

1-1-1985

Public Education in Boston

Joseph M. Cronin

Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp>



Part of the [Education Policy Commons](#), and the [Urban Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cronin, Joseph M. (1985) "Public Education in Boston," *New England Journal of Public Policy*. Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol1/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Journal of Public Policy by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact scholarworks@umb.edu.

Public Education in Boston

Joseph M. Cronin

72

Historically, Boston schools have been a source of pride and educational innovation, yet they have also been fraught with problems that are typical of urban education. Both the success achieved and the problems encountered in Boston schools bear analysis. In looking at such areas as overall quality of education, funding, and compliance with federal guidelines, specific recommendations for the future of public education in Boston can be offered. In addition, the impact of Boston's success or failure in implementing new ideas through the school committee and the mayor is not limited to the city itself. This article's outlining of public education in Boston has lessons for the whole of New England.

The issue of public education in Boston has been the topic of intense discussion and debate for the last twenty years. The injuries and complaints of Boston school parents have been considered by a series of state and federal courts. For several years, the rights both of minority children, now a majority of the school enrollment, and of handicapped children have been protected by judges and court desegregation monitors. Since Boston public schools educate 10 percent of the children of Massachusetts—5 percent of the children of New England—the problems of Boston schools spill over to other communities and other states. Indeed, even before the well-publicized federal court desegregation decision in 1974, Boston schools won attention in books such as *Village School Downtown* and *Death at an Early Age*.¹

During 1984, Boston voters elected a new mayor, and a new city council and school committee, both of which have four members elected at-large and nine members elected by neighborhood districts in the city. In the area of public education, the mayor, the council, and the school committee collectively face old problems and new opportunities. This article explores how the former may be overcome and the latter availed of. Specifically, it addresses the following questions:

What myths about New England schools get in the way of solving problems?

What are some of the key problem areas that affect educational excellence?

What is the history of urban school improvement, including state involvement?

What decisions can the mayor make about public education?

How can the Boston School Committee function effectively and find the necessary funds?

What can elected officials learn from historical precedents?

What does the future hold?

It is important to look to the future and to acknowledge that the infant born in 1984 will probably graduate from high school in 2001. Boston schools were indisputedly great in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries but were less so in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. There should be a major effort, therefore, to prepare Boston schools for excellence in the late 1980s and 1990s, with the focus of debate on the proper education of children who will spend most of their lives in the twenty-first century.

Mischievous Myths

73

One must begin the discussion of public education in Boston by rejecting the useless myths that retard understanding of today's problems. These myths concern Boston school enrollment, the school committee's role, the loss of "local" control, and the switch to parochial or private schools.

The problem of declining enrollments is not a recent one. Boston schools began to lose enrollments during the 1930s after public school enrollment reached a high of 137,000 in 1933. The schools then lost 52,000 pupils by the early 1960s. Although Judge W. Arthur Garrity's desegregation decision in 1974² and the State Board of Education's action may have accelerated parent flight from the public schools for several years, Boston families were buying or building homes in other communities for the four decades prior to their actions. White enrollment in the western Boston suburbs that have reputations for excellent schools has declined 35 to 50 percent since 1970, yet the same is true of major cities such as Baltimore, Cleveland, Columbus, Milwaukee, and San Francisco, whether or not courts have desegregated their schools.

A second myth, believed in all New England states, is that the school committee runs the schools. The most important decision a committee makes is the selection of an able superintendent of schools. Its most important function is to guide, question, and challenge yet support that superintendent in carrying out the mandate of economic, equal, and excellent education. Conflicts between school committees and superintendents can be counterproductive. Schools handle turmoil poorly, and controversy is useful only if it calls attention to resources needed to improve a situation.

A third New England myth, indeed a minor branch of secular theology, is that schools are a local problem governed by "local" control. Throughout this article, the traditional role and legal authority of the state in requiring cities to establish an educational system according to state criteria is examined: school committee members, it must be remembered, are state officials, and as such they are accountable to the state Board of Education and the legislature.

A fourth myth is that citizens have switched their children to parochial or private schools only very recently. The use of private schools in Boston actually began in the seventeenth century, well before the development of a Boston School Committee in the nineteenth century. During the 1930s, parochial and private schools attracted 30,000 students, and private school enrollment reached a peak of 45,000 in the years after World War II. During the 1960s, the numbers shrank to 30,000 and have, in recent years, stabilized. Of course, the percentage of all students using private and parochial

schools is higher now than it was many years ago. Thousands of Boston school parents, however, use *both* parochial and public schools: public schools for kindergarten and the high schools that require entrance examinations, and parochial schools for the elementary and junior high school years. The existence of educational alternatives should goad elective officials to compete in offering quality education in the public schools.

Key Problem Areas

Several key problem areas—overall quality of education, funding, security, community use, state involvement, successful graduation of students, and the competency of teachers—affect Boston's educational excellence. These areas require thoughtful analysis in order to solve the problems and thus further academic integrity.

Education quality encompasses the breadth and variety of school programs, and the adequacy of the curriculum in conventional and vital basic academic subjects such as math, science, reading, and writing. Quality includes the availability of art and music and pupil access to libraries and physical education. It also includes the education of the handicapped and vocational programs. Many specialized teachers, however, were laid off during Tregor/Proposition 2, severely limiting the level of educational quality.³

In fact, the teaching force, sometimes unfairly, is held responsible for the shortcomings of the schools. Clauses in the teachers' collective bargaining contract, however, such as "bumping rights" for teachers who have longer years in service, or rights to transfer to another school whether or not the principal feels the teacher is the right person for the job, may impede quality.

Another component of quality requiring attention is the service for educationally handicapped children. Boston school services for the physically handicapped were nationally recognized at the turn of the century. More recently, Judge Thomas Morse found the Boston schools out of compliance with state and federal standards for the education of the handicapped, and he appointed a monitor and supervisor of placement and program decisions.⁴ In order to remedy the problem and improve the services to handicapped children, the school committee should ask for a briefing on their responsibilities under the law. Although this receivership ended in the summer of 1983, the issue is one that could arise again.

Vocational education is another important issue. The magnificent Hubert H. Humphrey Occupational Resource Center, despite its attractive features, is one-third empty during the day and has space available in the late afternoon. Here the problem to consider is how to publicize the center and how to educate students about the merits of vocational training. A dozen headmasters and three dozen counselors have failed thus far to encourage enough students in their high schools to enroll. Encouragement and support for vocational education is necessary to maintain its quality.

Often, the results of testing programs highlight the achievements of school educational programs. For instance, a total of 32,600 Boston students in 1982 took the Metropolitan Test, a measure of national educational achievement. Boston elementary school students performed moderately well on the Metropolitan Test; however, in grades 9 and 10 the scores of Boston school children began to drop to the 30-40 percentile range. In 1983 Boston's 1,500 high school students taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) averaged a score of 362 for the verbal exam, which was seventy-five points below the state average, and a score of 407 for the math exam, which was below the Massachusetts average. However, the reporting of an "average score" does not display the 700 +

scores of the top Boston Latin School and Boston Latin Academy graduates or the 250 scores of some juniors who have great difficulty answering the questions. Hundreds of Boston high school graduates will not meet the 800 combined test score—the requirement for university admission mandated by the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education. Certainly, these standardized test results should be carefully examined and, as far as they reflect the relative overall quality of school programs, they should be improved.

A 1983 Becker Institute poll⁵ questioned adult citizens about their attitudes toward education. The poll, taken on behalf of the Becker Institute's clients, indicated that much remains to be accomplished concerning the quality of public schools. The respondents to the Becker poll, of whom 60 percent had no children in school (compared to 90 percent in Boston, where only 10 percent of the respondents had children in public schools) believed the following:

62 percent felt that the decline of education was serious;

48 percent labeled the quality of education "poor";

73 percent said that new teachers should be tested;

92 percent agreed that students should pass an annual test of basic skills;

65 percent thought the State Board of Education should make up the test for Massachusetts children;

70 percent felt that state aid should be withheld if a local school department failed to cooperate with the state in administering the statewide evaluation test.

The results of the Becker poll, therefore, underscore the need for serious improvement of quality, insofar as Massachusetts citizens perceive it.

A second key problem area in Boston concerns finance. The mayor and council each share responsibility for Boston's tax rate and the amount of the school budget over and above what the Tregor law requires. Deciding the level of the school budget is an annual issue of great importance. By rural or suburban standards, Boston schools are expensive. The allocation of \$229 million in FY 84 by the official votes of the school committee and the city council was only the city share. Another \$30 million for Boston school programs came from state and federal sources. Pensions and debt service on school construction appear nowhere in the school budget, unlike the budgets of many cities outside Massachusetts. In addition, only \$150 million of the total funds was allocated to instruction, of which \$75 million was for "regular" education (actually \$63 million after \$12 million was spent on transportation). Handicapped children needed \$48 million, of which \$5 million was for transportation, and \$15 million was allocated for tuition for private placements other than in city schools. Occupational education cost \$11 million and bilingual education cost another \$10 million.

This annual operating budget provides for staffing. In FY 84 among the 8,000-member staff, approximately 2,300 were regular instructors, 120 were vocational teachers, 750 were special education teachers, 400 were bilingual education teachers, and 200 were specialists and substitute teachers. Boston employed 769 pupil service workers, of whom 438 were hired for extracurricular programs and 99 as safety/security workers. Another 1,300 workers provide "support service," of whom 470 are assigned to the physical plant, 814 to administration, and 34 to information services. There were

45 staff members working on alterations and repair, with a steady supply of work orders and requests.

Since they affect the Boston school operating budget, these 2,500 non-teaching positions need a thorough review. There may be a surplus of district superintendents, principals and assistants (in small schools), nonteaching teachers, custodians, aides, and other staff. State and federal laws require that certain central office and school building functions be performed by qualified accountants, engineers, counselors, principals, and superintendents. In order to fairly examine staff and costs, it is possible to compare personnel levels in Boston with personnel levels in cities of comparable size, such as Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Louisville. The Municipal Research Bureau, the Boston Finance Commission, and area universities with the help of the Council of Great City Schools, have the resources to compare workloads and school staffing costs in these cities with Boston's in order to evaluate Boston's relative cost-effectiveness in these areas.

The issue of school finance also encompasses the building and maintenance of physical facilities. Boston has had some outstanding school facilities at all levels, such as the new Condon Community School and the electronics lab and cablevision studio at the Hubert H. Humphrey Occupational Resource Center.⁶ Boston also has middle schools that were converted from elementary school buildings, and which lack modern science facilities and space for other programs. Boston English High School suffers from design flaws that make it an inadequate high school for the long term. The Boston Latin Academy occupies a substandard facility that has long been scheduled for replacement.⁷ In addition, gymnasiums in many schools are inadequate for a full program of physical fitness, sports, and recreational activities. Physical education space is a problem at many middle schools and several of the senior high schools, especially in an age that requires equal access to facilities for young men and women.

In order to most effectively distribute the allocated funds to Boston schools, the two dozen schools with the most educational shortcomings, relatively small enrollments, the least energy-effective measures, and the highest maintenance costs, ought to be closed in 1984-86, despite alumni protest or neighborhood nostalgia.

A third key problem area facing Boston schools is security. The typical Boston school is a sturdy fortress, protecting those inside against unauthorized intruders. Fortunately, most Boston schools offer reasonably good protection against violence and disruption, and those schools with persistent problems of discipline, tension, and conflict are few. However, several hundred acts of vandalism and destruction of property are reported each year. It is important to note that many such acts are committed by out-of-school persons; the schools have strict discipline codes and violators are punished by reprimands, suspensions and, if necessary, expulsions. Arson and fire problems are less frequent but are a source of expense and concern to schools and public safety officials.

The role of schools in a community is a fourth problem area. All industrial communities, and many less developed ones, treat the school as a very special, almost sacred place. Very often, Boston schools are often named either for the neighborhood or for some hero or outstanding citizen, thus furthering this identity of the school as a special, perhaps inaccessible, place.

Ideally, the school should be a community facility utilized by all age groups, from infants to elderly people, and by the entire family. One positive example of community use is the Josiah Quincy School in South Cove, which also functions as the local community's social center. A dozen of the 123 Boston schools serve as community schools,

while the remainder exist on a strict schedule and are locked up in mid-afternoon. To use facilities at night requires payment of custodial and security fees that most neighborhood groups find exorbitant and prohibitive. Although other New England cities have similar constraints, the fact that, in general, Boston schools are not available after normal school hours for the use of the community is a problem for the mayor, council, and school committee. This is a reason that many neighborhood associations and councils look to churches, settlement houses, and other facilities as alternatives.

A fifth problem area is control of the schools. When former school committees refused to comply with state and federal statutes concerning equal education for racial minorities and handicapped children, the price for this noncompliance was heavy: several races were alienated, there were ten years of negative publicity, and the school committee lost control over student and staff assignments.

Judge Morse found Boston out of compliance with Chapter 766 of the Massachusetts statute and federal law 94-142—the statutory requirements for the evaluation and placement of handicapped children.⁸ Until 1983 special needs placements in Boston were closely monitored by the court. In 1981, Judge Garrity began to reduce his close supervision and control over Boston school operations. He asked the State Board of Education to perform most of the monitoring of Boston schools as that board does for other Massachusetts cities with substantial racial minorities. He requested business leaders to remain involved with Boston schools and urged that Boston parents participate in discussion and decisions about the schools.

In 1984 the Boston School Committee had an opportunity to regain a considerable measure of control by voting on a comprehensive educational plan. During 1983, an educational planning group involving school committee members, community representatives, leaders of several city-wide groups, school planners, and university personnel was established. Their recommendations, along with those of parents and other citizens, formed the framework of a plan that can be submitted to the court and state board, thus re-establishing some measure of leadership and control.⁹

Another important problem area is the success or failure of the school system in graduating students either into the world of college or into the world of work. As late as 1984, less than half of Boston school students graduated from high school and, of those, only half went on to college. A large proportion of the 25 percent of Boston students who do go on to college graduate from the Boston Latin School and the Boston Latin Academy. As an incentive to increase the numbers of graduating students, Boston schools signed a Compact with business organizations, universities, and cultural organizations to increase school attendance through grade 12; to teach basic skills more effectively; to graduate 5 percent more students each year; and to place more students in postsecondary education or in work, with notices of jobs provided by employers. With the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and the Private Industry Council locating 320 employers willing to sign an agreement to offer job notices and help to Boston graduates, 1984 was a year of measurable progress. For their part, area colleges have offered scholarships, college counseling, practice at SAT tests, and information about postsecondary opportunities.

Many Boston students would benefit from a one- or two-year technical program of education. A four- or five-year degree is only one option, but already the percentage of those expressing interest in further education has gone from 53 percent in 1982 to 61 percent in 1983.¹⁰ However, the school system's college and employment counseling problems include a very limited counseling staff with a 1:400 ratio, low expectations

among students at certain district high schools, and a lack of student achievement in certain middle and senior high schools. The business community has provided considerable inducement through the Trilateral Council for Education Quality and School Volunteers for Boston, both of which provide partnerships, tours, tutoring, and many other types of stimulation toward school improvement and career education.

A final problem area for Boston's public educational system concerns teachers. On the front line of urban education, Boston teachers have faced forcible reduction in their numbers due to the decline in enrollment and the shortage of funding. They have been bumped and beleaguered, and they need strong and consistent support from the school committee, superintendent, and mayor, as well as good materials and the chance to succeed. At the same time, teachers cannot expect to take the maximum sick leave and personal days each year or expect guaranteed employment in fields outside their college major or field of expertise. They cannot expect to survive by pass-fail grading systems for themselves, which deny excellence, or avoid periodic upgrading of their knowledge of subject matter. In order to maintain public support and the confidence of city officials, Boston teachers must abide by stricter professional standards.

Massachusetts will be faced with a challenge in 1985 to revise the curriculum, set higher standards, and upgrade the quality of teachers. Some teachers will need the option of retirement or retraining. Because teaching is demanding, especially in the city, the quality and morale of the teaching force should be given thoughtful, compassionate consideration by the school committee and superintendent as well as periodic recognition by others, including the mayor and local corporations.

The History of Urban School Improvement

The history of school improvement begins with the start of public education. Boston Latin School, founded in 1634, was the first public school in America. To this day it continues to function, along with the Boston Latin Academy, as a college preparatory school. During the 1800s, Boston founded the first English High School in America and was among the first cities to introduce public school legislation, industrial and vocational education, and school health programs. School superintendents spoke on these innovations at national meetings about education and welcomed many to Boston who wished to follow the city's progressive lead. At the height of Boston's academic excellence, more than one hundred Boston school seniors a year were admitted to Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University. University cooperation with Boston employers was such that hundreds of students were dismissed early in the afternoon each November and December to clerk at downtown retail establishments. Special programs for carpenters, upholsterers, electricians, and other trades led to early acceptance by the specialty labor unions and helped establish solid careers.

Boston schools grew from the late 1800s until 1933, when school enrollments peaked. Beginning in the 1920s, roads and commuter rail began to reach Boston's nearby rural communities and suburbs, and the city's family population began a fifty-year process of migration to larger, greener lawns. Federal mortgage and highway policy after World War II further stimulated the suburbs and thinned out the city. Initially, the families moving out were Protestant, then Irish and Italian Catholic, and then finally Jews, who were among the strongest patrons of Boston public schools. The population of Boston schools, which was 98 percent white, dropped 50,000 in twenty years to its low of 85,000 in 1955. For a decade, the school population grew slowly up to 93,000, largely

because of blacks and others migrating to Boston from other cities, the South, and Puerto Rico. Today both black and white enrollments, along with family size, is declining, although Hispanic and Asian enrollments are climbing each year.

During the 1800s, Boston's school organizational structure evolved. Most of the basic nineteenth-century organizational structure of Boston schools still exists. There is a school committee, a superintendent of schools, and headmasters (high school) and principals who are aided by various deputies and assistants. The city-wide high schools either select students by examination (the Latins and Technical High), offer a special program (English, Copley, and Boston High), or exist as district high schools serving neighborhoods (Brighton, Hyde Park, Jamaica Plain, Roslindale, and West Roxbury). At one time the mayor was a member of the Boston School Committee, but this practice was dropped in 1884. In Boston, as in other cities, ward politics led to scandals over textbook selection, schoolhouse maintenance, and school employment procedures. The school committee was reduced in size from seventy-six to twenty-four members, then in 1906 to five members, and in 1984 to the present size of thirteen. The history of state involvement in the management of schools began in the twentieth century. Prior to 1965, the State Board of Education essentially left Boston alone, partly because all the postwar requests for assistance came from the overflowing suburbs, which needed state help for new schools and for training new teachers for the suburban baby boom. Boston trained its own elementary teachers at the "normal" school, later Boston State (Teachers) College, and with its good tax base and declining enrollment, it raised 95 percent of its support for schools locally from taxes on property, while still enjoying higher teacher and administrative salaries than most of the suburbs.

However, during 1965 two major developments changed the relationship between Boston schools and the state. The Willis-Harrington report recommended a stronger leadership role for the State Board of Education and a new school aid formula increased state aid from less than 5 percent to more than 25 percent of the Boston school budget.¹¹ A blue-ribbon panel, including Cardinal Cushing and other leaders, recommended the state Racial Imbalance Law to provide for racial equality and integration of the growing number of minorities.¹² Both laws passed. Boston accepted the additional state aid for school operations and buildings but very reluctantly submitted to racial balance plans in 1966-74, plans meant to address a problem that had plagued Boston since the 1840s.

This was the first time that the Boston School Committee and State Board of Education members tried to work through major issues of educational planning, quality, and responsibility. Both state and federal courts were called in to resolve the racial controversy after the school committee failed to submit plans that adequately complied with either state law or federal civil rights standards. Judge Arthur Garrity found a "dual school district,"¹³ one in which minorities were moved through school on a different grade structure than were white students. He approved a state board plan in 1974, then his own modified version in 1975, always closely collaborating with state education officials.¹⁴

Since 1970, the state has passed laws concerning bilingual education and the education of handicapped persons. Also, the state must approve local plans for almost all federal educational programs, one of which is for vocational/technical education. The role of the state as supervisor, monitor, and regulator has grown considerably during the past twenty years in Massachusetts, as in all other states.

Education, implied by its omission from the United States Constitution and as it is briefly defined in the Massachusetts Constitution, is a state responsibility. School com-

mittees are in fact made up of state officials, and they exist due to state statutes. Only their size is regulated by home rule or local option. Schools must abide by minimum state standards that are set by state officials for length of day, length of year, and health and sanitary conditions. The placement of handicapped students, including the method of evaluation of needs; the contents of an individual education plan; the varieties of bilingual education; the safety standards for a school bus; and the kind of evaluation for federally funded reading programs, are subject to review by state officials.

80 The issue of state and local division of responsibility for education, quality, and dollars continues to attract considerable attention in New England. Other regions and states—from New York to Tennessee to California—have already begun debate over the question of how the state can both mandate and finance school improvement plans, and how much they can measure and enforce compliance with those standards. Indeed, states outside of New England, where local control is less of an ideology, often exert a much stronger influence on local school decisions. Twenty-one states actually approve the textbooks used in local classrooms. Dozens of states periodically send inspectors or evaluation teams into the schools. New York now requires that all teachers obtain a master's degree by their fifth year in teaching. Most of the southern states require teachers to pass a test, whereas in the North this has mainly been a city requirement for sixty years or more, and a growing number of states require that students pass a test either for promotion or graduation from each school level.

Local control, although a much trumpeted slogan, is not supported in the Massachusetts Constitution, state statutes, or public opinion. In fact, during the late 1980s, more control may be assumed by the state due to citizen discontent with the quality or productivity of schools, including Boston's schools. Public opinion surveys in Massachusetts (Becker 1983) reveal an overwhelming consensus that the state should require that students study academic subjects each year, such as English, math, and science, more than one year of U.S. history, and four years of physical education; and that the state should test student academic progress at several intervals as a condition for the continued flow of state funds.

Federal funding has also historically influenced Boston schools. Federal funds in the 1960s made possible new educational programs for disadvantaged students (Title I, now called Chapter I). These funds can only be spent according to a detailed plan, and are subject to annual evaluation and audit. However, the school committee and superintendent can periodically restructure Chapter I programs to make them work more effectively. Federal officials also supply much of the money for school lunch and breakfast programs, handicapped education, and bilingual education—each of which carries special rules and guidelines. State officials are paid to approve, monitor, and evaluate both the federal and state programs.

Although through the early 1980s the Reagan administration practiced deregulation and program consolidation, offering less rather than more federal funds, the nation continues to debate the need for increased federal funds for math and science teaching, curriculum development (possibly for foreign language and computer education), and federal encouragement of excellence through teacher merit pay, gifted student programs, and other means. Federal funds, however, should not be expected to account for more than 10 percent of the budget in the mid-1980s. Most likely it will be the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that will try to assume a larger role in assuring school quality and adequate funds.

Mayoral Decisions Affecting Public Education

The mayor is an important person in part because he or she approves the school budget and controls the purse on major school construction decisions. But he or she is also viewed as a leader in devising a total strategy of improving the economic climate of the city, including much that affects the schools, whether it is the quality of public housing, health, job training, family services, or the control of crime and delinquency.

On Curriculum and Operations

It is politically undesirable for a mayor to participate in decisions to name principals, to promote district superintendents, or to fire or transfer teachers—the lists of mayoral campaign contributors would be scrutinized for the names of educators. During the 1890s and again in the 1930s, teachers and administrators were believed to “purchase” their positions, which is a potential source of scandal that neither the mayor, school committee, nor school staff wants—or could get away with—in the 1980s. Occasionally, students need to be expelled or teachers disciplined. A mayor does not want to get involved in operational decisions that either punish or reprieve school offenders.

Although there is nothing wrong with a mayor expressing opinions on curriculum—for example, on the value of Latin or Greek, on the need to emphasize writing in the schools, or on the need for computer literacy or laser technology—a mayor might not want to vote on whether Biblical “creationism” is taught in biology or general science or whether the works of John Steinbeck, John Updike, or J. D. Salinger are included in the literature courses. Among the actions appropriate for a mayor are these: to visit a school, to honor an outstanding teacher or principal, to speak at an assembly (during a campaign the challenger should also appear), to address the graduating class, to invite students to spend a day at city hall, or to engage in community service. A mayor can properly propose and build new buildings, dedicate an addition, challenge the school officials to expand a program, cut the school budget, demand greater productivity, and require a performance-oriented program budget. A mayor can call on business, universities, and labor and arts groups to multiply their school services and work more closely with the schools.

The mayor does not employ the superintendent, who neither heads just another department of the city nor subordinates the needs of schoolchildren and teachers to the compelling political needs of a mayor. The success of Philadelphia’s Mayor Frank Rizzo in driving Dr. Mark Shedd out of that city’s superintendency or the efforts of Massachusetts Governor James Michael Curley to fire Payson Smith as state commissioner of education were violations of the tradition separating school politics from city politics. Yet, the mayor and chief school officer must cooperate, for the schools need money, encouragement, and facilities, and the mayor needs the city’s reputation for good or improving schools to attract or hold industry and young families. The city schools need superintendents who are retained for more than two or three years. The mutual regard of Boston’s Mayor Kevin White and Superintendent Robert Spillane was a healthy model, one which served the schools well in a period of fiscal uncertainty.

On the School Budget

Mayoral involvement is crucial in matters pertaining to the school budget. The real “cost” figure for Boston is rarely tabulated. Total school costs in FY 84 were as follows:

<i>Millions</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Source</i>
\$229.	school operations	city (40 percent state reimbursement)
30.	special programs	federal and state

With pensions and debt service, the real total was estimated at \$348 million in September 1984, or about \$6,000 per student. The school committee and mayor usually focus on the top line of the budget since this is the statutory figure affected by their decision. The city school budget in recent years was:

FY 1981/82	\$210,534,097
1982/83	\$234,400,000
1983/84	\$225,000,000
1984/85	\$245,000,000

82

During 1983, the mayor and council approved a \$5.2 million supplemental budget for FY 84 so that no more teachers had to be laid off. And then during 1984 another \$10 million was added to fulfill a new teacher contract. It is important to realize that the school committee, superintendent, and staff made deep budgetary and staff cuts in 1982 and 1983, and that the school budget was *reduced* by \$5 million in FY 84, even with the supplemental budget. At the same time the school department staff was reduced by 700 persons; otherwise costs would have increased by at least \$15 million. From the fiscal year ending in 1983, the costs had risen by \$25 million.

However, Boston schools need more money for four reasons: first, teacher salaries and other staff costs rise with inflation; second, the cost of bilingual and handicapped education is much higher than regular education, and Boston, compared to other New England communities, has an unusually high proportion of students (12 percent) requiring costly programs; third, certain educational programs such as math, science, art, music, and guidance counseling need to be improved; and fourth, many buildings, especially those used as middle schools, need considerable renovation and repair.

The mayor has the means to evaluate and approve the school budget. The operating budget needs to include more funds for maintenance, educational improvements, and restoration of art and music. The facility budget, including school building alterations and repair, could increase by \$40 million.

On Police and Fire Protection

Fire and police protection is one area where city officials, especially the mayor, must cooperate with school officials. The job of the police department is to protect the streets and territory around the schools. The job of the school department is to establish discipline and maintain security within the school. This is more difficult than it sounds, because community turmoil and conflict, including ethnic and racial tensions, can easily and quickly spill over into the schools. Each principal and district superintendent needs excellent relationships with the local and area police. Boston schools spend almost two million dollars a year on a special school security staff. This is needed in big city high schools, although it clearly takes away funds. The more that city police can do outside the school, the easier it should be for school staff inside. National or city incidents, controversial sporting events, assassinations, or racial conflicts call for extra preparations and staff, for which the mayor and police commissioner can negotiate or discuss with school superintendents and headmasters.

Police and fire officials offer several "educational" programs including "Officer Friendly," "Danger, Stranger," and "Learn Not to Burn." The mayor, commissioner, and superintendent should periodically evaluate the worth of these programs.

On Community Schools

A mayor must decide how to handle the community schools. For most of this century some of the district schools have served as evening schools, adult literacy centers, and recreation centers. Mayor Kevin White built new ones in South Boston, the South End, Charlestown, West Roxbury, and elsewhere. But most Boston schools become isolated fortresses by five in the afternoon, locking out all age groups for the night.

Community school programs are completely separate from the regular school program and theirs is a city, not a school department, budget item. Some community schools receive federal funds through neighborhood development or Private Industry Council sources, and the state funds certain programs. The community schools could be placed under the school department since it appears that they are no longer well served as part of the facilities department.

Adult literacy efforts are a priority for the federal government and for the city. Half the five hundred thousand dollars spent on adult literacy by the Neighborhood Development and Employment Agency (NDEA) was invested in programs offered in community schools. The community schools could offer more adult literacy and vocational skill development classes to better meet the needs of Boston citizens, which is a mayor's initiative, with or without school committee support. The youth job search and job readiness program could be expanded to more schools. Recreation programs, many of which have been replaced by adult education programs, could be expanded greatly in response to genuine need.

On other fronts, the mayor might foster cooperation between schools and health-related services. The mayor and council should review the old controversy as to who should provide health screening and nursing services for the schools, and the mayor should foster cooperation between schools and community in areas relating to recreation, such as the scheduling and sharing of rinks, courts, playing fields, and the George Robert White Stadium. A mayor can expand the use of school and community recreation facilities, especially in track-and-field events, soccer, and other popular sports, by promoting closer cooperation between the Metropolitan District Commission (MDC), Boston's Parks and Recreation Department, and the school department.

Other Mayoral Options

Further decisions that affect Boston's public education can be made by the mayor. In the 1980s a mayor can take initiatives to develop a positive link between organizations and employers using computer and health technologies and the schools in order to ease the transition for youth from school to work; to promote the fuller use of the Hubert H. Humphrey Occupational Resource Center by the Private Industry Council, by joint training partners, by employers and unions, by the community colleges and other state groups, as well as by the schools; to stimulate the growth of the Copley Square International High School and develop ties to the various consulates, international banks, importers and exporters, visitors and tourists, and universities to encourage careers in international occupations, goals to which the Greater Boston Area Chamber of Commerce and several universities have already pledged their cooperation; to expand services to very young children and offer a full-scale early education program such as the Brookline Early Education Project, to provide counseling, health checks, and advice to

parents; and to encourage and reward those universities and corporations that stimulate academic achievement through the Boston Compact. Certain universities, such as Boston University and Northeastern University, have already dedicated scholarships each year to Boston graduates. StrideRite is the latest company to offer scholarship support to Boston students. A mayor can acknowledge the most education-minded of Boston's organizations on an annual basis and can encourage college participation by students in many ways at city hall.

Making the School Committee Function and Finding the Funds

Financial decisions are of utmost importance to schools. Who will make decisions, what kinds of dollars are needed, and where will they come from? The school committee has most of the responsibility for the approval of major educational and financial decisions. After reviewing the bylaws, organization, and staffing of the school committee, it should consider the following changes.

First, the school committee of thirteen should have a *chairperson* and *vice chairperson* rather than a president. Virtually all of the other great city and Massachusetts school boards elect a chair as presiding officer. The job is not full-time, or even half-time, and "president" is too grand a term, suggesting executive duties that by law and tradition are assigned to the superintendent.

Second, the committee should designate as few subcommittees as possible. Subcommittees can clutter up the work of a board, consume expensive staff time, and assume excessive importance. The exceptions might be an executive committee (primarily of officers but no more than five persons), a budget committee, and an audit committee.

Third, the committee should consider, then reject, the option of individual staff costing \$40,000 a year. No one ever intended that raising the size of the school committee to thirteen would raise the "personal assistant" cost from \$200,000 a year, which is already excessive, to \$520,000, which is extravagant. The extra \$320,000 could provide money for twenty kindergarten teachers or 3,000 school textbooks a year. In 1965 each committee member had \$6,000 for staff stipends. There is no excuse for a 650 percent increase, especially in light of what staff aides for the city council receive. The city council operates independently of an elected mayor and supervises dozens of city functions and departments. The school committee, in contrast, supervises only one department whose top executive it hires and fires. The school committee should operate more like a city hospital or city library board. The temptation to hire campaign managers or political coordinators as assistants to the members should be stoutly resisted. The school committee, however, does need three secretaries, an assistant to the chairman, and a budget analyst. In 1984 the staff of five should cost less than \$100,000, including benefits. One, and only one, automobile should be available to the committee, due to the size of the city and available public transportation or cab service.

However, school committees should be reimbursed for expenses incurred in going to meetings—for transportation and day care for children, if needed. Also, big city school committee members themselves should be paid on a part-time basis. The 1970 Danforth-Massachusetts Advisory Council (Cronin) report suggests \$10,000 a year.¹⁵ The Boston Municipal Research Bureau suggests \$2,500. Working class parents, in particular, need the reimbursement for time off from other jobs. A total sum of \$130,000 ought to be set aside for salaries and reimbursement of expenses, and enabling legislation sought. However, the committee should not meet more than once a week and should avoid the

practice of hourly or per meeting fees. Moreover, the committee should refer parent complaints to the principal, and then to the district superintendent, and all inquiries about jobs to the personnel office for review.

The mayor should attend all school committee meetings for the first six months and then, and only then, make a decision on whether to seek legislation to become a member. Arguments in favor of any New England mayor serving on the school committee include several crucial points. First, the mayor has total responsibility for the city—and will get the blame when the schools fail to satisfy or educate many groups. Second, the mayor serves as either a member or ex-officio chair of the school committee in twenty-five Massachusetts communities, such as Springfield, Worcester, Cambridge, Lowell, New Bedford, and Brockton. However, many of these mayors are not full-time and have city managers actually running the city departments. And finally, several reports, such as an advisory bulletin of the Boston Municipal Research Bureau (MRB) in 1981,¹⁶ recommended that the mayor serve on the school committee. The present MRB director, however, does not think that this is a very good idea.

85

Key arguments against a mayor's serving on the school committee are as follows. First, since 1885, the Boston School Committee functioned without the mayor as member or chair. From 1885 to the 1930s, this was a reasonably productive arrangement, one providing for growth and quality. Second, no other city in the nation has a mayor on the Board of Education. Mayors have too much to do to attend or chair all the boards—hospitals, schools, libraries, renewal or development. A mayor cannot participate in every school personnel appointment or curriculum change or decision to approve a testing program. Third, a mayor can encounter trouble on the school committee as a member with a full vote. How can he or she vote on a budget as a member and then cut it a month later as mayor? As long as the mayor reviews the budget, as he or she does for the city council or other city boards, it would be best to be one step removed from school decision-making. And finally, schools need insulation from city politics, from patronage and from partisan dispute. Three hundred Massachusetts communities operate the schools separately from town or municipal governments. Several of the mayors who serve on school committees are actually city councilors, part-time mayors with city managers. Virtually all American cities with populations of under 250,000 keep the mayor off the school committee or board.

The weight of evidence and argument is that a mayor, no matter how strong or pure an advocate of education, should not serve on the Boston School Committee. Instead, once every quarter the mayor should invite the school committee to discuss finances, quality issues, facilities and general issues; should support the schools vigorously by occasional visits, by addresses to faculty or graduations, by participation in special events and by recognizing universities, the business community, and cultural organizations who work with the schools; should work closely with the governor, legislature and other officials in raising the money needed for the schools; and should consider forming a city-wide youth cabinet, of which the mayor could be the first chairperson, to coordinate the programs of in-school and out-of-school services to young people.

Funds Needed for the Schools

Boston needs substantially more dollars per pupil than other New England communities because it has a much higher percentage of bilingual and special needs children than any other city. It has more poor people, more persons in public housing, more students from single-parent homes, more students in need of compensatory education and early

childhood programs. It is a port of entry, not only to Massachusetts, but to the English-speaking world, accepting many refugee families who need kindergarten, early childhood education and extended days. And its vocational education costs more money to meet the specialized, technical needs of hundreds of employers.

Much of the new funds will come from city sources. However, private funds can also be raised for Boston schools. For example, many teachers need \$300 or \$500 a year to develop a new program or obtain special or supplementary materials. It might be possible to create a Boston Education Foundation to obtain and allocate funds for special or supplementary programs. The other new source of funds, mainly for math and science, will be federal, most of it allocated through the state and through universities. Boston should be ready with proposals for new educational programs and personnel.

During 1984 the state considered spending additional funds for education. Boston school officials will be able to support many of the state proposals, certainly those for additional computers in the school building and the excellent early step of acquiring 1,000 computer work stations since 1981, for funding math and science programs, especially in the middle schools and high schools, and for staff development and in-service training of teachers, counselors and administrators.

Additionally, teachers need to be paid for five days of curriculum development and continuing education time during the year. Certain other proposals, for testing and program review, could become state costs because of the provision in Proposition 2½ that the state assume the financial burden of any new state mandates and requirements.

Other proposals for a longer school day and year, for more teachers, and for a career-ladder for teachers will cost money. Teachers themselves should be consulted since their work hours, contracts, and compensation will be rearranged. It will be important to debate and discuss with parents and teachers the total school system priorities for use of additional funds.

Possible Retrenchment

The issue of cutting costs or utilizing Boston's school budget effectively can be aided by answering these questions: What costs can be reduced or contained? Can the non-teaching staff—administrative, custodians and others—be cut? What is the actual record?

The actual staff records show that the total Boston school staff amounts to 8,000, of whom 4,035 are teachers. The total staff numbered 9,300 for the years 1978 through 1981. The teaching staff was 5,147 in FY 75, 5,235 in FY 80, and 20 percent smaller by FY 83. The number of principals, central office supervisors, administrators, clerks, and maintenance and other staff was reduced from 3,200 to 2,000, or by more than 30 percent over the same time period.

The number of public school facilities has been reduced in accordance with enrollment decline and more than one hundred school buildings have been closed since 1950. In 1950 there were 233 schools; the number dropped to 197 schools in 1970, and by 1983 there were only 123 schools in Boston. Since 1970, the city has built seven new high schools, fifteen new elementary schools, one middle school, and the Hubert H. Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. One result of most of this building program was the closing or sale of many antiquated facilities—between 1977 and 1981, the city closed 36 schools. In 1981, the school committee approved the closing of 27 more schools. Boston is not alone in closing so many buildings. New York City, Chicago, San Francisco and many New England cities have closed hundreds of old schools or

underutilized school buildings due to a drastic drop in the birth rate, and not from the impact of desegregation alone. For example, suburbs such as Lexington and Newton have also experienced a 40 to 50 percent drop in pupil enrollment and have closed half of their school buildings.

Boston's process of school closings must continue. There are enough classroom seats for 70,000 students, which is a surplus capacity of more than 12,000 seats. Several dozen elementary schools and several high schools remain open with enrollment at less than 50 percent capacity. Closing a building and selling the land brings two benefits to the city: administrative and custodial staff can be reduced, and the surplus space can be used either for other public services or sold for housing or office use—uses that generate taxes. For instance, the conversion of the Prince School in Boston's Back Bay put \$2 million of taxable property back on the local tax rolls.¹⁷

Of course, school closings are unpopular with young parents, old alumni, and present employees who may love their school, however antiquated or underutilized. How can the situation be handled? First, the mayor can formally meet with the school committee and request in writing their cooperation in conducting a school facilities' survey. The superintendent has already begun work on a long-range plan, including facilities and student assignments. The mayor should appoint members of a task force from the staff of the Public Facilities Commission (PFC) and the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) to work with school facilities staff and ask for a report within six months. The report should include these questions: What schools are in good to excellent physical shape and are fully utilized? What schools are either educationally outmoded, underutilized, uneconomical, unsafe or otherwise in need of repair or closing? When could specific schools be closed or phased down?

The task force should define the criteria, rate the condition of the schools, prepare figures on the original and current capacity of the schools, and recommend options for the relocation of students and programs so as to minimize disruption. Much of this work has been done already by the school planning staff, which will make completion of this task easier.

School officials should indicate which facilities will or could be used for special needs, for magnet programs, or as part of a revised educational program plan. Another criterion is compliance with state and federal racial guidelines. The BRA expertise is needed to project the racial, ethnic, and age mix of the population of the next decade and state officials should also be consulted.

Fully utilized buildings should be properly maintained, repaired, or renovated on a scheduled basis, and facilities should be added to make a modern educational program possible. Every year the city and school department should update a five-year facilities plan that would be financed by the sale of bonds and surplus school space.

The mayor should support an early review of the role and number of district superintendencies. Both the Boston Municipal Research Bureau in 1981 and the School Committee Educational Planning Group in 1983 recommended a reduction from nine districts to three or five. When Boston served 90,000 students, there were six district superintendencies. With 50,000 students, there are nine districts, each with a high-ranking administrator and small staff. No more than five are needed to replace the numerically uneven and racially imbalanced districts of 1985. The decision to reorganize the districts should be made by the school committee after they receive the superintendent's recommendations.

A reduction from nine to five district superintendents would also send a positive signal to teachers and taxpayers alike that the administrative bureaucracy was further trimmed. The decision would save a quarter of a million dollars a year.

The argument is sometimes made that the nine district superintendents should be coordinated with the nine district members of the school committee. However, no educational expert would ever propose or endorse this. Each committee member, whether selected at large or by district, serves the entire city. Even if he or she is elected from a neighborhood district, this does not confer special jurisdiction over any subdivision of the city or its schools. Also, the district superintendent reports to the city superintendent, not directly to the school committee or to any one member. Any erosion of this chain of command could lead to personnel abuses, to divisive conflict, and to unnecessary tension between staff and the committee. A school committee member has no decision-making authority except as a member of the whole committee, whose collective votes make policy.

Other possible savings might occur by revising the excessive assistant principal staffing ratios; reviewing special needs placements and the number of special education evaluation team leaders; contracting out custodial services or managing the custodial services according to stricter ratios; reducing the City Parent Council budget of \$700,000 per year; tightening management of supplies and materials; and redesigning the heating systems to reduce energy costs.

A mayor can insist on a review of cost-saving opportunities either publicly, through consultants or citizen panel reports, or privately, as part of the budget review process. The mayor and council should annually ask the school committee for cost containment and cost reduction techniques as part of their responsibilities. City councils in the past have rarely exercised the right to ask tough questions, leaving most of the review process to the mayor and the Municipal Research Bureau or Finance Commission.

Learning from Historical Precedents

Boston schools have a history older than the city itself, the state, or Harvard University. Finding precedents for almost any educational or managerial initiative is relatively easy. For example, the mayor of Boston served on the school committee from about 1855 to 1885, when the city charter was changed. For thirty years, the mayor, as ex-officio chairman, presided over meetings and appointed subcommittees. However, because of another tradition of electing two school committee members from each ward, annexation of territory to Boston resulted in a very large committee.¹⁸ The mayor was removed partly due to the immediacy of other business, especially the rapid growth of population and other municipal services. Also, in 1885, the first foreign-born mayor, Hugh O'Brien, was elected, and state officials imposed a tax limit on Boston in order to curb the rising power of Irish political leaders.

More recently, Mayor Kevin White used state aid and construction bonds to build 17 schools in the early 1970s. Several of these schools were designated "community schools" to serve the neighborhoods, including the adult population on evenings and weekends. Mayor White also made \$500,000 in funds available to teach adult illiterates, utilizing community schools as part of this effort. Mayor White appointed several persons to serve as education aides or assistants to the mayor.

Boston School Committees have long experimented with standing committees and subcommittees whose frames of reference covered kindergarten, evening school, the

school for the deaf, military drill, supplies, truant officers, and rules and legislation. These precedents make little or no sense in 1984. Only since 1906 has the superintendent been executive officer for instruction and the supervisor of directors, principals and teachers. Through the 1970s, the business manager, chief schoolhouse custodian, chief secretary (in charge of all clerks), and head of building repairs reported directly to the school committee. This personnel chain of accountability does not meet the school system's needs. At some point what would be the most productive arrangement must be put into practice—the city school superintendent must serve as the chief executive officer of the school department. High turnover among Boston school superintendents in the 1970s contributed to confusion and discontent in the schools.

In 1914 a new mayor, James Michael Curley, called for an investigation of the high costs of schools. Who responds to such an inquiry? Who can be called in to get the facts? In 1916 the Boston Finance Commission hired James Van Sickle, the Springfield superintendent of schools, to propose management improvements and economies for Boston. In 1944 the Boston Finance Commission hired George D. Strayer to conduct a more comprehensive study of all aspects of the curriculum and business operations.¹⁹ Although the suggestion of an appointive school board was rejected, the legislature in 1946, in response to the Strayer report, gave the superintendent of schools the right to nominate assistant superintendents and most other employees of the school department.

The Strayer report offered detailed suggestions for the closing down of small schools, many of them one, two and four rooms. In 1952 the school committee called on Harvard University for still another appraisal and school enrollment projection. As a result, 16 school buildings were closed. When Mayor John Collins chose Edward Logue of New Haven to be his urban renewal administrator, he called on Harvard University once again for a second school building survey.

What can be expected from state officials, including the legislature? The state has for many years passed laws to limit Boston school spending, usually because of fears of waste and corruption. School construction scandals have led to an unusual practice of creating separate commissions for schoolhouse construction or, in recent years, for all public facilities construction. This practice in Boston results in divided responsibility for school construction and requires school committee-city cooperation. Since the 1920s, the state legislature has set a spending level beyond which the school committee could not spend without approval of the mayor and council. By 1953, the \$40 million budget was double that limit. In 1963 the legislature agreed to a new formula, setting the schools' minimum level budget, in any given year, at the level of the prior year's budget plus approved salary increase minus the year-end surplus. The most recent formula in response to Tregor sets a base figure of \$224 million. Time will tell whether this is any more logical than the other irrational schemes.

State aid was only 5 percent of the Boston school budget in 1965, while federal funds were available only for vocational education and school lunch programs. State and federal officials have appropriated much more support for Boston schools since the publication of reports and passage of laws on the needs of handicapped and bilingual children, on racial imbalance, on the need for a stronger system of state educational leadership, and on the need for reorganization of the Boston schools.

Since the time of Horace Mann, Boston school officials have tried to defend the system against criticism. However, the criticism has usually led to either corrective measures or even stronger criticism from outsiders. Criticism of school conditions and low performance have also led to increased dollars from outside sources, albeit most typically with specified school improvement strings attached.

The Future of Boston's Public Education

The two main issues for the Boston public schools, as they are for urban schools elsewhere in New England, are cost and quality. Both may need to be raised, and legislation in Massachusetts during 1985 could become even more important in achieving these objectives.

The Boston School Committee should take certain steps toward improving education. Members should elect a chair and vice-chair; reject any more than five paid staff for the committee; appoint as few subcommittees as possible; apply for modest compensation for their part-time service on the board; and request expert assistance in learning the job. The school committee must work closely with state officials in 1985 to define the high educational standards needed in the schools, and to obtain the additional funds, state and federal, needed to pay for additional or expanded programs. The mayor should be invited to meetings; a complete review of school facilities should be undertaken; and there should be a discussion of the city budget for the schools. The national reports on education and the Education Planning Group proposal should be studied. The superintendent must respond with specific recommendations and motions for school committee action on any matters remaining from the prior years. In order to comply with judicial decisions and end the court-ordered monitoring and supervision of the schools, staff recommendations should be made. Underutilized buildings and those that do not meet energy, educational, financial or racial integration criteria should be closed. A five-year facility plan and construction bond program should be made and approved. School committee members must evaluate the Boston Compact and ask for periodic reports from the work groups and task forces. Also, they must ask the superintendent to provide timely accounts of progress on school-based management, curriculum development, testing and other educational programs. The economic needs of teachers must be supported but management rights for school administrators, such as the right of a principal to reject a new teacher or transferee and to evaluate and discipline a teacher, must be upheld. New ways to expand the amount of time available to provide teachers and administrators with additional training and program development time must be found. Finally, school committee members help build bridges both to the neighborhoods and to the larger community, including corporations and universities.

Epilogue

In 1984 the Boston School Committee hired a total of 26 secretaries and administrative secretaries, which is the nation's largest school board staff. Meanwhile, they rejected the superintendent's recommendation for a research and development staff. The committee also asked for personal salaries of \$15,000 each, but this new expense of \$190,000 on top of \$535,000 seemed hard to justify in the face of city budget revenue shortfalls. The committee choked at the prospect of closing any schools or approving the comprehensive plan recommended by a citizen group and revised by the superintendent.

Mayor Raymond Flynn attended a school committee meeting and accepted an invitation to meet with or send a representative to school committee meetings. He established a city-wide youth cabinet that met monthly on juvenile issues, including education. He did not press openly for economies or school closings or for educational program improvements; however, he worked very hard to find summer job placements for Boston

high school students and spent considerable time on the problems of raising local revenues to meet school and public obligations.

The business community agreed to establish an urban education foundation called the Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools. The major banks and several foundations pledged two million dollars for school improvement and teacher training projects.

All New England cities face the problems of older buildings that need repairs, and an aging work force of experienced teachers who will soon retire. Each city struggles both to find additional funds and to win support for educational improvements. If Boston schools continue to improve and the test scores of students rise, this bodes well for the smaller cities and the other New England metropolitan areas.

Notes

91

1. Peter Schrag, *Village School Downtown* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), Jonathan Kozol, *Death at an Early Age* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967).
2. *Morgan v. Hennigan*, U.S. District Court, 1974.
3. Proposition 2 was a Massachusetts referendum passed in November 1981 that limited local property taxes to 2.5 percent of total property values. That measure and a Boston property tax abatement case won by Mr. Tregor in 1979 forced municipal officials to cut back on public services and staff, but the fiscal impact was not felt until 1982.
4. *Allen v. McDonough*, U.S. District Court, 1976-77.
5. In 1983 The Becker Institute (Boston) conducted a public opinion survey of five hundred Massachusetts adults aged eighteen years or over.
6. The Condon Community School in South Boston was designated to be open in the evening for adults and others. The Hubert H. Humphrey Occupational Resources Center is a 360,000-square-foot vocational training facility with tremendous resources for learning.
7. Boston English High School occupies a high-rise building with periodic elevator problems. The Boston Latin Academy, once the Girls Latin School, was moved several times and eventually relocated to a building across the street from Fenway Park.
8. Parents of the handicapped filed suit and won a district court order putting Boston schools' special education program under the jurisdiction of the court. Chapter 766 (1974) of the Massachusetts General Laws provided a major expansion of programs for the handicapped as did a 1976 federal statute, 94-142. See note 4, above.
9. "The Report of the Education Planning Group," Boston School Department, 1983.
10. Jeanette Hargrove, *Boston Public Schools, Class of '82: A Follow-up Study*, Boston: Federal Reserve Bank, October 1983.
11. The two reports were submitted to the Massachusetts legislature for action in 1965: the Willis report, named for Chicago general superintendent Benjamin J. Willis, who wrote recommendations for a legislative committee chaired by Senator Kevin B. Harrington, and a report on school desegregation submitted by a citizens group convened by Owen B. Kiernan, state education commissioner.
12. Owen B. Kiernan, "Because It Is Right—Educationally" (Boston: Massachusetts State Department of Education, 1964).
13. *Morgan v. Hennigan*.
14. *Ibid*.
15. Joseph M. Cronin and Richard M. Hailer, eds., *Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity* (Boston: Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 1970; Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1973).

16. "Boston School System in Crisis," Boston Municipal Research Bureau, May 1981.
17. The Prince School, in a fashionable urban neighborhood, probably represents the most profit a city can obtain from allowing a developer to turn an old but sturdy school building into housing.
18. See Joseph M. Cronin, *The Control of Urban Schools* (New York: The Free Press, 1973).
19. George D. Strayer, "A Survey of Boston Schools," Boston Finance Commission, 1944.