Journal of Philosophy & History of Education
vol. 66, no. 1, 2016, pp. 43–59

The Community School from the Great Depression to the Present: Is There a Future?

Sam F. Stack, Jr., West Virginia University

Introduction

Michael Johanek and John Puckett write in their historical study *Leonard Covello: The Making of Benjamin Franklin High School*,

> The Depression era called forth powerful social forces that galvanized a small but hardy band of progressive educators to keep the reformist vision of community-centered schooling alive in the 1930s and early 1940s. Working in disparate locales and circumstances, their projects often unbeknownst to one another, these reformers, built community schools and educational programs designed to improve the quality of local community life.[1]

Although the nature of these progressive schools varied in locale and content, they tended to be characterized by several common beliefs: that the curriculum needed to be grounded in the issues and problems of the local community; that all life was educative rather than gained only through the formal school; and they emphasized participation and activity over passive acceptance and were attentive to the needs of both adults and children in both work and play. Furthermore, these educators envisioned the school as the center of community life leading to the general improvement of community living at large. This often included cooperation "with community health, recreational, cultural, civic, and religious agencies, with the view of having pupils utilize the services of these agencies to carry out and extend activities initiated in classrooms and extra class pupil affairs."[2]

In this paper I take an historical approach briefly to describe the gradual transition of the community school in the 1930s from a more citizen-centered focus to a more client-centered or service focus following World War II. I further explore the history of the community school to include present-day discourse surrounding the community school. A successful community school in the 1930s was perceived as one integrated with the community, not detached, and where achievement was much more than the acquisition of book-knowledge,

with attention to the needs and interests of the community and emphasizing flexibility and experimentation.[3] School success heavily depended upon teachers and, according to Myles Horton, community school advocate and founder of the Highlander Folk School, teachers needed to be viewed as more than subject-matter specialists and replaced by those,

> ..who have an understanding of individual personalities and their relationships to the community and to society as a whole. Learning must not be meager, but supplement practical experience. Teachers must live in the community and take active part in community life. They should seek to coordinate the most advanced thinking and become identified with progressive influences.[4]

The Arthurdale Schools and the Benjamin Franklin High School

There was a strong sense of social justice in the community schools of the 1930s, a sense that the traditions and customs of the past had failed and that failure had led to poverty, unemployment, and alienation. For many progressive reformers, including the rural New Deal subsistence homestead planners and educators at the Arthurdale community school in West Virginia and the urban educators at the Ben Franklin High School in East Harlem, New York, the community school was the answer, the one institution that could improve the lives of many and provide services to the community linking educational, civic, social, and social welfare activities.[5] The Arthurdale Community School, a depression-era, progressive school under the direction of John Dewey disciple Elsie Ripley Clapp and largely supported and funded by Eleanor Roosevelt and Bernard Baruch, sought to meet the needs of its community through a variety of educational, social, civic, and social welfare activities. The community of Arthurdale originated as part of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and was a planned community to house displaced coal-mining families in north-central West Virginia. Following a visit to see for herself the devastation of coal camps in the region, Eleanor Roosevelt returned to Washington and convinced FDR that the first New Deal subsistence homestead project should take place in West Virginia.

Eleanor Roosevelt and federal planners were keenly aware of the alienation experienced by unemployed coal miners and sought a means to aid them. The planned homesteads were designed to be small family farms where people could grow enough food for their subsistence, giving them a sense of accomplishment, but also providing a means for their survival. New Deal reformers, including Eleanor Roosevelt, believed the child in this experimental community needed a special kind of education and sought to create a school grounded in the philosophy

of progressive education. Progressive education in the 1930s consisted of four major philosophical camps: the administrative progressives, the child-centered progressives, the social reconstructionists, and the community-school progressives. It is the latter group that developed the educational program at Arthurdale. Elsie Clapp, a former student of John Dewey's and considered an expert in rural community education was chosen to head the Arthurdale Schools. Clapp described the ideal community school as one fully integrated in the community, attentive to the needs and desires of the people with all stakeholders engaged in the process of education; she did not believe the mere imparting of information was educational. True community education was created "by people, with people, for people."[6]

Eleanor Roosevelt and Elsie Clapp clearly envisioned the Arthurdale Schools as experimental and within an experimental community. They believed the Depression necessitated experimentation in the promotion of new ideas and educational practice.[7] This experimental attitude was also characteristic of the Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem, New York under the direction of Leonard Covello. A white, Italian immigrant, sociologist, and social activist, Covello is known for his work in ethnic studies, educational leadership, teacher leadership, and urban sociology. Following extensive experience in urban education and obtaining a Ph.D. from New York University Covello founded the Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem. It opened in September 1934 with Covello as Principal seeking to provide service to the community through integrating education with the civic and the social. In essence, the school was designed to restore community life, believed by community school progressives—urban and rural—to be at the center of the alienation of modern, industrial America. Covello attempted to create an environment that moved beyond the individualism of modern society and provided students with the "knowledge, skills, and dispositions to participate in cooperative activity" that both engaged and valued the diversity of East Harlem. Covello envisioned East Harlem as a place where diversity could enrich community rather than fragment it. In a Deweyan sense he saw the community strengthened by common interest for the benefit of the common good and where students best learned this through educational processes. As part of his attempt to understand his community Covello created a Community Advisory Council composed of various committees which kept Covello informed of community issues and problems. With the assistance of the Works Progress Administration, Covello created community and remedial literacy programs along with an adult-education program.

The Arthurdale Schools and the Benjamin Franklin High School approached curriculum in an experimental fashion. In both curriculum development was grounded in the idea of learning basic subject matter, a type of "trying out." Students learned the basics but in innovative ways connected to their understanding of self and community. For example, in the Arthurdale Schools a great deal of emphasis was placed on the perceived alienation of the former coal camp children. The community-school educators created a curriculum that placed emphasis on identity and place, integrating traditional subject matter with the studies of Appalachian history, folklore, art, music, dance, and drama. Unfortunately, with the onset of World War II and the eventual Cold War conservatism the community school was challenged and although much of the rhetoric remained the same, the community schools of the Depression Era underwent a gradual conceptual change.

The Cold War and Community Schools

Johanek and Puckett refer to the conceptual change in the community school from the 1930s to the war years as one moving from "citizen-centered" to client- or "service-centered."[8] They note that beginning in the mid-1940s and continuing into the 1950s,

> Community education was swept up in an attack mounted by influential critics who charged that life adjustment education, by now the dominant version of progressive education, was diverting schools from teaching the liberal arts curriculum and depriving the nation of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and linguists it needed to win the Cold War.[9]

While I argue Johanek and Puckett give too much credence to the overall impact of life-adjustment, certainly its impact on classroom instruction, the post-Depression community school does seem to have lost its curricular concern for social justice and the alienation of the individual, moving instead to foster a less-engaged approach to the thoughtful and critical democratic citizen.[10] The most influential critics of life-adjustment included Hyman Rickover, Arthur Bestor, and Robert Hutchins.[11]

Lloyd Cook, a sociologist and community school educator at Ohio State, wrote in 1941 that a school is a community school if it,

> …educates youth by and for participating in the full range of basic life activities such as human needs, areas of living, persistent problems; seeks increasingly to democratize life in school and outside; uses community resources in all aspects of its program, and actively cooperates with other social agencies and groups in improving community life functions as a service center for youth and adult groups.[12]

Summarizing the community school literature in the 1940s, Milosh Muntyan surmised most community schools sought to integrate community life and activity and center their curriculum around the need and interests of the community.[13] However, by the end of the 1940s the community school paid more attention to programmatic change over the social and political change of the 1930s, yet the original concept of the community school was far from extinct.

By the early 1950s Edward Olsen, formerly of the state of Washington Department of Education could write, "The community school idea has come to involve the most promising ideas and practices in education. The needs-centered curriculum, cooperative planning, interpersonal relations, group processes, problem solving, world-citizenship—are all part of the community school concept now." While these clearly resemble life-adjustment goals, Olsen concludes his description noting, "One early emphasis which seems to have gone is the matter of improving the social order."[14] Olsen made his observation in the early years of the Cold War and seemed to understand there was little discussion on improving the social order, a trait of Depression Era community schools and social reconstructionists. Apparently in the opinion of many community school educators the social order had stabilized. Although the language or rhetoric of democracy was still present, democracy in the 1950s often meant cooperation in the form of patriotism—that we must all stand together against a common enemy: the Soviet Union. An example of this kind of "cooperation" took the form of civil-defense preparation, typically a community-based activity centered in schools. Yet at the same time community-school educator Maurice Seay claimed, "The community-school program, in very real sense represents the essence of democracy. It is in part a return to an older practice wherein the adults of the community worked together to improve their school…for the added benefits to the community."[15] In the 1950s community school programs were conceptualized as classroom studies, student activities, work-experience, school camps, libraries, recreation centers, school assemblies featuring speakers, concerts, plays, and guidance or counseling services.[16] Federal support of the interstate highway system, leading to the growth of suburbs and white flight from cities also contributed to the community school being conceived in geographical terms rather than sociopolitical ones. What had once concerned educators in the sense of place and identity now became associated with where one lived, not who they were and how they lived. While Olsen had noted less attention to reforming the social order, Paul Hanna and Robert Naslund reiterated in 1953 many of the concerns addressed by community school educators in the 1930s and noted the important contribution of Dewey's *Democracy and Education*

(1916) as key to "the establishment and organization of the community school."[17] Hanna and Naslund emphasized "the role of schools as agents of social and democratic revitalization."[18]

The Mott Foundation

Strangely, the demise of the Progressive Association and its mouthpiece, the journal *Progressive Education* in the 1950s did not eliminate discussions on community schools.[19] Community education in the 1960s and beyond was greatly influenced by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Frank Manley, director of physical education and recreation for the city of Flint, Michigan, proposed to General Motors founder Charles Stewart Mott a plan to make full utilization of the Flint public school grounds and city parks beyond school hours. Manley was concerned about keeping youth busy and active and the school plans provided public facilities to accomplish that goal through various programs. While the programs eventually included art, music, language, and citizenship classes, there did not seem to be a deep philosophical underpinning for the programs. However, like the many of the programs in the 1930s they did provide medical and dental care for poor children. With support from the Flint community, and matching funds from the Mott Foundation, the city was able to build nine elementary schools.[20] Under the direction of Ernest Melby, the Mott Foundation continued its support and created the National Center for Community Education which served as a training ground in educational leadership. By 1970, influenced by the work of the Mott Foundation, community education programs were established in Michigan, Florida, Utah, and Maryland.[21] By the early 1970s the Mott Foundation had relationships with 46 colleges and universities and was providing training, consulting, conducting research, and working with "local boards of education in financing and establishing community education programs."[22]

Others called for the community school to provide academic and vocational instruction for children, youth, and adults, provide a meeting place for social and civic groups, and serve as a place for the discussion of community problems.[23] As community education moved into the 1970s, Bert Greene sensed the lack of a philosophical foundation for the community school and called for greater clarification in what was meant and desired in community education. Sensing the lack of direction in the discourse of community schools, Greene concluded, "Unlike what has been done in the past, these definitions must be specific, concrete, and touch upon the lives of the people or are we simply engaged in a word game."[24] Some called for the decentralization of schools and smaller schools, changes in the curriculum, attention to work study, and apprenticeships.[25] Reminiscent of the 1930s, some looked to community for the resolution of the alienation in U.S. society at a time when U.S.

culture seemed at a breaking point due to social and political unrest stimulated by the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War. Community was believed to nurture trust, a collective identity, and a "desire for engagement—the wish to come directly to grips with social and interpersonal problems and to confront on equal terms an environment which is not composed of ego-extensions."[26]

Stirred by the social unrest of the late 1960s early 1970s and in a most Deweyan sense of community, Ernest Melby reemphasized in 1971 that people in rural/agricultural societies experienced closer human relations and "developed a feeling of community, and a sense of identity in relation to other human beings. They developed a feeling not only of belonging but of respect for themselves." Melby believed during the 1970s it was more difficult for children to develop their own identity or a sense of community and that people were searching for these qualities. Melby believed, "Community educators must take on the responsibility of supplying our children and our people with this lost sense of community, of self-identity."[27] In general, community education for Melby was about people working together to identify common needs, problems, and concerns, "to gain a greater sense of influencing what goes on about them as well as gain control over themselves."[28] It is a place "where living and learning meet. Where the intellect and the environment interact to seek resolution to the problems of humankind, individually as well as collectively."[29] Melby seemed to be bringing back the economic, social, and political concerns of the more civic-minded community educators of the 1930s.

Education Reform and the Community School

The Reagan era ushered in a more politically conservative ideology and through its publication of A Nation at Risk (1983) began the foundation of current educational reform. Reagan had sensed the frustration of many Americans with the unrest of the 1960s and 1970s and argued strength and attention to market-based values could restore U.S. greatness. This ideology stressed individualism over community and competition over cooperation, clearly a challenge to public schools and certainly community school advocates.

This conservative approach to educational reform did not destroy or dampen the interest among some in community education and many seemed awakened by the growing competitive nature of the school and the focus on the individualism and efficiency rather than working together for the common good. Regardless of the community-based rhetoric, often masked through the emphasis on local autonomy and control, educational reform took on a national aura, shifting away from the local community. There was an ever-emerging sense among community educators that it was "a sense of belonging, of continuity, of being connected to others and to ideas and values" that made our lives

'meaningful and significant,'" far beyond that of merely contributing to the global economy.[30] Writing in the 1990s, Thomas Sergiovanni concluded for successful community building to take place the school needed to define for,

> …itself its own practice of schooling. This inside-out strategy requires a considerable amount of searching and reflection as teachers struggle with such issues as who they are, what they hope to become for the students they served, and how they will decide, organize, teach, learn, and live together.[31]

Sergiovanni sensed an identity crisis among teachers, which is understandable based on the lack of teacher voice from A Nation at Risk (1983) to Race to the Top. Teacher identity has been submerged into the role of the technician who is simply told what to do rather than being allowed to practice their craft, teaching.

Desiring to be attentive to the unrest of the late 1970s rather than submerge that unrest as Reagan desired, historian and community educator Mary Anne Raywid (1980) expressed in a *Teachers College Record* article the need for a sense of "rootedness and social cohesion," and asserted that "the quest for community had been the dominant social tendency of the 20th century."[32] Raywid notes,

> The constitutive features of community…include the following: interaction and mutual dependence, the intention of longevity and permanence, experience ties, communication, common and mutual sentiments, shared beliefs, and an ethic in individual concern and sympathy. The impacts of these features on members are said to include the shaping of individual identity, an acceptance of group standards and a desire to abide by them, commitment, a sense of place, and identification with the group, along with a sense of consciousness of kind.[33]

In the tradition of the social/pedagogical progressive predecessors like Clapp and Covello, Raywid suggests the school is the key institution to build community.

Unfortunately, learning has become something that can be assessed with little attention to value of the experience, the culture, or the community students live in and how that might affect their learning. Today student achievement, largely defined in the area of high-stakes testing, has hurt the rural and urban poor who do not have the cultural and social capital middle-class children bring to school. Can a more community-based education help these children? There is a growing body of literature that suggests community schools need to be seriously considered or perhaps reconsidered. Some research suggests that when urban students are part of a community school they perceive themselves

as better connected to school and they report "feeling safer, more empathic, and less harassed."[34] Julie O'Donnell notes, "It is difficult to engage low-income, diverse parents onto school campuses even when they are involved in their children's education at home."[35] Yet, she emphasizes this engagement and partnering between the school and family is important because parental involvement at school increases children's academic achievement. Low-income families are typically genuinely concerned about the success of their children in schools so schools need to be imaginative in creating strategies and involvement opportunities.[36] Barriers for low-income parents can include lack of transportation, work schedule, lack of child care, language, and culture. In 2004, a report sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences noted: "The instruction typical of most urban high schools…fails to engage students cognitively, emotionally or behaviorally. Evidence indicates that when instruction draws on students' pre-existing understanding, interests, cultures, and real work experiences, the curriculum becomes more meaningful to them."[37] Findings from this report are informative, but not surprising to community-school educators who certainly have been concerned about and acting upon these issues since the 1930s. It seems like community educators have always known that community vitality, school effectiveness, family engagement, and student learning are all enhanced in a community-school environment.[38]

Schools must seek to be partners in the community, not isolated institutions only accessible during special events or athletics. For successful partnering to take place collaboration is necessary and attentive to the social, political, economic, and cultural characteristics and needs of the community. A community school seeks to involve all stakeholders, resisting top-down approaches from social service agencies or school officials.[39] Collaboration can and has led to better teacher and student relationships, and a more positive school climate that is inviting.[40] Successful partnerships are often teacher initiated. Support by educational leaders is also essential for success.[41] C. Warren Moses writes,

> The community school model demonstrates that by partnering with parents and community institutions in various and professional collaboration, we are about not only to deliver effective programs and services but also to transfer the institution formally known as the school into one that is multidimensional, vibrant, and alive—the community school.[42]

It seems today that the school is far more unidimensional and far from vibrant, what philosopher Kenneth Strikes refers to as "yoyo" or "you are on your own" rather than engaging a "witt" or "we are in this together" view to describe the contemporary plight. "Witt" requires a

"strong sense of the dignity and worth for each member of the school community, a strong commitment to the common good and a strong desire to include everyone because everyone is valuable."[43] Our current schools are a reflection of the values perpetuated in U.S. culture that link education to job acquisition and material accomplishment. In contrast, one can still be personally satisfied and accomplished and still desire and contribute to the benefit of the common good. As Johanek and Puckett suggest we live in a society that stresses the need for us to be served rather than us becoming servants.

John Dewey and Community

John Dewey was clearly concerned about the perceived loss of community in a society he believed fostered rampant materialism and individualism. He envisioned community as a form of shared interest and it was this shared interest that gave life to the community. Consequently, his ideas influenced both the Arthurdale Schools and the Benjamin Franklin High School. We come to an understanding of shared interest through freedom of inquiry and the willingness and desire to communicate. Freedom of intelligence can hardly occur without freedom of speech and inquiry, fundamental values of a democratic society that form the basis of community. Agreement is not a necessity, but the willingness to listen and interact is.[44] "Education should create," Dewey emphasized, "Our interest in all persons in furthering the general good, so that they will find their own happiness realized in what they can do to improve the condition of others."[45] Clearly his notion of happiness is not conceptualized as momentary joy, material acquisition, or as enhancement of the individual ego. For Dewey, ideally we find ourselves not in a culture of "yoyo" but of "witt." Dewey describes individualism as "inequity, harshness, and retrogression to barbarism (no matter what veneer of display and luxury) unless it is generalized individualism: an individualism which takes into account the real good and effective—not merely formal—freedom of every social member."[46]

In *School and Society* Dewey claims, "A society is a number of people held together because they are working along common lines, in a common spirit, and with references to common aims. The common needs and aims demand a growing interchange of thought and growing unity of sympathetic feeling."[47] This "growing unity of sympathetic feeling" does not develop overnight and must be nurtured and embodied in sympathy in both caring and trust. This "unity of sympathetic feeling" is made more difficult in a culture defined by reality TV, growing cynicism, distrust, and political disengagement that threatens not only classroom but also democratic society.[48] There is no question that current educational reform fails to meet the goals of most

community school advocates, even those less philosophically sophisticated where education has come to be more of a credentialing process and ritual with little meaning in what it means to be a part of the human narrative. Our students acquire knowledge but often fail to know how to use it and we provide little help or guidance on "how wise choices are made and what is worthwhile."[49]

Conclusions

Since its onset, the community school has come to mean many things and this has often reflected the time and place of the communities in which they originated. The Depression Era, accompanied by social, economic, and political upheaval led to the unique experiments of the Arthurdale community and its community schools and the Benjamin Franklin High School in Harlem. These schools were concerned with what William H. Kilpatrick characterized during the Depression as an,

> …antisocial and selfish individualism, in an economy of interdependence, the common welfare comes first as the necessary, prerequisite means to the welfare of the individual. Democracy, then, in order to be itself, must henceforth stress cooperative efforts for the prerequisite common good.[50]

The most fundamental characteristic of the community school is to prepare participatory citizens for a democratic society, what some have called a citizen-centered community school rather than the service-centered community school. It is the service-centered model which seems to have dominated the community-school movement since World War II.[51] In reality the community school must integrate both citizen and service components, for to be a good citizen is to serve the common good. Community schools must nurture intellectual inquiry as part of preparation with attention to the local community and its culture in designing curriculum. This preparation must take place in an environment of freedom which allows for the trying out or testing of ideas which may work in some communities and not others. This makes experimentation essential and heightens the need to listen to many voices. The community school not only involves but engages stakeholders and includes parents, students, teachers, educational leaders, and citizens in the community.[52] All need to share in the construction of the educational experience. In this type of school Ken Strike describes,

> Shared goals are expressed in a publically shared project; curriculum is coherent and expresses shared goals; teachers are more generalists than subject matter specialists [quite contrary to the current trend]; where students understand and make the decisions to work together grasping that "knowing is more

> than a commodity but for justice and citizenship, tracking is minimized; behavioral norms flow from school goals and aspirations; caring and trust come from this understanding of shared commitment."[53]

A community school is a place where one can seek an identity and sense of place; a place where one feels one belongs. It is a place where faith, hope, and tolerance are built and education is directed to nurture the whole person.[54] These goals are worthy of consideration for the contemporary school is far too alienating for too many students, particularly the rural and urban poor, and where a good or excellent education is measured by increasing test scores eventually leading to securing material prosperity regardless of the choices made to get there. The contemporary school with this focus does nothing to support the truly educated individual or civic-minded participant in a democratic society. Contemporary community-school advocate and practitioner Deborah Meier writes, "Democracy assumes the prior existence of communities of people with shared loyalties, confidences, and understandings. It doesn't create them—they are far older and more persistent than modern (or even ancient democracies). We have always taken such communities for granted."[55]

In conclusion, the community schools of the 1930s, although far from perfect, attempted to create a viable communal life and spirit of cooperation.[56] There is still much to be learned from communities and schools like Arthurdale and the Ben Franklin High School in terms of where they created community and where they failed. Perhaps that sense of experimentation in building and nurturing community schools and hope in education is worthy of an effort once again.

Endnotes

1 Michael C. Johanek and John L. Puckett, *Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin Franklin High School* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007), 77.

2 See Samuel Everett, *The Community School* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1938), 435; Paul Pierce, "The School and the Community It Serves," in Samuel Everett ed., *The Community School*, 89; and Leonard Covello, "The School as the Center of Community Life in an Immigrant Area," in Everett, *The Community School*, 127. William Wattenberg, "Annotated Bibliography," in Everett notes Clapp's work in Kentucky, 468–469. In the same volume see Samuel Everett, "An Analysis of the Programs," 435–462, and H. A. Tape, "A Consolidated Laboratory School," 340–376. In Paul Hanna, *Youth Serves the Community* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936 Hanna refers

to Clapp's article, "A Rural Community School in Kentucky" *Progressive Education* 10, no. 3 (March 1933): 123–128.

[3] Paul Misner, "A Community Educational Center," in Everett, *The Community School*, 70.

[4] Myles Horton, "The Community Folk School," in Everett, *The Community School*, 265–297.

[5] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 111.

[6] Elsie Ripley Clapp, *Community Schools in Action* (New York: Viking, 1939), 67.

[7] Ibid., 151. John Dewey was a member of the Arthurdale National Advisory Committee which served to advise Eleanor Roosevelt and government planners, particularly in regard to the educational project at Arthurdale. For details on the Arthurdale School see Sam F. Stack, Jr., *Elsie Ripley Clapp (1879–1965): Her Life and the Community School* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 187–210, and *The Arthurdale Community School: Education and Reform in Depression Era Appalachia* (University Press of Kentucky, 2016). Also see Daniel Perlstein and Sam F. Stack, Jr., "Building a New Deal Community: Progressive Education at Arthurdale," in *Schools of Tomorrow, Schools of Today*, eds. Susan F. Semel and Alan R. Sadovnik (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 213–238.

[8] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 12.

[9] Ibid., 234.

[10] Ibid., 233.

[11] Arthur Bestor, *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our School* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1953); Robert Hutchins, *Some Observations on American Education* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1956); Robert Hutchins, *Education for Freedom* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1943); and Hyman Rickover, *Education and Freedom* (New York: Dutton, 1959).

[12] Lloyd Cook, "School and Community," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), 1002. See also Edward Olsen, *The Modern Community School* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953), 193. Olsen's book was essentially a sequel to Samuel Everett's, *The Community School* originally published in 1938. It contains various examples of community schools in the late 1940s and early 1950s. See also John Lund, "Education Can Change Community Life," *School Life* 31 (November 1948): 11–12, and William K. McCharon. *Selected Community School Programs in the South* (Nashville, TN: George Peabody, 1948), Chapter Two.

[13] Milosh Muntyan, "Community School Concepts in Relation to Societal Determinants," *Journal of Educational Research* 41, no. 8 (April 1948): 597–609.

[14] Olsen, *The Modern Community School*, 200–201.

[15] Maurice Seay, "The Community School: New Meaning for an Old Term," in *The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education Part II: The Community School*, ed. Nelson Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 287. Henry's yearbook gives a sense of the community school movement in the post-war years. For an extensive bibliography on community school literature prior to 1954 see Edward G. Olsen, *School and Community* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1954).

[16] Edward Krug, "The Program of the Community School," in Nelson Henry, *The Fifty-Second Yearbook*, 83. For other articles of interest in this volume see Harold Drummond, "The Staff of the Community School," 100–126; James A. Lewis and Russell Wilson, "School-Building Facilities for Community Schools," 145–155; Paul Hanna, "The Community School and Larger Geographic Areas," 228–237; Maurice Seay and John A. Wilkinson, "Overcoming Barriers to the Development of Community Schools," 265–287; and L. D. Haskew and Geneva Hanna, "The Organization and Administration of the Community School," 127–144.

[17] Paul Hanna and Robert Naslund, "The Community School Defined," in *The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education Part II: The Community School*, ed. Nelson Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 62.

[18] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello,* 10.

[19] Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education (1876–1957)* (New York: Vintage, 1964), 348–353 for discussion on the demise of progressive education.

[20] Johanek and Puckett*, Leonard Covello*, 236. Charles Stewart Harding Mott, the son of Charles Mott recalls the events that led to the Mott Foundation and its association with community education in William Grimshaw, "Mott Foundation Announces Creation of a Community Education Board of Advisors," *Community Education Journal* 4, no. 2 (March–April 1974): 32–33. Grimshaw was director of information for the Mott Foundation. Terrell Bell, Secretary of Education during the Reagan Administration when *A Nation at Risk* was published was a member of the Mott Advisory Board. See also "In Memorium," *Community Education Journal* 2 (November 1972): 5, written after the death of Frank Manley.

[21] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 236–237.

[22] Grimshaw, "Mott Foundation Announces," 33.

[23] Leslie Purdy, "Serving the Community: A Literature Review," *Community Education Journal* 5, no. 1 (January–February, 1975): 13.

[24] Bert Greene, "Another View of Community Education," *Community Education Journal* 3, no. 5 (September 1973): 42. See also C. S. Harding Mott, "Community School Development Act," *Community Education Journal* 3, no. 5 (November 1973): 39–42.

[25] Robert Whitt, "Accountability, Commitment and the Community School," *Community Education Journal* 1, no. 1 (February 1971): 22. See also Clyde Letarte and Jack Minzey, "Community Education and the Neighborhood School Concept," *Community Education Journal* 1 (February 1971): 2.

[26] Peter Hackett, "Comparative Perspectives on a Sense of Community," *Community Education Journal* 5, no. 4 (July–August): 34. See also Phillip Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture at a Breaking Point* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), 5.

[27] Ernest Melby and Clyde Campbell, "Community Education: America's Hope for the Future," *Community Education Journal* 1, no. 3 (August 1971): 33. Melby's perceptions of alienation are similar to those of the reformers who were behind the subsistence homestead movement that led to the formation of Arthurdale. See Lewis Harris, "Community Schools: Motivating the Unmotivated," *Community Education Journal* 1, no. 3 (May 1971): 16, for a more democratic perception of the community school and that one learned democracy by participating in it and that it could not be "accomplished in a course of civics."

[28] Melby and Campbell, "Community Education," 33.

[29] Lou J. Piotrowski, "The Third Century Educational Process," *Community Education Journal* 5, no. 6 (November–December, 1975): 14.

[30] Thomas Sergiovanni, *Building Community in Schools* (New York: Jossey Bass, 1994), xiv.

[31] Ibid., xv.

[32] Mary Anne Raywid, "Community and Schools: A Prolegomenon," *Teachers College Record* 90, no. 2 (Winter 1988): 197–210. Raywid quotes Robert Nisbet, *The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethic of Order and Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), 45.

[33] Raywid, "Community and Schools," 198–199. She mentions Eric Fromm, Erik Erikson, Urie Brofenbrenner, and Abraham Maslow were also interested in the concept of community and how the lack of it can affect students in schools.

[34] Constance Perry and Walter McIntire, "School Connection as School Reform in Rural Schools," *The School Community Journal* 11, no. 2 (Fall–Winter 2001): 63–64.

[35] Julie O'Donnell, Sandra L. Kirkner, and Nancy Meyer-Adams, "Low-Income, Urban Consumers' Perceptions of Community School Outreach Practices, Desired Services, and Outcomes," *The School Community Journal* 18, no. 2 (2008): 147.

[36] Ibid., 149, 161.

[37] Martin Blank, "Reaching Out to Create a Movement," in Joy G. Dryfoos, Jane Quinn, and Carol Barkin, *Community Schools in Action* (New York: Oxford University, 2005), 257. See also National Academy of Sciences, *Engaging Schools: Fostering High School Students' Motivation to Learn* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2004).

[38] Ibid., 251. See also Martin Blank, et al., *Making the Difference: Research and Practice in Community Schools* (Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools, 2003). Blank mentions the significance that Dewey played in helping generate the wider idea of the community school as well as Jane Addams and the settlement house, 244.

[39] Linwood H. Cousins, Roslyn A, Mikelson, Brian Williams and Anne Velsaco, "Race and Class Challenges in Community Collaboration for Educational Change," *The School Community Journal* 18, no. 2 (2008): 34.

[40] O'Donnell, et al., "Low-Income, Urban Consumers' Conceptions," 148. See also Diane Ciuffetelli Parker, Heather Grenville, and Joseph Flessa, "Case Studies of School Community and Climate: Success Narratives of Schools in Challenging Circumstances," *The School Community Journal* 21, no. 1 (2011): 147.

[41] Catherine Hands, "It's Who You Know and What You Know: The Process of Creating Partnerships Between Schools and Communities," *The School Community Journal* 15, no. 2 (2005): 63, 76. Hands discusses the importance of teachers in the partnering process.

[42] C. Warren Moses, "History of the Children's Aid Society Model," in Dryfoos, *Community Schools in Action*, 23. The Children's Aid Society model is an attempt to involve parents, maintain after-school enrichment programs, early-childhood programs, health services with the aid of school administration.

[43] Kenneth Strike, *Small Schools and Strong Communities* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2010), 62. See also Diane Johnson, "Faith, Hope, Tolerance, and Sense of Community," *The School Community Journal* 21, no. 1 (2011): 151–170, and Cousins, "Race and Class Challenges," 29–52.

[44] John Dewey, *LW* 1: 138. See also Feodor Cruz, *John Dewey's Theory of Community* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987) for a thorough discussion of Dewey's thoughts on community and also James Campbell's "Dewey's Conception of Community," in Larry Hickman, ed., *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a Postmodern Generation* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998), 24, and James Campbell, *Understanding John Dewey* (Chicago: Open Court, 1995).

[45] John Dewey, *LW* 7: 243.

[46] John Dewey, *LW* 5: 423.

[47] Ibid., 10.

[48] Blank, "Reaching Out to Create a Movement," 253.

[49] Strike, *Small Schools*, 10; and Raywid, "Community and Schools," 202. See also Michael Sedlak, *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986), 4, 9. See Parker, et al., "Case Studies of School Community and Climate: Success Narratives of Schools in Challenging Circumstances," 129–149. On the issue of credentialing see Randall Collins, "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification," *American Sociological Review* 36, no. 6 (December 1971): 1002–1019.

[50] William H. Kilpatrick, "The Underlying Philosophy of Cooperative Activities for Community Involvement," in Paul Hanna, *Youth Serves the Community* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936), 6.

[51] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 227.

[52] N. L. Engelhardt and N. L. Engelhardt, Jr., *Planning the Community School* (New York: American Book Company, 1940), 98.

[53] Strike, *Small Schools*, 36.

[54] Johnson, "Faith, Hope, Tolerance, and Sense of Community," 167. Johnson makes note of the significance of Dewey's *Democracy and Education* (1916) in understanding a school community "that prepares students to find community with their fellows and to continue to grow together wherever they find themselves," 165. These themes can also be found in the work of Benjamin Barber, *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America* (New York: Ballentine, 1992), and Robert Bellah, *The Good Society* (New York: Vintage, 1991).

[55] Deborah Meier, *In Schools We Trust: Creating Communities of Learning in an Era of Testing and Standardization* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 178.

[56] Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 40.