Bringing Community Organizing Into the School Reform Picture

Abstract

Community organizing plays an essential role in urban school reform that has been overlooked in much of the school reform literature. However, without a way to systematically document the accomplishments of community groups in the area of education organizing, their work remains largely invisible to educators, funders, policy-makers and the public-at-large. The authors have identified eight distinct areas in which community organizing groups are working to improve schools and student learning and show, through a Theory of Change model, how accomplishments in these areas connect community capacity to school improvement. The eight areas are: leadership development, social capital, community power, public accountability, equity, school/community connections, curriculum and instruction, and school climate. Community organizing groups add value to school reform by ensuring school improvement that is equitable and responsive to community expectations will be carried out and sustained.

INTRODUCTION

Across the country, community organizing groups, which historically have attended to neighborhood issues such as affordable housing, job generation, and crime prevention, are turning attention to public education (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002; Mediratta, Fruchter & Lewis, 2002). Nationwide, urban public schools in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods face similar problems--overcrowding, deteriorating facilities, inadequate funding, high staff turnover and a shortage of qualified teachers, lack of up-to-date textbooks, and children performing below grade level. Students attending these schools are shut out of high quality programs, discouraged from going to college, and shortchanged in their employment opportunities. Community organizing groups, interested in strengthening neighborhoods and concerned about their children's futures, have begun to address these issues, and their efforts are beginning to pay off (Gold, Simon & Brown, 2002; Gutierrez & Stowell, forthcoming; Hatch, 1998; Mediratta, Fruchter & Lewis, 2002; Schorr, 2002; Shirley, 1997). The studies show that when school reform goes hand-in-hand with building strong communities, schooling itself changes fundamentally, increasing the chances that reform will be carried out and sustained.

Educators, funders, and policy makers, however, lack a framework for seeing the significance of the work of community organizing to education reform. This failure to perceive the contribution community organizing is making to school reform derives partly from the assumption that urban communities are the problem and partly from the belief that professional educators know best how to address education issues. What we have found in our research, however, is that parents and residents of low- to moderate-

income communities can be an important part of the solution to the problems of urban schools. Research on education reform has suggested that long-lasting and substantive reform requires a high level of civic capacity, where coalitions of citizens with the credibility to bring together a range of public education stakeholders reach agreement on the problems facing public schools, make public commitments to solutions, and ensure follow through on promises to improve public education (Stone, 2001). In this paper, we show that the work of community organizing groups is important in that it strengthens communities and develops the civic capacity, or what community organizing groups call public accountability, needed to improve schools. We present a framework here that challenges the traditional separation of schools and communities by making the work of community organizing groups visible and demonstrating its contribution to school improvement. We argue that community organizing can make a difference in schools and school systems where internal efforts have failed because strong community capacity is critical to school improvement.

THEORETICAL CONTEXT: CONNECTING SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Our work articulates with literatures on the connections between communities and schools, the building of community capacity, and the work of community organizing for school reform. Though many urban educators still see deficits in families and communities as the source of schools' problems (Delpit, 1995; Hidalgo, 1992; and Lightfoot, 1978 offer this critique), much of the recent school reform literature has focused on the importance of tapping a community's assets and creating links between schools and communities. Some of this literature has begun to erode the professional paradigm that elevates professional expertise and overlooks the contributions of low-income families and communities to the educational process. At the same time, community development advocates have identified the building of community capacity as a crucial ingredient for change in poor neighborhoods. In general, however, research in both education and community development still focuses on the ways that education and community development professionals engage parents and does not address the ways that parents themselves might gain the political power to influence public education to best serve their children. This latter approach is found instead in the literature on community organizing for school reform, which distinguishes between what Dennis Shirley calls "accommodationist forms of parental involvement and transformational forms of parental engagement" (Shirley 1997, p. 73, emphasis in original). Like Shirley, we have found that community organizing offers a model for improving urban schools through the leadership and impetus of parents themselves.

Connecting Schools and Communities

A variety of studies over the past decade have documented the impact of parent and community involvement on student achievement; Anne Henderson and Karen Mapp provide a comprehensive overview of this literature (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Work on "parent involvement" points to the value of parents as aids to professional educators, reinforcing teachers' work through activities such as reading to children at home, showing an interest in children's school achievement, providing enrichment activities, and volunteering in school. (Chall and Snow, 1982; Epstein, 1995; Henderson and Berla 1994; Snow, 1998). Nancy Chavkin's work highlights the ways that parental involvement might particularly benefit minority students, who lag behind majority students in educational achievement, and whose families are often excluded from traditional parent-involvement programs directed at middle-class, educated parents (Chavkin, 1993; see also Lareau, 1989). Nonetheless, Chavkin provides a somewhat limited vision of the role that parents might play in schools. Attempting to show teacher enthusiasm for parent involvement, Chavkin reports that educational professionals participating in a study in the southwestern United States were overwhelmingly interested "in parents performing roles of school-program supporter, home tutor, and audience" (Williams & Chavkin, 1985). While such studies do offer an expanded role for parents as active partners in their children's education, they place parents firmly in the role of listener and supporter rather than as a decision-maker at the school level and an advocate for equity in education.

A second body of related research provides models for the ways that schools can engage parents by becoming more culturally responsive to families and creating new governance structures to increase participation. Researchers who have examined the role of culture in schooling have shown that local knowledge can enrich curriculum and

pedagogy (Au, 1980; Delgado-Gaitan, 1987; Erickson & Mohatt, 1987; Heath, 1983; McConnell, 1989; Moll, Amanti, Neff and Gonzalez, 1992; Valdes, 1996) Sociologists and political scientists have applied the concept of social capital to education and noted that strong local culture and community solidarity support children's sense of identity and buoy up their educational career aspirations (Coleman, 1988; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Putnam, 2000). Recent research has also begun to identify correlations between strong social capital in schools – measured by the existence of trusting relational networks connecting parents, students, and community members – and student achievement (Morgan & Sorensen, 1999; Goddard, 2003). Putting such insights into practice, James Comer's model of schooling is built on a partnership model rather than what has been called a "delegation" model, whereby parents delegate responsibility for their children's education to school professionals (Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Ben-Avie, 1996). Comer argues that schools must take responsibility for involving parents who have traditionally been shut out of the school culture, and his school model includes mechanisms for parental involvement at three levels: as parent representatives involved in collaborative decision-making, as active participants in the daily life of the school, and as regular supporters of their children's education (Comer, 1988). Such schools build social trust by treating parents as assets rather than liabilities (Payne, 1991). Finally, research on Chicago school reform's democratic decentralization, in which parents and community members have an equal role with educators in school decision-making, demonstrates the contribution of such participation to improving curriculum and instruction and raising student achievement (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1998; Moore 1998).

The notion that strong parent involvement enhances student achievement and that schools have a responsibility to reach out in a culturally appropriate way to their students' families seems well established. The vast majority of this literature, however, sees educators and education policy makers as the agents of reform, focusing on outreach from the school for parent involvement. Our work on community organizing has shown that parent organizations external to the school have introduced, pressured for, and contributed to sustaining such reforms. As they develop leadership skills and social capital, parents not only support the work of professional educators but also take the lead in school improvement.

Building Community Capacity

As will be illustrated in our change model below, one of the primary purposes of community organizing is to build community capacity and harness it for school improvement. This notion of community capacity building has become the centerpiece of a variety of community development initiatives in recent years, many of which include schools as essential neighborhood institutions (Schorr, 1988). Some authors have suggested that schools have the potential to provide more than just education to students. They can also serve as full-service community centers in poor neighborhoods, providing physical and mental health care, recreational activities, job training, and other social services (Davies, Burch, & Johnson, 1992; Dryfoos, 1994; Kirst, 1994). The Beacon model exemplifies this approach. First introduced in New York City, it makes public school buildings available as "safe havens" for the community after school hours. The Beacon model does turn school buildings into neighborhood centers, but it does not

necessarily lead to strategies for community participation in the school's educational program itself.

Advocates of Comprehensive Community Initiatives have sought a holistic approach, pursuing an "ecology of change" in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Kubisch et al., 2002). Such initiatives are particularly difficult to evaluate precisely because of the elements that make them attractive to these authors: their holistic approach to community development, their flexibility and evolving nature, and the wide range of outcomes pursued. Kubisch and her colleagues call for social science research that can help to explain "how disadvantaged communities function and evolve and what it means to 'build' a community" (Kubisch, et al., 2002, p.18). In particular, they seek information about how to influence the environmental factors that affect family and individual outcomes. Our discussion of community organizing (a strategy for community building conspicuously absent from these accounts) does provide useful examples of what it means to build a community, but it also complicates the underlying premise that "disadvantaged" communities can and must be "influenced" in order to be strengthened. Clearly, community organizing brings skills and resources to poor communities, but it also focuses on transforming power relations, rather than simply "fixing" individuals, families, or communities.

Community Organizing and Power Relations

Other scholarship on building community capacity has incorporated an analysis of community organizing as one of several strategies for capacity building. Chaskin and his colleagues, in particular, provide a definition of community capacity that links capacity to power: community capacity is "the interaction of human capital, organizational resources,

and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the well-being of that community" (Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh, & Vidal, 2001, p. 7). While Chaskin, et al., sometimes conflate volunteerism and techniques for building power, our work highlights the ability to leverage resources, focusing on the way that community organizing builds public accountability to create political will. Our research builds on Chaskin and his colleagues' work by illustrating the ways that community capacity can lead to a particular outcome: school improvement.

In this sense, our work contributes to a growing body of literature documenting the contributions of community organizing to the reform of public schools (Shirley, 1997; Giles, 1998; Moses & Cobb, 2001; Warren, 2001; Mediratta, Fruchter, & Lewis, 2002; Jacobs & Hirota, 2002). As Gary Anderson has shown, educational reform designed to make schools more inclusive of parents are often ineffective, serving instead as "a form of public relations to create greater institutional legitimacy for current educational practices" (Anderson, 1998, p. 571). Community organizing, with its community base outside the school and power-building model, helps to move a school toward embracing authentic parent participation, including involvement in governance, decision-making, and curriculum. Hollyce Giles argues that community organizing also helps to combat what Lareau and Shumar call the "individualist approach to family-school relationships" which keeps parents isolated from one another and prevents them from building relationships that would allow them to challenge school leadership (Giles, 1998; Lareau & Shumar, 1996). This individualist approach is also a danger of the free-market approaches that are currently dominating the school reform landscape in the United

States. Some scholars suggest that community organizing, and other techniques of building power in low-income communities could stand as a powerful alternative to such approaches (Zachary & olatoye, 2001).

Research on community organizing has also begun to explore the numerous challenges that confront school communities engaged in this work. Dennis Shirley, who has extensively studied the Industrial Areas Foundation's school reform work in South Texas, found that parent engagement did not always lead to improved student achievement, as measured by standardized test scores. This frustrated the teaching staff and led them to question the dedication of school resources to parent education. Not surprisingly, some teachers also perceived the community organization as encroaching on their professional autonomy and resented the additional workload that parent engagement required (Shirley, 2002). As we learn more about the successes of community organizing, we must also consider how this expanding network of school reformers can develop strategies to address such challenges head-on.

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

The study described in this article was a collaborative effort between Research for Action, an independent research group with a focus on the dynamics among parents, communities and schools, and the Cross City Campaign for Urban School reform, a nine-city network of school reform leaders.

We began the study by doing a search, using the web, citations and personal referral, for groups that self-identified as "organizing" parents and communities on education issues; within several months we turned up 500 groups nationwide. When we scrutinized these 500, we discovered that they had a range of approaches, including organizing volunteers for schools, legal challenges, parent education, cultural activities, social services and parent advocacy. We turned to the literature on community organizing to determine criteria for the kind of organizing group on which we would focus. The criteria we determined were that the groups: work to change public schools to make them more equitable and effective for all students; build a large base of members who take collective action to further their agenda; build relationships and collective responsibility by identifying shared concerns among neighborhood residents and creating alliances and coalitions that cross neighborhood and institutional boundaries; develop leadership among community residents to carry out agendas that the membership determines through a democratic governance structure; and use the strategies of adult education, civic participation, public action, and negotiation to build power for residents of low- to moderate-income communities.

When we applied these criteria to the 500 groups, we found 140 engaged in community organizing. This diverse pool included groups that were urban and rural, part

of national networks and independent, and multi- and single-issue. The groups were geographically dispersed across the country but concentrated in low-to moderate- income areas. Their members included African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and whites and many of them worked across several racial, ethnic, and language groups.

From the pool of 140, we chose 19 groups, representing the range of variation, for lengthy telephone interviews. We asked them about the focus of their work on education, where they were meeting success, and how they measured their accomplishments. This gave us a preliminary notion of the areas in which education organizing was working and making a contribution to school reform. We then selected five groups to study more comprehensively. These case study groups all were urban, but the sample was diverse in its inclusion of both multi-issue and single-issue focus, independent and networked, and geographically dispersed groups. Our sample selection represents a critical case strategy since we were interested in groups that had been involved with education organizing long enough that we could expect to see results.

For over two years we followed the education organizing of the Alliance Organizing Project (Philadelphia, PA), Austin Interfaith (Austin, TX), Logan Square Neighborhood Association (Chicago, IL), New York ACORN (New York, NY), and Oakland Community Organizations (Oakland, CA).[i] During that time we gathered many stories[ii] of education organizing. These stories, told to us by a range of public education stakeholders—including parents, organizers, teachers, administrators, elected officials, and school board members--allowed us to understand from many different perspectives the kinds of impacts the groups were having and the challenges they face. We looked in depth at the work of each group as well as across groups to understand how their work at

the neighborhood level links to changing schools and school systems. We incorporated into our research process periodic feedback sessions with staff, board members, leaders (active parent or resident members), teachers, and others with whom the groups worked in order us to check our findings and to develop a language for describing the groups' areas of work that resonated locally and was also compatible with the literatures on school reform and community development.

UNDERSTANDING STORIES OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING FOR SCHOOL
REFORM

As we gathered and reviewed stories of community organizing from the five groups, we found that no two organizing efforts looked exactly alike. On the surface, organizing campaigns varied depending on factors in the local context, characteristics of the organizing group itself, how far along an organizing effort was, and the intended scale of impact. Underlying this variation, however, we discerned common elements in the organizing process. Oakland Community Organization's (OCO) campaign for small schools is representative of many stories we heard in the course of our research and we will use it to describe the common elements we found in our analysis.

Oakland Community Organizations' Small Schools Campaign

OCO has been working in Oakland neighborhoods for nearly 30 years, the first 20 on neighborhood issues such as housing, drugs, and crime prevention. OCO began working on education in the early 1990s because of its members' concern with school overcrowding and their children's low scores on standardized tests. By the time OCO began its education organizing, it already had established its reputation in Oakland as a political player representing the interests of low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. OCO's early efforts in the school reform arena introduced the organization to the possibilities as well as the barriers to working on schools. Tying together members' concern about school overcrowding, concerns about neighborhood conditions, and a growing awareness of the benefits of small schools in urban districts, OCO initiated a small schools campaign both as a way to reduce overcrowding in neighborhood schools and as a way to improve public education in Oakland.

In order to make small schools a reality, OCO organized for a district-wide small schools policy that ensured the full participation of parents in design teams and implementation of plans, funding for renovations and construction of new facilities, and securing land for new small schools. The small schools campaign story we tell here begins with the fight for land for two small schools. By linking community development and school improvement, this story illustrates how, from a community perspective, concerns about neighborhood well-being and education quality are inseparable. The story also illustrates how community organizing links community capacity to school improvement by building citizen participation to create the power necessary to influence decisions critical to the quality of life in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods.

<u>The fight for land and new small schools</u>

In 1986, Montgomery Ward abandoned its mail order warehouse in Oakland and the building began to deteriorate with disuse. By 1993, OCO leaders in one neighborhood, who had been conducting individual one-on-one meetings and house meetings with neighborhood residents, heard complaints about the building. The empty building was a neighborhood eyesore. The windows were broken. People who lived near the building reported that they heard gunshots coming from the building at night. One leader explained, "There was graffiti inside and out and …certain gangs were there…It was very scary."

During the same time period, leaders in all the neighborhoods where OCO was working, heard about parents' concern with school overcrowding. As a result, the OCO Board decided that school overcrowding would be a focus for the whole organization and leaders began research into the issue. Their research revealed a

huge difference in student achievement between crowded schools in their neighborhoods and smaller schools in more affluent areas. Their research into the effects of school size on student learning helped them see the advantages of small schools and they began to develop a campaign to have the Oakland Unified School District adopt a small schools policy. The search for locations for new, small schools brought them back to the Montgomery Ward site. In the words of a neighborhood leader who told us this story:

> At our annual meeting in May 1997, we publicly talked for the first time to city representatives and the school district and got their support for three badly needed schools in Oakland, including one at the Montgomery Ward site. So it was out there publicly that this is what we were working towards….

With gentrification threatening the neighborhood, however, residents found themselves in the middle of competing interests regarding how the site should be used. Gentrification had increased the site's land value. Whenever the leaders thought they were close to having the building torn down, they would meet new obstacles, often in the form of lawsuits launched by developers who wanted to use the property for commercial purposes of for new middle class housing. They also had to confront the Montgomery Ward Corporation. OCO members learned that while Montgomery Ward claimed it lacked the financial resources to tear down the building, the company was buying up chain stores throughout the Northeast.

To succeed in demolishing the building and acquiring the space for small schools, OCO used a range of tactics directed at different levels of the system.

Leaders continuously met with neighborhood residents to build and replenish the ranks to keep the effort going. Regarding the need to create a strong base, one leader commented, "We kept pulling together hundreds and thousands of people." OCO sent 1,500 petitions to Montgomery Ward's Chicago headquarters. Leaders met with elected and non-elected officials at city, School District, and state levels to make their concerns known and enlist their support. They held public events attended by thousands of residents at which they asked officials for their commitment. "An important piece of our organizing was making sure the school district, the city, and the community were on the same page constantly and trying to keep that number one priority." They met with Montgomery Ward's corporate leaders. They made regular phone calls to mobilize people to accompany the city inspector into the building or monitor the proceedings of lawsuits in courtrooms.

Finally, in February 2001, despite a last ditch effort by developers to get the court to grant a stay on demolition, the Montgomery Ward building was torn down and temporary classrooms were put in place while plans moved ahead for new small schools. In the process, new community leaders were beginning to experience the reality of community power as teachers and parents met together to design new small schools. Reflecting on the campaign, one leader said,

> All these research meeting and actions and the work and training they necessitated became a veritable leadership "classroom" for new and emerging leaders, as well as for experienced leaders…. Armed with all the facts, willing to do the work and to testify on our own behalf, and

strengthened with the knowledge that none of us stands alone. Through our organized efforts we know we can win many victories.

Successes in the small schools campaign

During the eight years of the Montgomery Ward struggle, OCO achieved a number of significant accomplishments furthering its small schools initiative. OCO and Bay Area Coalition of Equitable Schools (BayCES), a local school reform group, joined together in a powerful partnership. Together they hired an organizer to work directly with teachers around the idea of small schools. As a result of the partnership, the support of hundreds of teachers, and the systematic one-to-one meetings OCO leaders had with school board members and other elected leaders, the district adopted a small schools policy that BayCES had drafted. A new superintendent open to small schools as a reform strategy created a school reform office charged to work in partnership with OCO and BayCES to implement the new policy was put in place. OCO helped to win passage of a $300 million bond issue for new school facilities targeted to low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. The Gates Foundation awarded a grant for nearly $16 million to BayCES to implement small schools, stating that Oakland had been selected as the first grantee "because of the great leadership in the school, city, the non-profits and the community. The necessary groundwork [for success] has been laid." Finally, OCO and BayCES, along with the district and union, sit at the table where successful designs for new small schools are selected. With these accomplishments, OCO turned its attention toward developing the capacity of the central office to support small schools and of parents and teachers to work collaboratively in the design and implementation of small

schools, continuing the search for additional land for new small schools, and sustaining the partnership it had with BayCES and the Oakland Unified School District.

Making Visible the Contributions of Community Organizing to School Reform: A Theory of Change

From stories such as the one about small schools in Oakland, we categorized the strategies and results of the work of education organizing into eight areas: leadership development, social capital, community power, public accountability, equity, school/community connections, curriculum and instruction, and school climate. By reading across many of them we were able to see the ways in which the eight areas work together in a change process that underlies education organizing, illustrated below in a Theory of Change model. The theory of change model shows the eight areas and the link between efforts to strengthen communities and school improvement.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

The OCO story illustrates the theory of change and demonstrates how discrete and perhaps seemingly unrelated efforts work in synchrony and help community organizing groups move toward their larger goals.

Building Community Capacity: Leadership Development, Community Power and Social Capital

Leadership development, community power and social capital are the building blocks of community organizing. Through work in these areas, community organizing increases civic participation and leverages by creating partnerships and relationships within and across communities, as well as with those in positions of authority.

Leadership development is a continuous activity of OCO. OCO organizers and leaders regularly held one-on-one meetings and house meetings with neighborhood residents in order to surface shared concerns. As they identified sh ared concerns, they carried out and reflected on research. For example, in this case OCO members investigated successful schools as well as the city, corporate, and private interests that were resisting their efforts to have the Montgomery Ward building torn down. Organizers and leaders also brought together community residents in public actions, where they engaged with public officials. Through these and other organizing activities OCO members developed the expertise and strategic thinking leaders need. As one OCO leader pointed out, she experienced the Montgomery Ward campaign as a "classroom" for leadership development.

Over the course of the eight-year campaign, OCO held several public actions attended by thousands of community residents. OCO's ability to turn out large numbers drew the attention of school district and political leaders as well as the media, reinforcing OCO's reputation as a powerful organization and voice of the community. In this way, OCO was building the community power needed to bring attention to the issues identified by low- and moderate-income communities.

The story of the Montgomery Ward struggle also illustrates OCO's success in building influence through expanding social capital. Within the neighborhood, OCO reached out to neighborhood residents and built a partnership with another community group that worked primarily with Asian residents around a shared interest in the local schools. OCO leaders met with city and school district officials as well as with teachers, and through face-to-face discussions built strategic alliances around small schools as a

strategy to address overcrowding and improve the schools. OCO brought together a range of diverse stakeholders at the neighborhood and city levels who do not usually associate because of racial, ethnic or linguistic differences or differences in roles and positions. This "bridging" social capital (Putnam, 2000; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002) is especially important in moving organizing campaigns forward because it builds accountable relationships which generate the political will to override private interests.

Public Accountability

Public accountability is the hinge that connects community capacity with school improvement. Increased community participation, strong relationships, and an organizational base recognized for being an authentic voice of the community can bring diverse interests together and broaden accountability for improving public education for children of low-to moderate- income families. Public accountability is what generates the political will necessary to forward equity and school/community connections.

The story of OCO's fight for land and a district policy for small schools drew on its reputation and relationship with a respected education reform organization to engaging district and elected officials in meetings and public actions. In these public settings, the officials made public commitments, promising to obtain land for small schools, as in the Montgomery Ward site, and to continue support for the implementation of small schools. By bringing its agenda into the public arena time and time again, OCO prepared the ground for a public decision making process rather than one that takes place behind closed doors. This created the basis for OCO members to hold their elected officials accountable for their promises, which ultimately resulted in winning the Montgomery Ward land for new small schools.

School Improvement: The Pressure for Equity and School/Community Connections
Enhances School Climate and Instruction and Curriculum

When those in power follow through on commitments to increase equity and when schools are more responsive to and connected with their communities, then authentic improvements in school climate and curriculum and instruction can result. This lays the basis for improved student learning and achievement. As schools grow stronger they contribute, in turn, to strengthening the capacity of the local community.

Linking the effort to tear down the Montgomery Ward building with the small schools campaign reflects OCO's struggle to increase equity. Through their research efforts, they uncovered and made public the disparity in size and quality between schools in Oakland low- to moderate- income neighborhoods and the more affluent neighborhoods. They found that schools in affluent neighborhoods were small and that children were achieving. OCO adopted a small schools strategy because its research on school reform showed that there were fewer discipline problems and higher student achievement in more intimate settings where relationships among teachers, students, and parents were closer and more supportive. They also learned that small schools could reduce the pattern of high teacher turnover that plagues urban schools because teachers in small settings feel a greater sense of connection and ownership. In addition, replacing the abandoned and deteriorating Montgomery Ward building with small schools that would include a public play area would address concerns about neighborhood conditions

By focusing on equity and school/community connections, including the redesign of teaching and learning, the small schools campaign intended to influence the quality of children's educational experience and set the stage for greater academic success. OCO

hoped that having parents and teachers working together in the design process for new small schools would sensitize teachers to students' needs and raise their expectations for academic achievement.

Community organizing groups have been working to improve schools for more than a decade, but their stories and accomplishments remain largely invisible in the field of school reform. Though there are variations in how they carry out their work, community organizing has long history and well-developed set of practices that make up the methodology. Our study, in focusing on the contribution that community organizing makes to education reform, reveals the value of applying the community organizing methodology to school reform. Although it is taken for granted that community organizing groups aim to build community capacity, there are few studies that explore the links between capacity building and change in the institutions that are the targets of these groups. By naming the eight areas in which they work and showing through a theory of change how work in each of these areas contributes to the goal of school improvement, our work describes the underlying "grammar" of community organizing in a way that shows its significance to audiences both in the fields of education and community development.

THE ADDED VALUE OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING TO SCHOOL REFORM

Community organizing does not take the place of professional attention to reform. Nor are community organizing groups alone in the field of external groups exerting influence on school reform. Community organizing in education reform plays a unique role by building community capacity and linking that to school improvement through public accountability.

The areas we have identified as the building blocks of community capacity and public accountability (leadership development, community power and social capital) are scarce in the work of school reform as it is usually defined. Even in areas where there is overlap between the work of community organizing and the work of educators and reform experts (for example, in the areas of equity, school/community connections, school climate, and curriculum and instruction), community organizing adds a critical dimension that otherwise would be missing. Our work demonstrates the significance to school improvement of community organizing and the community capacity it builds.

The added value of community organizing to school reform stems from the unique and important vantage point that community members and organizers bring to their work. Community organizing groups are rooted in neighborhoods and have a long-term commitment and a deep understanding of what it takes to support local families. In the study described here, for example, four of the five community organizing groups have been organizing in their settings for 20 years or more. They see schools as tied to other community concerns that need attention. Their constituents are deeply affected and angry when public institutions are ineffective or corrupt. Organizers tap constituents' anger and

motivation and help them build the skills and power to become formidable and uncompromising in working for institutional change.

Looking across the groups in our study, we identified four ways that education organizing adds value to school reform: sustaining the vision and momentum for change over time; persisting in working towards change despite obstacles and setbacks; creating the political will that motivates officials to take action; and producing authentic change in policies and programs to reflect the concerns of parents and community members.

<u>Sustainability</u>

School reform is a long-term enterprise, yet many factors in the larger context, such as short-term funding patterns and turnover of politicians and school and city administrations, mean that reforms often come and go without taking hold (Hess, 1999; Cuban and Usdan, 2003). Every school district we studied had a turnover of superintendent at least once during the three years of this project. Community organizing groups, because of their commitment to neighborhoods, are a force external to the schools and school system that can sustain the vision and momentum for change over time and with a changing cast of school district players.

Bringing in new members is a critical part of the work of community organizers and leaders. A common argument is that schools cannot depend on parents because they are only interested and involved during the time their children are attending a school. Organizing practice, however, involves continually renewing the base of members. As a result, organized parents and community members are able to sustain their efforts over time. Almost any organizing campaign extends over several years, and although some neighborhood residents or parents are part of an effort for the entire time, newer

constituents or those who had been working in other issue areas are able to replenish the group of participants.

The community organizing practice of calling on officials for commitments and then monitoring promises and programs also contributes to sustaining reform. Community organizing groups hold periodic accountability sessions, participate on review boards, and teach others through stories of change and resistance. Community organizing also contributes to sustainability by nurturing education professionals who come to share concerns and beliefs about the central role of parents and community in improving schools. In several of the sites we studied, teachers who were working with community organizing groups became principals in other schools and were instrumental in developing the next generation of reform educators. Even when they remained as teachers in the school setting, they would often play an important role in keeping up strong school/community connections by "socializing" incoming principals and teachers. In both cases, the assumptions and practice of these teachers and administrators changed as they begin to value the community/school connection.

Persistence

Without persistent champions, the strong counter-forces of entrenched bureaucracy and competing political and economic interests can derail reforms (Sarason, 1982, 1990; Stone, 2001) The strong motivation of parents and community members to make schools successful for their children energizes them to find ways around obstacles. A strength of community organizing is that it engages parents in analyzing the power relationships among elected and other public officials, which gives them the tools to anticipate and deal with obstacles. In addition, the strategic alliances that community

organizations form often prevent officials from raising obstacles in the first place. Because they are firmly rooted in valued community institutions, often churches, community organizations may gain the attention and respect of politicians who appreciate their role as active citizens (Wood, 2002).

<u>Creation of Political Will</u>

Bureaucracies, such as city government and urban school systems, are known for inaction, corruption, and resistance to change (Katz, 1992; Tyack, 1995; Zachary and olatoya, 2001) Conversely, district superintendents, who need to show that they are actively injecting new ideas and programs into failing systems, often end up introducing continuous reform, which the system does not have the capacity to absorb. This "reform overload" can be a barrier to schools becoming functioning organizations with a focus on teaching and learning. The result is more the appearance that things are changing than real change (Hess, 1999).

Community organizing strengthens systems of accountability in order to redress the problems of bureaucratic inertia and symbolic reform. Currently, accountability rests on one measure—results on standardized tests. The reliance on this single measure puts the burden on teachers and students. Elected officials can pass off responsibility for providing the resources and conditions that ensure educational opportunity. In addition, school and public officials manage competing interests, and they often act in their own best interest to avoid losing power. Community organizing strategies mitigate such impediments to action.

Among the ways that community organizing contributes to the creation of political will is through the "bridging" social capital it builds to connect parents, schools, and

community institutions, which enables low-income residents to tap into social networks that might otherwise be closed to them (Putnam, 2000). Community organizations use this bridging social capital to establish relationships with school and elected officials, making them aware of their concerns and agendas and soliciting commitments for action and follow-through. As Mark Warren has argued, "building social capital [alone] may not be sufficient, if those community institutions remain detached from our political system" (Warren, 2001, p.19; see also Wood, 2002).

Secondly, powerful community organizations can counter competing economic and political interests, for example providing political cover that allows officials to act in the interests of low-income communities. Making discussions public is a third way that education organizing creates the political will that can bring about action. When discussions of problems and solutions are public, everyone's interests are on the table. Without back door deals, it is more difficult for officials to dodge responsibility. Rather than avoiding politics, as so many education reformers advocate, community organizations focus on politics as a "critical tool" for implementing a parent-centered vision of reform (Stone, 2001).

<u>Authentic change that represents the perspectives of parents and community members</u>

Too often, the kinds of changes that take place in education reform are superficial or only partially implemented, what Hess terms "symbolic reform" (Hess, 1999). Historians of education have characterized this type of change as "tinkering" or as merely "moving the furniture around in the room" rather than moving the walls, while others have characterized the problem as reform with shallow roots (Tyack, 1995; Katz, 1992; Cuban & Usdan, 2003). The changes called for and that result from community

organizing efforts often aim at the underlying culture of schools and systems. In addition, through their persistence, community organizing groups press for full implementation. When the perspectives of families and communities are added to the school reform equation as a result of community organizing efforts, the kinds of changes that occur in schools are fundamental. The bottom line for parents, regardless of their circumstances, is that their children get what they need to be successful at the next level of school or in life. When low-income parents and community members gain sophistication with education issues and politics and make the kinds of demands on schools that their middle-class, suburban counterparts do, they challenge the taken-for-granted assumptions that urban parents do not care.

The educational changes that community organizing call for include more challenging curriculum and teaching, curriculum that reflects the values and culture of the students, and more respectful, supportive environments. Current research on urban school improvement notes that children in failing schools are simply not challenged intellectually (Schorr, 2002; Moses & Cobb, 2001). Community organizing teaches parents and community members to look at indicators of effective teaching and learning, such as comparing test scores to their children's letter grades or to schools in other neighborhoods in and out of the city. Parents also compare what happens in their own children's classrooms to what happens in classrooms in exemplary schools, where they see examples of challenging teaching and curriculum that reflects their values and culture. Armed with increased knowledge and understanding their rights, parents who spend time in their children's schools demand respectful relationships between adults and children and safe, supportive environments. They are not satisfied simply with "name-

brand" programs, but press for authentic efforts to challenge their children intellectually and create curriculum that taps into student and community knowledge. They demand equity in assignment to magnet programs and teacher assignment, and other resources across districts.

There are some who see a dark side to privileging community values, specifically fear that parochial interests will win out (Casanova, 1996). Our examples offer a counter argument. By building relationships and a collective sensibility across racial, ethnic and linguistic groups as well as social classes, community organizing prevents community input from turning into an opportunity to advance narrow and exclusionary interests.

When schools value parents' and community members' knowledge and traditions, the continuity between students' homes and school is stronger. Congruence between home, community, and school undergirds parents' ability to support their children and children's ability to make positive choices about their own commitment to their academic pursuits (Coleman, 1988; Portes & Rumbaut, 2000; Putnam, 2000). Responsiveness to community interests shapes reform in ways that make the school program more effective in motivating and challenging students, as well as in activating external support systems to work for children's school success.

CONCLUSION

Recognizing the crucial contribution of communities to urban school reform is imperative if education reformers are to make a case for continued investment in improving public education. Despite well-researched plans and good intentions, time and again improvement efforts, especially large-scale urban reforms, have not made progress. We have shown that initiating and sustaining reform requires involvement of groups outside the system, such as community organizing groups. From their outside vantage point, community organizing groups can bring together an array of citizen and political forces capable of challenging bureaucratic inertia or political norms of inaction which lead to symbolic reform. The theory of change presented here explains how the work of education organizing contributes to school reform by linking capacity in local communities to school improvement. Our work offers a counter-image to the "indifferent" or simply "angry" urban parent, which is a skilled, knowledgeable, powerful and socially connected community member -- a part of the solution to improving urban public schools.

The mission of community organizing groups is to build the power and base that parents and other residents in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods need to fight for resources and to make societal institutions, such as public education, responsive to the needs and expectations of the neighborhood's families. Just as more affluent parents have done, these low- to moderate-income families seek to make the school an extension of the community and to establish a common ground with school professionals (Stone, personal communication, June 27, 2003). Seeing the role of parents as agents of change represents a striking departure and fundamental difference from the way education reform theorists

and professional educators traditionally have conceptualized parents' and communities' roles in school reform efforts. School reformers usually only consider using channels within the system to try to bring about change. Community organizing groups challenge this deeply held belief about change coming only from within the system.

In this article we have pointed to some of the successes of the Oakland Community Organizations, but we have evidence of many successes from the other groups as well. Austin Interfaith, similar to OCO helped to win city bonds targeted to benefit schools in low-income neighborhoods. Virtually all five of the groups we studied obtained district and/or city allocations for after-school programs that provide academic enrichment, many at an impressive scale. For example, Austin Interfaith was instrumental in gaining funds to establish after-school programs in 28 schools. Four of the groups have been successful in winning allocations for new facilities or renovations where schools are overcrowded or deteriorating. Logan Square Neighborhood Association, for example, in a campaign to reduce overcrowding, won five new annexes at elementary schools and two new middle schools. New York ACORN has opened three new high schools. The Alliance Organizing Project and Austin Interfaith have increased school safety by obtaining more crossing guards, better lighting, and improved traffic patterns in school areas. After a two and a half year struggle, the Alliance Organizing Project won a city allocation for 37 new crossing guards, targeted for corners in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. Austin Interfaith has negotiated District policies that open access for low-income students to challenging academic programs and bilingual instruction. Four elementary schools in Austin's low-income neighborhoods now have "Young Scientists" programs that feed into a magnet middle school. Since the program began in

the early 1990s, the proportion of students from those schools who go on to the magnet middle school has increased from one in ten to one in four, and this has changed the demographic composition of the magnet program significantly. We could go on, but these examples provide concrete evidence of the depth and breadth of the accomplishments of these groups.

While our project was to make the contributions of low-income parents and community members to school reform visible, we do not mean to idealize or romanticize low-income parents and communities. The economic and social problems in their neighborhoods are serious, and community members often are isolated because of them. Community organizing offers a methodology that activates and builds on community assets for community improvement (McKnight and Kretzmann, 1990). What we have noted in our research is that community organizing groups look to existing social networks, in religious or other community-based groups. Their aim is to connect those networks and expand the range of issues addressed. They develop community members' skills of civic participation through coaching people in public speaking and dialogue, teaching members how to create meeting agendas and facilitate meetings, carrying out research and reflection, making members more knowledgeable about the issues that concern them, and holding public officials accountable. Again, the work of community organizing challenges the omnipresent discourse of deficit heard in schools, which casts families in low- to moderate-income communities as problems to work around or to be avoided, community organizing groups have developed an approach that takes on the disadvantages of poverty for the purpose of activating communities to be able to win what they need to thrive.

Across education, political science, sociology and other disciplines there has been a confluence of interest in social capital, bringing widespread agreement on the importance of relational networks, shared norms and social trust. Nonetheless, the mere existence of social capital does not guarantee its activation. There has not been sufficient attention to the <u>mechanisms</u> through which social capital affects schools and communities (Sandefur & Lauman, 1998). Our study describes the work community organizing groups do to produce social capital. Our theory of change shows the dynamic among three elements that make up community capacity -- social capital, leadership development, and community power -- that leads to public accountability for improving schools. More research needs to be done that explores this intersection of community capacity and school improvement. Such research could deepen our understanding of how schools improve and support the efforts of community organizing groups working to ensure that schools meet the education needs of low income families.

[i] See case studies for each site (Blanc, Brown, & Nevarez-La Torre, 2002; Gold & Pickron-Davis, 2002; Gold & Simon 2002; Simon & Gold, 2002; Simon & Pickron-Davis, 2002).

[ii] In referring to education organizing "stories," we are adopting the language used by community organizing groups for the narratives that describe their campaigns, leadership development, and successes. Stories are the way community organizing groups create a record of their history. They serve as the memory of the role of organizing in bringing about change, which too often is lost as the accomplishments of the groups are absorbed within the system. This institutional memory is important for both inspiring and instructing future leaders and organizing efforts.

REFERENCES

Anderson, G.L. (1998). Toward authentic participation: Deconstructing the discourses of
participatory reforms in education. <u>American Educational Research Journal.</u> 35
(4), 571-603.

Au, K. (1980). Participation in structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children:
Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. <u>Anthropology and
Education Quarterly,</u> 11 (2), 91-115.

Blanc, S., Brown, J., & Nevarez-La Torre, A. with Brown, C. (2002). <u>Strong
Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: Case Study: Logan Square Neighborhood
Association.</u> Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. Kerbow, D., Rollow, S., & Easton J.Q. (1998) <u>Charting Chicago
School Reform: Democratic Localism as a Lever for Change.</u> Boulder, CO:
Westview Press.

Casanova, U. (1996). Parent involvement: A call for prudence. <u>Educational Researcher,</u>
25 (8), 30-32, 46.

Chall, J.S. & Snow, C. (1982). Families and literacy: The contributions of out of school
experiences to children's acquisition of literacy. <u>The Harvard Families and
Literacy Project Final Report.</u> Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Chaskin, R., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., & Vidal, A. (2001). <u>Building Community
Capacity.</u> New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Chavkin, N.F. (1993). <u>Families and Schools in a Pluralistic Society.</u> Albany: State
University of New York Press.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. <u>American Journal of</u>

Sociology, 94 (Supplement), S95-S120.

Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259, 42-48.

Comer, J., Haynes, N., Joyner, E., & Ben-Avie, M. (1996). Rallying the Whole Village: The Comer Process for Reforming Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuban, L. & Usdan, M. (2003). Powerful Reforms with Shallow Roots: Improving America's Urban Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Davies, D., Burch, P. & Johnson, V.R. (1992). Policies to increase family-community involvement. Equity and Choice, 8(3), 48-51.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1987). Traditions and transitions in the learning process of Mexican children: An ethnographic view. In G.S. and L. Spindler (Eds.), Interpretive Ethnography of Education At Home and Abroad (pp. 333-359). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other People's Children. New York: New York Press.

Dryfoos, J.D. (1994). Full-Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth and Families. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Epstein, J. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (9), 701-712.

Erickson, F. & Mohatt, G. (1987). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. G. Spindler, & L. Spindler (Eds.), Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Giles, H.C. (1998). Parent engagement as a school reform strategy. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education Digest, 135.

Goddard, R.D. (2003). Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success. <u>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</u>, 25 (1), 59-74.

Gold, E. & Pickron-Davis, M. with Brown, C. (2002). <u>Strong Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: Case Study: Alliance Organizing Project</u>. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Gold, E., Simon, E. & Brown, C. (2002). <u>Successful Community Organizing for School Reform</u>. Chicago: The Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Gold, E. & Simon, E. with Brown, C. (2002). <u>Strong Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: Case Study: Oakland Community Organizations</u>. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Gutierrez, M. & Stowell, B. (forthcoming) <u>Alliance Schools: A Comparative Study</u>. Philadelphia: OMG Center for Collaborative Learning.

Hatch, T. (1998). How community action contributes to achievement. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 55, (8), 16-19.

Heath, S.B. (1983). <u>Ways With Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms</u>, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Henderson, A.T. & Berla, N. (Eds.) (1994). <u>A New Generation of Evidence: The Family is Critical to Student Achievement.</u> Washington, D.C.: The Center for Law and Education.

Henderson, A. T. & Mapp, K. L. (2002). <u>A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement</u>. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hess, F.M. (1999). <u>Spinning Wheels: The Politics of Urban School Reform</u>. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Hidalgo, N.M. (1992). <u>i saw pureto rico once: A Review of the Literature on Puerto Rican Families and School Achievement in the United States,</u> (Report No. 12). Baltimore: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, John Hopkins University.

Jacobs, L. & Hirota, J. (2002). New York and Chicago: Academy for Educational Development and Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago.

Katz, M. B. (1992). Chicago school reform as history. <u>Teachers College Record</u>, 94 (1), 56-72.

Kirst, M.W. (1994). School-linked services: Appraisal, financing, and future directions. Paper prepared for the Invitational Conference on School-Linked Comprehensive Services for Children and Families, Leesburg, VA, September 28-October 2, 1994.

Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P., Brown, P., Chaskin, R., Fulbright-Anderson, K., & Hamilton, R. (2002). <u>Voices from the Field II: Reflections on Comprehensive Community Change</u>. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Lareau, A. (1989). <u>Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education</u>. London: Falmer Press.

Lareau, A., & Shumar, W. (1996). The problem of individualism in family-school policies. <u>Sociology of Education</u>, extra issue, 24-39.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). <u>Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools</u>. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

McConnell, B. (1989). Education as a cultural process: The interaction between community and classroom in fostering learning. In J. Allen & J.M. Mason (Eds.). <u>Risk Makers, Risk Takers, Risk Breakers: Reducing the Risks for Young Literacy Learners</u>. (pp. 201-221). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

McKnight, J.L. and Kretzmann, J.P. (1990). <u>Mapping Community Capacity.</u> Evanston, IL: Institute of Policy Research, Northwestern University.

Mediratta, K., Fruchter, N. & Lewis, A.C. (2002). <u>Organizing for School Reform: How Communities are Finding their Voice and Reclaiming their Public Schools</u>. New York: Institute for Education and Social Policy, New York University.

Moll, L.C, Amanti, C., Neff, D. & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms, <u>Theory into Practice</u>, 31 (2), 132-141.

Moore, D.R. (1998). <u>What Makes These Schools Stand Out? Chicago Elementary Schools with a Seven-Year Trend of Improved Reading Achievement</u>. Chicago: Designs for Change.

Morgan, S.L., & Sorensen, A.B. (1999). Parental networks, social closure, and mathematics learning: A test of Coleman's social capital explanation of school effects. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 64, 661-681.

Moses, R.P. & Cobb, C.E. (2001). <u>Radical Equations: Math Literacy and Civil Rights</u>. Boston: Beacon Press.

Payne, C.M. (1991) The Comer intervention model and school reform in Chicago: Implications of two models of change. <u>Urban Education,</u> 26 (1), 8-24.

Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R.G. (2001). Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). Bowling Alone. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Sandefur, R.L. & Lauman, E.O. (1998). A paradigm for social capital. Rationality and Society, 10, 481-501.

Sarason, S.B. (1982) The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., (second edition);

Sarason, S.B. (1990). The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schorr, J. (2002). Hard Lessons: The Promise of an Inner City Charter School. New York: Ballantine.

Schorr, L. B. (1988). Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America. New York: Anchor Books.

Shirley, D. (1997). Community Organizing for Urban School Reform. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Shirley, D. (2002). Valley Interfaith and School Reform: Organizing for Power in South Texas. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Simon, E. & Gold, E. with Brown, C. (2002). Strong Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: Case Study: Austin Interfaith. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Simon, E. & Pickron-Davis, M. with Brown, C. (2002). Strong Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: Case Study: New York ACORN. Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Snow, C. (1998). <u>Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children</u>. Washington, DC:
National Academy Press.

Stone, C.N. (2001). Civic capacity and urban education. Retrieved November 4, 2001,
from http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/stone/prolo.html.

Stone, C.N, Henig, J.R., Jones, B.D., & Pierannunzi, C. (2001). <u>Building Civic Capacity:
The Politics of Reforming Urban Schools</u>. Lawrence, KS: University Press of
Kansas.

Tyack, D.B. (1995). Tinkering Toward Utopia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press.

Valdes, G. (1996). <u>Con Respeto: Bridging the Distances Between Culturally Diverse
Families and Schools</u>. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Warren, M. (2001). <u>Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American
Democracy</u>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Williams, D. L., Jr. and Chavkin, N. F. (1985). <u>Final Report of the Parent Involvement in
Education Project</u>. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Wood, R.L. (2002). <u>Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in
America</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zachary, E., & olatoye, s. (2001). <u>A Case Study: Community Organizing for School
Improvement in the South Bronx</u>. New York: New York University Institute for
Education and Social Policy.