a new world economy and order
2. An increased understanding of learning theories and cognitive development
3. More nontraditional learners with multitudes of learning styles and needs
4. A changing American work place which requires people to effectively interface with each other and understand their roles as team players
5. An economic necessity for higher education to more closely interface with business and community
6. Administrative and faculty concerns about their roles in selection and control and evaluation of the learning process.

J. Slater (1998) suggests that the need to pool organizational resources could mean the difference between success and failure for individual organizations such as schools because they don't have the infrastructure to meet the diverse needs of students who are potentially at-risk due to the variables mentioned above. This is why Gray (1989), Kagan et al. (1990), and

Crowson and Boyd (1992) indicate that the need for organizations to collaborate around educational issues is steadily increasing. Schools have started to reach out to the community to forge relationships with businesses, universities, colleges, and social service agencies to gain support to meet their educational goals. Policymakers, in their attempt to respond to the constituents' growing concern about crime in their communities and at schools, are looking to government-funded organizations such as public schools and land-grant higher education institutions to provide them with answers. Universities, colleges, and public schools all over the United States have increased their efforts to connect with constituencies to form initiatives that respond to the concerns of policy makers.

Public School Collaborations

Public schools are often called upon by society to deal with problems associated with human development. Gross (1988) confesses that the magnitude of issues that society faces cannot be addressed by the public schools alone. Schools must have the involvement of corporations, universities, colleges, and community and government agencies. In a projection, Irmsher (1997) infers that by the year 2020, most American public schools will be serving students from environments that place them in educational failure. Ascher (1988) infers that low-income parents are neither sufficiently interested nor powerful enough to help the schools politically, so the schools must look for new, powerful, and vocal support groups to help them respond to society's call for better human development.

University and Public School Collaborations

Universities and public schools are linking up for a number of reasons: to provide college students with service learning projects, to provide teachers and staff with professional development opportunities, and to prepare teacher education students to educate potentially at-risk students. Universities utilize public schools to provide student teachers with classroom and practicum experience, while schools look to universities to assist in areas such as staff and teacher training, curriculum and instruction support, and helping prepare potentially at-risk children and families with the skills necessary to be productive and contributing members of society.

In 1993, Chancellor James Stukel of the University of Illinois at Chicago announced during his State of UIC address that:

> During the next ten years UIC must become the nation's leading, urban public research university, striving to accomplish the land grant mission in an urban setting. In doing so, it will become a much greater participant in the education, cultural, community and economic life of metropolitan Chicago. (p. 64)

Stukel introduced an effort called the "Great Cities Initiative," which was developed to promote various research and outreach instructional projects that the university had embarked upon, but also to reflect the efforts that they were planning to implement. One of the goals of the initiative was to develop a collaborative relationship with the various public schools and community agencies in the urban and suburban areas as an attempt to help prepare elementary and secondary students with the skills they need to be productive in the classroom.

The initiative was also developed to provide teachers and administrators with the necessary knowledge to address the educational needs of urban and suburban students. These types of collaborations provide an opportunity to learn about the implications of race, racism, ethnocentrism, and discrimination on effective education for diverse student populations (Nevarez, Sanford, & Parker, 1997). In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education and the Education Trust released a report titled "Community Compacts for Student Success: Brief Site Descriptions." This report discusses various educational collaboratives around the country that were set up to help low income and minority students increase their academic performance in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary institutions. I used the report to provide examples of collaborative relationships such as the North Philadelphia Compact, Birmingham Compact, The El Paso Collaborative, Hartford Urban Education Network, Providence Community Compact, and the Pueblo Community Compact. After presenting the various compacts I provide a synopsis of the traits found within each compact to reflect the similarities and non-similarities.

North Philadelphia Compact

The North Philadelphia Compact came into fruition to improve achievement at three north Philadelphia high schools, nine middle schools that feed into the high schools, and two higher education organizations, Temple and the Community College of Philadelphia. The intent of the compact was to better use the resources allocated to their organization to create smaller learning communities for students from grades 7 through 14 (second year in college)

(American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994). The compact laid out eight points of proficiency:

- The high school would be the building block to bridge the communities.
- Each partner would provide an organizational commitment that included top administrators access to resources, staff and organizational commitment to the partnerships.
- Establishing a collective understanding amongst human development organizations such as charters, higher education institutions, parents, and community organizations to set high standards of academic expectation to support students and families in meeting college entrance exams.
- Developing a linkage between higher education, community groups, family, and school to eliminate barriers to educational development so students can take college credit courses in the Community College of Philadelphia.
- Parents, community members, and higher education representatives will be represented in a decision-making capacity within the charter as it relates to educational development. Likewise, school personnel will be represented in higher education and community-based decisions regarding the three high schools.
- The School District and higher education institutions will provide the support to teachers, students, and college professors to work in a multi-year collaborative with the necessary commitment for serious collaborative initiatives.
- All partners must commit to a seven-year effort with a laid out work plan for the initial three years.
- Partners will provide an annual report of routinely collected data on student achievement and compact as a whole. Attend a retreat once a year to formally review progress and renegotiate agreement as necessary. (American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994, np)

Birmingham Compact

The Birmingham Compact was set up to improve the number of urban youth who finished high school and go on to post-secondary education (American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994). The organizations involved in the compact included the Birmingham Public Schools, Jefferson State Community College, Lawson State

Community College, and the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). The Birmingham Compact was a bit different than the North Philadelphia Compact because Birmingham involved corporate partners and government sponsored human service organizations such as the Jefferson County Health Department. Like the North Philadelphia Compact, the Birmingham Compact established several goals: parental involvement and education, curriculum and instruction, school organization and management, college and career counseling, professional development, social and health services, and transition to the workplace. Their approach was a reform effort that addressed impediments in the home, community, school policy, staff development, curriculum, and the business community. The El Paso, Texas, collaborative goals were similar to the Birmingham Compact.

The El Paso Collaborative

The El Paso Collaborative was set up to ensure educational success for all students in El Paso County. The collaborative intended to assist students in making the transition from secondary education to post-secondary education or the workplace (American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994). Some of the organizations involved were the Socorro Independent School District, the Ysleta Independent School District, the El Paso Independent School District, the University of Texas at El Paso, the Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, and the El Paso Inter-religious Sponsoring Organization. Each member of the collaborative made a pact to eliminate barriers that hamper student achievement within their own institutions and areas, but they also like to support other organizations within the process.

Unlike the Birmingham Compact, the El Paso collaborative was broken into two parts, elementary/secondary and post-secondary. Each part identified its own goals. The elementary/secondary component focused on addressing issues such as curriculum and instruction, teacher development in science and mathematics, and identifying and setting assessment standards for students to demonstrate competencies before completing high school. At the post-secondary level, the collaborative focused on restructuring the teacher education program, enhancing college and university courses, and improving retention in degree-oriented science and engineering courses. Although the collaborative was broken down into two components, the organizational structure was very similar to Birmingham Compact, whereby a university professor was assigned to the project and the operation of the project was housed on the University of El Paso campus.

Hartford Urban Education Network (HUEN)

Like the compacts and collaborative discussed earlier, the Hartford Urban Education Network was set up to increase the number of low-income youth attending college (American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994). From data collected around student achievement, the University of Hartford, Hartford Public Schools, the Connecticut State Department of Public Education, Capital Community Technical College, the Hartford Federation of Teachers, and the Hartford Consortium for Higher Education approached the cause from the perspective of two emergent themes--traditions and transitions.

The traditions theme concentrated on creating a culture of college bound low-income students by involving the whole community and families in the process of building college

academic opportunity into the future of the low-income students. The transitions theme concentrated on decreasing low-income student's placement into lower-track courses. The goal of the HUEN Compact is to provide information to parents and students about educational options outside of low-track courses and also to work with colleges and universities in their outreach efforts to produce more successful outcomes for students coming from transitional environments. Very similar to the previously mentioned compacts, the organizational structure consists of seven task forces and a steering committee that sets the direction for the HUEN Compact. The members of the steering committee included high level representatives such as the dean of the College of Education from the University of Connecticut, and the assistant superintendent of Hartford Public Schools. There was also corporate involvement from Aetna Life Insurance and community based social service groups. Similar to the El Paso Compact, the priorities for the HUEN Compact was broken down into two parts, secondary level priorities and post-secondary level priorities.

The secondary level priorities concentrated on goals such as increasing expectations for Hartford students to attend college, assist schools in better demonstrating student success in grades 7 through 12; increasing the number of students in the transition process from selected grades such as 8 to 9, and from high school to college so more low-income and minority students get involved in college preparatory courses.

The post-secondary level priorities focused on improving outreach efforts for first generation college students by working with college professors and other personnel and increasing the awareness of Hartford High School graduates to utilize Capital Community Technical College as a link to get prepared or for careers or attending a four-year institution (American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust, 1994). Providence, Rhode

Island also had a collaborative initiative to address low performance of low-income and minority students in their public schools.

In 1992, the Providence Community Compact was set up to address the needs of low-income and minority students. An overall goal of the compact was to assist in the restructuring of the education the Providence area. University of Rhode Island, the Community college of Rhode Island, Rhode Island College, and Providence Public Schools were the educational partners in the compact, while the Urban Field Center, Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education, politicians, the teachers' union and parents were also involved. This group identified a five-issue area to be addressed by the compact: achievement and assessment, curriculum, guidance and advisement, organizational structure and financial resources, and professional development. A sixth component was added, compact visibility, to help inform the various constituencies about issues related to the compact.

The organizational structure consisted of high level administrators such as the President of the University of Rhode Island and the Superintendent of Rhode Island Public Schools serving in the capacity as co-chairs of the policy steering committee. A working committee and task forces from the working committee were responsible for collecting data, following steering committee directives, and community outreach. Two co-directors were responsible for the daily operation of the compact. One was housed in the superintendent's office of the Providence Schools and the other in the president's office at the University of Rhode Island. The Pueblo Compact had goals and structures very similar to the Providence effort.

Pueblo Community Compact

The Pueblo Community Compact was designed to engage the education, business and community institutions and organizations as a means to share resources and create strategies to address the systemic issues that prevent poor and minority students from completing high school and pursuing post-secondary opportunities. The focus of the compact was on grades seven through fourteen. A Leadership Group made up of six CEO's and the Community Compact Collaboration Council sets direction and policy. The groups involved are the Pueblo School District No. 60, the Pueblo School District No. 70, Pueblo Community College, the University of Southern Colorado, and the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce. Moreover, it was the responsibility of the Leadership Group to link the initiatives of the group to the activities involved in the educational reform efforts.

Parents, students, teachers, administrators, college faculty, the business community, community members, and social service organizations united around the efforts of the compact in order to:

1. Increase parent and family involvement in the schools.
2. Improve curriculum within grades 7-14.
3. Establish incentives for achievement.
4. Encourage staff professional development.
5. Coordinate effective outreach efforts for mentoring urban youth.

The Compact laid out an agenda to accomplish these initiatives over a three-year timeline through the following three objectives:

1. Substantially increase systemic efforts at the secondary and post-secondary levels,

2. Substantially increase the number of students enrolling in achieving in science and mathematics at the secondary and post-secondary levels, and

3. Substantially increase the number of students selecting and succeeding in writing courses at the secondary and post-secondary level.

Synopsis

The history of collaboration shows that organizational linkage and gatherings to meet educational needs are not uncommon. In fact, it is a part of the foundation that upholds the institution. What varies may be the motives that each organization brings to the collaborative. For example, a university may be a participating agent in a project designed to increase minority student performance in the public schools. however, their tactic for helping accomplish that goal may be reforming how it prepares its teacher education students. while a community-based organization such as a social service organization may be more direct-service oriented and concentrates its efforts on projects that assist students through a program. In linking of elementary and secondary public schools with community colleges and universities the relationship tends to be reciprocal. meaning that each group has something to gain from the effort. The universities and community colleges provide the public schools with teacher's aids while the public schools provide the arena for university and community colleges to comply with state law for practicum experience before students receive their teaching credential.

Sometimes organizations have to stretch in a manner that differs from how they conduct their daily operation to accommodate the needs of their collaborating partners, particularly when it involves multiple organizations representing a diverse constituency base. For example, the majority of the compacts discussed earlier had an organizational hierarchy in which the local public school district and the representing higher education organizations did the decision making about the fiscal management and daily operation of the compact at or through their organizations. The fiscal operation and hiring of directors tended to come from the educational institutions. The community-based organizations were sometimes at the table, but did not appear to have a large role or decision-making authority around the daily operation of the compact. This is where the coordination of the collaboration becomes very important because each organization involved in the effort will not come to the relationship with equal power or resources. Moreover, low income and minority families tend to reach out to community-based organizations for assistance due to the advocacy roles they play in the community. Even though they may not have the resources of public educational institutions, community based organizations can still play a critical role in the effort to get parents and families involved and help low-income and minority students boost their academic achievement. It's up to the compact members to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the various entities involved and use them accordingly.

Each of the collaborative projects mentioned above had a common theme, improving their local public school district's performance in educating low-income and minority students. A reoccurring theme was extending educational opportunity for these students by structuring a system that reached them as early as pre-kindergarten and worked with them through their first two years of college. Some compacts had goals to extend their efforts

through graduate school. That was particularly the case in compacts that had increasing low-income and minority student involvement in science and mathematics as a goal.

In several of the collaboratives professional and teacher development were goals of the compact. This in turn brought representatives from various teachers unions and other professional advocacy groups such as the local Chamber of Commerce to the compacts. Although the diversity of the organizations linked local public school districts, universities, community colleges, corporations, teachers' unions, parents, and social service agencies, the organizational structuring tended to be consistent across each of the compacts.

The organizational structuring of the compacts consistently had:

1. Universities, colleges, and local school districts at the top governing the effort,
2. A Policy Steering Committee,
3. Multi-level committees with particular tasks,
4. Research or data collection teams, and
5. An operational base that was either at the university or local school district.

The staffing and decision making of the compacts were typically structured by:

1. Professional abilities or organizational capacity which were determined by the heads of the governing groups and
2. Two co-directors that were top level administrators from each educational level with decision making authority in their educational organizations (e.g., presidents, chancellor, dean, superintendent, and assistant superintendent).

Areas that were priorities included:

1. Whole-family engagement in the human development process

2. Increasing community outreach amongst university and community colleges in low-income and minority communities

3. Increasing low-income and minority student performance at elementary/secondary level as a means to prepare them for collegiate opportunity

4. Creating community awareness about its role in providing educational opportunity for all students

5. Creating a system for learner outcomes that are inclusive and link various support structures to assist students in meeting those outcomes

6. Increasing mathematics and science performance of low income and minority students.

Although the listings above do not demonstrate the failure or success of the efforts they do indicate how some educational, business, and community groups in urban settings have attempted to address the issues that impede low income and minority students from reaching their full academic potential. Ascher (1988), Bruner (1991), Fruchter (1987), Pitman-Gellas (1985), and Trubowitz (1985) suggest that commitment, egalitarian decision-making, a sense of ownership by participants at all levels, clarity about roles, clarity and flexibility about methods and goals, an ability to bridge different institutional cultures, training, and patience concerning the collaborative process itself are principals for successful collaborations across the board. This review by no means exhausts the literature on collaborative relationships between public schools, universities, and community colleges. However, it does show that when local public schools attempt to address the academic underachievement of low-income and minority students, they look to higher education

organizations to provide expertise and direction to solve the problem. More importantly, when organizations are brought together, it is important to understand the structuring around each organization.

For example, Sergiovanni & Corbally (1986) imply that school and universities are organizations that are open systems that are an integral part of their larger external environment. Moreover, they respond to the forces in their external environment. For example, various community constituencies set expectations on schools to respond to their needs. Whether these groups are business, social service organizations, and other special interest groups, schools process their input and the output demands of what process often cause the schools conflict. Universities are very similar. There is the expectation from forces in their external environment that require them to teach; yet to remain a solvent entity, they must receive the research grants that are necessary to maintain their financial stability. In both scenarios, schools and universities respond to interplay that is political. The resolution of issues, through bargaining and agreements between the interdependent groups and sub units within these organizations, are determined when needs are met (Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1986).

When the Urban League of Township, Illinois, Gilpin State University, Land Community College, and Township Public Schools collaborated in an after-school program to address the educational needs of African American students in Township Public Schools. The theoretical structure that framed the collective was bound in an unbalanced political power structure that was made up of race and power which were the factors that determined the allocation of resources. The Urban League was an external force that was attempting to address the issue of academic underachievement of African-American kindergarten through

third-grade students in Township Public Schools. They were attempting this task due to a mandate passed by the National Urban League Inc.

The National Urban League Inc., however, did not providing any funding for resources to assist in this charge. So the Urban League had to form an advisory council that was made up of community representatives (i.e., city mayor, school superintendents, and community college presidents) and other community service groups, such as the boys and girls clubs of the city. Each of these special interest groups represented constituencies that did not have African Americans as their sole charge. The local Urban League was the only organization that had the specific charge of responding to the underachievement of African-American students in Township Public Schools. However, this mission became stifled due to the self-interest of advisory council members, some of whom had direct responsibility for the schools. When the Urban League of Township could not gain the necessary resources to sustain the efforts of the STARS after-school program, new leadership on the Urban League board brought Gilpin State University and Land Community College into the fold, but they also had their self-interests to consider in the initiative.

The focus of this inquiry was to understand the relationship between these organizations and to better understand the external forces that impacted the relationships between and among Urban League of Township, Illinois, Gilpin State University, Land Community College, and Township Public Schools. The STARS program was the case that supports the usage of a political perspective for examining organizational relationships.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this inquiry was to understand the implications of an advocacy-based policy on the relationship between educational organizations and a social service organization that were brought together in response to policy mandate. The National Urban League's Education Initiative was designed to strengthen the black community connection to the public schools in the United States in an effort to address academic underachievement of African-American students. The initiative had some difficulties at the affiliate level due to limited resources available to implement and maintain services that the initiative encouraged. A strategy that the National Urban League Inc. suggested to resolve that problem was to build coalitions with other organizations in the community to overcome the limitations that the affiliates or black community was not able to resolve.

Policy and Collaboration

The Urban League of Township, Illinois for the past four years has been attempting to understand the ecology of the education community in Township, Illinois. This was necessary in order to develop a policy that would encourage more effective collaborations between non-bureaucratic-based social service organizations, such as the Urban League, and public educational institutions at the elementary, secondary, and higher educational levels. The formation of policy with funding streams linked to educational organizations, such as the stakeholders in the inquiry, to support initiatives spearheaded by advocacy-based

organizations that address the underachievement of African-Americans in the public schools was not a priority for the educational institutions in the Township community. In an attempt to change the climate and place the Township community within the current trends of educational reform, the goal of the inquiry was to magnify the intricacies of advocacy-based policies by focusing on the working relationship among and between the Urban League of Township, Illinois and the Township Public Schools, Gilpin State University, and Land Community College. By illuminating the relationship of the organizations, the research provides an example of how advocacy-based policy can work to address the academic underachievement of African-American students in the public schools of Township, Illinois.

The methodology chosen as most applicable for this study was the qualitative method. Krathwohl (1993) mentions that qualitative methods are descriptive and qualify occurrences through words, which is an important aspect of the methodology. Bogden and Bilken (1982, as cited in Krathwohl, 1993) propose that the "qualitative method provides the means to understand how individuals perceive themselves in the world around them" (Krathwohl, 1993, p. 311). My goal was to understand each stakeholder's interpretation of the project, and their role in it, in order to grasp the various perspectives about issues around the program. The next section provides information regarding the case study research approach.

Research Approach

A case study is expected to catch the complexity of a single case:

> A single leaf, even a single toothpick, has unique complexities-but rarely will we care enough to submit it to case study. We study a case when it itself is of very special interest. We look for the detail of interaction with its contexts. Case study is the

> study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances. (Stake, 1995, p. xi)

This quote from the opening of Stake's book is a very fitting way to describe my quest to uncover the phases of the evolution of the STARS program and how effective it was in achieving its mission of addressing the underachievement of African-American students. Utilizing a case study approach on STARS is an effective way of linking the results of the inquiry to the current trend of educational reform across the country (Weiner, 1993). A naturalistic approach allows the case study to remain nonjudgmental so that intended and unintended outcomes are discovered through the inquiry. By taking this approach the challenges of cooperative projects between higher education organizations and community-based organizations external to higher education environments were further explored to provide insight on the trend of collaboration.

In order to develop data that can be effectively used for this case, it was necessary at times to link the techniques from other approaches such as ethnography to the case study. For this study various techniques from ethnography were used to illustrate a more in-depth view of the phenomenon. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) state:

> Ethnography is a set of methods used to collect data, and it is the written record that is the product of using ethnographic techniques. Ethnographic techniques are the strategies researchers use to collect data about the social order, setting, or situation being investigated. Common techniques of data gathering are interviewing, documentary analysis, life history, investigator diaries, and participant observation. Just using these techniques, however, does not necessarily produce ethnography in the second sense of the word. An ethnography is a sociocultural interpretation of the data. As analytic descriptions or reconstructions of participants' symbolic meanings and the patterns of social interactions, ethnographers recreate for the reader the shared beliefs, practices, artifacts, folk knowledge, and behaviors of some group of people. (p. 2)

It is important to understand the implications of how stakeholders perceive themselves within a project as well as how they perceive the roles of other stakeholders. Through informal dialogue with a former stakeholder in the STARS program, the socio-cultural interpretation of data helped provide an understanding of how informants within the case study perceived the phenomenon, particularly as it relates to the cultural values of their organization.

As Stake (1994) posits, gaining an understanding of the occurrences within a particular case helps transfer that knowledge and makes it applicable to a larger interest. The historical and cultural context of this particular phenomenon will help future stakeholders who are attempting to conduct a cooperative among dissimilar organizations avoid issues that could potentially disrupt their ability to meet their goals. Therefore, the data collection centered around the evolution of the STARS program.

The document gathering consists of data developed from each organization that centered on the cooperative relationship evolving among Gilpin State, Land Community College, Township Public Schools, and the Urban League. For example, to better understand the relationship of the stakeholders around the restructuring of STARS when Urban League came under new management, minutes from the restructuring meeting were used to provide a window for recalling the scenario. Interviews with key informants such as an administrator at the Illinois State Board of Higher Education told the story of why funding was discontinued a short time after Land Community College disengaged from the Gilpin State STARS project.

The historical data collection (e.g., forms such as the proposal submitted to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education) was used to provide some insight on ideas that each

organization has concerning its role in the cooperative, and the role it saw other organizations provide in the cooperative. Interviews were used to provide a window into how various stakeholders see their role and the roles of others in the program. Hence, my focus was to interview key informants who had a stake in the program at various levels, to gain a multi-level perspective. The historical documentation and interviews concentrated on the primary stakeholders that were involved in the STARS from 1987 through 1998.

Figure 1 (p. 35) provides the organizational schematic during each phase and displays the timeline that identifies the occurrences within the project over the identified timeline mentioned above. The timeline was selected because it reflects the history of each stakeholder involved in STARS over three periods: before, during, and after the Higher Education Cooperation Act (ISBE, 1991, 1992) funding. Likewise, the interviews were set-up for each informant to describe their role and their organization's role in the project.

The informants in the study are the individuals who represent the four primary organizations involved in the collaborative: Gilpin State University, Land Community College, Township Public Schools, and the Urban League. However, there are also respondents from secondary stakeholders such as the Illinois State Board of Higher Education. It was necessary to interview the secondary stakeholders, particularly the Illinois State Board of Higher Education, because they are responsible for funding the project and can explain the occurrences that led up to their discontinuing the funding. Hopefully, the information from the interviews will be useful for future community-university collaborators that use state higher education funding to support their project.

A multitude of subjects were targeted for interviews from the primary stakeholder organizations (e.g., Urban League of Township, Illinois; Land Community College; Gilpin

State University; and Township Public Schools) (see Research Management Plan section): social service officials, higher education representatives, and public school officials. The interviews occurred at locations where confidentiality and open discussion could occur without interruption or inhibition. In each interview I attempted to procure responses to all of my questions and any clarification necessary. A tape recorder was used to capture the interview in full length. Interviewees were provided with a letter regarding the inquiry and how the data were to be managed. In order to maintain anonymity, names of the interviewees were changed. The interviewees were informed of this in a letter and reminded them of the confidentiality process.

Due to the sensitive nature of the study, and because I am an employee of the Urban League organization, I informed school board officials, university professors, and administrators that my goal utilized the case to illuminate the issues surrounding the STARS program as it relates to providing educational support to minority students potentially at-risk of academic failure in the public schools. Furthermore, I am aware of my subjectivity and acknowledged my struggles and biases where warranted. The advantage for me to conduct the case study is my familiarity with the program and the struggles it had when making the transitions during the three phases of its existence. Staffing, organizational restructures, and funding changes were issues that occurred throughout the program's existence.

Limitations

The limitations of the case study are the potential loss of open and frank discussions with some stakeholders who made administrative changes to limit their involvement or no

longer support the program, particularly when I was involved through my affiliate appointment. In order to get a more objective opinion, particularly during the period of my involvement in the program, I utilized data collected from an external research project conducted by a graduate student who researched the STARS program a few years ago. Her objectivity for debriefing purposes around areas where my involvement in the program may be potentially biased was used for triangulation purposes. I also incorporated the interview of a community activist who worked with each organization involved in the inquiry to provide an additional view on the history of the STARS program. The next section describes the research management plan I used to conduct the inquiry.

Research Management Plan

The Research Management Plan (Figure 1) describes how the inquiry was conducted. Items such as interviewees, positions, organizations, data sources, interview dates, and timelines are represented in the plan.

Interview Questions

The questions for the study were constructed based on the history of collaboration as documented in this study, and also through informal discussions with the various stakeholders involved in the Gilpin State research initiative. The questions were written in a manner that reflect the intentions of stakeholders involved in the initiative and provide information that suggested what the expectations and outcomes were for each organization as well as for the overall project. They are as follows:

Organization	Position	Timeline	Data	Data Source
Gilpin State	Dean College of Ed	February 11, 1999	Discussed project history, proposal development, and the implications of role changes during project Examined historical documents	Interview/ audio Program Proposal
Gilpin State	Professor Ed Policy, Former Assoc. Dean	October 6, 1998- February 1999	Discussed project history, proposal development, and implications of the dual role of serving two organizations	Interview/ audio
Land Community College	President	February 1, 1999	Discussed project organization role and reasons for pull-out	Interview/ audio
Education Advocacy Group	Community Activist	February 11, 1999	Discussed program change and implications it had on the community	Interview/ audio
Township District 111	Superintende nt	January 28, 1999	Discussed organizational role particularly during all three periods of the inquiry	Interview/audio, Historical Document
Washington Elementary School	Principal	October 12, 1998	Discussed the project, but focused on all three periods due to involvement in the program over all three periods	Interview/audio
Urban League of Township, IL	President	December 11, 1998	Discussed program, but focused on the during-and-after periods of the project due to when he became President of Urban League org.	Interview/ audio
Illinois State Board of Higher Education	Higher Education Commission Act Official	February 3, 1999	Discussed project, particularly reasons for funding and decisions for discontinuing funding.	Interview/ Document Analysis
Urban League of Township, IL	Program Developer	February 12, 1999	Discussed project, but focused on all three periods due to involvement in the program over all three periods	Interview/ audio
Land Comm. College	Program Coordinator	March 2, 1999	Discussed project, but focused on the during-and-after periods in Township District 112	Interview/ audio

Figure 1. Research management plan.

1. Please describe your organization's involvement in the STARS program.

2. Was there a selection process for your organization to become involved in the Gilpin State project? If so, please describe that process.

3. Who was responsible for deciding what would happen in the project?

4. Prior to participating in the Gilpin State initiative were there any partnership activities that your organization was involved in with the other stakeholders?

5. What was your organization's relationship with each of the stakeholders prior to the project?

6. Did the relationship change when both organizations were involved in the project? Please explain.

7. What happened to Land Community Colleges role in the project?

8. Were there implications on the project when Land was no longer involved? If so, please describe.

9. Would your organization have had the same goals outside of the Higher Education Commission Act (HECA) fund period of the program?

10. After the HECA funding ended, was it necessary to continue the project? Please expound.

11. Should the Gilpin State University's College of Education utilize its own dollars to better prepare their teacher education students to educate potentially at-risk African-American students?

12. Please describe the organizations involved in the project.

13. Why were the particular organizations selected to participate in the initiative?

14. Who was responsible for selecting the organizations involved in the initiative?

15. Were you expecting to gain anything organizationally from being involved in the effort? Please elaborate.

16. Was there a reason for the other organizations to become involved in the initiative? Please describe those reasons.

17. Was there an opportunity for each organization to learn about the goals of the participating stakeholders involved in the initiative?

Data Analysis

Weiss (1982), Rist (1994), Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), and Malen and Knapp's (1997) works were used to analyze the National Urban League educational policy mandate. Their processes include understanding decision making in policy, the policy cycle, and the three-stage process used for analyzing the effectiveness of policy through central assumptions: ends and means, related assumptions; key factors shaping policy; and implications for influencing policy. Across the three stages, nine principles were used to break the educational mandate down. Those principles included purpose, process, outcomes, theoretical action, actors, problems, role of information, role of values, and avenues of influence. A blending of these variables in the analysis demonstrated what the National Urban League, Inc. Education Initiative results were throughout the three phases of the inquiry at the local affiliate.

Since this was a case study, the data analyses consisted of triangulation methods where interviews were used to corroborate or provide a different perspective on stakeholders' reflective accounts, historical documents, and my own personal experiences within the inquiry. Moreover, analyses were ongoing throughout the duration of the data collection period in order to provide a clearer understanding of the various occurrences and issues surrounding each period. An organizational schematic was developed to provide an outline of key informants in order to recite and analyze roles, responsibilities, and occurrences at

different periods within the STARS program. In addition to the interviews, field notes were used as ticklers to restructure interview questions and probe areas for additional information. The field notes also helped identify other informants for further analysis of a particular scenario, situation, or circumstance.

A case record was used to gather data for analysis from the various documents, recordings, and field notes. The case record was used as a means to tabulate the information and to audit findings prior to final analyses. Merriam (1988) mentions that the case record includes information that is necessary for the case analysis and case study. This was useful for organizing data in a manner that allowed a more thorough and consistent analysis. Through a consistent and intensive analysis the case study emerged with leads into a grounded theoretical base that recognized patterns for presenting the findings, recommendations, and conclusions of the study.

Trustworthiness of Data

Because the data were collected from historical documents and interviews, the organizational schematic was used as a tool to structure the data collection process in order to categorize reoccurring themes that emerged from the data sources. Memos, budgets, proposals, meeting agendas, and minutes were used to provide an understanding of the issues that surrounded the Urban League of Township's implementation of the mandated National Urban League Inc. policy, the Education Initiative. An understanding of various political events that instigated the evolution of stakeholders involvement, roles, and resources were the data sources used to validate or identify the reoccurring themes surrounding the issues mentioned above. Moreover, it was also necessary to have a colleague from the Gilpin State University to serve as a debriefing agent to help process the findings. Likewise, the President of the Urban League organization was contacted to help in clarifying the transition period

when Gilpin State's College of Education discontinued their support of the program, and illuminate the implications of that decision on the STARS program thereafter.

An additional debriefing safeguard that was implemented was the perspective of a community activist on the collaborative. That design helped triangulate each of the informants' statements. Finally, closing interviews were conducted with informants from the Urban League, Gilpin State College, Land Community College, and the Township Public Schools to discuss the information which offered them an opportunity to support or disclaim the findings. A copy of the dissertation proposal was presented to each of the primary stakeholders.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings for the evolution of the STARS program are chronologically organized based on the stakeholders' introduction to and involvement in the program. The presentations of the findings are introduced in three phases: 1987-1990, 1991-1993, and 1994-1998. Each phase of the findings represents significant turning points for each organization involved: Gilpin State University, Land Community College, Township Public School Districts, and the Urban League of Township, Illinois. The purpose of the investigation was to examine the relationship among the various stakeholders, inquiring about their role in the STARS program, and the resources allotted to the program during each organization's involvement.

Recapping the Mission of the Program and the Various Stakeholders

When the STARS program began, the mission was to address the educational needs of minority students who were potentially at risk of academic failure in Township, Illinois. Over time, the STARS program experienced changes in organizational relationships and program resources. Gilpin State University, Land Community College, Township Public School Districts 111 and 112, and Urban League participated in the program at various levels and at various times throughout its history. These data involve four areas: stakeholders, roles, resources, and issues. Interviews and historical documents such as budget reports, program proposals, and newspaper clippings are presented to offer the various perspectives of

each organization or individual involved in the phenomenon. The findings flow in the sequence of the three phases with data collected from the four stakeholders. Figure 2 specifies the stakeholders that were involved in the STARS program during each phase. Each stakeholder's testimony was used as a triangulation point along with various historical documents for corroborating various themes within each phase.

Stakeholders			
Phase	**Organization**	**Representative**	**Position**
Phase I	**Urban League of Township Illinois**	**Karen Johnson**	**Program Developer**
	Township School Dist. 111	**Dan Anderson**	**Washington School Principal**
	Educational Activist, Inc.	**Hayward Jackson**	**Educational Advocate**
Phase II	Urban League of Township, Illinois	Karen Johnson	Program Developer
	Township School Dist. 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Land Community College	Dr. Lisa Thomas	President
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Henry	Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair
Phase III	Urban League of Township, Illinois	Mark Todd	President/CEO
	Educational Activist, Inc.	Hayward Jackson	Community Educational Advocate
	Township School Dist. 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Grayson	Dean, Gilpin State University, College of Education
	Urban League of Township, Illinois	William Patterson *	Director of Education and Youth Development
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Henry	Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair

Figure 2. Active stakeholders (in bold) during Phase I. Asterisk indicates researcher of this study.

Phase I: 1987 to 1990

Affiliate Outreach: Mobilizing Resources to Meet the Need

So what the National Urban League Inc. said, in a sense, was "Let's stop and look at

> the other people to figure out our problem and help our children and come up with programs. We have enough of us now educated and we have enough Urban Leagues across the country that we should be able to help ourselves." (Karen Johnson, Urban League Developer, February 12, 1999)

The concerns of a nationally recognized civil rights organization found its way to the community of Township, Illinois. A community with racially integrated school systems and two higher education organizations. Each are respected nationally and internationally: Gilpin State University is a world-class research institution in areas as diverse as computer science, engineering, and agriculture; Land Community College is recognized for its practical application of an educational mission that prepares students with significant career opportunities and provides an avenue for students to enter into four-year institutions.

Karen Johnson (Urban League Program Developer) suggested that despite the national and international achievements of the higher education organizations in the community, locally, African-American children in the Township School Districts were performing below their Caucasian counter-parts and at-risk of academic failure. This was not an exception, in fact. Township, Illinois was falling in line with a statewide trend that showed African-American students were performing well below their white counterparts in Illinois elementary and secondary public schools. The Township School Districts attempted to address the issue in a variety of ways. For example, Township District 112 formed a program called Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA) to assist teachers in the use of instructional methods to help underachieving or disadvantaged students achieve in the classroom. In a 1989 article on the educational achievement of minority students, a local newspaper in Township, Illinois reported that a state study indicated that teachers unexpectedly lower their educational expectation level for minority students as compared

with white students. The article further reported that in Township District 111 of the 69 students that dropped out of school in 1988, 21 were African-American. Karen Johnson indicated that one of the motivations to start the STARS program was some of the teachers' attitudes about black students' ability to achieve:

> I didn't know that at the time that the children that we were getting mostly in the STARS program were children who the teachers in the schools had in a sense already set aside. (Karen Johnson, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

However, the main thrust behind the STARS program was the motivation of the National Urban League Inc. mandate.

In 1985, when the Delegate Assembly of the National Urban League Inc. passed its resolution on public education, it was largely an attempt by the National Urban League Inc. to reaffirm itself to the strength of the organization. This strength was the ability to mobilize people and to demonstrate concern for people (National Urban League Inc., 1985). John Jacobs, then president of the National Urban League Inc., had received criticism by community groups and Urban League affiliates that under his leadership, the League did little to address the needs of black people outside issuing the annual "State of Black America" report. The report had been criticized by some Urban League officials as only being a platform for John Jacobs to campaign for change through mobilizing around a domestic Marshall Plan that he had not delivered on. Through the implementation of the mandated Education Initiative, John Jacobs attempted to quell his critics regarding the National Urban League Inc.'s ability to mobilize resources on a national level under his leadership. John Jacobs used the resolution on public education as a mobilizing agent to get black people mobilized around the National Urban League Inc.'s Education Initiative.

"This is a call to all black people to assume far greater responsibility for the educational destinies of black youth" (National Urban League Inc., 1985). That was the language used by the National Urban League Inc. to encourage its affiliates to muster the enthusiasm needed to gain the support to address the issue of academic underachievement of African-American children attending local public schools throughout the nation. In a background paper on the effort, the National Urban League indicated that advocacy and services were the thrusting points. Advocacy could occur by lobbying for curriculum changes, and to encourage institutions to raise their expectations towards black student achievement. Services that would be provided at the affiliate level could include non-instructional and supplemental academic assistance activities such as:

1. Tutoring, enrichment, and test review course in basic subject areas (e.g., English, math, and science)

2. Guidance programs, career counseling, and mentor relationships to encourage academic achievement

3. Programs encouraging parental monitoring of students daily school work and overall academic progress

4. Coalitions among parents, schools and the community to facilitate the provision of technical and human resources to insure responsiveness to student needs

5. Black history and culture programs to instill pride and positive feelings of self-worth in black youth to spur their desire to excel

6. Early childhood development programs to expose pre-schoolers to technological and scientific concepts (National Urban League Inc., 1989).

The Urban League of Township, Illinois conducted a community needs assessment to learn about the educational needs of African-American children in the Township community. The purpose was to assess the education programs and needs of public schools, pre-K-12, and minority students in the Township community, and then make programming recommendations to the Board of the Directors of the Urban League of Township, Illinois (Urban League of Township, Illinois, 1985). The inquiry had three objectives: (a) collect and interpret data from the local school districts on minority student achievement, (b) make recommendations to the Board of Directors on programming, and (c) identify sources of funding for the recommended programs (Urban League of Township, Illinois, 1985). The Chairman of the Urban League Board and a graduate student from Gilpin State University conducted the inquiry (Davis, 1988). A letter to a group of Township residents that represented the education profession and other community groups reflected that the Urban League hosted a luncheon at the Community Civic Center for further dialogue and to collect data around the Education Initiative. Approximately 60 representatives from the community, which included but was not limited to the Mayor of Township, Township School Superintendents, Land Community College Administrators, Corporate Sponsors, Gilpin State University Representatives, and Regional Office of Education Officials (Urban League of Township, Illinois, 1987). At the luncheon, the League distributed a survey among the participants to collect data around areas such as "Who the Education Initiative" should serve? What segment of community did they represent? And what educational level represented the greatest need (Urban League August, 1987)?

In a follow-up letter to the luncheon participants, the Urban League communicated the results of the survey which suggested that services should begin at the elementary school level particularly in the formative stages of educational development (Urban League of Township, Illinois, 1987). Those survey results were incorporated into the remainder of the community needs assessment which ultimately produced three recommendations: (a) the development of a Task Force or Advisory Council that would serve as an umbrella organization that collected, evaluated, coordinated, and disseminated data to improve the educational achievement level of black public school students; (b) the establishment of an after school tutoring program to serve public school students grades 1-12, between the months of September through May; and (c) the establishment of a Parent Involvement Program to serve families that were at-risk. It also suggested hiring a program developer (Karen Johnson) to spearhead the activities of the Education Initiative (Davis, 1988).

The Urban League of Township, Illinois acted on all three recommendations, the formation of an advisory council, and after-school and parent involvement programs. Karen Johnson implied that the Urban League study reflected that other community-based programs such as Principal Scholars, Upward Bound, Boys Club, and Girls Club were programs serving black students after school and that many of these students were considered achievers. Moreover, there was continuous dialogue with several school principals, superintendents, parents, community leaders, and ministers about the students cited in the study. Karen felt that the Urban League's role was to advocate and serve students that were poor, average, or on the bottom rung--basically, the ones that were not considered achievers and not served by the other programs.

According to a local community newspaper, a group called the Joint Committee on Minority Achievement was formed to inquire about black students' academic performance. Upon the completion of their study, a report was developed that recommended:

1. Expanded support programs, such as all-day kindergarten, early childhood classes, summer school, and tutoring that make up for help lacking in students' homes.

2. Reasonable class sizes.

3. Homework centers or neighborhood centers for schools with large minority enrollments.

4. Special programs, such as bilingual education or English as a second language.

5. Extra counseling for minority students preparing them to effectively teach minority students.

6. Awards for schools that are effective in improving minority student achievement.

The report also indicated that Township Districts 111 and 112 had begun to incorporate some of the recommendations. Full-day kindergarten and bilingual education were programs adopted by both districts. Township District 112 had a program called "Get Ready" for "at-risk" 3- and 4-year-olds that was noted by the News-Gazette, a local newspaper, to have improved the academic performance of the students once they reached kindergarten. While the newspaper published a report that the Township School Districts' early childhood development programs were getting encouraging results, it also reported in 1985 that minority enrollment in elementary schools has grown steadily, the proportion of minorities at each successive grade level dropped off severely, and that minorities accounted for 36% of the state's first graders but only 22% of high school seniors (Report Teach, 1988).

The report, however, did not cover the gap in educational support services such as after-school programs for kindergarten through third-grade students from at-risk environments. That unreported gap, along with the reported drop in the proportion of minorities who were graduating from high school, was the determining factor for the Urban League to begin its role as a service provider for K-3 students after school. In 1988, the newspaper reported that each district had established a cooperative relationship with the Urban League on an after-school program. That after-school program was STARS, a supplemental educational tutorial program for kindergarten through third-grade students.

In keeping with the National Urban League's mandate, the Urban League of Township, Illinois developed STARS at the local level. The program was affiliate specific, meaning it was based on fulfilling a programming void for African-American children attending school in the Township Public Schools. The National Urban League's policy encouraged service efforts to be community specific:

> National Urban League, Inc. wanted each of their affiliates, and it must have been somewhere between 110-113 Urban Leagues across the country, to develop an education initiative for their particular community. So they didn't come out with a canned program and say, "This is what we want implemented in every Urban League" because of course then different communities had certain things going already. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

The Urban League looked at several different types of programs. Some were after-school tutoring programs, some were recognition programs, some were pull-out programs or mentoring--putting people in the schools, things like that. But what they said overall is: "Do a community needs assessment. See where you all stand. And see what the Urban League can do to improve things." So our Urban League struggled with that for a while in

Township, Illinois and gave it to their program committee. They hashed it around for awhile, but did not come up with anything. And then in 1987 Louis Ball hired me. My task was to determine what the Urban League should be involved in. And I did do a kind of informal community needs assessment. I met with people from Principal Scholars and people from Upward Bound. I met with several school principals, superintendents, parents, community leaders, and ministers--many people from different walks of life. I met with all of those people to try to find out from them "Where do you think the gap is in terms of helping to support our children?" And the unofficial consensus was that yes, our children are falling in the bottom 25% on standardized tests. They are not performing well. They have a lot of suspensions. They have a lot of things going on. But most of the programs that are in place already are for children who have shown some promise and potential, not for that bottom group, for the ones that are C average or lower. And so across the board people said, "We need to start looking at that other poor average--that bottom rung" (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999).

Roles

With regard to the STARS program, Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, had this to say:

> What I proposed for the Urban League was that they do basic educational skills tutoring for kids in elementary school so we could catch them early and make sure that they at least knew how to read and do basic math. And that we also try to collaborate with other community tutoring programs and work with them to see if there were places where we could fill in the gap. So that's how the STARS program started, mostly to say there are a bunch of the children in the district who could use

> our help. And they don't need to be put in a category where they have to qualify by some kind of academic excellence or showing promise, or kids who are probably going to succeed to a certain extent anyway. So that's how we started the STARS program. It was targeted at those children. (Personal communication, February 12, 1999)

The National Urban League mandate required affiliates to accept responsibility for addressing the educational condition of black children in their communities and to take on the role of academic advocate for these children. The local Urban League began their advocacy strategy by implementing STARS as a program that operates after school. The Urban League of Township wanted to use after school as a time for activities that were steeped in culture enrichment and nontraditional instruction methods that got the African-American community more involved in the schools. The Urban League knew that the Township districts could not be eliminated from the process, so the schools' role was to assist in student recruitment, diagnosing students' needs, and providing homework. The stakeholder schematic (Figure 3) provides a layout of the stakeholders and their roles, resource allocation to the program, and the funding infrastructure that supported the program

Dan Anderson, a principal in Township District 111 (hereinafter referred to as Township School Principal), was involved in the STARS program from its inception. He had some anxiety about the Urban League doing the STARS program due to the level of resources that was needed to operate the program. The principal suggested that staffing was a concern because of experiences that he had with other school programs:

> As a school, we've occasionally--it kind of depends on our PTA--we've occasionally had an after-school program with a different focus. It wasn't just focusing on an at-risk kid. It was an optional program so that kids could take enrichment types of things after school, and the PTA organized it. For example, we had a computer class. We had a plants class. So they learned about growing and they grew their own plants and they learned science through it. They had an art class. There were a number of

different options, but it was more general enrichment. It wasn't really targeted just at at-risk kids like this one is, so it was a little different and it was so dependent on somebody being there from the PTA who was willing to take that on. It was a big job, and it has been gone for 5 or 6 years--there hasn't been anybody on the PTA who's willing to pick it back up. Just like a site coordinator for STARS, you need somebody who can take that driving position and organize all the pieces that have to go together to make it work. (Dan Anderson, Township School Principal, personal communication, October 12, 1998)

	URBAN LEAGUE SOCIAL SERVICE ORG.	TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIST. 111 & 112	GILPIN STATE UNIVERSITY HIGHER EDUCATION LINK	LAND COMMUN-ITY COLLEGE
Stakeholder Relationship	Primary	Primary	Secondary	None
Role	Program Management	Program Support	No Official Role	None
Resources	- tutors - snacks - student recruitment - curriculum development - instruction - site coordination	- facility usage - student identification - teacher referral	- volunteers - tutors	None
Monetary Contribution	$25,000	None	None	None

Figure 3. Phase I of STARS demonstrates primarily a community-based program. Gilpin State University was not officially involved but had students providing volunteer tutorial support.

Although the Urban League's role was to develop an after school program, they also provided the necessary program management and resources which included recruiting tutors, securing snacks, registering and assessing students, providing instruction, and site coordination. Likewise, the administrative staff within the Township Public Schools helped the program by identifying students and freeing up space for the STARS program to operate

at that particular site. The principal had some concern about the program and its limited professional staff, but he did allow the program operate in his building. Gilpin State University was also involved but in a non-official capacity. Student organizations at the college participated in STARS by providing volunteer tutoring. Land Community College had no role nor provided any resources during this phase.

Issues

Karen Johnson mentioned that she constantly had to sell the importance of the program to community factions. School district officials and parents had their reservations about the program. The parents' reservations had a lot to do with their child being stigmatized by being labeled as a child that needs additional academic support, so parents were not immediately opting to place their child in the program:

> We did have some problems in the beginning with stigma being attached to the program because it seemed like it was a program for special needs kids or children who were failing or however you want to perceive it. The way our children and their parents don't like to get involved in--they don't want to get involved in things that . . . you know, your child is not performing and they need help. So a lot of what I did in the early part of it had to do with what you'd probably call PR (Public Relations), getting out trying to sell a certain concept to the community and to the parents and to the schools and say no, this is an enrichment program or remedial help type program not so much for kids who are dumb but for children who could use some extra help. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

While Urban League began program operations in Township School Districts 111 and 112, the districts were still concerned about the Urban League's ability being able to provide instructional support for the students with no designated money for resources such as

instructors for the program. Although the Urban League officials were also concerned about the limited resources to operate the program, it did not stop them from getting the program up and running. In the resolution on public education, the National Urban League's message to the black community was to take responsibility for the education of black children. That was the motivation for Urban League of Township, Illinois to find a coordinator to develop, implement, and operate a program like STARS:

> We didn't have any money, so all of the materials were donated and most of the workers were volunteer tutors. So the other portion of my time was spent doing the volunteer recruitment and volunteer administration, training the tutors. We didn't have any people in education who were considered educators involved in all of that. We had to figure out "Ok, how do we figure out what these kids need? Where their weaknesses are?" We came up with our own instruments for testing their reading and math skills, and they were mostly things that I had purchased from Pyramid Paper Company that were materials for teachers to use. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

Even though newspaper reports indicated that black students in Township School Districts were at risk academically, the district's support of the STARS program was limited to providing space and identifying students that needed academic support. An article of 1988 in the local newspaper implied that the school districts were in a cooperative relationship with the Urban League on an after-school program. However, during the interview with Karen Johnson, the Urban League's former program developer, it was clear that she felt that they were advocating on behalf of the children attending the STARS program, due to the perception that some teachers had regarding the students ability to learn. Karen implied that some teachers were not thorough, and often didn't fill out their portion of the application form and had a bad attitude about the children:

> I didn't know that at the time that the children that we were getting mostly in the BEST Program were children who the teachers in the schools had, in a sense, already

> set aside and it was like, "Well, if you can help them, fine," whatever. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

Building administrator support was fragmented. Dan Anderson, a principal at Township Public Schools, although a supporter of the STARS program, still had his reservations:

> I remember some of the initial conversations about the STARS program were with it being completely a volunteer program, and it was at a time where we were finding it tough to get volunteers, period, in the school and I thought it was a nice idea, it seemed to be a needed component, a needed addition for the school, but I didn't--I guess I left with some hesitation about it. Just knowing to get something worthwhile going, completely with volunteers, without really a site coordinator going for it, I had my doubts about how far it would go. (Dan Anderson, Township School Principal, personal communication, October 12, 1998)

Instances such as those and the minimal amount of funding irritated the Urban League because the need for resources to operate the program weighed on the League and they felt the districts were not vested enough.

Funding

The Urban League of Township provided the initial start up funding for the STARS program. The League as pilot funding allotted $25,000 dollars. National Urban League provided no support for the program, and Karen Johnson (Urban League Program Developer) stated that this caused some friction between the National Urban League and the Urban League of Township about the mandate: "Often my boss would say 'you can't mandate something if you don't give up any money; you can strongly encourage but you can't mandate it'" (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999).

Karen Johnson mentioned that the majority of the $25,000 dollars went towards her full-time salary, which amounted to $22,000 dollars. This did not leave a lot of dollars for instructional resources. The program developer also indicated that the Regional Office of Education provided $500.00 dollars as one-time seed money to support the initiative.

Summary of roles and issues in Phase I. Around the latter part of 1989, the League began to struggle with the continuation of the National Urban League Inc.'s mandate because the resources to maintain their service to the community was ending in 1990. Although there was volunteer support from students at Gilpin State University, Township high schools, parents, and concerned citizens, it was not enough to maintain the operational cost of the program. Program and Assistant Program Coordinator wages and program supplies were continual costs. When the funding expired, the Urban League of Township, Illinois had on its Board of Directors an Assistant Dean of the College of Education at Gilpin State University; Dr. Henry.

A Gilpin State University professor and administrator wrote a proposal to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education to receive a grant that would revive the STARS program, but with additional resources from Gilpin State University and Land Community College. It was during this period that the Urban League would embark on a new era of after-school educational programming that linked two higher education organizations and two public school districts, with a social service organizations in a collaborative education project, STARS. In the next section, Dr. Henry's reflective experience in Phase II includes how Gilpin State University became involved in the program and what role and resources the

university brought to the STARS program (Figure 3 on p. 51 provides a schematic for final roles and resources allocated during Phase I.)

Phase II: 1991 to 1993

A "Township Public School District Application For Use of School Property" document indicated that the STARS program was implemented in both Township School Districts on April 4, 1988 (the program developer was hired in the fall of 1987). Each district had one elementary school serving as host. The document further indicated that the program was designed to serve 60 kindergarten through third-grade students, 30 students per district. There were also 12 adult volunteers per district assigned to the sites. The program operated through the fall of 1989 which, by that time, the pilot funding had ended and the Urban League had to discontinue the program's operation.

An Official Higher Education Presence in a Local Problem

In 1990, Dr. Henry (the chairman of the Urban League's Board and Associate Dean from the College of Education) submitted a proposal to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education under the "Minority Educational Achievement Cooperation Project," a component of the Higher Education Cooperation Act (sometimes referred to as HECA) (ISBE 1991,). Gilpin State's College of Education and Land Community College (an Illinois Community College) had not been officially involved in the STARS program until Dr. Henry's proposal

got approved and brought both organizations together to collaborate with Township Public Schools and the Urban League (see Figure 4).

Stakeholders			
Phase	**Organization**	**Representative**	**Position**
Phase I	Urban League of Township, Illinois	Karen Johnson	Program developer
	Township School District 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Educational Activist, Inc.	Hayward Jackson	Educational Activist
Phase II	**Urban League of Township, Illinois**	**Karen Johnson**	**Program developer**
	Township School District 111	**Dan Anderson**	**Washington School Principal**
	Land Community College	**Dr. Lisa Thomas**	**President**
	Gilpin State University	**Dr. Henry**	**Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair**
Phase III	Urban League of Township, Illinois	Mark Todd	President/CEO
	Educational Activist, Inc.	Hayward Jackson	Community Educational Advocate
	Township School District 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Grayson	Dean, Gilpin State University and College of Education
	Urban League of Township Illinois	William Patterson *	Director of Education And Youth Development
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Henry	Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair

Figure 4. Active stakeholders (in bold) during Phase II. Note. The asterisk represents the researcher.

According to Dr. Henry's proposal, the collaborative was set up to attack three problem areas of American education--the uncertain future of many minority children in school, the dwindling number of certified minority teachers, and the inexperience and insensitivity of many white teachers in dealing with minority children. During his interview, Dr. Henry suggested that his research implied that supplemental tutorial support was one of

many components needed to address the academic needs of at-risk African-American K-3 students. Furthermore, he felt that Caucasian students needed exposure to the learning barriers of at-risk African-American students early in their teacher education training if they wanted to be effective teachers with that particular population of students. He also implied that more minority high school and undergraduate students needed to be involved in teacher education and that the STARS program could meet many of the objectives mentioned:

> I first became aware of the STARS program the first year I was on the Urban League Board. I'm not sure of the date of that now but it must have been about '85 or '86 (it was 1987). So far as I know, the instigator of the STARS program originally was Karen Johnson, the program coordinator. She had a program in place but it was strapped for money and didn't have much prospect of continuing. Yet the United Way had expressed a lot of interest in that as an Urban League program. About the same time I was acting as Associate Dean we were aware of the HECA initiatives and that there was money available from the State for cooperative programs. So we prepared a proposal that would do three things really: (a) it would try to help kids in Township who needed the additional help with school, (b) it would help our predominantly White students in teacher education programs in their first experience with minority kids and low income kids as part of their teacher education program early on, and (c) it would try to prepare a larger core of minority teachers by drawing students from Township high schools into the program as tutors and assistants and get them interested in education even before they set foot in a university. So those were the three parts of the program. We needed, because the HECA grant called for cooperation between institutions of higher education, we needed another institution of higher education, so we went to Land and they were interested in helping with it. They didn't have a major role; they were in transition at that point, too, between presidents. But the Acting President signed off on it that we work with some of their people and their portion of it would be in large part working with the students from Township high schools in that program. (Dr. Henry, Gilpin State University, personal communication, October 6, 1998)

The National Urban League Inc.'s policy mandate, the Education Initiative, was developed with advocacy being the implementation mission. However, when the Urban League of Township, Illinois attempted to meet the objectives of the mandate, it was able to deliver a service to the community as suggested by the policy mandate, but it was not able to

sustain the initiative due to the funding a depletion of operational funds. When Gilpin State University's College of Education revived the STARS program, it no longer had a singular mission. It was operating based on the objectives of the College of Education, which had become the administrative agent of the program due to Dr. Henry receiving funding for the program from the Illinois State Board of Higher Education. The policy shift of the STARS program being a program operated solely by a community-based social service agency to one that was supported through the Higher Education Cooperation Act (ISBE, 1991) shifted the roles of the stakeholders involved in the program.

Roles

The approved HECA grant provided funding to support each stakeholder's role in the program. The proposal stated:

> The STARS program is a collaborative effort undertaken by two higher education institutions. two high school districts. and an interracial community agency to create a better opportunity for children of any color or social origin to succeed in school.
>
> Objectives:
> 1. To improve the academic chances of at risk minority children in kindergarten through third-grade through an intensive after-school-tutoring program.
> 2. To interest talented minority students in local high schools and at Land Community College in elementary teacher education programs at Gilpin State University by first enlisting them as tutors in our program.
> 3. To improve the skill and sensitivity of all Gilpin State University elementary teacher candidates. irrespective of ethnicity. in working with minority pupils by requiring a tutoring experience as part of their pre-service teacher education program.
> 4. To explore linkages between Land Community College and Gilpin State University for the purpose of recruiting more minority students into our teacher education programs.

5. To develop and test instructional strategies and curriculum materials specifically designed to enhance the learning of at risk elementary school children. (Illinois State Board of Higher Education, 1992)

Land Community College and Township Public Schools were responsible recruiting STARS scholars. Land had the charge of identifying six academically able minority students who were seniors at the college, and had a strong aptitude for teaching. The Land faculty made the recommendations. In the program they recognized as the Land STARS Scholars. Land Community College had a significant number of minority students enrolled in their education program, and the president of Land, Dr. Lisa Thomas, spoke proudly of that accomplishment during her interview. She valued the component of the STARS project that expanded the educational training of their teacher education students by collaborating with Gilpin State University:

> We became involved in the STARS program because of two reasons: (1) my relationship with the Urban League, and (2) because we do have a two-year degree program that assists students in becoming teachers. So, it's not just the academic part of their careers that we provide but we saw the STARS program as providing the laboratory for freshman and sophomore students who are going to go into teaching, to give them a real work experience that would help them to decide early on either to remain in teaching or to give them some idea that "This is really not what I want to do." But for the most part the students in our program are adults and pretty much committed to the teaching profession. So, that was the way we got involved--because of my relationship with the Urban League and also because we do the first years of preparing students who want to go into the field of teaching. (Dr. Thomas, Land Community College President, personal communication, February 1, 1999)

The Township School Districts were required to comply in a similar manner by having the three-area high school Principals, with consultation from teachers, identify six minority juniors to be designated as STARS scholars during their senior year in high school. The selection criteria was based on academic record, teacher recommendation, and aptitude for teaching as a profession.

In a subcontract between Gilpin State University and Urban League, the Urban League's role was to identify and recruit pupils, involve parents, communicate regularly with public schools and classroom teachers about the program, assume public relations about STARS, arrange presentations by community members. The League was also responsible for planning and carrying out the program evaluation regarding client satisfaction and public school personnel (HECA Minority Educational Achievement Cooperation Project Proposal, 1992).

Gilpin State's role was to link their Education Psychology 236, Child Development course, to the program. The teacher education students would conduct 24 clock hours of their field experience over three weeks at one of the STARS program sites. Their grade would be based on their professor's assessment of their journal entry that documented assessment of skills, design and implementation of instructional methods amongst other criteria. Also because the HECA grant required that an institution of higher education be the administrator of projects funded by them. Gilpin State University assumed the Urban League's former role of program manager and administrator. By 1991, STARS had changed from being a program developed and managed by a community-based organization to a program that was administrated by a research based state university. That shift was a significant turning point in the roles of the stakeholders involved in the STARS program.

Summary of roles. With the implementation of HECA funding into the STARS program, the Urban League was able to revive the program by having additional stakeholder involvement. By assuming the role as program administrator and curriculum and instruction developer, Gilpin State University was able to leverage additional support from Land

Community College and Township Public Schools in the areas of tutoring and program support. Land Community College and Township Public Schools also had the responsibility of meeting the objectives of the grant that called for the recruitment of more minority students in Gilpin State's teacher education program. A total of 12 students between Land and the Township Public Schools were recruited as tutors for the program the first year Gilpin was officially involved. This was something that the Urban League had been unable to do on its own. The Urban League's charge was the coordination of the various activities between the school districts and the community as it related to the STARS program.

Resources

Gilpin State's presence expanded the STARS program. The Higher Education Cooperation Act Proposal (ISBE, 1992) funding provided resources that the program needed, such as additional tutorial support, funds to support instructional development and transportation for the k-3 students who needed a ride to and from the program. STARS was designed to serve 30 students in each of the two public school sites. However, the approval of HECA funding increased the number of students the program served to 132 (60 Gilpin State undergraduates, 6 Land students, and 60 elementary and 6 high school students from Township Public Schools) (HECA, 1992). The HECA funded proposal not only revived the program, it also increased the financial resources that Gilpin State University used to support their administration of the program. Funding increased from $25,500 dollars in 1990 to $77,500 in 1991 and $100,000 dollars in 1992. When Gilpin State University got involved in

the program, they provide the Urban League with the credibility it needed to leverage additional funding from United Way ($12,000 dollars), Kraft Foods Inc. ($5,000 dollars), Township Regional Planning Commission ($10,000 dollars), and Township Public Schools ($2,200 dollars). In fiscal 1993, the Higher Education Cooperation Act Fiscal Year Grant Allocations Report (ISBE, 1993) indicated that the Illinois State Board of Higher Education only approved $24,000 dollars of HECA monies to the STARS program.

Summary of resources. When Gilpin State University became the administrator of the STARS program monetary support increased more than four times the original amount that was used to begin the program. This assisted in the revival of the program with more resources for program coordination, additional tutors, site coordinators, assistant site coordinators, curriculum and instruction developers, and transportation. Similarly, the other community based organizations such as corporations, government offices, and the public schools showed their support for the effort with monetary contributions.

Issues

Evaluation report. In an evaluation report attached to a continuation grant submitted to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education by Gilpin State University's College of Education. Documentation on the first year (1991) indicated that Gilpin State, Land, Urban League and Township Public Schools collaborated on the STARS program. The first semester of year one was devoted to recruiting staff and selecting tutors from Land and the Township high schools. The Gilpin State tutors were part of the Education Psychology 236

course, so it was part of their curriculum. During the second semester, site coordinators were hired, while three GSU professors planned curriculum and instruction. Orientations were held for the tutors by the Urban League and Land program coordinators, and the two site coordinators. In terms of K-3 student development, the evaluation report implied that the program had only been meeting with students for two months, so no conclusion could be reached to whether students made academic gains. However, the report did indicate that the attendance rate at the sites had reached over 80% (HECA Minority Educational Achievement Project Proposal, 1991).

The evaluation further implied that some of the Gilpin State tutors felt that program was a bit more challenging than they had expected, so they need more time for consultation with the site coordinator about instructional strategies. The Township public school tutors had yet to be evaluated. However, six Land students had exercised their option to apply for admission into a teacher education program at Gilpin State University, while three of the five Township high school students applied to teacher programs at Gilpin State University. In a concluding statement, the evaluation suggested that "ten of the twelve STARS scholarships had been filled with qualified minority candidates who appear to be admissable to the Gilpin State University College of Education" (HECA Minority Educational Achievement Project Proposal, 1991, n.p.).

Land Community College concerns. During her interview, Dr. Thomas, Land Community College President, suggested that the staff at Land began expressing in 1992 their concern about how Gilpin State was administering the STARS project and later on disengaged from the project. She indicated that they felt Gilpin State's College of Education

was not committed to the goals of the HECA grant, particularly as it related to improving the academic achievement of the K-3 students:

> I thought there was a lack of commitment to really get those students up to par, up to reading level or whatever and I saw it as a babysitting service and our people did not want to be involved. And even after we met with the University, they still did not have the commitment we thought they should have. (Dr. Thomas, Land Community College, personal communication, February 1, 1999)

The evaluation further suggested that professors from the college had developed curriculum, but because of the demonstrated need of the elementary school students, the tutors indicated that they needed more direction to tutor them effectively. Dr. Thomas's concerns did not stop with Gilpin State.

Dr. Thomas suggested that the Urban League did not have the knowledge to address the academic needs of the children through that sort of collaborative effort:

> The Urban League didn't have the staff nor the knowledge. They did not have the support staff to provide the kind of collaborative effort needed to make this whole thing work. And so my thinking was that since we were a collaborator; in the (HECA) grant, normally the University initiated all of them and Land would sign off. When I came, my thinking was that equal partnership means that you sit down and talk about it and you design the goals collaboratively, and the University doesn't decide singularly that this is what we're going to do. And that was what I attempted to do, but I was not effective, so we pulled out. (Dr. Lisa Thomas, Land Community College, personal communication, February 1, 1999)

The Land staff felt that the project was not a partnership and that Gilpin State University was the authority. According to Dr. Henry, a major issue between Land and Gilpin State's College of Education was the fact that Land students were not gaining admission to Gilpin State University. The proposal submitted by Dr. Henry suggested that the Land and Township high school students that tutored in the STARS program would be guaranteed admission to Gilpin State University, paid an hourly wage, and receive a tuition

and fee waiver comparable to the number of semesters they provided instruction (HECA Proposal, 1992; Illinois State Board of Higher Education, 1974). Dr. Henry states:

> There was a problem that came up, too, because we did in our proposal promise them (Land and High School students) a tuition and fee waiver and didn't quite promise them admission but made it clear they would get preference for admission if they worked in the STARS program and indicated interest in teacher education. The Office of Admissions and Records was quite adamant after the first semester that we could not make that kind of promise. They had to make the final decisions as to who would be admitted. We also had difficulty paying tuition, securing the money to provide the tuition and fee waivers, although in that respect, we were two or three years down the line in funding--I guess in the third year of funding this thing, whether we were short of money for assistantships and for our students and tuition and fee waivers for minority kids coming in the teacher education program. So, the Provost just heard about it and said, "Here's the money for it." So that came directly from higher administration to the college and gave us very clear indication of his support for the program. (Dr. Henry, Gilpin State University, personal communication, October 6, 1998)

Because the College of Education was unable to fulfill its full obligation to Land Community College and Township high school students, Land decided to disengage from the project.

Urban League concerns. Karen Johnson, Program Developer for the Urban League, suggested that even though one of the objectives of the HECA grant called for Caucasian students to gain experience in working with academically distressed African-American children, Urban League's role was limited once Gilpin State became involved. She insinuated that Gilpin State's College of Education faculty exerted an authority over the STARS curriculum and instruction development, and that it created animosity between the two organizations. Moreover, she also exclaimed that she felt that the Urban League's experience in working with children from at-risk environments could have helped ready Caucasian Gilipin State students for some of the cultural issues that ultimately impeded their tutorial sessions:

> I had the idea that, and of course this was just me thinking we were all thinking that, I had the idea that they [Gilpin State University faculty] wanted to come and see how to do it, how to deal with these children as they developed, and to realize that no child is hopeless at that age, at that point. You just need to know how to work them. So here is a group of people who are making it work, so you all come and see if you want to be good teachers--look, listen, and learn. That's what I really thought would happen with that when the Gilpin State University got involved. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

Summary of issues. The Urban League struggled with the College of Education implementing their resources, particularly in the area of curriculum and instruction. The former staff of the League implied that they felt the league was slighted from the process because they were accustomed to deciding what and how the K-3 African-American students learned in the program. But when the College of Education became involved, they lost control of the program. The League thought that it was great getting the additional resources from the College of Education. However, they were not pleased about losing control of the program:

> I don't think the Urban League should ever have given up that authority because somebody has to keep a hand or thumb on the thought of "Is this program still serving the needs of the people we said we were going to serve?" And when that is not happening and something needs to be tweaked here or dusted here, somebody has to make the calls and say "I know this seems like good, but from now on you're not doing the orientation anymore, period. (Karen Johnson, Urban League Program Developer, personal communication, February 12, 1999)

This was an ironic twist, because it was the Urban League staff that suggested that the League staff had no knowledge in curriculum and instruction development and Gilpin State's College of Education would provide the program with the expertise that was needed to develop the innovative instructional tools.

In terms of Land Community College, the limited readiness of Gilpin tutors and nonadmission of eligible Land and Township high school tutors into a Gilpin State

University teacher education program were issues that fractured the collaborative relationship between Land Community College and the College of Education on the STARS project. Dr. Thomas reflects:

> I recall a period when those students from Gilpin State University, and I talked to the College of Education Dean about it based on what my staff person told me Gilpin State students were not prepared to enter the program. They had no courses in education. I believe they were freshmen and sophomores and they were just placed over there. The kids were pulling their hair, on the tables. It was like a jungle. And because these White students had no expectations of these, many of whom were Black, kids, it was just total chaos. One of the things I said to Mildred is we ought to wait until these students are in teacher education and have taken some courses before we assign them to those students. So, to me it was a babysitting service but it was worse than that. You had a group of--I don't know if there were any minority students from Gilpin State University--a group of White students who had no expectations because they were very permissive and they let kids do whatever the heck they wanted to do. So we tried a couple of people with that program and our people just pulled out and said we didn't want to be involved, and our meeting with Gilpin State University was rather defensive. (Dr. Thomas, Land Community College, personal communication, February 1, 1999)

Moreover, Land Community College suggested that they were not satisfied with Urban Leagues' limited knowledge, ability, and influence for maintaining the collaborative project. Ultimately, these were the issues that pushed Land Community College to the point that they removed themselves from the project (see Figure 5). This in turn killed the HECA funding.

According to an Illinois State Board of Higher Education representative, the project had funding for three years from the State, but in fiscal 1994 their request was denied due to the tuition problems between Land Community and Gilpin State's College of Education:

> We did fund it in FY 91, in FY 92 we gave $100,000, in FY 93 we gave $24,000, so we must have had real difficulties someplace. But in FY 94 they applied and they asked for $133,391 and it was not funded because of the tuition situation. Land did not participate in the program and we didn't fund it. (Illinois State Board of Higher Education, personal communication, February 3, 1999)

	URBAN LEAGUE SOCIAL SERVICE ORG.	TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIST. 111 & 112	GILPIN STATE UNIVERSITY	LAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Stakeholder Relationship	Primary	Primary	Primary	Primary
Role	Program Coordination	Program Support	Program Administration	Program Instruction
Resources	- tutors - snacks - student recruitment - site coordination - tutor orientation	- facility usage - student identification - teacher referral	- volunteers - tutors - fiscal - curriculum and instruction development	- tutors
Financial Contribution	$29,200	$2,200	$201,500	No funding

Figure 5. Phase II demonstrates official higher education involvement with specified roles and increased resources for all stakeholders.

Phase III: Reestablishing a Home Base

Life After the Gilpin State University Project

> At that time, we really did not have an Education Department. We had just was one program that we were operating as an after-school supportive program for low-income and minority students. That was the total extent of our program at the time. It became very obvious very quickly that that was not sufficient if we were going to be able to truly assist in the educational process for low income and minority kids. The program itself was far from what I would want the Urban League to be involved in. I think my initial perception of the program was that it wasn't capable, as it was set up, of going into enough detail and enough depth to make a difference in the kids' lives. (Mark Todd, Urban League President, personal communication, December 11, 1998)

In 1994, the Urban League of Township, Illinois began an organizational restructure that brought new leadership to the top of the organization. During this period, the former executive director retired and a new president/CEO was hired, Mark Todd. Mr. Todd immediately began questioning the viability of various programs within the organization.

STARS was one of them. The quoted statement above reflects the perception he had of the program. As the director of the newly formed Department of Education and Youth Development, it was my charge to manage, develop, and implement program within the department. Informally, I began assessing the STARS program through meetings with teachers, parents, and school administrators to learn who the stakeholders were. Figure 6 reflects that discovery.

Stakeholders			
Phase	**Organization**	**Representative**	**Position**
Phase I	Urban League of Township Illinois	Karen Johnson	Program developer
	Township School District 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Educational Activist, Inc.	Hayward Jackson	Educational Activist
Phase II	Urban League of Township Illinois	Karen Johnson	Program developer
	Township School District 111	Dan Anderson	Washington School Principal
	Land Community College	Dr. Lisa Thomas	President
	Gilpin State University	Dr. Henry	Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair
Phase III	**Urban League of Township Illinois**	**Mark Todd**	**President/CEO**
	Educational Activist, Inc.	**Hayward Jackson**	**Community Educational Advocate**
	Township School District 111	**Dan Anderson**	**Washington School Principal**
	Gilpin State University	**Dr. Grayson**	**Dean, Gilpin State University College of Education**
	Urban League of Township Illinois	**William Patterson***	**Director of Education Youth Development**
	Gilpin State University	**Dr. Henry**	**Associate Dean and Urban League Board Chair**

Figure 6. Active stakeholders (in bold) involved in Phase III. (The asterisk indicates the researcher).

Some of the stakeholders were organizations that had been involved in the STARS program from its inception, while others came on board during Gilpin State College of Education's HECA project. In spite of the fact that the STARS program lost the HECA funding, the College of Education remained officially involved for another year by allocating a portion of its own budget to maintain the program with the same resources that were supported with the HECA grant.

Roles

My orientation to the STARS program began with site visits to the two-host school sites within Township Districts 111 and 112. The Urban League was still responsible as in Phase II for coordinating the program and Gilpin State University's College of Education remained the program administrator. However, that changed when the new CEO of the Urban League began expressing his concern about the STARS program and wanted more accountability for how the program was benefiting the K-3 African-American student's academic performance. Focus group discussions were held with the Township Administrators and the College of Education faculty responsible for the implementing the college's resources into the program during the summer of 1995. Community educational activists also participated.

The Urban League as a body did two things: (a) expressed their disdain about the current operational structure of the program; and (b) learned whether the participating stakeholders, which included representatives from Township Public Schools and Gilpin State

University's College of Education, were committed or continued to be interested in improving the academic performance of the students participating in the program. The representatives from Gilpin agreed to get the Urban League more involved in the administrative and instructional decisions. It was an effort to improve how the program helped the students participating in the program by giving them a larger role in the orientation process, but also by including them in the site coordination development meetings between the graduate students and faculty. However, before any changes could occur, Gilpin State University's College of Education came under new leadership.

Dr. Grayson, the new Dean of the college and part of the original faculty group that helped coordinate the college's involvement in STARS, explained that it was not the college's role to assume any responsibility for the improvement of the K-3 students' academic performance. Dr. Grayson was concerned that the Urban League's effort would begin assessing student performance, and she did not believe the tutors were prepared for that type of responsibility. She reflected:

> One of the things that we had agreed to do over the time we worked with the school systems was not to in any way assume that any academic growth could be directly attributed to STARS. So there were these kinds of things that measured students to see what kind of contributions STARS was making and that was putting us in a position where we were really competing with the schools to get credit for any change that had taken place, and that was really a violation to the principle that we had set out to uphold. We were going to cooperate, to collaborate, to get input from teachers about what the children needed and try to individualize this to the best extent possible. (Dr. Grayson, Dean, College of Education, personal communication, February 11, 1999)

Dr. Grayson expressed that she did not agree with the new direction of the program and that the College of Education was operating in a financial deficit and, therefore, would be unable to continue funding the STARS program minus HECA funding:

> It was external funding that really engaged the University and it was the absence of external funding to support the cost of those things that caused the University to withdraw. That as well as that ours was a tutorial program and there was some interest on the part of the Urban League in expanding that to take on a greater role. (Dr. Grayson, Dean, College of Education, personal communication, February 11, 1999)

The Urban League was not immediately impacted by the discontinuation of the HECA funding because the college maintained the program through fiscal 1994. Tutors, site coordinators, transportation, curriculum and instruction tools, and program supplies immediately became the responsibility of the Urban League and they did not have the capacity to support the cost of a program that had grown beyond its original size of two sites over the years due to the expansion during the official higher education involvement. The League began to look to the remaining stakeholder, namely, Township Public Schools.

Resources

Figure 7 provides an approximate summation of resources that were allocated, such as funding, tutors, facilities, and volunteers. The figure also reflects the number of times various school sites were served during the three phases.

Summary of roles and resources. The transition from being a Gilpin State College of Education program that had a multitude of resources to one that had a questionable future, caused the Urban League some discomfort in the community. I look back at the circumstance humorously and associate the project with a Cinderella storyline. The College of Education was this fairy godmother who had the ability to grant several wishes and it did,

Program Summation				
Category	Phase I 1987-1990	Phase II 1990-1993	Phase III 1993-1998	Total
Number of sites	2	2	4	8
Students served	150	180	390	730
Number of schools served	12	12	12	36
Gilpin State tutors	Volunteers	180	120	300
Land tutors	none	12	none	12
Township High School tutors	none	12	8	17
Volunteers	12	N/A	N/A	12
Funding	$25,500	$252,700	$255,800	$534,000

Figure 7. Scope of the resources, school sites, and students that were impacted by the STARS program.

for a time. Gilpin State's College of Education--the fairy godmother--had provided the funding for transportation, site coordinator and assistant site coordinators, tutors to provide instruction, and some funding to the Urban League organization after HECA. Then the Urban League organization forgot that the clock struck 12, and the HECA funding ran out before the STARS program could make it back home.

The Urban League began to reexamine the role of the STARS program and its ability to address the educational deficits of black students in Township Public Schools. The League came to the conclusion that it did not have the capacity to operate a program such as STARS for that purpose because the operational needs of the program required a continuous funding stream that the Urban League did not possess. The League then looked to the Township Public School Districts to contribute more resources such as funding for site coordinators. The League took that stand because they believed that ultimately it was the

public school's responsibility to provide a quality public school education to all of its citizens, particularly black students because the districts were performing poorly in educating black students.

The districts did not immediately respond well to the pressure the Urban League was placing on them to provide additional resources to the STARS program; in fact, because the Districts were responding so slowly, the Urban League came close to discontinuing the program. However, when several community activists and parents heard about that plan, the League continued operating STARS, but in a reduced manner. There was a cap on the number of students served. Since there was no paid tutorial support, the League reverted back to volunteers. This, again, caused concern with Dan Anderson, principal of Washington School in Township District 111. Dan reflects:

> When we started again talking about the volunteer program again, I guess--from how I've seen those operate--again, I was hesitant and worried about the longevity of the program. Working with you and working with other people in our district and people from Township, I think the desire and the need for it were definitely still there. It was a matter of coming up with the people to do it. I think with either the school district or through the Title I program. (Dan Anderson, Principal, Township Public Schools, personal communication, October 11, 1998)

Gaining support from the school districts was no easy task. I was of the firm belief that the school districts had dollars to support the program but needed to make STARS a priority in the school district. Hayward Jackson (Educational Activist, personal communication, 1998) pointed out earlier that the school districts' own records indicated that the achievement levels of African-American children clearly revealed that the schools had a tremendous responsibility that they were not willing to carry out, and the Urban League provided them a way to shirk that responsibility.

Issues

Race, commitment, and community perception. During the fall of 1995, the STARS program was unable to operate due to the funding cut by Gilpin State University's College of Education. Because of that, the league came under heavy pressure from several community activists to continue operating the program. The Urban League decided to re-institute the program but with scaled-back resources. Student attendance per site went from 25-30 per site to 8-10 per site, and from 5 to 3 days of operation per week. Parents were still calling the League for the program, but transportation, program size, and days of operation were the items that were scaled back. There was an attempt by the League to get transportation and tutorial support from various church groups in the community, but was denied. The perception in the community was that Gilpin State University could have pulled together the necessary resources to continue operating the STARS program at the same capacity. However, what the activists in the community did not know was that the college's involvement in the program was designed to be short lived.

Hayward Jackson suggested during his interview that because there was a concerted effort by African-American faculty at the college not to support the Urban League's efforts, black students in the Township community became the victims:

> What you had, here again, you had a Black woman who became the Dean of Education who rejected the premise in which the University came to the STARS Program with. And that is that it had a moral as well as a political responsibility to deliver some kind of services to the Black community. As a Black person, she rejected that. She said that "This program doesn't fit in with the College of Education's budget and I will no longer try to find the funds that you need to pay for it, so we will simply reject it." It was sad for several reasons. Sad because it was Black folks who made that decision and other White beings that were faced also with

> a deficit budget did not make that decision. And it was sad that she felt, as a Black woman, that she had the moral authority to do that. And it was also sad that the College of Education did not reject that premise and did not devise within its own capacity to operate, the ability to continue to deliver their services to these children. So, in my opinion, it was a continuing or a growing continuum of local Black GSU administrators who have come to the school in the past 25 years who were not a part of the 60s struggle and the effort by the Black community to forge a partnership, who have made internal decisions within their capacity as administrators with the University to create walls and barriers between the campus and the Black community. And if you would go back and look at what the partnerships were in the early 60s and what the partnerships are now, it's a difference like night and day. And ironically, these Black men who are making these decisions and have made these decisions are all members or have been members of the Urban League Board of Directors. (Hayward Jackson, Educational Activist, personal communication, February 11, 1999)

After the college's pull-out, the Urban League approached the Township Public School Districts to increase their support of the program. The argument was that, ultimately, it was the public schools' responsibility to educate the citizens of the State. Moreover, the STARS program existed because the Township School Districts were not providing African-American students with a quality public school education. Hayward Jackson believed that the Township School Districts, Land Community College, and Gilpin State University were not committed to the Urban League's role as a conduit for educational change in the African-American community:

> It was cloak and dagger that the Superintendents of the Township schools played with the Urban League in relationship to the STARS program. Now I'm going to tell you why I say that. Both school superintendents and indeed the President of Land Community College and Dr. Henry, a senior member of the faculty of the College of Education at Gilpin State University, could have brought billions of dollars to the table to tackle problems of deficit learning children, and the Urban League could have been the conduit of that which would have given the graduate school component the resources. The superintendents only gave buildings--they never gave any money, never went out and got any money, never went out and got joint programs that the Urban League could have tackled. (Hayward Jackson, Educational Activist, personal communication, February 11, 1999)

Even though the College of Education had supported the STARS project a year after the HECA funding was discontinued, the stigma of insensitivity remained a suspecting characteristic of the College of Education by some members of the African-American community in Township, Illinois.

Although the Township School Districts were not receptive to the idea of funding the STARS program, the Urban League kept the issue on the front of their agenda. Hayward Jackson mentioned that a former Urban League executive director did a disservice to the organization by placing officials from Gilpin State University, Land Community College, and Township on the executive board. His belief was that these organizations were not going to cause or allow harm to come to their own organization by the Urban League. Moreover, the League would never have been in a position to truly advocate for African-American children as long as these individuals were governing the activities of the Urban League.

In 1996, a senior vice chancellor of Gilpin State University, Dr. Tim Calhoun, joined the Urban League Board. It was during his tenure that the Urban League once again received help from the university on a macro-university level. The vice chancellor provided funding to the League to reinstate transportation for the program to serve more students. Even though African-American churches had not stepped up to support the program without the lure of funding, the Urban League contracted with two different church groups to transport the students to the host sites and then home after the program. The Urban League's goal was to use the arrangement to raise the consciousness of the churches as it related to their role in helping address the academic condition of K-3 children in the African-American community.

Township public schools concerns. By 1997, the STARS program had become primarily a community-based, supported program. For example, continued dialogues with the Township Public School Districts linked the Urban League with other community-based groups, particularly churches that were interested in supporting the STARS program. Several interreligious organizations provided funding as well as volunteer tutors for the program. Both Township School Districts continued to provide facility usage. However, Township School District 112 increased its support by expanding its support from $1,500 to $8,400 dollars annually for STARS. The Urban League was to utilize the funding for a site coordinator and supplies for the program within their district. The Urban League was responsible for recruiting the candidates, and jointly, the League and principals who were hosting the STARS program in Township School District 112 would conduct the final interview and collectively decide the appropriate candidate for the site coordinator position in that principals' building. Township School District 111 used Title I funding from each building hosting the STARS program to support the program.

Again, because the Gilpin State University project had previously expanded the operational capacity of the STARS program, the Township School Districts and the Urban League funding constraints called for the program to operate as a site-based program. Originally, STARS was a program whose participating students were selected district-wide. The tutor support remained very limited, with some coming from church organizations and a few parents were involved. The program was largely back to its original structure prior to the College of Education; however, the United Way provided $12,000 for STARS to operate while Kraft Foods, Inc., provided $5,000.00 (Urban League Budget Report, 1994-1995).

Stan Barker, Superintendent of Township Public School District 111 and a member of the Urban League's Board, explained that in discussions with administrators in Township School District 112, there was some concern about the STARS program. Dr. Barker reflects:

> I do remember in the STARS program early on that the districts were more leery about investing additional dollars because they weren't seeing in their mind, if I remember all of this correctly, the kind of assessment evaluation progress that warranted them continuing. We felt that there was progress. We felt that we wanted to continue to fund and to be a part of it. And so we were trying to do that in whichever way, through grants, through reading-improvement monies, whatever from the state or how else we could get it. There were some real rocky times there and we had to make a continued commitment to staying in. (Stan Barker, Superintendent, Township District 112, personal communication, January 28, 1999)

Dr. Barker further explained that the support for the program would need to come at the building level due to the decentralized management plan under which the school district operated. Therefore, I began dialoging with principals such as Dr. Dan Anderson, who had been a supporter of the program over the years. The Urban League and several building principals decided that the STARS program would continue to operate three days per week instead of five. Township School District 111 expanded the program to operate from one site to three sites within its district. Each site was identified as having a number of at-risk African-American students.

Dan Anderson, became quite disenchanted when administrators at Township District 111 cut his building's Title I funding and used it to support STAR program sites at buildings where there was a larger percentage of at-risk students:

> I was kind of taken aback last year, to tell you the truth, even though we've been fairly steadily funded in Title I over the years, and this was a pretty recent addition to our Title I funding, to have it knocked out for a semester. It had never been knocked out. We were the initial school that had it and it had never been knocked out in five or six years, however many years it had been actually been going, and all of a sudden we're told "you can't have it" "maybe later" and they finally did pull through in

> January to re-fund it. That was a big loss and kind of a surprise. I think, a negative surprise for our staff that that happened. (Dan Anderson, Principal, Township Public Schools, personal communication, October 12, 1998)

Instead of the district finding funds to support the STARS program at one host site within the Township school district. They decided not to operate the program at that particular site, despite the fact that the school was in the heart of the African-American community and students at the school needed the service. Even though the central office did not provide funding for the STARS program one semester, Dan Anderson had a budget allocated to his building which gave him the administrative power to possibly fund the program, but funding was not provided. However, through his own admission, he felt it was more important to support initiatives that operated in the building during the regular school day. Figure 8 shows the roles and resources in the curtailed, community-based STARS program.

Race, organizational conflict, and community perception. Beginning in 1996 the STARS program began operating as a site-based program. Since that time, the Urban League has continued its struggle to work with the Township School Districts in a manner that would help improve the academic performance of African-American students in the schools.

In 1997, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) began conducting an investigation on Township School District 112 to learn if their busing plans were contributing to unequal educational outcomes between black and white students. Hayward Jackson's advocacy group filed a compliant with the federal government regarding the busing plans of the Township School Districts. Hayward's perception was that the STARS program allowed the school districts to suggest that they were partnering with the Urban League to address the problems

	URBAN LEAGUE SOCIAL SERVICE ORG.	TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS DISTS. 111 & 112	GILPIN STATE UNIVERSITY HIGHER EDUCATION LINK	LAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Stakeholder relationship	Primary	Primary	Secondary	None
Role	Program Management	Program Support	Program Support	None
Resources	- tutors - snacks - student recruitment - curriculum development - instruction - site coordination	- facility usage - student identification - teacher referral - funding - site coordinators	- transportation	None
Financial contribution	$19, 200	$8,400	$10,000	No funding

Figure 8. Phase III reflects the STARS program reverting back to Urban League administration but with funding and support from the Township Public Schools. The funding reflects annual allotment.

of African-American student academic underachievement by providing funding that was simply more of a symbolic gesture than a real commitment to change. He further suggested that the League was being positioned to protect a two-tier educational system that hampered the educational development of African-American students.

The Urban League had both Township School District superintendents on its board, and Hayward implied that the Urban League was being placed in a comprising situation that clouded its judgement of no comprise as it related to holding the Township School Districts accountable for the educational condition of African-American children attending its schools:

> Even today, as you know, there are OCR findings against Township Public Schools. There have been civil rights complaints against both school districts, and the Urban League still is not a player. The STARS program is not looked to as a strategy by both school systems to deal with the deficit relationship of African-American households, their children, and the public schools of Township, Illinois. Even though

there's a younger, energetic director, it is still the same old suit where these men, these White men have no intention of radically altering the educational service that they deliver to black people (Hayward Jackson, Educational Activist, personal communication, February 11, 1999)

Chapter Conclusion

In closing Chapter 4, the Urban League, Township Public Schools, Gilpin State University, and Land Community College made an attempt to work collectively towards addressing academic underachievement of African-American K-3 students in Township Public Schools. The case reflected struggles that dealt with roles, resources, and the issues of race, commitment, organizational cultural conflict, and community perception.

Phase I reflected the implementation of a nationally mandated policy by the National Urban League Inc. to instigate change in local public schools to increase African-American student performance. The local Urban League was successful at developing and implementing an after-school program (STARS) to comply with the mandate. However, they had a difficult time securing a "partnership" relationship with the Township Public School Districts. The Urban League was positioned to be "the heavy" in an effort that required an operational capacity that they did not have. The organizational schematic (Figure 3) reflects how a limited support from the school districts, coupled with the National Urban League, Inc.'s failure to provide the economic clout needed to develop and support a national initiative at the local level, crippled the STARS program to the point that it was nonoperative. It may have remained that way had it not been for the involvement of an Urban League board

member who happened to be an Associate Dean of the College of Education at Gilpin State University.

In Phase II, when the Associate Dean/Urban League board member submitted a proposal to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education to fund the STARS project, the Urban League received dollars to support a program that they were no longer controlling. The mission of Gilpin State University's College of Education became the primary focus of a program that was originally set up to serve disenfranchised elementary school students. The STARS program became a lab to expose non-minority teacher education students to the educational struggles and antics of African-American children from at-risk environments, as well as a recruitment tool for more minority students to enter Gilpin State University's teacher education program. Gilpin State made an attempt to include African-American undergraduate students in the process by partnering with Land Community College. Yet, when the limited enrollment of minority students from Land into Gilpin State University and other circumstances strained the relationship between the two partnering higher education organizations, it ultimately led to disengagement of Land Community College. The failed relationship influenced the Illinois State Board of Higher Education to pull the HECA funding from the project.

Although Gilpin State continued funding the project on their own, the organizational schematic for Phase II (see Figure 5) reflects the only period during the STARS program where the primary educational organizations in the Township community were officially involved and working collectively.

The solo funding of the project by the College of Education at Gilpin State University was a short-lived effort because administrative changes at the College of Education and Urban League forced a reexamination of the relationship between the remaining stakeholders in the STARS program. These were the Urban League, Gilpin State University and Township Public Schools. When Gilpin State University's College of Education decided to pull their funding from the STARS program, it was up to the Urban League to attempt to meet the demand of the African-American community to continue operation of the program.

In the findings for Phase III, the Urban League began looking to the community to support the program. The organizational schematic (see Figure 8) reflects a program that was primarily community-supported, with funds coming from the Township School Districts and financial support from Gilpin State University for resources, such as transportation and supplies. The Township school funding came as a direct result of the Urban League's continual urging of the school districts to provide more financial support for the STARS program. This caused some tension between the Urban League and the Township Public School officials, due to the fact that two Urban League board members were superintendents of the Township School Districts. This escalated when the League began inquiring at the State level about specified funding allocated to the school districts and how it was being used within the schools. Eventually, the Township School Districts increased their support of the STARS program by expanding the sites and providing more funding for resources. Even though the districts have expanded their support of the STARS program, the Urban League remained concerned about their willingness to make the systemic changes necessary for improving the educational condition of African-American students attending Township

Public Schools. Still, STARS reflects one case where there was a concerted effort by a diverse, collective community pooling together resources to support an initiative that was designed to improve the academic performance of K-3 African-American students attending Township Public Schools.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This research utilized qualitative case study research methods to (a) examine the relationship between two higher education organizations and an Urban League affiliate that came together in response to a National Urban League, Inc. resolution to improve the educational performance of African-American students in two public school districts; (b) to evaluate the effectiveness of the collaboration using the stakeholders perspectives and other data sources; and (c) to assess the views of social service, public school, university, and community college officials on the potential of this type of collaboration to help improve the academic performance of African-American students in the public schools. Moreover, this study may help us understand what roles each organization should play for effective collaboration to address the needs of low income and minority students in local public school districts. It will also offer guidelines to help education and advocacy organizations such as Urban League affiliates establish collaborative or partnership relationships

Relationship Between National Mandate and Local Organization Capacity

The relationship between the Urban League of Township, Illinois and the other organizations mentioned in the study had considerable potential to address the issue of academic underachievement of black children in the Township schools. However, in part, because of the

structure of the National Urban League Inc. and the manner in which they developed their education advocacy policy (the Education Initiative), the local Urban League was unable to establish itself as an autonomous advocacy agent for at-risk black students attending the Township Public Schools. Limited resources and lack of support from the black community positioned the local Urban League to depend on the local school districts for operational support. Given that sort of financial arrangement, the League was strung along by the school districts and sometimes used as a mask to hide their limited commitment to developing African-American students at risk. If the local Urban League spent more time raising the consciousness of the black community about the educational outcomes of black students in the local public schools, they may have been more successful mobilizing the black community, which, in turn, may have influenced the local school districts to increase the support of the STARS program.

In the resolution on public education, the National Urban League, Inc. was attempting to lead the call for black people to take control of the condition of their children's education. The Urban League of Township, Illinois was not prepared by the national organization on strategies to leverage the resources in the black community to effectively advocate on behalf of the black children attending the Township Public Schools. In a background paper regarding the implementation of the Education Initiative, the National Urban League, Inc. encouraged coalitions among parents, schools, and community groups to facilitate the provision for technical and human resources to ensure responsiveness to student needs in the community (National Urban League Inc., 1987).

If the Education Initiative had been developed within a more consistent organizational structure, National Urban League, Inc. would have recognized that the governance structure of

some of the affiliates did not afford them the ability to implement objectives of the mandate without additional support. The service provision depended largely on the local Urban League's ability to mobilize resources to accomplish the objectives of the policy mandate. The Urban League of Township, Illinois had $25,000 dollars of initial pilot funding that they used to begin the STARS program, but did not have the capacity to maintain the operation of the program.

The National Urban League, Inc. basically used the Education Initiative as a politically correct symbolic gesture to rise above the criticism that they had historically received both internally and externally for not being more pro-active on issues (National Urban League, 1988). They had the wealthy dollar benefactors sitting on their board providing resources to the national organization, but the dollars did not trickle down to the Urban League of Township, Illinois to help maintain the implementation of the STARS program (a program that was developed as a response to the policy mandate of the national office).

Rist (1994) implies that the policy cycle functions at two levels. It begins with a parameter setting where various politicians, special interest groups, and media convene to create the hype necessary for setting the stage for a national agenda. In the case of the National Urban League, Inc., movement, these groups convene annually at the national conference. The appearance of a unified front with politicians, corporate representatives, and affiliates from around the country paint the picture of groups rallying around one common agenda, in this case, the Education Initiative. However, the second level of Rist's perspective identifies the adaptation of policy intentions into policy and programmatic realities. These are two aspects of the policy cycle that plagued the Urban League of Township, Illinois during the initiative. They

did not have the capacity nor the governance structure to effectively implement and maintain the service provision they set up in an attempt to comply with the national mandate.

Blau and Scott (1962) explain that organizations have been traditionally defined as a purposive collection of individuals who exert a collective effort toward some common goals. In theory, this seems clear; however, when it is applied to an organization with a structure of governance that functions both on a macro and micro level, structuring a policy to function in an operative manner at every level within the organization is important. If this does not happen, there will be intra-organizational conflict; that is, conflict at various levels, departments, and positions that will ultimately affect the organization's ability to achieve its desired outcome. For example, from the beginning the Urban League of Township, Illinois had the superintendents of both Township School Districts involved, at least nominally, the national mandate was not completely addressed because the superintendents did very little to encourage their teachers and building principals to participate in the STARS program. Some teachers believed that some of the students could not be helped, while some of the principals believed that the League did not have the ability to develop and operate a quality after-school tutorial program without support from professional educational organizations such as local public schools, universities, and colleges.

Unfortunately, the reality of organizations functioning as intended, on the premise of a collective understanding, does not occur often. In fact, the Urban League of Township, Illinois and its implementation of the National Urban League, Inc., mandate is one case where the organizational structure at the local level, meaning representatives of the governing board of the Urban League of Township, Illinois and the mission of the national organization, came into

conflict. The data in my study demonstrated that the Urban League of Township, Illinois was unable to establish a coalition with the school districts in the first phase of the case, even though the superintendents sat on its board. The absence of coalition is evidence by the limited support by the schools. Township public school districts provided only a meeting space for the STARS program, with teachers providing some homework. Given that the goal of the program was to improve the academic performance of their students, this level of involvement seems minimal at best.

Concomitant with this failure, and the ensuing lack of credibility for the STARS program in the black community, was the inability of the Urban League of Township to establish collaborative relationships with families and community-based organizations such as black churches and civic groups. With little support from those who stood to gain the most from the program--the schools and the families--and only limited support from the black community, the League's ability to sustain operations of the STARS program was severely hampered once the seed money (provided by the local League) was gone. Hence the STARS program ceased operation in the latter part of 1989.

Roles and Relationships Among Collaborators

When the Urban League of Township, Illinois was unable to secure the necessary support in the community from black parents and various community-based organizations such as black churches and civic groups to sustain the operation of the STARS program, the League had to discontinue the program for almost a year. The students that were being served by STARS were

the ones that ultimately suffered because there was no other community-based tutorial program at the time that focused on the supplemental needs of black students attending kindergarten through third grade. Since there was no effective collaboration between the entities that would benefit most from black students being developed educationally--black parents and the black community in general--it is no wonder that the League was unable to get the school districts to place the STARS program as a priority on their educational agenda. In fact, some of the public schools officials resented the League attempting to get involved in the schools. Dan Anderson, a Township school's principal, indicated that his staff had difficulty effectively implementing after-school programs. He gave the impression that because they were professionally trained and yet struggled with their own programs, the Urban League would have even more difficulty effectively implementing and operating an after school program. However, when the College of Education became officially involved in the STARS program, it "provided legitimacy" and changed the school district's posture towards working with the Urban League on the issue of academic underachievement of black students in the Township Public Schools.

University Involvement

One of the implications of getting Gilpin State University's College of Education involved in the STARS program was that it gave the local Urban League some of the leverage it needed to get the school district administrators to be more cooperative; it also provided additional funding for staff, transportation, food, and supplies. What the school administrators and the Urban League did not grasp was that the College of Education's involvement in the

STARS program was not a direct or exclusive partnership or collaboration with the Urban League. The College of Education waspartnering and collaborating primarily with another higher education organization, Land Community College. Cross institutional collaboration was a stipulation of the funding source (HECA) that provided the grant dollars for the College of Education to get involved in the STARS program.

Implications of HECA Policy Support

When the College of Education became involved in the STARS program, the local Urban League, again, felt the consequences of an educational policy initiative that was not structured in their favor. Moreover, because of that, they lost control of the STARS program and watched it become a higher education project that was based on the goals and objectives set by Gilpin State's College of Education. The College of Education was in an ill-conceived role as an administrator of a project that began initially as a community-based program.

For instance, when the College of Education gained administrative control of STARS, each of the organizations participating in the project received resources. Land Community College received admission access to Gilpin State University while the Urban League received funding to coordinator the STARS project. The Township schools benefited the most from the effort because they had access to resources to act upon the issue of academic underachievement of its black students. Unfortunately, not long after the project began, conflicts between the College of Education and Land Community College began to jeopardize the STARS project. The conflicts ultimately caused Land to withdraw from the partnership and the HECA funding to end.

Braskamp and Wergin (1992) exclaim that collaborations do not occur without the partners spending time together to foster mutual trust. Land Community College, Gilpin State University, Urban League, and Township Public Schools were never able to gel as a group with a common objective to foster that trust. The Higher Education Cooperation Act (ISBE, 1991, 1992) provided structure for higher education organizations to work collaboratively on projects, but it did not provide the structure for each of the organizations to have an administrative voice in the project. The higher education organization that secured the funding, in this case, Gilpin State, had the administrative power to assign roles and distribute resources in a manner that was not conducive to the structure of each organization. Land Community College indicated that they pulled out of the STARS project for that reason. The Urban League also had conflict with the College of Education because they felt that the faculty did not respect their abilities to educate black students. Harkavy and Puckett (1991), Braskamp and Wergin (n.d.), and Whyte (1984) note that too often higher education faculty are perceived as elitist, unidimensional, and nonconforming from their professional expertise in resolving community-based issues. Gilpin State University was perceived in that manner by Land Community College and the Urban League due to their position as grant administrator and curriculum and instruction specialist. There is a need to build a collegial participatory and cooperative partnership between community members and university researchers in order to resolve social issues, but that can only occur if research and learning are done in conjunction with a community's people.

Implications of Collaborative Policy on Organizational Roles

The findings of my study showed that the organizations struggled in their roles because there was no policy structure to support their endeavor internally or externally. Gilpin State University's primary mission was research; however, the STARS project was not necessarily research but a collaborative educational project. It was constructed around the frame of an advocacy-based outreach service component of a national policy mandate that failed to maintain implementation at the local level.

Karen Johnson (personal communication, February 12, 1999) indicated that, initially, the Urban League looked forward to collaborating with the College of Education to revive the STARS program because they needed the college's experience in developing curriculum and implementing innovative instructional methods within the program.

Conflicts Between Interests and Responsibilities, and Competing Agendas

When HECA was used as the source to achieve those objectives, the roles shifted. The Urban League was no longer in administrative control of the program. The College of Education's role was project administration while their goal was to provide their teacher education students with a clinical experience that exposed them to at-risk black kindergarten through third grade students. Moreover, the Urban League's role in the STARS project was coordination, while their goal was still to improve the educational performance of black students

in the Township Public Schools. Land Community College's role in the project was tutorial support while their goal was to use Gilpin State University as a resource to send their students to a four-year university. Township Public Schools' role was facility provider while their goal was to benefit from efforts from the other organizations. However, a more active role in both the program and the project would have given their students an opportunity to gain the most from those relationships. Harkavy and Puckett (1991) suggest that it is inappropriate for universities and colleges to assume operational roles of programs that are society based, and, that they should only be concerned with the production and transmission of knowledge. When the College of Education assumed administrative control of the STARS program, it would have been appropriate for each organization involved in the STARS program to learn about the administrative change as well as set parameters for operation. Kunesh and Farley (1991) mention that in establishing a collaborative it is important to involve all stakeholders so that collaborative decisions and activities receive widespread support and recognition. Because the Urban League of Township, Illinois never fully accepted the College of Education's pedagogical approach and because Land Community College was unable to establish parable admittance procedure and instructional methods, the STARS project failed. There was too much inter-organizational conflict caused by each organization attempting to meet their independent goals. They could have shaped the relationship between the organizations into a collaborative if all stakeholders and each organization would have established a central mission and structured their organizational goals around meeting the overall mission.

Implications of Collaborative Policy on Organizational Culture

Sergiovanni and Corbally (1986) suggest that educational organizations consist of people who respond to events and objects on the basis of the meanings these things have for them, as well as the meanings derived from the social interactions that occur between individuals and organizations. Eventually, the meanings evolve and are modified by individuals through an interpretive process in which one person or perhaps several create an environment among these individuals to structure a sense of purpose under which the organization then operates. Sergiovanni and Corbally note that it is important for organization leaders to assist their subordinates in answering questions such as: What is the organization about? What are the values? What do we believe in? Why do we function the way we do? How are we unique? and How do I fit into the scheme of things? This should happen before the organization links with others for collaboratives or partnerships and should be revisited periodically in order to stay abreast of any variance of opinion or action that could jeopardize the success of a collaborative or partnership project. This notion can be directly applied to the case under consideration.

Dr. Henry, Associate Dean of the College of Education, HECA grant writer, and Chairman of Urban League of Township Board of Directors was in the best position to answer those questions among the key collaborators. This would have allowed the faculty and staff within the organizations to forge a mode of operation that would have been conducive to each organization's culture, and resolve the conflicts between interests and roles and resources discussed earlier. Kunesh and Farley (1991) exclaim that it is important for a collaborative relationship to have visionary leadership that is willing to take risks, and facilitate change. Dr.

Henry could have positioned the Urban League to be the change agent on how K-3 students were educated in the Township School Districts. However, the College of Education came into the STARS program and became the educational experts and did not establish a reciprocal relationship with the Urban League where each organization could have assumed roles that would have been conducive to their organizational culture and helped meet their goals.

Culture, in relation to the STARS collaborative, must be viewed divergently to understand the role of race, politics, and class in the collaboration. For example, Gilpin State University, Land Community College, and Township Public Schools are entities that have some common themes. Each is a public education organization, each is governed by a predominately white-middle and upper-middle-class social structure, and finally, each utilized the Urban League to demonstrate symbolically that they are providing some outreach to the African-American community. The common culture in each of these organizations is that they are state supported, and legislators utilize these entities as the agents to distribute the knowledge necessary to maintain the various social constructs of society. Whereas, the Urban League is an advocacy-based organization, not a state entity; nor does it have the power or the resources to maintain or change the social structure of society without assistance. The Urban League's central mission is to advocate for equitable treatment of low-income and African-American residents. However, in the Township community, those who sit on the Urban League board are too often part of the decision making that causes the oppressive practices responsible for the condition that the Urban League is advocating against.

Bredo and Feinberg's (1974) writings further suggest that schools are agents of social and cultural reproduction, and the Urban League is not. Given those comments, one could view the

organizational relationships in the STARS project as a non-supportive environment where each organization was only concerned about their self-interest; and when things did not work the way each organization intended, they threw in the towel.

Referring back to roles, the College of Education faculty's primary concern was their students' clinical experience. They had difficulty assuming the larger role of working towards improving the educational outcomes of black students. Land Community College became disenchanted after they had trouble accessing the resources that were promised to them by the College of Education, so they pulled out and Township Public School administrators and teachers did not want to overextend themselves to support the program. They did not want to do anything to hurt the program because of Urban League's stature in the community, but they also did see the program as a resource for resolving the underachievement of black children attending their schools.

Giroux (1981) explains that the domination and subordination in which these collaborative efforts stand produces cultural conflict that disrupts the collaborative process. Meaning that the power play or organization goals of each of the various stakeholders ultimately impedes the collaborative process. In the case of the STARS program, its political viability was that a STARS program demonstrated an effort by the College of Education to get more involved in the local community, particularly with those that need academic assistance--black children. The STARS collaborative, although set up to address the academic and career deficiencies of minorities in education, it was also designed to prepare white teacher education students with the educational experience that would increase their ability to function as instructors in a variety of educational settings.

Harkavy and Puckett (1991) indicate that the current mission of urban universities and colleges is in direct conflict with the need of their social surroundings, since research, teaching, and service are typically the charter of urban higher educational centers. Sometimes there is internal conflict between the three components. Harkavy and Puckett also suggest that in order to resolve the conflict, universities and colleges should move to a participatory action model where the university is programmed with a mission for improving human welfare. As in the literature review, Beaumont and Hallmark (1998) indicated that school-university collaborations tend to be based on the resources that universities bring to the relationship. They also suggest that the goals and objectives are typically determined by the participants, the resources available, and the entity that provides the resources.

Instead of attempting to maintain a service provision, developed under the guise of the National Urban League, Inc. mandate, the Urban League of Township, Illinois could have established a relationship with Gilpin State University's College of Education to evaluate the outcomes of the mandate locally, develop curriculum, and analyze the policy. Each of those points of collaboration with the College of Education could have helped the Urban League of Township, Illinois's effort to remedy the ineffective educational practices of the Township School Districts towards black kindergarten through third grade students.

Potential for Collaboration

What was the potential of this type of collaboration for improving the performance of African-American students? The following describes the need for community organizations'

assistance in the maintenance of the STARS program and begins with the role of community agencies.

The Role of Community Agencies and the Community at Large

When the Urban League of Township, Illinois was unable to secure resources in the black community to assist in the maintenance of the STARS program and when Gilpin State University's College of Education discontinued the funding of the STARS project after HECA funding discontinued, the need for community organizations to support the program became vital. For example, the vice-chancellor's office of the university became involved in the STARS program after the College of Education discontinued funding the STARS project. Moreover, it was during a time of significant need, because the Urban League was under heavy criticism for allowing the STARS program to become non-operational. It was during that period that the Urban League began critical discussions with the school districts about reallocating funds to support the STARS program.

Up until the time that the College of Education pulled out of the STARS project, the Township school districts only showed a very small monetary commitment to the program. The Urban League recognized that if the STARS program were to continue operating, the Township school districts and other community groups would have to step up and take some fiscal responsibility for the program. The Township School Districts began to reallocate funding from the Title I program at each school building where there was a large number of students eligible for free and reduced lunch, which was the criteria for Title I eligibility. Moreover, Gilpin State

University students became tutors in the program again through a federal education policy called "America Reads." This program provided funding through the college work-study program for college students to work at public schools assisting students to read.

Berman and McLaughlin's (1978) study of the implementation of federal programs supporting educational change suggested that community-based or street-level service providers play an important role for federal initiatives to be successful. The street-level organizations are typically connected to targeted populations through past services or program initiatives, and they can act as a liaison to get the community connected through a common agenda. However, without federal or state policy to support or provide funding for advocacy-based organizations (to create inter-institutional networks for change), the community-based support will be fragmented, limited, and inconsistent because there is no consistent culture among organizations in the community to provide educational advocacy.

Clearly, the role for community-based organizations such as the Urban League in supporting an initiative like the STARS program is to first understand the culture of the organizations attempting to come together in a collaborative relationship. Vare (1994) and Clift (1994) note that the issue of culture is a major factor in community/university collaborations. The data suggest that when Gilpin State University took administrative control of the STARS program, the Urban League staff and the College of Education faculty had difficulty finding a common ground for the program outcomes. However, the same resistance occurred with teachers and administrators in the Township school districts when the Urban League began putting pressure on the school districts to provide more support for the program. In fact, McLaughlin (1990) implies that any type of reform effort must have the support of the

professional networks, school departments, school associations, and colleagues if it is going to be successfully implemented. The Urban League was working with the central administrative staff of the school districts (e.g., superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors of curriculum and instruction, etc.) and they agreed to provide more support for the STARS program. However, the second level, or the "B Team" (e.g., teachers, principals, and deans) have the ability and power to resist or implement reform initiatives at the building level. Therefore, as Adler and Gardner (1994) suggested, it was the people not organizations that collaborated or did not collaborate. If a collaborative is to be successful, there must be a common ethos among the collaborating entities to invest in the effort to make the collaborative work.

Guidelines for Effective Collaboration

Interagency collaboration, such as improving the academic performance of African-American students, depends a lot on the circumstances and composition of the participating organizations. However, it is the responsibility of the community take charge of the educational condition of its schools. Too often apathy in the black community causes school districts to go unchecked in their educational practices of black children. This research clearly indicated that it is the responsibility of the black community to advocate for black children in the public schools. Moreover, black people must support the organizations that are at the forefront of addressing issues relative to the black communities concerns. In this case, the Urban League of Township of Illinois did not have the full support of the black community in addressing the dismal educational outcomes of black students in the Township Public schools. National or local

chapter, the Urban League must do a better job of uniting community organizations around issues relative to the black community's concern. Churches, civic, recreation, and fraternal organizations must be provided with data that outlines the climate of education in the black community. Likewise, the practice of creating or duplicating programs to address the same issue is not an effective way of resolving a problem that systemically perpetuates the same condition across generations. The business community must be made aware of the condition because they are the recipients of a work force that is not prepared to meet their needs. The political community should be made aware about the condition because their platforms should be a voice for resolve and not complacence.

A strength of the Urban League is its broad appeal and interracial make-up of its membership and governance. This, in effect, could position the League to become the premier bridge-building organization for constituency that seeks outcomes suitable for achieving their organization or personal goals. The League was developed to meet the inequities of African-Americans in housing, employment, and education. Each primary stakeholder of the case study indicated that it is the League's responsibility to hold institutions of learning accountable for educational practices that inhibit low-income and African-Americans from reaching their full potential. Hence, the League must position itself to develop hard funding streams without compromising the integrity of its mission in order to gain the resources needed to maintain the role of advocate and bridge builder in the communities in which they reside.

Implications for Future Research and Concluding Remarks

"Keeping a Face on Policy" is a reflective case study on the experiences of an Urban League affiliate attempting to establish a collaborative relationship with education organizations in Township, Illinois. The intent was to implement a National Urban League, Inc. policy mandate, the Education Initiative, as an attempt to mobilize the black community, civic organizations, and other community groups to address the issue of academic underachievement of black students in the Township Public Schools.

Price (1999) states that the "education accountability movement should be directed by holding educators accountable, providing quality education, holding students accountable, ending social promotion, and focusing on fundamentals" (p.196). What the author did not mention was the role of organizations like the Urban League in the process. As this study demonstrated, the League is often positioned to serve as advocates for families involved in public education in a variety of capacities from in-school advocate to after-school program developer and operator. Moreover, the League, in their various communities, often have the ability to form the necessary collaborations and coalitions with other community-based organizations to help challenge and support the school districts that are bound by law to provide a quality education to all students. From a movement perspective, the League must create its advocacy policy so it can be consistently implemented among its affiliates if it is to be effective as a movement based organization. The research demonstrated that although collaborative educational relationships are not a new phenomenon, issues such as how collaborative policy is developed to support the roles and resources of a program or project will have a significant impact on the outcome of the

effort. In this case, race and power were critical cultural components that stifled the Urban League of Township's ability to sustain operation of the program that was designed help address the academic deficiencies of black students in the Township elementary schools.

This study was limited to examining the relationship of the organizations responsible for education in the Township community. Future research questions that emerged from this case are; what happened to the students after the STARS program ended? What type of policy should be developed to support diverse education and social development collaboration initiatives? Who should develop that policy? What was the short-term impact of STARS? Likewise, a longitudinal study could be conducted to examine the academic success rate of students who participated in the STARS program versus those who did not during a specified time period. If the relationship between organizations that are responsible for education in the Township community cannot work collaboratively, it is the students who suffer in the end. Policy must be developed to support collaboratively relationships between community-base social service agencies, public schools, universities, and colleges in order for students to have the foundation they need for academic and social development experiences that will help them reach their full potential.

REFERENCES

Adler, L., & Gardner, S. (1994). The politics of linking schools and social services. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

American Association for Higher Education & Education Trust. (1994). Community compacts for student success: Brief site descriptions. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1989). Science for all Americans: A project 2061 report on literacy goals in science, mathematics, and technology. Washington, DC: Author.

Ascher, C. (1988). Urban school-community alliances, trends and issues (No. 10). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education/Institute for Urban and Minority Education.

Beaumont, J., & Hallmark, D. (1998). School-university partnerships in urban settings. Urban Education, 32(5), 557-560.

Berlin, G., & Sum, A. (1988). Toward a more perfect union: Basic skills, poor families, and our economic future. New York Ford Foundation.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). Formal organizations: A comparative approach. San Francisco: Chandler.

Braskamp, L. A., & Wergin, J. F. (nd). Forming new social partnerships. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Bruner, C. (1991). Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Service Consortium.

Cantor, J. (1997). Experiential learning in higher education: Linking classroom and community. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404 948)

Clift, B. R., & Tipton, R. (1984). Teacher education and the social context of the workplace. Childhood Education, 61(2), 115-119, 122-128.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1992). Coordinated services for children: Problems of organization and implementation. The CEIC Review, 1(2), 3-5,8.

Davis, W. (1988). Evaluation of the urban league education initiative. Champaign, IL: Urban League.

Edelman, M. (1977). Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail. New York: Academic Press.

Feldman, A. F. (1993). Promoting equitable collaboration between university researchers and school teachers. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 6(4), 341-358.

Fruchter, N. (1987). School-community collaborations: Dilemmas and opportunities. New York: Academy for Educational Development.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gross, T. (1988). Partners in education: How colleges can work with schools to improve teaching and learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hackney, S. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington: DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. L. (1991). Toward effective university-public school partnerships: An analysis of a contemporary model. Teachers College Record, 92(4) 557-581.

Houser, N. (1990). Teacher-researcher: The synthesis of roles for teacher empowerment. Action in Teacher Education, 12(2), 55-60.

Illinois Commission of Higher Education. (1960). Inter-institutional cooperation among colleges and universities in Illinois (Special Report No. 1). Chicago: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1964). Master plan for higher education in Illinois. Springfield: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1966). Master plan: Phase II. Springfield: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1971). Master plan: Phase III. Springfield: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1972). Higher Education Cooperation Act. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1974). Progress through cooperation: A report on the Illinois Higher Education Cooperation Act (HECA). Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1991). Higher Education Cooperation Act Project Proposal. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Higher Education. (1992). Higher Education Cooperation Act Minority Educational Achievement Project Proposal (1992). Springfield, IL: Author.

Irmsher, K. (1997). Education reform and students at risk. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 405 642)

Kagan, S. L., Rivera, A. M., & Parker, F. L. (1990). Collaboration in practice: Reshaping services for young children and their families. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Bush Center for Child Development and Social Policy.

Kunesh, L., & Farley, J. (1991). Collaboration: The prerequisite for school readiness and success. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED D00 036 U.S. Illinois)

Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Levy, J., & Sheppardson, W. (1992). A look at current school-linked service efforts. The Future of Children, 2, 44-55.

Malen, B., & Knapp, M. (1997). Rethinking the multiple perspectives approach to education policy analysis: Implications for policy practice connections. Journal of Education Policy, 12(5), 419-445.

March, J., & Olson, J. (1980). Ambiguity and choice in organizations. London: Oxford University Press.

McCollum , P. A., & Walker, C.L. (1992). Minorities in America 2000. Education and Urban Society, 24, 178-195.

McLaughlin, M. (1990). The rand change agent study revisited: macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19(9), 11-16.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1983). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In J. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), Organizational environments (pp. 21-43). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Nakamura, R.T., & Smallwood, F. (1980). The politics of policy implementation. New York: St. Martins.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Research Council. (1989). Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics in education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Urban League Inc. (1985). A resolution on public education. New York: Author.

National Urban League Inc. (1987, June). Urban League national education initiative. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Urban League/Educational Testing Service workshop on the evaluation of the Urban League's Education Initiative, Princeton, NJ.

Nevarez, A., Sanford, J., & Parker, L. (1997). Do the right thing: Transformative multicultural education in teacher preparation. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 3(2), 160-179.

New York State Department of Education. (1987). Partnerships for the future: Business-education partnerships in New York State. Albany, NY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 946)

Perrow, C. (1986). Complex organizations: A critical essay. New York: Random House.

Reich, R. B. (1990). Education and the next economy, In S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), Education reform: making sense of it (pp. 194-212). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Rist, R. C. (1994). Influencing the policy process with qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 545-557). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sanford, D. S. (1934). Inter-institutional agreements in higher education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Salwak, S. (1968). New patterns of inter-institutional cooperation. Journal of Higher Education, 39, 490-496.

Scheurich, J. J. (1994). Policy archaeology: a new policy studies methodology. Journal of Education Policy, 9(4), 297-316.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (1986). Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Slater, G. R. L. (1991). Staff development programs in universities: A curriculum proposal. Higher Education Research & Development, 0(1). 79-91.

Slater, J. (1998). Anatomy of a collaboration: Study of a college of education/public school partnership. Urban Education, 32(5), 661-674.

Stake, R. (1994). Case study. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 236-247).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stefkovich, J. A., & Guba, G. J. (1993). Using public policy to impact local practice: Can it work? Journal of Education Policy, 8(5-6), 107-119.

Trubowitz, S. (1984). When a college works with a public school: A case study of school-college collaboration. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (1998). The condition of education, 1998. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1987). Work force 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vare, J. W. (1994). Partnership contrasts: Microteaching activity as two apprenticeships in thinking. Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (3), 209-217.

Webb, C. (1993). What is meant by the term, "Thoughtfulness in schools?" Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 358 536)

Webb, R. D. (1972). The status of inter-institutional cooperation among institutions of higher education in Illinois, 1971-72: The feasibility of change. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Weick, K. (1983). Administering education loosely in coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(10), 673-676.

Weiner, E. B. (1993). Great activities for great science teaching. Instructor, 102(7), 28, 32-35.

Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2), 139-162.

VITA

WILLIAM MAURICE PATTERSON

EDUCATION

Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL, 1994-2000
Focus: Educational Policy Studies

M..S., Illinois State University, Normal, IL, 1992-1994
Focus: Curriculum and Instruction

B.A., Columbia College Chicago, 1990

Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity Program (ICEOP) Scholarship Fellow

EMPLOYMENT

Director of Education & Youth Development
The Urban League of Champaign Co.
Champaign, IL, 1994-Present

Assistant Hall Coordinator
Office of Residential Life
Illinois State University, 1992-1994

Training Consultant
Cabet, Inc.
Chicago, IL, 1990-1992

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Regional Board of Education Board Member, 1997-1999
Urbana Public Schools Educational Equity Steering Committee Member, 1999
Champaign Unit 4 Public Schools Diversity Committee Member, 1998

PRESENTATIONS

1998: "Achievement Matters," Urban League/State Farm Urban Education Outreach Initiative.

1997: "Defining your network," Champaign/Ford Education and Employment System, Eighth Grade Career Conference.

PRESENTATIONS (continued)

1997: "Education Circle of Life," National Urban League/Educational Testing Services, Best Practices Educational Summit.

1996: "Defining your network," Champaign/Ford Education and Employment System, Eighth Grade Career Conference.

1996: "Nature's Playground," a formative evaluative case study of an after school science enrichment program, Association of Black Sociologists.

1994: "Meritocracy in Higher Education," an examination of affirmative action policy on higher education, Indiana University.

PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Created and implemented the Department of Education and Youth Development at the Champaign County Urban League; restructured the funding base for B.E.S.T. After-School Program; developed and coordinated community component of Nature's Playground science enrichment program and Cyber Club middle-school computer programming program; coordinated and expanded research relationships with various University of Illinois colleges and departments, Parkland College, Champaign and Urban Public schools, and Regional Education Department (i.e., R.E.A.D.Y. program).

Through my tenure at the Urban League, the demand to respond to educational needs of under-served families led to the conceptualization and development of many programs. What began as independent programs eventually evolved into an educational model called the "Circle of Life." This is a supplemental and enrichment-based strategy designed to operate as a continuum that focuses on intervention- and prevention-based educational methods for potentially at-risk students and families. The Circle of Life is comprised of 9 programs and serves approximately 250 families.

Created an audio recording outreach program for urban youth called REAP (Recording Education and Awareness Program). This program engages students through popular culture as a means to provide them with skills but also disengage them from negative pathologies such as youth violence.

WORK IN PROGRESS

Developing an educational compact for Champaign Public Schools to increase parent involvement in the public schools. Areas of concentration include special education and gifted programs.