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CHAPTER I

IN SEARCH OF AN OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Statement of the Problem

The problem which this study addresses is one of finding a systematic way to characterize Community Education's tenants, its purposes, and its components so that every community will have a consistent basis for analyzing and assessing its operation, both extent and intended, with respect to the Community Education concept.

This is a time when there is great need for a working and workable definition of "Community Education." As educational leaders become interested in implementing Community Education, as they seek to relate it to traditional education patterns, as they attempt to establish effective leadership training practices, as support is sought from community citizens and agencies, as potential funding sources are contacted with dollar requests, the need to identify precisely what it is that they are to implement or train for or support or fund becomes crucial. The more national the concept becomes and the more widespread the need for understanding the concept, the more important it is that there exists a meaningful description or definition of the process that can be applied to each local situation consistently and effectively, especially a definition which can be used with some facility in making operational decisions.

The purpose of this study then is to develop a model for describing local Community Education in terms of identifiable operational
levels. The purpose of such a model is to provide insights into the characteristics of and relationships between the apparently different operational philosophies that underlie the variety of Community Education programs across the nation. In that way, the model will provide a greater understanding of the Community Education concept in action and may be used as the basis for analysis, planning, and evaluation.

The Community Education Concept

Community Education has experienced many generations of conceptual development. Seay (1974) traces the development of the concept and finds its origins to be a natural outgrowth of American life and education. Even so, among professional Community Educators there is no common agreement as to what Community Education is, nor any real agreement about how to go about describing it. Some descriptions identify broad philosophical goals for Community Education without reference to operational characteristics. Others identify activities lists or client populations served or the existence of organizational jobs, all of which address operational characteristics only by implication.

Possibly the most widely used definition of Community Education at the moment is that developed by Minzey and LeTarte (1972) and subsequently quoted by the Michigan Community Education Association and others in various documents:

Community Education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all of its community members. It uses the local school to serve as the catalyst for bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop the community process toward the end of self-actualization.
Seay (1974) defines it as follows:

The process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of all of the people of a community. . . balance refers to a dynamic equilibrium maintained among the contributions that various agencies make to an individual's education. (pp. 11-12)

In saying that "the local school" somehow brings "community resources to bear on community problems," Minzey and LeTarte suggest an operation which can be conceptualized and acted upon, but which avoids making a distinction between those community problem-solving operations which are Community Education and those which may be conceptualized in some other way. The concept risks becoming everything to everybody and therefore, no particular operation at all. In saying that Community Education "provides for all of the educational needs of all of its community members" and that it tries to develop "a positive sense of community, to improve community living" and to lead the community to Maslow's "self-actualization" state of existence, Minzey and LeTarte use terms which virtually defy common definition, even among educators, and which therefore, are not very helpful in developing universal operational conceptions.

Seay, on the other hand, talks of "a use of all institutional forces in the education of all the people." Although the expectation is idealistic in the extreme, it is possible to think and plan in terms of utilizing all of the identifiable "institutional forces" in a community and affecting the educational patterns of all of the people, in one way or another. Even the concept of "balance" in this definition is useful. It refers to a mix of institutional forces which optimizes their use. The problem with Seay's definition is that it provides no
handle for modeling what the "process" itself is, nor does it identify any operation.

While the desire by Community Education philosophers to create a definition which is flexible enough to include all possible operational variations is understandable, the result nevertheless is a concept without a concept-to-operation logic. In the absence of such logic, Community Educators have developed a collection of operations which have had varying degrees of success and which have become, in varying combinations, the "guidelines" for local Community Education operation.

As a result, the variety of operational "musts" for Community Education include advisory councils, "full-time" directors, "at least half-time" directors, the optimal use of school buildings, a school board and/or city council resolution of support, an annual needs assessment, cooperative action among agencies, and so forth. Again the problem is that each "common" practice advanced as an incontrovertible characteristic of the Community Education concept is made suspect by its uneven application in operation. For example, since advisory councils come in different shapes and with different responsibilities, some are held to be "not Community Education councils." This circumstance raises the question of "Which are which?" Similarly, even "full-time" adult education or recreation directors are often seen as not directing "Community Education," even while "Community Education Directors" do direct adult education and/or recreation operations, sometimes with no other areas of activity. School building usage becomes controversial in arguments between "school-based" and "community-based" theorists. School boards have been known to pass resolutions in support
of Community Education without having any real knowledge about or involvement in the process. And Community Education has been termed "successful" in places where there has been neither a comprehensive needs assessment effort nor a consistent pattern of agency cooperation. The writer's own experiences as Associate Director of Western Michigan University's Community School Development Center have included contact with each of the situations described in this paragraph. And the list could be lengthened with other similar situations.

Recognizing the kinds of definitional problems that exist, some Community Education leaders suggest that it may not be possible to develop a consistently applicable operational definition for the concept. Decker (1972) writes:

> It is difficult to exactly or precisely define Community Education because the philosophy encompasses both a process and programs. The implementation of Community Education varies in any specific situation so that no two Community Education programs are identical. Intrinsic in the Community Education philosophy is the belief that each program should reflect its specific community, and the dynamic and self-renewed processes in the philosophy demand that changes and modifications occur as times and problems change. Thus, there is diversity in Community Education programs. It is this diversity that is the strength of the philosophy but which makes it difficult to describe in a succinct definition.

Kerensky and Melby (1971) view the problem of definition in this way:

> Community Education is much easier to describe than it is to define . . . To think of Community Education as a separate program superimposed upon existing school destroys the concept at its inception . . . Further it is important to note that Community Education programs are not always centered in the schoolhouse . . . In short, an extended school day concept is used as a substitute for true Community Education. Community Education is a new concept with new dimensions . . . Possibly the
best way to get a true feeling for Community Education is to analyze the anatomy and spirit of a school that centers around a new position in education, that of community school director.

Since in many instances "community school directors" are specifically appointed to effect an "extended school day," one can see the potential built-in contradiction here and the danger of analyzing a "director's school" without some external criteria for establishing Community Education parameters.

Clearly, if the foregoing is truly representative of the dilemma that one faces in establishing a functional definition for Community Education, the existence of any consistent conceptual structure becomes suspect and the term takes on an educational patchwork quality, embracing whatever educational program or service or process or reform fits the local situation. If Community Education is in any way a unique operational process, then that operational process needs a descriptive model which pinpoints its operational characteristics and/or levels and/or variations. Such an operational model is important in developing a greater understanding of the concept, in making local decisions about operational development, in establishing operational goals, in training leaders, and in evaluating Community Education.

This report rejects the notion of Kerensky and Melby that what is needed is "a true feeling for Community Education." A "feeling" is too vague and unreliable for making the hard decisions that the administrator needs to make. Similarly, the definitional approach, as if Community Education were a thing with size and weight and color and purpose, to be manipulated, is unsatisfactory.
The problem of "definition" may have been inevitable under the conditions in which Community Education has evolved in the many diverse communities. That is, often a program, activity, or action has been undertaken for purposes both provincial and ambiguous in nature. The claim that these actions are "Community Education" is often made after the fact, usually if some success has resulted. Community Education's "definers" have then approached their task with the assumption that all such actions should be included in a definition. Somehow they had to create a composite construct from these often ambiguous purposes and then define the thing that they had constructed.

The point is that by starting with a description of the structure and processes of systems which are in a "state" of Community Education the problem of dealing with a multitude of purposes can be avoided and other systems can be guided as to how to create a similar system condition.

As Katz and Kahn (1966) point out in their efforts to encourage a systems approach to understanding organizations or social systems,

It would be much better . . . to start with concepts which do not call for identifying the purposes of the designers and then correcting for them when they do not seem to be fulfilled . . . We may want to utilize such purposive notions to lead us to sources of data or as subjects of special study, but not as our basic theoretical constructs for understanding organizations. (p. 89)

It is somewhat ironic that some Community Education theorists have envisioned "process" as a goal or result of Community Education (Minzey and LeTarte, 1972). This report sees Community Education as the process itself. An analysis of the system operation is the means by which the process can be identified, described, and mapped.
Buckley's (1967) statement, made in a slightly different institutional context, may be applied here: "The problem is to specify and conceptualize the processes and mechanisms." In this study the reference is to the processes and mechanisms of Community Education.

The study which is the basis of this report sought to specify the processes and mechanisms of Community Education by applying systems analysis principles and procedures to existing Community Education phenomena.

Overview

This report consists of five chapters and proposes that the character of Community Education in a community is related to the degree to which the educational agencies are "open systems" as opposed to "closed systems." This transition of the system from "closed" to "open" through a morphogenic process will be used as the basis for describing operational "levels" of Community Education, the "levels" being some operational modes assumed to exist in a transition continuum relationship which offer useful analytical distinctions. The assumption is that no system in education is completely open or completely closed.

The specific design of the dissertation calls for chapters on (1) the search for an operational definition of Community Education; (2) building a conceptual foundation for applying a systems approach to Community Education; (3) a systems model for Community Education; (4) an application of the model; and (5) review, conclusions, and recommendations.
Definitions

The definitions for the following systems terms used in this study are those of Kuhn (1974):

A **system**, in the broadest sense, is any pattern whose elements are related in a sufficiently regular way to justify attention. (p. 21)

**Input** is any movement of information or matter-energy from the environment across the boundaries and into an acting system. Any action on its surface that affects any part of the system is construed to have 'crossed the boundaries' into the system. An input necessarily modifies the system in some way. (p. 27)

**Output** is any movement of information or matter-energy from any acting system across its boundaries to the environment. Any action of the system's surface on its environment is construed as a movement 'across the boundary.' Any output necessarily modifies the environment in some way. (p. 27)

A **closed system** is a system in which interactions occur only among components of the system. There are no inputs from or outputs to the environment of either information or matter-energy. A real system can be partially or temporarily closed by sealing it from its environment. An analytic system can be closed by assuming that no influences are felt from the environment. (p. 28)

An **open system** is a system that receives inputs from or releases outputs to its environment—that is, it is influenced by and influences its environment. All real systems are presumably open at some times, in some respects, or to some degree. (p. 28)

Buckley's (1967) definitions will be used for the following terms:

**Morphostasis** refers to "those processes in complex system-environment exchanges that tend to preserve or maintain a system's given form, organization, or state." (p. 58)

**Morphogenesis** refers to "those processes which tend to elaborate or change a system's given form, structure, or state." (p. 58)
Limitations of the Study

This study has two primary limitations by design:

1. Although it is possible to administer Community Education programs and processes with organizational patterns other than that in which the school system is the central administrative agent, the school is most commonly found in that role and in the past has been most often expected to initiate educational change in the community. More information exists on the "school-based" model of Community Education than any other. Therefore, this study will concentrate on an analysis of the school-based operation as being the most representative and most preferable for analysis. However, there is also a notion that the principle ideas in the study could be applied to other models and other agencies or institutions engaged in Community Education efforts.

2. Likewise, in order to limit the scope of the study to manageable proportions, the emphasis will be upon specifying and conceptualizing "the processes and mechanisms" of Community Education which are found to be basic operational elements. The intention is to model the basic elements and demonstrate their applicability. The study does not intend to do a complete operational analysis of any one community.
CHAPTER II

BUILDING A CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION FOR APPLYING A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Common Factors in Community Education

The search for a consistent, workable approach to structuring and applying the Community Education concept has led to the idea that the overriding common factor underlying all programs, processes, and leadership responsibilities in Community Education is some movement in the direction of greater interaction beyond the usual "professional service" level between the individuals, institutions, and agencies held responsible for education on the one hand and the environments or "communities" in which those agents are operating on the other.

Seay (1974) observes that

The Community School Movement viewed school-community cooperation as a two-way street. The school helped solve community problems and the community provided resources for the instructional program of the school. Of the six 'significant threads' this perhaps was the one most publicized during the forties. (p. 35)

Seay (1974) further notes in connection with his own definition (cited earlier) that "the formulation of the plan and organization to implement the Community Education concept are accomplished through the involvement of representatives of the people--leaders who . . . can influence the use of agency resources (staff and facilities . . . (p. 15)

Kerensky and Melby (1972) suggest that " . . . the success of a Community Education program hinges on . . . bringing students, faculty, and community into a meaningful juxtaposition." (p. 166)
Decker (1974), who avoids a formal definition, seeks to explain Community Education in terms of "Relationships Between School and Community," concluding by quoting Totten and Manley's (1969) notion that "citizens serve as a communication bridge between professionals and the community and provide feedback from the community environment as a basis for planning."

Various educational leaders see this interaction as manifesting itself in different ways--sometimes as new formal learning relationships, sometimes as community development of learning resources, sometimes as community feedback for agency planning, and sometimes as educational agency involvement in solving community problems not directly concerned with formal learning. These different manifestations raise questions about what relationship exists among the manifestations and what accounts for the differences among systems seeking greater school-community interaction. Simply to cite individual differences in communities avoids the need to find some pattern which would make all operational variations logical outgrowths of the same concept--Community Education.

Existing Guidelines

Possibly a look at some foundation, state, and federal guidelines for funding Community Education will provide further insight into the problem. The need for government to disseminate funds so that they specifically effect Community Education in all eligible communities while at the same time recognizing the differences in needs, resources, and operational styles in those communities requires that the funding
guidelines identify some basic pattern for Community Education which can be required in all communities.

The C. S. Mott Foundation, in establishing seed money grants to local communities (school districts) in the 1960's and early 1970's, required the following operational criteria of the communities:

1. A trained professional community school director employed by the board of education.
2. Each school has an advisory council. This council should be as representative of the community as possible. There must be evidence that representation from the community are involved in program development.
3. Board of education must pass upon a formal resolution supporting the concept of Community Education. This should be done after they have an understanding of the basic principles of Community Education.
4. Budget line item for support of Community Education programs and personnel within the general operating budget (local support).
5. Established measurable goals and objectives for the system's Community Education program.
6. Liberal policies on use of school buildings.
7. Maximize use of existing human resources.
8. The establishment of cooperative procedures with other agencies, such as government, business, and industry. (C. S. Mott Foundation, 1967)

In 1974-75, the State of Michigan, with a four-year history of funding Community Education, required in part the following criteria in the local Community Education pattern for funding eligibility: (1) evidence that the board has adopted a policy recognizing and accepting responsibility for a community school program; (2) an employed director or coordinator possessing minimum qualifications; (3) a demonstration of involvement and cooperation with governmental, other institutional, and
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service agencies in identifying and serving the needs of citizens; and (4) utilization of a citizen's advisory council. Community school program was defined as:

The composite of those services provided to the citizens of a community by a district. . . . A community school program may include, but need not be limited to, preschool activities for children and their parents, continuing and remedial education for adults, cultural enrichment and recreational activities for all citizens, and the offerings of technical services to community groups. The services may be provided at any time during any day of the week throughout the calendar year. (Michigan Department of Education, 1974)

Similarly, the State of Minnesota "Guidelines for Community Schools" (1973) uses the following operational criteria for funding:

1. Evidence that the maximum number of persons in the community will be served within the limits of resources available.

2. Evidence that maximum use of human and material resources will be made.

3. Evidence that the nature and content of the district comprehensive plan is compatible with state goals and consistent with the basic concept of the community school.

4. Evidence that a community school director or coordinator be employed.

5. Evidence that your community school director or coordinator will participate in inservice activities that become available.

In addition, Minnesota districts receiving Community School grants were evaluated in the spring of 1973 on the following criteria:

1. Evidence of the involvement of a broad cross section of the community (lay citizens, civic and service groups, local and area organizations).

2. Establishment and operation of a representative advisory committee for community schools.
3. Evidence of an inventory of community needs and resources.

4. History of participants by number, average day per use, and numbers of times buildings were used per week, and year around offerings, age groups involved.

5. Evidence of participation in inservice activities of the director or coordinator.

6. An indication of the major problems and accomplishments of your Community Education programming including recommendations for the future. (pp. 29-30)

Other states' requirements follow very similar lines, with no rejection of the major Michigan and Minnesota operational assumptions.

The federal government after surveying the procedures and experiences of the state and foundation funding projects, produced the following operational requirements for the local communities, as part of the proposed rules for funding (Federal Register, April 18, 1975):

1. **Public facility as a community center.** Program services must be sufficiently concentrated and comprehensive in a specific public facility, including, but not limited to, a public elementary and secondary school . . .

2. **Scope of activities and services.** The program must extend the program activities and services offered by, and uses made of, the public facility . . .

3. **Community needs.** The program must include systematic and effective procedures for identifying and documenting on a continuing basis the needs, interests, and concerns of the community . . .

4. **Community resources.** The program must provide for the identification and utilization of educational, cultural, recreational, and other existing and planned resources located outside of the school . . .

5. **Program clients.** The program must have the potential for accommodating all age groups . . . as well as groups with special needs . . .
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6. Community participation. The program must provide for
the active and continuous involvement of institutions,
groups, and individuals, including but not limited to,
local community colleges, social, recreational, and
health groups and persons broadly representative of
the community served . . . involvement in the planning
and carrying out of the program, including involvement
in the assessment of community needs and resources and
in program evaluation. (p. 17396)

Certain common elements can be detected in the various criteria.
They call upon the school system to open facilities to greater community
use for a greater variety of purposes, to increase community needs
assessment activity, to increase identification and utilization of
community resources in addition to the school system resources, to
increase the scope of service to include all age groups and all groups
with special needs, and, particularly, to establish specific procedures
for providing "active and continuous" community participation in assessing
needs, planning, implementing, and evaluating. The "community partici-
pation" criteria consistently include interaction/cooperation/
coordination with other local agencies and institutions, as well as
"management" interaction with the clients being served. Additionally,
the various guidelines call for specific board of education policy or
role commitment to the concept and the employment of trained personnel
for implementing the concept. The emphasis on "opening" the schools to
the community in these criteria suggests a need to examine schools as
social systems to see if the published theory on "open-closed systems"
can be applied.
Schools as Social Systems

Kimbrough (1968) sees schools and their communities as interacting social systems. Operationally, he suggests that schools can make choices with respect to how "open" or "closed" their systems are as they interact with the community and its systems. He explains that

Theorists view social systems as open or closed or, more specifically, as having degrees of openness or closedness. Closed systems are insulated from the exchange of matter, information, and energy with their environment, whereas open systems exchange matter, energy, and information with the environment. (p. 20)

The notion of school system movement from relatively closed to a greater degree of openness appears to be related to the intended results of the Community Education guidelines cited in this study.

Buckley (1967) adds important dimensions to the notion when he says:

That a system is open means, not simply that it engages in interchanges with the environment, but that this interchange is an essential factor underlying the system's viability, its reproductive ability or continuity, and its ability to change. (p. 50)

Buckley also speaks of biological systems levels in which "we find the systems becoming more and more open in the sense that they become involved in a wider interchange with a greater variety of aspects of the environment, that is, are capable of mapping or responding selectively to a greater range and detail of the endless variety of the environment." (p. 51) This study assumes that the idea of "systems levels" can also be applied to social systems.

Monane (1967) contributes still another consideration when he describes an open system as follows:
A social system is normally open—is engaged in action with its environments. From them it receives; to them it sends. This movement in and out may involve any kind of energy/information: people, things, ideas, and affect. Inflow moves in, outflow leaves. These comings and goings move through system components serving as gateways. (p. 78)

The Community Education criteria cited in preceding sections of this chapter may be seen as creating gateways for increased inflow-outflow movement between a school system and its environment (community).

Before proceeding further with the discussion of the characteristics of open, or adaptive, systems, it is well to note that systems analysts generally deny the existence of completely "closed" social systems by definition. Therefore, the fact of a system's interaction with the environment has little meaning except as it can be measured and/or compared with the interactions of other systems. It is also well to consider Kimbrough's (1968) observation:

Just as there are no absolutely closed social systems, there are likewise no absolutely open systems. A completely open system would cease to be a system as we define system because, as one approaches complete openness the boundary and structure would disappear. A completely open system would become so loaded with inputs that are in conflict that the system would not survive. (p. 21)

The Morphogenic Process

What is necessary at this point is to move from what an open system is to how an open system operates, how a system becomes more open, and how "open systems" relate operationally to Community Education. What factors are involved? What relationships? What actions?

Buckley's (1967) discussion of "the morphogenetic process in complex adaptive systems" appears to be consistent with the kind of information...
required by this study. He says that the process "assumes an ongoing system of interacting components with an internal source of tension." The school system is such a system. One internal source of tension is the need to perform its educational function in and for a community. Both the community and the system itself consist of human beings whose relationships and values are in a constant state of change. The school system's very reason for being is an internal source of tension, provided that the system does not isolate itself from the complexity of its mission and, in effect, become a "closed" system.

The system in question, says Buckley, is to be seen as "a complex, adaptive organization" which continually "attempts to map the variety of its external environment." He describes the adaptive process as a "continuous transaction" within the system and between the system and its environment in which the environment becomes "selectively mapped into the system structure in some way." The existence of such an adaptive process marks the system as open.

As to the mechanical elements involved in the adaptive process, Buckley says that adaption involves "a source of variety against which to draw, a number of selective mechanisms which sift and test this environmental variety against some criteria of viability, and processes which tend to bind and perpetuate the selected variety for some length of time." In the case of school systems, the source of variety may be the community which it serves and in which it is located. The selective mechanisms may be the school system's communication and decision-making patterns and personnel. The criteria of viability may be the roles and action mandates assumed by the leadership for the system. The pro-
cesses which tend to bind and perpetuate the selected variety may range
from the structuring of programs and activities to the formation of on­
going councils and other community involvement groups.

Buckley supports the notion of communication and decision-making
patterns as selective mechanisms in the adaptive process. In addition,
he becomes more specific about some factors that underlie or influence
these selective mechanisms:

Esteem and prestige, authority and power, expertise and
leadership are also being viewed as mechanisms of social
selection, underlying as they do intergroup decision­
making; that is, they underlie the selection of communi­
cation content and interaction networks, of the rule­
making apparatus, of ecological settings and physical
layouts, and so forth, all of which work to channel
actions, attitudes, collective behavior, and decisions.

On such a basis, the genesis and crystallization of
new social and psychological structures occurs, some­
times crescively and sometimes fairly abruptly, with
greater or with lesser conscious and deliberate pur­
pose, sometimes taking place within the existing insti­
tutional organization and sometimes starting from rela­
tively unstructured collective processes outside the
institutional spheres . . . (pp. 129-130) (writer
emphasis)

Buckley continues with some observations about the maintenance, a
structure-elaboration, and exigency implications of the open system
model:

Structure is never self-maintaining; a constant expendi­
ture of energy of some kind is required to maintain any
open system's 'steady state.' Discrepancies or exi­
gencies of one kind or another lead to continual remapping
and reorganization. This means, not only that any given
social structure must always fail, to some degree, to
define, specify, or provide adequately for some exi­
gencies or unstructured events, but that it will itself
positively generate such exigencies: conflicts of
interest, ambiguous standards, role discrepancies, and
failure to achieve goals.
In an open system, then, the 'normal operation' of its institutions constantly generates an input of variety and strains thereby contributing to a continuous process of 'structure-elaboration' and reorganization. Not only are such inputs normal to such a system, they are inherent features contributing to, though not guaranteeing, its viability. (p. 130)

"The adaptive system model," Buckley says, is related to "new developments in the areas of collective decision processes, role theory, exchange and bargaining models, and theories of tension and conflict." (p. 131)

Buckley identifies a need for "both stability and flexibility" in the adaptive socioculture system and specifies the "basic elements of the adaptive process":

Modern systems analysis suggests that a sociocultural system with high adaptive potential, or integration as we might call it, requires some optimum level of both stability and flexibility: a relative stability of the social-psychological foundations of interpersonal relations and of the cultural meanings and value hierarchies that hold group members together in the same universe of discourse and, at the same time, a flexibility of structural relations characterized by the lack of strong barriers to change, along with a certain propensity for reorganizing the current institutional structure should environmental challenges or emerging internal conditions suggest the need. A central feature of the complex adaptive system is its capacity to persist or develop by changing its own structure, sometimes in fundamental ways. (p. 206)

Buckley then lists the basic elements of the adaptive process in a way which relates to some of the criteria cited earlier for Community Education. Relationships between the adaptive process of an "open system" and the Community Education process in a school system are thus established, at least by implication. He says:
Underlying the criteria of stability and flexibility are the basic elements of the adaptive process: 1) a source for the continuous introduction of 'variety' into the system, which may refine or revitalize the pool of commonly usable information and the set of common meanings and symbols that, by and large, represent adequate 'mappings' of the physical and social milieu; but variety means deviance, and although some may be adaptive, some will be pathogenic; 2) maintenance of an optimum level of tension in the system, but also, a relatively high level of satisfaction of members' needs—both basic needs and those generated by the system itself; society is not a tension-reducing system—tension is produced by the normal impulses to action, the 'role-strain' of everyday social relations, cognitive dissonance, incongruence of interpersonal matrices, and the like; 3) a full, two-way communication network extending throughout all parts of the system to provide adequate linkage of components and to make possible the various feedback loops essential to effective goal attainment; 4) a selective, or decision-making, system that is sensitive not only to changes in the external environment but also to those in its internal state (that is, it must be self conscious), and which is capable of 'learning' or allowing for changes in its goals and values; and 5) effective mechanisms for preserving and propagating those meanings, symbol systems, and information sets that have, for the moment, passed the tests of truth, goodness, and beauty; and this newly structured variety becomes the basis of the sociocultural framework within which the next round of adaptive process occurs. (pp. 206-207)

Buckley also identifies a source of reticence by school system leaders to undertake open system processes. The adaptive, or open system, model is not an equilibrium model. The adaptive model is complex, Buckley says, and "it is not as comforting as an equilibrium or functionistic model." (p. 207) The potential for conflict then increases, not decreases, as a system "opens." The management of conflict is an important consideration in the process.

Finally, Buckley cites a "principle" or a caution:

A principle we shall find important in studying the morphogenetic social process is that the amount of information available as the basis for the selective actions or decisions of
the individuals in a complex system is never sufficient to specify more than the general rules or broader outlines of the total structure. The total structure must thus be seen as generated both by the limited rules and decisions channeling the various actors taken separately, and also by the ongoing interactions and accommodations of these components as they come into conjuncture. This principle is partially recognized in sociology when we say that the norms and roles of a group can specify, at best, only a range of expected or acceptable behaviors, and it is within this range that much of the essential dynamics of society occurs. It was also recognized in MacIver's concept of 'social conjuncture': institutional patterns are the resultant of a large number of individual or group lines of actions directed at various ends or purposes that are crossing, running parallel, converging and diverging, such that the total product, only partially matches any original plans or purposes. That many of us tend to equate the end product with the initial intentions is probably largely due to our limited and selective observation and to our tendency to confuse idealized verbalization and symbolic representation with sociocultural reality. (p. 130)

This principle of limited information and structuring leads to one of the limitations placed upon this study, that is, that the study will deal only with the basic operational elements or "general rules" of the open system/Community Education relationship.

Some Common Characteristics of Open Systems

Katz and Kahn (1966) also provide useful information about the nature of open systems. They identify and describe what they call the nine "common characteristics of open systems":

1. Importation of energy: Open systems import some form of energy from the external environments . . .

2. The through-put: Open systems transform the energy available to them. The body converts starch and sugar into heat and action. The personality converts chemical and electrical forms of stimulation into sensory qualities, and information into thought patterns. The organization creates a new product, or processes
materials, or trains people, or provides a service. These activities entail some reorganization of input. Some work gets done in the system.

3. The output: Open systems export some product into the environment, whether it be the invention of an inquiring mind or a bridge constructed by an engineering firm . . .

4. Systems as cycles of events: The pattern of activities of the energy exchange has a cyclic character. The product exported into the environment furnishes the sources of energy for the repetition of the cycle of activities. The energy reinforcing the cycle of activities can derive from some exchange of the product in the external world or from the activity itself . . .

5. Negative entropy: To survive, open systems must move to arrest the entropic process; they must acquire negative entropy. The entropic process is a universal law of nature in which all forms of organization move toward disorganization or death . . .

6. Information input, negative feedback, and the coding process: The inputs into living systems consist not only of energetic materials which become transformed or altered in the work that gets done. Inputs are also informative in character and furnish signals to the structure about the environment and about its own functioning in relation to the environment. Just as we recognize the distinction between cues and drives in individual psychology, so must we take account of information and energetic inputs for all living systems.

The simplest type of information input found in all systems is negative feedback. Information feedback of a negative kind enables the system to correct its deviations from course . . .

The reception of inputs into a system is selective. Not all energetic inputs are capable of being absorbed into every system. The digestive system of living creatures assimilates only those inputs to which it is adapted. Similarly, systems can react only to those information signals to which they are attuned. The general term for the selective mechanisms of a system by which incoming materials are rejected or accepted and translated for the structure is coding. Through the coding process the 'blooming, buzzing confusion' of the world is simplified into a few meaningful and simplified categories for a given
system. The nature of the functions performed by the system determines its coding mechanisms, which in turn perpetuate this type of functioning.

7. The steady state and dynamic homeostasis: The importation of energy to arrest entropy operates to maintain some constancy in energy exchange, so that open systems which survive are characterized by a steady state. A steady state is not motionless or a true equilibrium. There is a continuous inflow of energy from the external environment and a continuous export of the products of the system, but the character of the system, the ratio of the energy exchanges and the relations between parts, remains the same . . .

The homeostatic principle does not apply literally to the functioning of all complex living systems, in that in counteracting entropy they move toward growth and expansion . . .

8. Differentiation: Open systems move in the direction of differentiation and elaboration . . . Social organizations move toward the multiplication and elaboration of roles with greater specialization of function . . .

9. Equifinality: Open systems are further characterized by the principle of equifinality, a principle suggested by von Bertalanffy, in 1940. According to this principle, a system can reach the same final state from differing initial conditions and by a variety of paths.

As Katz and Kahn point out, it is common error to fail . . . to recognize the equifinality of the open system, namely that there are more ways than one of producing a given outcome. In a closed physical system the same initial conditions must lead to the same final result. In open systems this is not true even at the biological level. It is much less true at the social level. (p. 101)

The concept of "equifinality" is particularly useful in this study because it speaks to the variability of processes and results that Community Education, as an open system approach, promises. The notion of equifinality suggests that the end should not be seen as imminent in the beginning. The notion has a practical significance in that an
operation has more options available if the end is not seen as imminent in the beginning, and a greater variety of results can be seen as acceptable. In applying the notion of equifinality, the school system creates a dynamic, flexible operation.

In terms of communication selectivity, decision-making involvement of diverse community elements, and differential power distribution, the "opening" Community Education system is asymmetrical, rather than symmetrical. It is both a social strength of the school system and a problem for its leadership that congruency gives way to variability.

Amid the variability and flexibility, the systems approach nevertheless provides the basis for understanding how Community Education models can be so different from community to community and yet all be seen as having commonalities. The unifying element is the systems notion of "isomorphism," which Burian and Flynn (1974) describe as the idea that "all human systems are . . . similar (but not identical) in their patterns of interaction and in the processes which they allow. There are observable basic and fundamental parallels that exist in the structures and processes." (p. 9) The notion of isomorphism allows the basic systems framework to apply to all human systems and demonstrate the parallels that exist between systems, including school systems being examined in a Community Education context.

Common Factors and Gateways

The common denominators among these open-adaptive system elements, when applied to the school system patterns that relate to Community Education, seem to be the following: (1) role assumptions by system
leadership and system actions based upon role assumptions, (2) communication patterns, (3) decision-making patterns (including related planning, implementation, and resource allocation), and (4) the character and extent of programs and other service output. All of the criteria and characteristics appear directly related to these factors.

The input-throughput-output processes are evident in and controlled by the manipulation of the factors. Stability-flexibility, differentiation, and equifinality are outgrowths of these factors. The variety of energies, selective mechanisms, criteria of viability, and processes to bind and perpetuate also can be traced to the factors.

Monane's (1967) notion of "gateways" is useful at this point. "Environmental inflow and outflow," he says, "come in and out through system components, for example, people and things, which serve as gateways." (p. 3) He continues,

Moreover, components serving as gateways of inflow are often at the same time gateways of outflow as well . . . Inflow and outflow with environments do not happen indiscriminately . . . specific gateways of entry and exit occur . . . Gatekeepers, moreover, do not arise on their own steam. They depend upon a system's identity and leadership for their action. The more clearcut this identity and leadership, the more rigid will gatekeepers be . . .

Norms of gateway action develop . . .

Gatekeepers are a major bulwark of system stability . . .

A system's major gatekeepers are those of inflow. Social systems are generally more concerned about what comes in than what goes out because the former more visibly involves the threat of negative feedback . . .

Gateways of outflow screen the energy/information that leaves a social system . . . They are designed to ensure that items leaving the system do not through their leaving create negative feedback for the system . . . (pp. 78-95)
If the role, communication, decision-making, and output factors which relate to school system Community Education patterns can be seen as indicators or regulators of the "gateways," which may be opened or closed to the community, thus regulating the degree (or level) of openness in operation at any given time, then examining the operant nature of the factors (or variables) may lead to discoveries about the level of Community Education being implemented. It may be well to look at each factor in this context.

There is also one further factor that deserves attention, and that is the human factor, especially the specific agent or agents, within the system, whose responsibility is facilitating or expediting the processes otherwise assumed to be inherent in the various operations of the other factors. A system framework is not real until it is activated by people.

There must be an examination of the relationship of system people to the particular assumptions and structures for role, communication, decision-making, and programming in making an operational level operant. Although at first this study may seem not to need to deal with facilitators or motivations in determining what the operant condition is of the four primary factors cited, two considerations make it important to do so: One is the fact that the study may be used by communities which hope to translate the results immediately into a plan of action which will succeed and not just use the analysis techniques after implementation. The second is that historically the presence of a facilitator (community school director) has been seen as the chief (and sometimes only) criteria for identifying Community Education in action. Therefore, it is important to include a discussion of the human factor in order to
relate the study to implementation concerns and to a deeply entrenched operational assumption.

What follows then is a discussion of the five factors cited here as they influence school operations, particularly with respect to their function as gateways for interaction between school and community and determinants of the "open-closed system" character of those school operations. Specifically, the factors are: (1) role assumptions, (2) communication patterns, (3) decision-making patterns, (4) program and service output, and (5) leadership focuses and skills.

Role Assumptions of System Leadership

This factor refers to the assumptions made by system leaders about what particular role or roles the system should play in the community. The Western Michigan University Community School Development Center (1974) has identified the following role actions as potential goals for Community Education school systems:

The systems should--

1. provide basic skills and academic learning opportunities for children from age 5 to age 18 (or 21 if one includes public colleges and universities).

2. provide basic skills and academic learning opportunities for citizens of all ages, in addition to the 5-18 year olds.

3. extend the use of facilities to include academic, recreational, and social activities throughout the day/week/month/year.

4. facilitate the use of community resources to enrich learning in school/community.
5. apply school resources to community problem solving.
6. create a sharing of educational goals, as well as resources, between the school and community through a direct interaction of school and community in the formulation of goals.
7. create a sharing by school and other community agencies and institutions in planning for and implementing actions to meet education-related needs of the citizen and the community.

These roles appear to suggest differing assumptions about the open/closed nature of the interaction between system and environment, different degrees or levels of interaction. The progression from (1) to (7) points to an underlying effort toward more openness by the system as the fundamental operational principle when a social system, such as a school system, adopts the Community Education concept. That such assumptions about the system's role can be used as "gateway" indicators seems a distinct probability. Monane (1967) demonstrates the logic of the situation. "Gateways are normally agents of a system's power structure," he says (p. 83). And, "it is the energy/information sent by a power component which by definition manipulates the system." (p. 54)

"An idea ... may operate as a significant component of this social system and furnish the core of its identity. It may determine the major 'doorman' of the system so that ideas or other items of inflow that are perceived as threatening (negative feedback) to it are denied entry." (p. 10)

This "idea" which operates as a component and a control in the system may be a central belief or role assumption, as Monane conceives a human system in which both "material and non-material culture are
treated as components." (p. 9) And, therefore, translating the term "power structure" into "leadership," it can be seen that beliefs or assumptions, particularly those that leadership uses in defining roles for the system, are likely to have profound effects upon the system gateways and are likely to be accurate indicators of the relative openness/closedness of the system.

Kuhn (1974) also seems to support this notion when he says that "all behavior of the system consists of responses to its inner state." (p. 68) "Different systems will give different responses to the same environmental element . . . Thus from one environmental situation different kinds of behavior will be selected, depending on the nature . . . and state . . . of the system involved." (pp. 41-42) It would seem evident that a vital element of the "inner state" of a human social system are the beliefs and assumptions which are central to the system. Both Monane and Kahn then seem to be saying that role assumptions affect the manner in which the system interacts with the environment, since the beliefs and other ideas central to the system are a primary source of role assumptions.

The cited systems views on the relationship between the beliefs or assumptions of system leadership and the nature of system interaction with environment are consistent with what one can observe about school systems in operation. At a very superficial level of observation, schools do seem to operate in a manner consistent with the assumptions that their leaders make about what their roles ought to be at that particular time. The writer's experience suggests that if the school board and superintendent find a role inappropriate, a school operation very rarely moves in that direction.
Among the variety of actions that school systems from place to place do now perform, whether called "Community Education" or not, one can find very different role assumptions. For example, some school leaders in Southwestern Michigan view the role of schools as one of providing academic learning opportunities for children, ages 5 to 18, and only that. Other leaders with whom the writer has had contact assume that schools should actively offer system resources to help solve community social problems. Leadership which holds the former view is unlikely to "open the gate" to the latter kind of school-community interaction. And it is just as clear that the second role assumption presumes a more open gateway to interaction than the first, thus providing one supportive factor for that interaction.

Communication Patterns

In this chapter there already exists substantial published authority that communication is a major factor in the interaction of any open system and its environment. Much of the input and output consists of the movement of information between system and environment.

According to Kuhn (1974),

... one can communicate information, motivation, or instruction. Strictly speaking, only information can be communicated. Once the message is decoded, however, it may motivate or instruct, as well as inform ... 

Two widely used terms can be defined communicationally as follows: Intellectual influence is the ability, through communication, to alter the perceptions of others so that certain things are no longer conceived as before. Intellectual influence changes concepts or their associated clues. Moral influence is the ability, through communication, to . . . change the motivational set of others about certain things. (p. 148)
These distinctions will be useful in modeling the communication factor in the operational analysis of Community Education.

Kimbrough (1968) contends that "schools that promote openness . . . promote two-way and circular channels of communication" and that "in the closed school the school message and community feedback are more likely to be heavily filtered at the boundary of the system." (p. 385) It seems likely then that the pattern of communications between system and environment and the actions of the elements in that pattern will exercise "gateway" influences on information input/output. If that is true, then the communications patterns can be used as indicators of levels of openness/closedness.

Of primary interest are (1) the nature of the pattern in terms of one-way and two-way processes and (2) the degree of selectivity exercised in accepting feedback into the system and dealing with it.

Buckley's (1967) statement that interchanges between system and environment is an "essential factor" underlying an open system's "viability" supports Kimbrough's suggested requisite of "two-way" communication. The Buckley statement also is consistent with a conclusion that Monane (1967) reaches about feedback selectivity: "... The more selective the . . . particular kinds of messages . . . the less likely the system's inventiveness in the solution of new problems." (p. 51) Buckley indicates that "systems and their power structures normally strive for positive feedback and seek to avoid negative" and that "receivers often receive what they wish by selectivity encouraging the sender's 'proper' sending." (p. 102)
At this point it is important to observe the systems interrelation-
ship that is characteristic of the first two factors in our Community
Education mapping. The matter of what is "positive" or "negative" or
"proper" feedback to a system in part depends upon what "role assump-
tions" are in operation, and at the same time the feedback itself can
affect the role assumptions by changing their importance or interpreta-
tion or even the assumptions themselves.

Decision-Making Patterns

Possibly no other action better demonstrates the character and
importance of the interaction between school system and community than
the relationship of that interaction to the decision-making processes
of the system. Kahn (1974) says that a decision is a selection of a
preferred alternative from a set of alternatives perceived to be avail-
able in a response selection situation (pp. 105-106), and it is these
selections that are the key to determining input priorities and trans-
forming input into through-put and ultimately into output. If the
decision-making responsibility defines the power structure of a system,
then the precise nature of environmental involvement in that process is
a logical indicator of system "openness." The degree to which the system
power structure guards its decision-making function, even in extreme
cases against relevant input from the environment, or shares it is an-
other major "gateway" indicator.

In mapping the role of community in school system decision-making
for Community Education purposes, it is useful to employ Kuhn's (1974)
notion about the "detector, selector, and effector" functions in a
system:
The **detector** is the function by which a system acquires information about its environment . . .

The **selector** is the function of selecting a behavioral response to an environmental state . . .

The **effector** is the function of executing the behavior selected by the selector. (pp. 43-44)

Decision-making patterns, then, as they relate to community involvement can be described in terms of the functioning of community people as detectors and/or selectors and/or effectors. This conceptualizing encompasses the possible involvement factors in the entire through-put process with the emphasis upon the decision as the central act.

For many Community Education leaders Seay's earlier quoted comment about viewing "school-community cooperation as a two-way street" means greater community participation in the decision-making processes of schools as they relate to the educational needs of the community. At the other extreme is the relatively "closed" notion that, as professionals, the school central administration is employed by the community to make all decisions on the basis of its judgment alone.

Building on an earlier observation about the interrelationships of the factors, decision-making patterns can be seen as related to role assumptions and communication patterns. Further, these seem to hold promise as the primary "gateway indicators" of the community involvement in (environment interaction with) the operation of the school system. The fourth factor, programs and services, has gateway implications in terms of environment interaction with the system or a client of consumer basis.
Character and Extent of Program/Service Output

In the systems vernacular, the program/service factor comes under the heading of "output," as in the output of goods or materials or measurable results. Since the operational output of Community Education is normally described in terms of programs and services that the system provides the community, another possible indication of "outflow gateways" and system "openness" may be found in two dimensions of the output: (1) the representativeness of programs/services themselves and (2) the representativeness of the output contact made with the various segments of the community population (chronologic, geographic, economic, racial, ethnic, and social). That is, a system may be said to be more open to interaction with the environment if its output represents many of the kinds of output needed and serves many segments of the environment than if its output focuses on one area of need and one or two segments of the environment. And in Community Education, of course, the ideal output consists of programs and services that are at least available to, if not always relevant to, everyone in the community.

As Decker (1975) says,

Community education programs are as varied as community needs and desires and are limited only by the creativity of people to plan and develop opportunities and their ability to make maximum use of other agencies, organization resources, human talents and skills. (p. 10)

Decker goes on to suggest that "the following list presents some of the programs that would fall under the umbrella of Community Education."
Martin and Seay (1974) point out that

Because programming is based upon the problems, needs, and interests, of those for whom they are planned (as they are identified through the process of community education) there are great differences in the programs developed to meet the problems, needs, and interests of one community and those developed by another community. There are no program models to be transferred from one community to another. (p. 204)

The point is well taken, and it is therefore, true that we cannot identify any combination of specific programs to model the levels of Community Education for all communities. However, at the various levels in our model we may be able to identify role assumptions (factor one) which logically lead to an expectation of programming/service activities related to the roles, as in Decker's six categories, for example. Assuming a recreational role should lead to representative recreational programming, academic roles to academic programming, and so forth. One can see the need for "systems mapping" in the operational analysis (or definition) of Community Education in view of the interactive nature of the basic factors that are involved.
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In Community Education, the output characteristics not only provide information about output or outflow gateways, but also about input gateways, by inference at any rate. The client focuses of the programming also tend to be input focuses, and the interactive quality of program and service contacts may indicate something about the input relationships being encouraged between the system and environment. Monane (1967), quoted earlier, is suggesting this when he says:

Gateways of outflow . . . are designed to ensure that items leaving the system do not through their leaving create negative feedback for the system. (p. 95)

The other side of this matter of avoiding negative feedback is that certain kinds of outflow can encourage feedback, or input. Thus, output is tied to input in the changes it makes in the environment and in the interaction patterns that it encourages. The process is cyclical, and the basic elements must be mapped to get an insight into their separate gateway functions and their interrelationships if the open/closed character of the operational cycle is to be pinpointed.

Leadership Focuses and Skills

There is little argument that significant organized activity in any human system requires the exercise of some kind of leadership by someone. In an operation as complex as that envisioned for Community Education, the assignment of certain specific responsibilities for facilitation and administration is clearly necessary. As noted earlier, the identification of administrative or motivational functions within the system may not, strictly speaking, be seen as necessary to map the interaction between system and environment. However, to the extent that
the purpose of the resulting model may be to understand why the system pattern works or does not work, as well as what the pattern is, it is important to map something about the system itself, particularly its method of operationalizing its intentions. The assignment of specific administrative responsibilities may be the difference between a conceptualized plan at a particular level and actual operation at that level. In this study, leadership roles will be used as additional indicators of levels.

As Martin and Seay point out,

Leadership is a requisite for dissemination and implementation of any concept. Thus the growth of the community education concept has been most successful in localities where one or more positions related to a community education program have been defined and filled through the employment of trained personnel. The title of the position may not be too important; it varies from place to place. 'Director of Community Education' is gradually replacing 'Community School Director' where the programs are becoming more comprehensive and are involving a larger number of institutional forces. Other titles used are 'Community Education Coordinator', 'Community Education Agent', and 'Director of Community Services'. (p. 156)

A majority of the community education programs which have been initiated in mid-twentieth century rural America and suburban carry the imprint of their historical evolution from the community school. They are school-centered programs. They begin with the appointment of a system-wide 'Community Education Director' or 'Central Coordinator' of community education. A direct line relationship is established between the community education administrator and the central administration of the school. Usually the line relationship runs between the community education administrator and the superintendent of schools. (p. 163)

How to build an organizational and administrative structure that will facilitate lifelong learning for all the people of a community is a major problem facing lay and professional leaders in community education. The problem involves the many differing procedures being used today to implement the educational process for achieving a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the
education of all of the people. The problem includes the fact that several differing viewpoints regarding the implications of the community education concept exist side by side today in the ranks of professional educators.

(p. 149)

Decker (1975) says,

Although the community education philosophy is increasingly being implemented, major changes are needed to move from a philosophy into the realities of practice. Without an understanding of the concept and a commitment to the purpose of community education by school administrators, the board of education, school faculties and community leaders, achieving a successful and comprehensive community education program is difficult. No school system immediately adopts and implements a comprehensive community education effort. It is unrealistic to assume that the traditional staffing pattern of public education can fulfill the expanded functions of community education. A new position, usually titled Community School Coordinator or Community School Director, is required at each school location, as well as one system-wide position of Community Education Coordinator. The system-wide position has proven essential for all but the smallest school systems where the system-wide and building level coordination is assumed by one person with the assistance of volunteers and part-time aides.

A vital step in implementing community education is identifying individuals who have human, technical and conceptual skills that will assist in developing strategies for achieving fundamental goals. The Coordinator for Community Education and his staff are responsible for developing a functioning community education team to insure an efficient and effective organization that works toward meeting the goals of community education.

The community education staff serve as facilitators in bringing the resources to bear upon problems and their major concern is assisting citizens in identifying individual and community needs and marshalling human, financial and physical resources in the community to meet these needs. (pp. 9-10)

Decker's reference to a "functioning community education team" suggests that under certain conditions responsibilities should be decentralized, an idea which seems consistent with this study's focus on the process of opening up the system. One would assume that the
"team" could (and should at some levels) include members other than just the director and people on his immediate staff.

While it is true administrative responsibilities must be identified and assigned for any system to operate successfully, it by no means follows that placing the total responsibility in the hands of a director and his staff is the only alternative to no plan at all. There are, among Community Education philosophers and analysts, people who believe in fact that identifying administrative responsibilities totally with a singly office within the system severely limits the operational alternatives at certain levels, in terms of the time, resources, status, and training that such a person or limited staff can be expected to bring to bear on the situation.

Whatever the particular administrative structure, the key elements in the process seem to be (1) that administrative time and resources be designated, (2) that there be an understanding of what is expected (3) that responsibility is matched with training which permits the individual or group to be equal to the task, and (4) that there be a mandate to get the job done. It is the intention of this study to include "leadership requirements" in the model as one of the factors which influence the levels of operation and therefore may be an indicator of levels.

Open Systems and Conflict

An earlier brief reference in this report to the relationship between open systems and "conflict" deserves greater attention. The asymmetrical character of opening systems requires a clear understanding
of their inherent potential for conflict. Buckley (1967) and others have described the complex interaction of system with environment as including both the processes of morphogenesis and morphostasis. That is, both change and preservation forces are at work. The tendency toward the preservation of the system (morphostasis) is likely to make the state of "equilibrium" a value among some system leaders. A state of equilibrium implies a system-environment interaction pattern which allows the system to maintain its traditional operation in an unchanged, or only temporarily changed, form. Substantial change in the system is seen only as a necessary reaction to a system imbalance in order to restore equilibrium. Conflict is minimized. It is difficult at times to know whether the human motive is to minimize conflict in order to maintain equilibrium or to maintain equilibrium in order to minimize conflict. In any event, this report presents the contention that Community Education systems increase the importance and extent of the morphogenesis processes. An increased emphasis upon morphogenesis means a de-emphasis of equilibrium and an increasing incidence of conflict as an operational factor.

Deutsch (1973) describes the situation:

Paradoxically, if contact leads to the development of a cooperative relationship, this will as a consequence promote more frequent interaction, which will in turn increase the chances of conflict. (p. 68)

However, Deutsch (1973) then points out that "conflicts do occur frequently in the course of cooperative interrelations, but such conflicts are often less problematic . . . than the conflicts arising in a noncooperative context." (p. 68)
Buckley (1967) says, in fact, that certain amounts of tension on a continuous basis are a "source of dynamics" for systems. Deutsch (1973) asserts that, "the institutionalization and regulation of conflict decreases the likelihood that conflict will take a destructive course." (p. 101)

What is needed then is not the absence of conflict, but a process for managing conflict and optimizing levels of conflict. An educational systems become more open and interactive with their environments, clearly the importance of having an understanding of conflict and procedures for resolving conflict similarly increase.
CHAPTER III

A SYSTEMS MODEL FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION

The Rationale

Chapter II listed seven goals, or goal areas, generally considered to be desirable arenas of activity for school systems under the Community Education concept: (1) instruction for children, (2) instruction for adults, (3) recreational and social learning, (4) learning enrichment through the use of community resources, (5) community problem solving, (6) community involvement in education planning and decision-making, and (7) planning, decision-making, and implementation coordination with other agencies and institutions. The point was made that the "arenas" appeared to require varying degrees of "open system" behavior. Also in Chapter II, several funding guidelines were reviewed which called for advisory councils, community input, agency coordination, expanding service functions, and broadening client focus. Again there can be seen in these guidelines a basic encouragement or requirement that school systems become more "open." A conclusion from this may be that the Community Education concept parallels the open systems concept, allowing the mapping of Community Education operations by using open systems assumptions.

Chapter II further identified five factors in the operation of the system which related to its open/closed state and which might be used as indicators for mapping the Community Education operation in
any given location. It was suggested that these five factors directly influence or characterize the "gateways" which control the nature and levels of interaction between schools and community. The factors are (1) system role assumptions, (2) communication patterns, (3) decision-making processes, (4) programs/services, and (5) leadership patterns.

The Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University has spent 8 years (1967-1975) working with more than 50 school systems (and their communities) to operationalize the Community Education concept. During that time consistent records were kept on each school system operation. More than two file drawers of operational records were examined for this study and the components of the various systems compared. In addition, numerous published sources of information on Community Education programs and operations were read, mostly notably Seay (1974) and Minzey and Letarte (1972). The result was an emerging theoretical framework of five rather distinct levels of operation, related to the arenas of activity chosen by the school systems and involving the five operational factors mentioned previously in this chapter. The theoretical framework became a matrix for mapping the degrees of openness of a school system.

This chapter will construct the matrix and map the factors at all five levels. The result will be a model which can be applied to any local situation as an aid for analyzing and characterizing Community Education, which in turn will assist in planning, making decisions, and evaluating with regard to that local situation.
Another View of System Openness

Before proceeding to the process of modeling the five factors and five levels of Community Education, it may be helpful to consider a modeling of system openness which demonstrates the general assumption on which the more complex model is based. That is, as the system assumes more roles in the environment, its inevitable action is to become more open to interaction with the environment. In education, the process is called "Community Education".

Figure 1 demonstrates the notion that as school systems expand their operational focus, they are creating an interaction pattern of increasing openness. This expansion of focus is not so much a matter of increasing the numbers of activities. Instead, the expansion relates to the assumption of new or broader responsibilities for interaction. Specifically, Figure 1 describes the movement of the operational parameters from the narrow area of training to the broader notion of service and finally to an even more open involvement process.

The use of the normal distribution curve to demonstrate the kind of relationship that exists between school and community in this process is suggestive of a notion of Burian and Flynn (1973) which they call "stochastic process". In an unpublished paper, they content that "life process is neither determined nor random. Rather, prior life processes shape the probability of future events. Stated another way, prior life process shapes the probable range of future patterns of interaction." (p. 14)

As said previously, Community Education is an opening of the school system. However, the degree of openness increases, processes
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are included which become more and more peripheral, that is, less and less supported as probabilities on the basis of prior purposes and operations (life processes). The use of the normal distribution curve in Figure 1 suggests, among other things, that each new area of responsibility may be seen as lying more and more distant from the norm, or what were previously regarded as the normal functions of the system. The figure indicates something about the task of gaining legitimacy for the new interaction patterns, both in the community and among traditionalist professionals. It provides an overview and a suggestion of the formidable nature of the task of implementing the progressively more open levels of operation in the Community Education model which follows.

The System and Its Gateways

Chapter II noted Monane's (1967) notion of gateways which produce desired levels of interaction between system and environment, thus exercising control on the degree of system openness. The suggestion was made that the five factors, or indicators, could be seen as acting as gateways controls, particularly those which control community input--role assumptions, communications patterns, decision-making patterns, and the leadership which influences these first three.

Figure 2 shows a model of the general Community Education process and the interaction of the factors. One can see how each factor may act as a process filter or influence and how these factors interact with each other to produce series of gateways. The relative condition
of the factors at the various levels determine the amount of school-community interaction, the nature of the interaction, and sometimes whether a particular kind of interaction occurs or not, as, for example, in the matter of whether there is community involvement in decision-making. Figure 3 demonstrates three different gateway relationships at work in relation to decision-making. In Example X, leadership control limits the process to its input only. In Example Y, the gateways are open for leadership to be influenced by community input filtered through the communications pattern. And in Example Z, community people, communications data, and systems leadership all interact in decision-making. While on the subject of decision-making, it is well to note that our concern is primarily with decisions that relate directly to school-community interaction and not those which are strictly internal structuring decisions, although it is recognized that decisions in the two categories do influence each other somewhat.

The Five Levels

Perhaps the logical starting point for building an operational model for Community Education is a brief explanation of the five levels, alluded to earlier, which will comprise one dimension of the model framework (the five factors will comprise the second dimension). These levels can be conveniently identified with the following operational tags: Level 1 -- Basic K - 12, Level 2 -- Extension of K - 12, Level 3 -- Enrichment, Recreation, Social Activities, and the Lighted Schoolhouse, Level 4 -- Community Problem Solving, Level 5 -- Community Based Education.
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Figure 4 charts the levels in a pyramid format which suggests perceptions about the levels similar to those in Figure 1. That is, in Figure 4 the K - 12 level is seen as the base and most important (or legitimate) focus, with each succeeding level being farther removed from the base and somewhat less significant in magnitude.

A better figure to represent the "opening up" characteristic of each succeeding level is the inverted pyramid, as in Figure 5.

Possibly an even better technique for diagraming the increasingly "open" characteristics of each succeeding area of interaction (level) is the use of concentric circles, as in Figure 6. Each additional "ring of interaction" involves a greater area, physically and philosophically, in the community.

The Levels and the Factors

The next step in building the model is to map the levels and factors by using descriptors to identify the condition associated with each factor at each level. The procedure will be to take the factors in turn and describe their changing nature from level to level. The emphasis in this chapter will be on specifying the elements of the operational model. Chapter IV will discuss the implications of the elements and their application to local situations, ending with a sample evaluation procedure and result.

System Role Assumptions

The major role assumptions at each level have already been suggested by "operational tags" that the levels have been given. However, in a somewhat more complete form, they are as follows:
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Level 1 -- The school system should devote its attention to educating the community's children.

Level 2 -- The school system should provide academic, basic skills, and other related education opportunities for children and adults.

Level 3 -- The school educational pattern should include enrichment, social and educational opportunities for people of all ages. Schools should maximize facility usage.

Level 4 -- The role of the school is to help people of all ages to learn whatever is necessary in any situation which can benefit from school participation wherever in the community the learning can best be accomplished. The school is an instrument for and should provide resources for community problem solving.

Level 5 -- The school is an instrument of the community, and, as such, should act as part of a community educational consortium which should include other agencies, institutions, and community groups addressing community education in a coordinated manner.

Figure 7 shows the levels with the major role assumptions reduced to key phrases.
## FIGURE 7

**Major Role Assumptions at the Five Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide K - 12 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide Extended K - 12 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Academic, Enrichment, Recreational and Social Educational Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide Community Problem Solving Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Consortium Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication Patterns

Two primary concerns must be taken into account when mapping communications patterns: (1) the flow pattern, that is, the extent and relationship of input and output and (2) the content characteristics and functions of the input/output. The flow pattern descriptors have been developed by the writer and appear self-explanatory. The content/function descriptors come from Kuhn (1974) and are as follows: information (to enlighten), motivation (to persuade to act), instruction (to direct to act), intellectual influence (to alter perceptions), and moral influence (to change the motivational set). In this study a distinction will be made between communicating motivation.
and exerting a *moral influence*. The former will refer to communication which persuades one to act or respond in some manner in a particular time frame, while the latter will mean that quality of communication which changes one's basic motivational set about matters or situations on a basis assumed to be permanent. The two terms may, but do not necessarily, refer to the same communications pattern. The distinctions here are the writer's and do not necessarily represent the views of Kuhn.

Given the relative situations described throughout the chapter representing the other four factors in the Community Education operation, the communications characteristics expected at each level are as follows:

- **Level 1** -- Regular outflow, little inflow; informational and intellectual functions.
- **Level 2** -- Regular outflow, irregular inflow; informational and intellectual functions.
- **Level 3** -- Regular outflow and inflow (with strong outflow emphasis); informational, motivational, and intellectual functions.
- **Level 4** -- Regular outflow and inflow (with outflow emphasis); informational, motivational, intellectual, and moral functions.
- **Level 5** -- Equalized inflow/outflow; informational, motivational, instructional, intellectual, and moral functions.

Figure 8, which follows, shows the role assumptions and communications characteristics at each level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Flow Descriptor</th>
<th>Content/Function Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular Outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Inflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide Extended K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular Outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irregular Inflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Academic, enrichment, Recreational and Social Educational Service</td>
<td>Regular Outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Inflow</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(strong outflow emphasis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide Community Problem Solving Resources</td>
<td>Regular Outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Inflow</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(outflow emphasis)</td>
<td>Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Consortium Member</td>
<td>Equalized Inflow/Outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Involvement in Decision-Making

Although the general term used for this factor so far is "decision-making", it is clear that we are really talking about community involvement in planning and implementing, as well, or that "decision-making" in its broadest sense includes the other two functions. Kuhn (1974), for one, includes all three functions under the one heading, and it is his operational descriptors that will be used in the model: detector (acquiring information about the environment), selector (selecting a behavior response), and effector (executing the behavior selected).

In mapping this factor, it is obvious that "community" is too broad a concept to use. There are at least three subdivisions of community which are identifiable in this context and will be useful in the mapping. One such subdivision consists of the other agencies and institutions in the environment which are also concerned with education or education-related matters. A second is any council or committee designated specifically to assist the system in Community Education matters. The third includes individual citizens, ad hoc advisory or action groups, and other related informal groupings of people. For a variety of reasons these three subcommunity groups may interact differently with the system at a particular level. The total interaction found between the system and the subcommunity groups seems to be a reasonably reliable indicator of the general state of system-environment interaction.

Given these assumptions, the major functions of each grouping at each level seem to be the following:
Level 1 -- Ad hoc groups (limited detector)
Council (none in existence)
Agencies (limited detector)

Level 2 -- Ad hoc groups (detector)
Council (none or detector)
Agencies (limited detector)

Level 3 -- Ad hoc groups (detector/limited effector)
Council (detector/limited effector)
Agencies (detector/limited effector)

Level 4 -- Ad hoc groups (detector/effector)
Council (detector/effector)
Agencies (detector/effector)

Level 5 -- Ad hoc groups (detector/selector/effector)
Council (detector/selector/effector)
Agencies (detector/selector/effector)

Figure 9, which follows, shows the role assumptions, communication characteristics, and decision-making characteristics at each level.

The Program/Service Factor

As indicated in Chapter II, the operational model is specifically concerned with two dimensions of the program/service factor: (1) the representativeness of the programs/services and (2) the population parameters within which the programs/services are operating. Both the areas of programming and the target populations vary from level to level, becoming more complex and extensive from Level 1 to Level 5. This is, of course, consistent with the "opening" of the system that is being modeled by these factors and levels.
### FIGURE 9

Primary Characteristics of Community Involvement in System Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Flow Descriptor</th>
<th>Content/Function Descriptor</th>
<th>Categories and Decision-Making Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little inflow</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector (limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide Extended K-12</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Detector or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Irregular inflow</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Academic, enrich-</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Detector or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ment, Recreational</td>
<td>Regular inflow</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Effector (limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Social Educational</td>
<td>(strong outflow</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Effector (limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>emphasis)</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Effector (limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide Community Problem</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Detector or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solving Resources</td>
<td>Regular inflow</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Effector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(outflow emphasis)</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Selector (limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Consortium Member</td>
<td>Equalized inflow</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Detector or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outflow</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Effector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Moral</td>
<td>Selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Effector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Selector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Selector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For purposes of describing program areas with maximum economy, Decker's six categories mentioned earlier have become five "cultural" and some avocational "skill" activities identified as enrichment and vocational skill classes being grouped under academic/training. The other potential areas are social, recreation, and community problem solving.

The population parameters dimension is concerned with a general description of the population to be involved at each level. The matter of whether representative chronologic, geographic, economic, racial, ethnic, and social groupings or individuals are involved within the general parameter is a matter of concern when determining whether the general population cited has been sufficiently involved. For example, these categories should be used in any effort to determine whether in fact "all community people" were potential participants at Levels 4 and 5.

The specific levels and factors are as follows:

Level 1 -- Programs (K-12 curriculum)
Population (Youth ages 5-18)

Level 2 -- Programs (K-12 curriculum)
Population (Youth and adults needing diplomas/training)

Level 3 -- Programs (Academic/training, Enrichment, recreation, social)
Population (All people interested in offerings/activities)

Level 4 -- Programs (Academic/training, Enrichment, recreation, social, problem solving)
Population (All community people)

Level 5 -- Programs (Same as Level 4)

Population (All community people)

Figure 10, which follows, shows the characteristics of the first four factors at all five levels.

Leadership

The leadership factor models two dimensions seen as key indicators: (1) the primary mandate(s) operating in relation to the system role assumptions and (2) the basic skills/training necessary to carrying out the mandated actions. The questions of who in the system assumes the specific leadership responsibilities and what resources are devoted to the tasks are, of course, important ones to be answered within the system. However, given some faith that the system will generate the necessary leadership time and resources, the principle of equifinality seems to work with respect to the adoption of particular leadership patterns. Whatever the pattern, the key is a clear understanding of the mandate in operation and the existence of the necessary skills in those system people charged with carrying out the operational elements of the mandate, whoever the responsible leaders may be.

Most of the descriptors in the leadership levels are self-explanatory, at least for purposes of a basic understanding of the items being cited. However, there are two which warrant more specific explanations at this point.

The reference to peer relationships with community leaders at Levels 4 and 5 refers not so much to training as it does to a level
### FIGURE 10

Areas of Representative Programming and Populations Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Communications Patterns</th>
<th>Categories and Decision-Making Descriptors</th>
<th>Program Areas Descriptors</th>
<th>Population Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector (limited)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide Extended K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector</td>
<td>Detector or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide Academic, enrichment, Recreational and Social Educational Service</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector</td>
<td>Detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide Community Problem Solving Resources</td>
<td>Regular outflow</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector</td>
<td>Detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Consortium Member</td>
<td>Equalized inflow/outflow</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual</td>
<td>Detector</td>
<td>Detector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Flow Descriptor**: Regular outflow, Little inflow, Irregular inflow
- **Content/Function Descriptor**: Informational, Intellectual
- **Citizens-at-large and Ad Hoc Groups**: Detector (limited), None
- **Community Education Council**: Detector or None
- **Agencies/Institutions**: Detector (limited)
- **Program Areas Descriptors**: K-12 Curriculum, Academic/Training Recreation Social Problem Solving
- **Population Parameters**: Youth ages 5 to 18 or 21, People age 5 and over with diploma or special training needs, All interested in offerings/activities, All community people
of social and political acceptance. Monane (1967) points out that communication is simply more efficient and more effective along peer lines than it is across those lines. As a result, this may be suggesting that it is unrealistic to expect Level 4 or 5 operations from a single "director and staff" because of the need for effective action at different peer levels.

The term "human systems management" at Levels 3, 4, and 5 refers to the need for skill in mapping, developing, and managing new or different systems of interaction among people not previously identified as elements in a common system. Specifically, this relates to the rather complex human interactions which must be managed under the communication and decision-making factors at Levels 3, 4, and 5. Implied in the term "human systems management" is a competence in conflict resolution. It is not the same as the skill required to administer the traditional institutionalized K-12 system, although some of the same skills may be helpful in both endeavors.

The specific leadership levels are as follows:

Level 1 -- Mandate (K-12 development)
Training (K-12 curriculum/staff administration)

Level 2 -- Mandate (K-12 Development Adult Formal Education)
Training (K-12 Administration Adult Recruitment/Counseling)

Level 3 -- Mandate (K-12 Development Adult Formal Education Enrichment, Recreation and Social Facility Usage, Use of Community Resources)
Training (K-12 Administration, Group Process,
Recruitment, Counseling, Educational Facilities Management, Human Systems Development/Management

**Level 4 --** Mandate (K-12 Development Adult Formal Education E-R-S Facility Usage, Use of Community Resources Community Problems, Educational Assistance)
Training (K-12/Adult Education Administration Facilities Management, Human Systems Development/ Management, Community Structure/Process, Peer Relationships with Community Leadership)

**Level 5 --** Mandate (Same as Level 4 with emphasis on operating within consortium structure)
Training (Same as Level 4 with emphasis on operating within consortium structure)

**Summary**

Figure 11, which follows, presents the complete model of levels and factors. A visual analysis of the model indicates consistent movement toward more complexity from level to level in each factor area. This is entirely consistent with the concept of open systems. As Buckley (1967) says, "The typical response of open systems to environmental intrusions is elaboration or change of their structure to a higher or more complex level." (p. 50)

The identification of levels should not be construed as implying that an operation can be located entirely on one level or another. For one thing, open systems are constantly in a changing posture, and the elements of a system do not change at uniform rates. Also, for a
FIGURE 11  
Primary Leadership Focuses and Skills Requirements and Final Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Communications Patterns Flow Descriptor</th>
<th>Program Areas Descriptors</th>
<th>Categories and Decision-Making Descriptors</th>
<th>Leadership Descriptor</th>
<th>Skills (Primary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular outflow Little inflow</td>
<td>K-12 Curriculum Youth ages 5 to 18 or 21</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual Detector (limited) None Detector</td>
<td>K-12 Curriculum/ Staff Administration</td>
<td>K-12 Curriculum/ Staff Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide Extended K-12 Education</td>
<td>Regular outflow Irregular inflow</td>
<td>K-12 Development Adult Education People age 5 and over with diploma or special training needs</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual Detector Detector or none Detector (limited)</td>
<td>K-12 Administration Adult Recruitment/Counseling</td>
<td>K-12 Administration Adult Recruitment/Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide Community Problem Solving Resources</td>
<td>Regular outflow Regular inflow (outflow emphasis)</td>
<td>All community people K-12 Development Adult Formal Education L-R-S Facility Use of Community Resources Community Problem Solving</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual Detector Detector (limited) Detector (limited)</td>
<td>K-12 Adult Education Administration Facilities Management Human Systems Development/Management Community Structure/Process (Peer Relationships with Community Leadership)</td>
<td>K-12 Adult Education Administration Facilities Management Human Systems Development/Management Community Structure/Process (Peer Relationships with Community Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Consortium Member</td>
<td>Equalized inflow/ outflow</td>
<td>Same as Level 4 All community people Same as Level 4 with emphasis on operating within consortium structure</td>
<td>Informational Intellectual Instructional Intellectual Moral Detector Detector Selector Detector Effect</td>
<td>Same as Level 4 Same as Level 4 with emphasis on operating within consortium structure</td>
<td>Same as Level 4 Same as Level 4 with emphasis on operating within consortium structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variety of reasons the people within a system may value performance in the different factor areas differently and therefore establish an operation with one or more factors at levels untypical of the basic operant pattern.

What the model is suggesting is that an effective Community Education operation at any level requires at least that level of operation in all factor areas. Also, the model is being presented as a useful tool for mapping an ongoing or planned operation for analysis and decision-making purposes. Just knowing what is actually happening in a complex human system has a value all by itself if one is responsible for managing that system.

The modeling process does allow us to make some general observations about the levels and the differences between levels. The movement from Level 1 to Level 2 requires little more than some adjusting of the population focus and a change in the scope and techniques for informational outflow. The emphasis is on formal schooling and training.

Level 3, on the other hand, involves a redefining of "educational experiences" to include new areas of responsibility as part of the school's role. Also, the emphasis of facility usage brings a need for interaction on other than purely academic bases. Informational needs are different than at the previous two levels. The system role takes on service characteristics. However, the decision-making power is still strictly in the hands of system people, and the system independence of action is still preserved. Involvement of community people is pretty much limited to actions in which they are either clients or
instruments of the system. For example, councils exist but serve limited program review or information-gathering purposes.

Level 4 brings entry of the system into the open-ended arena of community problem solving. Significant changes in communication patterns and community involvement in identifying problems and priorities are necessary. The system still has the ultimate decision about what actions it does or does not undertake, but it no longer can make those decisions on the basis of limited information gathering. There must be extensive ongoing contact with agencies, councils, and the community-at-large. There is a change of direction of the same magnitude from Level 3 to Level 4 as there is between Levels 2 and 3.

Level 5 involves a shift in management emphasis, from that of a self-contained system operating at various levels of service to the environment (Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) to that of a partner in a consortium of systems which coordinates the interaction of the systems with each other and the environment. Community involvement in the operation of the system becomes as extensive as it can be and still have a viable, identifiable system in operation.

It is important for system leaders who would use the model being developed here to understand that conflict is an integral part of the system-environment interaction and that the conflict potential increases as that interaction increases in degree and complexity, that is, as the system moves toward Level 5. The need for "the institutionalization and regulation of conflict," identified by Deutsch (1973) and mentioned earlier in this report, becomes critical at Level 5 with its emphasis upon consortium and joint decision making.
Deutsch (1973) suggests some of the conditions which must be met in order to develop conflict regulation. He says that (1) each party must be "sufficiently internally coherent and stable to act as an organized unit so that the actions of its components are controlled and unified in relation to the conflict," (2) each party must be willing "to recognize the legitimacy of the outcome of the regulated conflict, even if it is considered unfavorable," (3) the parties should understand that there are precedents which can be studied for the resolution of most conflicts to be regulated, and (4) "the regulation of conflict is most likely to develop when both sides to a conflict are a part of a common community." (pp. 377-378)

Starting with a recognition of the common community relationship, the requirements for conflict resolution appear consistent with the basic assumptions and operations that develop in the Community Education model as the system moves toward Level 5. Or, in other words, a system which finds itself incapable of effective participation in conflict regulation for lack of any of the four conditions mentioned would almost certainly not be effecting the appropriate actions in the level indicator categories. What is needed, of course, is a determination by the system leadership and personnel that the desire to operate at a particular level will be accompanied by a commitment to the necessary operational requirements in each indicator category and to whatever specific processes those operational requirements identify.

In summation, it seems obvious that in choosing levels of operation, communities and school systems are making different kinds of decisions.
at different levels. They are not simply deciding to have more or fewer activities. They are deciding upon the purposes and nature of the system--specifically the degree to which it must be "opened" in order to carry out its responsibilities to the community.
CHAPTER IV

APPLICATION OF THE MODEL

Implications and Purposes

The purpose of developing the model outlined in Chapter III, as noted in the "Statement of the Problem" for this study, is to "provide a greater understanding of the Community Education concept in action." Specifically, the purpose is to develop reference points that "may be used as a basis for analysis, planning, and evaluation." It is necessary, then, in this chapter, to look at the specific implications of the elements in applying them to local situations in order to develop a process for analyzing and evaluating local operations. The chapter will proceed along two lines simultaneously: (1) a discussion of the specific implications of the descriptors used in the model and (2) the development of an evaluation guide designed to assist in the analysis of local situations. Between the two, the former is seen as more important than the latter. The purposes for an evaluation/analysis can be so varied that it is entirely conceivable that the evaluation guide will need to be modified to be of maximum utility in a local situation, particularly if more information is required in one or more factor areas than the basic approach suggested here will provide. Therefore, it is more important to understand the nature and significance of the distinctions that the descriptors are intended to make than to have an arbitrary list of questions to be applied. The idea
is that such an understanding of the model will allow the evaluator/analyst to make whatever adjustments are necessary to adapt the basic evaluation design to the local situation. In fact, in the absence of the design itself, the insights into the intentions and workings of the model would permit the creation of a new, parallel analysis procedure. On the other hand, the suggested procedure without benefit of a clear understanding of the rationale would not be nearly as useful.

A second observation must also be made about analyzing or evaluating a local situation with the model developed in this study. The amount of data required to map performance under each factor may vary depending upon the importance of the decisions to be made on the basis of the analysis. There is, the anticipated uses of the data can vary to such an extent that: (1) one purpose may be served by the subjective estimates of performance by one or two key people (the director and superintendent, for example), (2) another may require a local evaluator to produce documented proof of activity, and (3) a third may call for a full-scale analysis by a team external to the system itself. Such varied uses and procedures seem to suggest that what is needed in this chapter are some interpretive insights and some general guidelines for using the model in analysis situations.

The procedure here will be consistent with those in Chapters II and III. That is, each factor will be discussed in turn. And finally, a suggested model application procedure will be identified and used on a community situation to demonstrate the model in practice.
Role Assumptions

The intention in examining the role assumptions of a school system is to determine what role assumptions are really operant or an influence (gateway) with respect to school-community interaction. Therefore, the obvious sources of information about role assumptions are not necessarily the most reliable ones. The references are to general statements of personal philosophy by leaders and general policy statements by boards of education. It is logical for any assessment to start with such evidence, but there must also be some way to determine whether those personal philosophies and policy statements are really operational or hold promise of being operational. One way to do this is to analyze actual program plans and results and compare these with role statements. The interdependence of the factors in our mapping is thus demonstrated. However, the output factor is dealt with separately at length in this discussion and will be discussed later. Also, there are role assumptions which are not always immediately visible in plans of program results, but which nevertheless do influence system interaction with environment, as is the area of communication. Level 3 role assumptions should produce Level 3 communications patterns. And there again the interdependence of factors is obvious.

Apart from analyzing the other factors, what checks can be made upon the operant quality of role assumptions? One technique is to see whether such assumptions are readily translated into resource allocation. Another is to request that the leadership show evidence that their actions (and those of the system) are consistent with the roles that they espouse.
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It is important to differentiate between roles that leaders or others in the system espouse or play themselves and roles which represent the overall operation of the system itself. In the past, schools have been known to single out system people involved in isolated personal projects or the singular leader with unique personal views as representing system action. Determining what is "system" in nature is not necessarily a matter of consensus, but there does have to be some evidence that the role in question is more than just a person or two "doing their thing" with no real involvement or commitment by the system, establishing the action as a norm.

In summary then, the suggested components on role assumption in applying the model are as follows: (1) identification by system leadership of philosophical or policy or role assumptions that are seen as system norms and commitments, (2) evidence that the role assumptions are sufficiently valid that they can affect (or effect) resource allocation, (3) evidence that leadership actions support the assumptions, and (4) evidence that other system policies, procedures, and rationales are consistent with the role assumptions, or at least do not preclude action on them.

Communication Patterns

As the model itself indicates, two dimensions of the communication pattern between system and community are to be analyzed and/or measured: (1) the direction and extent of the flow of information and (2) the particular functions that the communication is to serve. "Flow" refers to the movement of information from system to community and from
community to system. "Function" refers to the use of communications content for informational, motivational, and/or instructional purposes, incorporating intellectual and/or moral modes of influence into the content structure. It is the combination of flow and function which determines the basic level of communication operation. That is, either advanced flow characteristics with insufficient functional content or advanced functional content with severely limited flow patterns tend to peg the overall communication operation at the lower of the two levels in question.

Although the flow pattern deals with both inflow and outflow, it is the inflow pattern, commonly referred to as "feedback", which is the key flow determiner of level. The extent of outflow certainly does vary, and one can make judgments about how successful a system is in getting its messages to the community, but the perceived need and attempts at regular outflow, however inept, are common to most school systems. What varies are the perceptions and efforts of these same systems to encourage, facilitate, and process feedback. What is necessary in any mapping situation are analysis techniques or questions for pegging the particular level of feedback corresponding the distinctions in the model: little, irregular, regular (strong outflow emphasis), regular (outflow emphasis), and equalized inflow/outflow.

The questions to be answered are "How extensive is the feedback?" and "How regular is it collected and processed?" Clearly, the more community involvement, as in decision-making, is assumed, the more feedback patterns should be in evidence. The possibilities range from
little feedback and involvement to extensive amounts of both. In fact, at Level 5 feedback is of equal importance to outflow because in the community consortium arrangement the system depends upon the community to give it direction. Maximum two-way communication processes must be at work if such a consortium is to function.

The descriptors of content/function are defined earlier. It may be helpful now to demonstrate the differences that exist between levels and the characteristics that must be identified in a local mapping situation.

Levels 1 and 2 both use communication to inform (enlighten) and to alter or influence the perceptions of system and community people. The basic difference between the two levels of communication is the need for somewhat more communication, particularly inflow, in order to deal with the expanded client population and the fact that adults have service problems that are somewhat different than youth (jobs, family schedules, greater personal independence, etc.).

Level 3, with its emphasis upon extensive use of school facilities for a variety of education-related activities and upon the involvement of community people in planning and implementing many of these activities, begins to involve regular "communication to persuade to act" between system and community people. The system needs to persuade community people to be involved, and part of the function of these people is to persuade the system to embrace particular activities in its programming. On the basis of the sheer weight of emphasis and effort, however, one can see that the communication focus is still much more heavily on publicizing the necessary information to recruit clients than it is on community input and decision-making involvement.
Level 4, with the new open-ended community problem solving dimension, seems to require a significant communications thrust in the direction of changing "the basic motivational set about matters or situations" of people, both in the system and in the environment. The amount and regularity of inflow must also be increased to allow for problem identification and prioritizing by the community.

Finally, Level 5 adds a new "instructional" dimension to the inflow with the community, through the consortium structure, now "directing the system to act" in certain capacities and situations. The equalized inflow/outflow characteristic of this level was discussed earlier.

To summarize, in applying the model one must determine: (1) how extensively feedback is taken into the system, (2) how regularly it is collected and processed, and (3) whether the nature and purposes of communication are to enlighten, to persuade to act, to direct to act, to alter perceptions, and/or to change motivational sets of people, both in the system and in the community.

Decision-Making

The descriptors (detector, selector, effector) distinguish between one who gathers information, one who chooses from among behavioral alternatives, and one who sees that the choice of behaviors is activated. The three community subdivisions permit the mapping of the chief sources of potential community involvement in school system decision-making: the Community Education Council or Committee specifically organized for such purposes, various kinds of ad hoc groups and
citizens-at-large, and community agencies and/or institutions assumed to have education-related roles in the community and therefore operational relationships to the school system, particularly at the advanced levels of system openness.

At Levels 1 and 2, a Community Education Council, as such, rarely exists except on an ad hoc basis, and the function of whatever involvement there is by community representatives is entirely informational. That is, they provide the system with a ready means of acquiring immediate information on which to base decisions. The difference between Levels 1 or 2, as with the communication factor, lies in the extent of the factor activity, with the greater community assistance necessary at Level 2 where the system's clients include adults as well as youth.

Level 3 introduces a new function of involvement—community assistance in producing and promoting the activities which are an outgrowth of system decisions. In fact, at this level there may be appearances of community selector involvement. One can observe community groups which "hold activities" in the school facilities making decisions about the format of those activities. However, this phenomenon should not be confused with making decisions for the system or as part of the system. In effect, the system "leases out" the right of the group to make its own decisions in its designated facility space, but does not condone selector involvement in policy matters or basic operational procedure. The community provides information (and suggestions in the process) and even assists system personnel in publicizing, recruiting, and implementing, but at this level systems personnel ultimately make all final selections from among the alternatives.
Level 4 does provide a first legitimate entry of community into the actual choosing of priorities and alternatives for the system. The need comes from the fact that the limitless numbers of possible community problem-solving actions requires the system to seek community expertise, experience, and assistance in making selector decisions within that limited area of the total spectrum of system decisions. The Community Education Council is usually the specific instrument, and it is usually given a status which makes it both representative of the community and a functional component of the system. Sometimes this status is identified in council by-laws, sometimes in school board policies, and sometimes in a less formal common agreement among the parties.

Level 5, for reasons already outlined in the discussion of the role and communication factors, calls for community involvement as detector, selector, and effector, with the agencies, institutions, and other groups acquiring some general selector responsibilities as part of the consortium operation.

To summarize, mapping the decision-making factor in a local operation requires that the involvement of the previously identified three subgroupings of the community be characterized in terms of their informational, activational, or behavior selection functions.

Programs/Activities

Given the role assumptions in operation in the system and a record of the programs and activities in existence, the level of programming is not difficult to determine—with two possible exceptions. (1) There
may be some question as to whether there is any minimum number of programs (more than one) required to establish a bonafide operation in such areas as enrichment or community problem solving. (2) The criteria for establishing acceptable population coverage or involvement may be subject to discussion or disagreement.

In the case of the numbers of programs, it may be necessary to establish some norms for different types of communities to differentiate between a bonafide full-scale operation and tokenism in the basic program areas. The population question probably requires the identification of the various chronological, social, ethnic, geographical, etc., groupings in the area followed by a sampling technique to demonstrate coverage. In less stringent mapping situations, an estimate of the coverage of each of the population groupings may be acceptable.

In summary, what is necessary is (1) a complete list of programs/activities to be matched against the model descriptors and local role assumptions, (2) a complete list of population groupings, and (3) data relative to the coverage of population groupings.

Leadership

In some respects the mapping of the leadership factor and its two subdivisions may be seen as a check on the purposefulness with which the system approaches the operationalizing of the other factors.

The mandate subsection identifies leadership action cues, which should be consistent with role assumptions. It is true, however, that the philosophical role assumptions are not always reflected in the very practical action mandate. The question to be answered is "What exactly
are the system leaders and personnel expected to do?" What are the top priority operational expectations? If we strip away the non-essentials, what must be done without fail? In a sense then, the mandate information tells us what the absolutely basic level of operation is for the system. The mandates may or may not match the system role assumptions. Where they do not, especially in times of social, political, or economic stress, one may be able to discern operational discrepancies.

The training subsection provides the opportunity to map the training and qualifications of leadership, which in turn allows us to match those qualifications against the performance expectations implied in the key operational factors. The implications of such a matching action are obvious. It is important to note that under the leadership factor we are concerned with which leadership figures assume which leadership roles and whether or not they are specifically qualified to assume those roles. The model suggests some specific training requirements at the various levels which may be used, at least as a starting point, for mapping the local leadership skills.

To summarize, the model application must answer the following questions: (1) What must be operationally sustained without fail? (2) Which leadership figures assume which roles in the Community Education operation? (3) What training and skills do these leaders bring to these roles?

An Additional Dimension

There is an additional data collection approach which can be used as a cross check or validity check on the operational levels identified
for the factors through investigating the factors directly. The idea is to take members of various community groups and identify specifically the roles they play in relation to the system and the way in which the system responds to them. Are they simply students? Clients? Council members? Decision-makers? A list of the involvement possibilities allows the evaluator to map individual patterns as a way of checking on the conclusions reached about levels of operation through the analysis of the factors.

A Suggested Evaluation/Analysis Format Using Model Factors

The following is a list of specific items drawn from the discussions of factor intentions and designed to make possible the application of the model to local Community Education patterns. It is important to keep in mind that the purpose of the model is to estimate the degree of system openness and Community Education development, not program value or success per se. Specific directions for carrying out the analysis steps have not been included because it is the intention of this study only to demonstrate that the model is applicable and because, as indicated earlier, the purposes for a local evaluation/analysis can be so varied that refinement of the analysis procedures may be necessary on an individual project basis, or, at the very least, such refinements should receive the full attention of another study such as this one. The suggested format then should be seen as a guide designed to assist in the analysis of local situations.

"The Community Education System Analysis Procedure" which follows is constructed in such a way that each section deals with one indicator
area, except for Section 6.0 which employs the cross check technique mentioned earlier. Under each section heading, the data collection items are organized so that they refer to specific levels of Community Education. For example, the subsections under 1.1, that is, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, and 1.15, represent Levels 1 through 5 respectively. Under 1.2 there is a single list of items, but again these items can be clearly identified individually with the various levels in the model. The rest of the items in the procedure can similarly be linked with particular levels of operation. Thus, a map of the local situation is created by the responses (or lack of response) to the items.
THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION SYSTEM ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Section 1.0 -- Role Assumptions

1.1 Which of the following statements represent the convictions of school leadership about the proper role(s) of the schools in the community:

1.11 The school system should educate the community's children.

____ Basic reading, writing and mathematics
____ Advanced mathematics
____ Literature
____ Sciences
____ Social Sciences
____ Languages and language arts
____ Vocational-technical
____ Career education
____ Fine arts
____ Physical education
____ Other (specify) ______________________

1.12 The school system should provide academic, basic skills, and other related education opportunities for adults.

____ Basic reading, writing and mathematics
____ Advanced mathematics
____ Literature
____ Sciences
____ Social Sciences
____ Languages and language arts
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1.13 The school educational pattern should include enrichment, social and educational opportunities for people of all ages. Schools should maximize facility usage.

- Vocational-technical
- Career education
- Fine arts
- Physical education
- Other (specify) _______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crafts, hobbies, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social meetings, games, parties, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts, films, lectures, theatres, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor/outdoor sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community use of playgrounds and parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.14 The role of the school is to help people of all ages to learn whatever is necessary in any situation which can benefit from school participation wherever in the community the learning can best be accomplished. The school is an instrument for and should provide resources for community problem solving.

- Community health
- Community mental health
- Community economics/employment/housing
- Community security
- Community physical environment
- Community energy use
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1.15 The school is an instrument of the community, and, as such, should act as part of a community educational consortium which should include other agencies, institutions, and community groups addressing community education in a coordinated manner.

1.2 When it is necessary to spend local tax dollars in an amount equal to one tenth of one percent or more of the total school budget (a $5 million budget would mean at least a $5,000 expenditure) to operate the following activities, which are considered important enough to spend such an amount properly?

___ Academic classes for youth
___ Academic classes for adults
___ School readiness activities for preschool children
Recreation activities for all ages, using school facilities

Enrichment activities for all ages, using school facilities

Social activities for all ages, using school facilities

Alternative education opportunities/activities in places other than school facilities

A study of community conditions and education-related community problems

To support the activities of a community-based "Council on Education" consisting of representatives of all agencies, institutions, and community groups including the school system.

(Assume that such a council would have an office and staff and that other agencies would contribute like amounts.)

1.3 What evidence is there that leadership actions support the role assumptions identified in item number 1?

1.31 Specific policies (itemize)

1.32 Public statements

____ Board members

____ Central administration

____ Community school administration

1.33 Personal administrative involvement

____ Board members
Superintendent
Other central administrators
Community school administrators
Building principals

1.34 Personal participation

Board members
Superintendent
Other central administrators
Building principals (2 of principals)

1.35 Personal advisory involvement

Board members
Superintendent
Other central administrators
Building principals (1 on advisory council)

1.36 Appropriation of funds

Administrative funds
Program funds
Research/planning funds
Training

1.37 Assignment of other resources

Space
Equipment
Materials
Personnel time

1.38 Preservice/inservice training involvement

Board members
Superintendent
1.39 Other leadership actions (itemize)

1.4 Are any school system policies, procedures, or rationales inconsistent with the role assumptions, that is, prevent action on them? (itemize)

Section 2.0 -- Communications

2.1 Identify all instances of outgoing system communications to the community. Indicate whether each occurs (a) once per month or more often or (b) once per year or more often (but less often than every month).

____ Public media news releases
____ School news publications
____ Special mailings and brochures
____ Advertising campaigns, notices, signs, etc.
____ Open houses, public meetings
____ Formal presentations to community groups, including Parents
          Students
          Special age groups
          School advisory committees
          Community government
          Educational leaders
          Social service agencies
          Fraternal/social groups
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Religious groups
Neighborhood groups
Business groups
Labor groups
Racial/ethnic groups
Other _______________________

Planned personal contact pattern or campaign involving --
Board members
Superintendent
Community school staff
Other central administrators
Building principals
Teachers
Non-teaching staff
Aids/paraprofessionals/etc.
School advisory councils
Community volunteers
Other ______________________

2.2 Identify all instances of feedback from the community collected and processed by the school system. Indicate whether each occurs (a) once per month or more often or (b) once per year or more often (but less often than every month).

Formal surveys
School advisory council/committee meetings
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Open houses, public meetings

Telephone calls, suggestion boxes, etc.

Meetings with community groups, including --

Parents

Students

Special age groups

Community government (departments)

Educational leaders

Social service agencies

Fraternal/social groups

Religious groups

Neighborhood groups

Business groups

Labor groups

Racial/ethnic groups

Other ____________________

Planned use of informal one-to-one personal contacts involving --

Board members

Superintendent

Community school staff

Other central administrators

Building principals

Teachers

Non-teaching staff

Aids/paraprofessionals/etc.
Advisory council members

Community volunteers

Other _______________________

2.3 Identify the nature and purposes of each regular instance of communication (input and output) in terms of how the following descriptors apply:

2.31 To enlighten
2.32 To persuade to act
2.33 To direct to act
2.34 To alter or influence perceptions
2.35 To change or influence motivational sets

Section 3.0 -- Decision-Making

3.1 Does the system have a Community School Council or Committee consisting of a majority of (or entirely of) community people (as opposed to school system employees)?

3.2 The community participates formally in gathering and/or providing information to be used in system decision-making.

Participants include --

____ Community school committees
____ Ad hoc groups (specify)
____ Citizens-at-large (specify)
____ Other education institutions
____ Community government (departments)
____ Social service agencies
____ Religious institutions
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3.3 The community participates formally in choosing courses of action for the system. Participants include --

- Community school committees
- Ad hoc groups (specify)
- Citizens-at-large (specify)
- Other educational institutions
- Community government (departments)
- Social service agencies
- Religious institutions
- Business organizations
- Labor organizations
- Social or recreational organizations
- Other (specify)

3.4 The community participates formally in converting system decisions into actions. Participants include --

- Community school committees
- Ad hoc groups (specify)
- Citizens-at-large (specify)
- Other education institutions
- Community government (departments)
- Social service agencies
- Religious institutions
Business organizations
Labor organizations
Social or recreational organizations
Other (specify) ______________________

Section 4.0 -- Programs/Activities

4.1 The system's community may be analyzed in terms of the following subdivisions:

4.11 Geographical subdivisions (list them)

4.12 Age subdivisions (population size)

4.13 Racial and ethnic subdivisions

4.14 Other pertinent subdivisions
4.2 The system provides the following academic programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 The system provides the following vocational training programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The system provides the following avocational training programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 The system provides the following enrichment programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 The system provides the following recreation programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 The system provides the following social programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 The system has been participating in the following community problem solving activities involving the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(activity)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 Identify the system procedure for making participation opportunities available to the various population subdivisions.

4.9.1 Processes for making populations aware of opportunities

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Section 5.0 -- Leadership

5.1 Indicate leadership perceptions about the operational importance of the following roles of the system. Identify each role as primary (P), secondary (S), or unimportant (U). Distinguish between the perceptions of the superintendent and the consensus of other administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(supt.)</th>
<th>(admin.)</th>
<th>(function)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K-12 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult academic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-school development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrichment development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social programs development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School facility usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community resource usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation with other agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with other agents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Indicate the specific leader(s) responsible for the following system functions. Indicate specific training or demonstration of skill in the functional area.

5.21 K-12 staff administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22 Curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.23 Client recruitment/counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.24 Facilities planning/management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.25 Educational resource development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>Group process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>Human System development/management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Community decision-making/coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>System communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Assessment/evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6.0 -- Cross Check

6.1 Using the population subdivisions identified in 4.1, indicate the nature of the system interaction with each group by listing each group under the proper interaction categories.

6.11 No interaction (except as taxpayers)

6.12 Students, class members

6.13 Activities participants

6.14 Clients in problem-solving

6.15 Educational resources

6.16 Informal sources of information
6.17 Members of formal input/output council

6.18 Activities planners/facilitators

6.19 Participants in choosing system actions
A Sample Application of the Model

To demonstrate the use of the model and the Community Education System Analysis Procedure (CESAP), data have been collected from a sample community. The school system has a full-time community school director and a history of interaction with its community beyond the traditional K-12 level over a period of some 7 years. The community is a village and surrounding rural community of approximately 5,000 people. The community chosen is located in southwestern Michigan and has a Community Education operation in progress. It is therefore particularly useful in demonstrating the CESAP. Success in applying the CESAP with this community seems to promise similar application results in larger communities, except that the data will be more voluminous and the collection process considerably more complex. In fact, it is probably that in urban systems the CESAP will be used with each neighborhood school and also with the systemwide operation, with the data from the resulting analyses being used to map the individual neighborhood operations or the systemwide operation or both.

The data were collected in an extended interview session with three school system leaders, including the community school director. With the necessity to collect or document the information even more extensively, the collection process could have included more sources, including some non-school system sources. However, the need to provide voluminous evidence was not deemed necessary for purposes of this demonstration.

The following is a completed CESAP form based upon the responses of the interviewed system leaders:
Section 1.0 -- Role Assumptions

1.1 Which of the following statements represent the convictions of school leadership about the proper role(s) of the schools in the community:

1.11 The school system should educate the community's children.

- Basic reading, writing and mathematics
- Advanced mathematics
- Literature
- Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Languages and language arts
- Vocational-technical
- Career education
- Fine arts
- Physical education
- Other (specify) ______________________

1.12 The school system should provide academic, basic skills, and other related education opportunities for adults.

- Basic reading, writing and mathematics
- Advanced mathematics
- Literature
- Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Languages and language arts
1.13 The school educational pattern should include enrichment, social and educational opportunities for people of all ages. Schools should maximize facility usage.

- Vocational-technical
- Career education
- Fine arts
- Physical education
- Other (specify) ____________

1.14 The role of the school is to help people of all ages to learn whatever is necessary in any situation which can benefit from school participation wherever in the community the learning can best be accomplished. The school is an instrument for and should provide resources for community problem solving.

- Community health
- Community mental health
- Community economics/employment/housing
- Community security
- Community physical environment
- Community energy use
1.15 The school is an instrument of the community, and, as such, should act as part of a community educational consortium which should include other agencies, institutions, and community groups addressing community education in a coordinated manner.

1.2 When it is necessary to spend local tax dollars in an amount equal to one tenth of one percent or more of the total school budget (a $5 million budget would mean at least a $5,000 expenditure) to operate the following activities, which are considered important enough to spend such an amount properly?

- Academic classes for youth
- Academic classes for adults
- School readiness activities for preschool children
1.3 What evidence is there that leadership actions support the role assumptions identified in item number 1?

1.31 Specific policies (itemize)

1.32 Public statements

   - Board members (at board meetings)

   - Central administration (at board meetings)

   - Community school administration

1.33 Personal administrative involvement

   - Board members

---
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1.34 Personal participation

- Board members
- Superintendent
- Other central administrators
- Building principals

1.35 Personal advisory involvement

- Board members
- Superintendent
- Other central administrators
- Building principals

1.36 Appropriation of funds

- Administrative funds ( Appropriations by board based on income from Community Education activities and grants. No general fund investment. )
- Program funds
- Research/planning funds
- Training

1.37 Assignment of other resources

- Space
- Equipment
- Materials (limited)
- Personnel time (on voluntary basis)

1.38 Preservice/inservice training involvement

- Board members
- Superintendent
Community school administrators
Other central administrators (on voluntary basis)
Building principals (on voluntary basis)

1.39 Other leadership actions (itemize)
None

1.4 Are any school system policies, procedures, or rationales inconsistent with the role assumptions, that is, prevent action on them? (itemize)
None

Section 2.0 -- Communications

2.1 Identify all instances of outgoing system communications to the community. Indicate whether each occurs (a) once per month or more often or (b) once per year or more often (but less often than every month).

   a. Public media news releases (2.31) (2.32) (2.34)
   a. School news publications (2.31) (2.34)
   b. Special mailings and brochures (2.31) (2.32) (2.34)
   b. Advertising campaigns, notices, signs, etc. (2.31) (2.32) (2.34)
   b. Open houses, public meetings (2.31) (2.34)
   b. Formal presentations to community groups, including Parents (2.31) (2.34)
   Student:
   Special age groups (1 presentation to Senior Citizen) (2.31) (2.34)
   School Advisory committees (2.31) (2.34)
   Community government
Educational leaders
Social service agencies
Fraternal/Social groups
Religious groups
Neighborhood groups
Business groups
Labor groups
Racial/ethnic groups
Other _______________________

b Planned personal contact pattern or campaign involving --

Board members
Superintendent
Community school staff (2.31) (2.32) (2.34)
Other central administrators
Building principals
Teachers
Non-Teaching staff
Aids/paraprofessionals/etc.
School advisory councils
Community volunteers
Other _______________________

2.2 Identify all instances of feedback from the community collected and processed by the school system. Indicate whether each occurs (a) once per month or more often or (b) once per year or more often (but less often than every month).
Formal surveys (Enrichment Survey, Publications Survey) (2.31) (2.34)

School advisory council/committee meetings (2.31) (2.34)

Open houses, public meetings (2.31) (2.34)

Telephone calls, suggestion boxes, etc. (Parent Hot Line) (2.32)

Meetings with community groups, including --

- Parents (2.31) (2.34)
- Students
- Special age groups (1 meeting with Senior Citizens) (2.31) (2.34)
- Community government (departments)
- Educational leaders
- Social service agencies
- Fraternal/social groups
- Religious groups
- Neighborhood groups
- Business groups
- Labor groups
- Racial/ethnic groups
- Other Summer Softball League Players (2.31) (2.34)

Planned use of informal one-to-one personal contacts involving --

- Board members
- Superintendent
- Community school staff (2.31) (2.34)
Other central administrators
Building principals
Teachers
Non-teaching staff
Aids/paraprofessionals/etc.

Advisory council members (Expected to provide general feedback) (2.31) (2.34)

Community Volunteers
Other

2.3 Identify the nature and purposes of each regular instance of communication (input and output) in terms of how the following descriptors apply:

2.31 To enlighten
2.32 To persuade to act
2.33 To direct to act
2.34 To alter or influence perceptions
2.35 To change or influence motivational sets

Section 3.0 -- Decision-Making

3.1 Does the system have a Community School Council or Committee consisting of a majority of (or entirely of) community people (as opposed to school system employees)? --Yes--

3.2 The community participates formally in gathering and/or providing information to be used in system decision-making. Participants include --

   x   Community school committees

   ___ Ad hoc groups (specify)
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3.3 The community participates formally in choosing courses of action for the system. Participants include --

- Community school committees
- Ad hoc groups (specify)
- Citizens-at-large (specify)
- Other educational institutions
- Community government (departments)
- Social service agencies
- Religious institutions
- Business organizations
- Labor organizations
- Social or recreational organizations
- Other (specify) _______________________

3.4 The community participates formally in converting system decisions into actions. Participants include --

- Community school committees
- Ad hoc groups (specify)
Section 4.0 -- Programs/Activities

4.1 The system's community may be analyzed in terms of the following subdivisions:

4.11 Geographical subdivisions (list them)

- Village
- Rural
- Housing Project #1
- Housing Project #2

4.12 Age subdivisions (population size)

- Birth - 4 years
- 5 years - 17 years
- 18 years - 55 years
- Over 55 years

4.13 Racial and ethnic subdivisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(group)</th>
<th>(population size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.14 Other pertinent subdivisions

4.2 The system provides the following **academic** programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Traditional Programs</td>
<td>All Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 The system provides the following **vocational training** programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional K-12 Vocational Courses</td>
<td>All Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The system provides the following **avocational training** programs for the identified populations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(program)</th>
<th>(population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Sewing</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholstery</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 The system provides the following enrichment programs for the identified populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folk Guitar</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly Dancing</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess Club</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cake Decorating</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>Pre-School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The system provides the following recreation programs for the identified populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbling</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>All Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open gym</td>
<td>All Citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 The system provides the following social programs for the identified populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen Nights</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td>Adults/Senior Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Party</td>
<td>Adult Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Parties</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctions</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 The system has been participating in the following community problem solving activities involving the identified populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aid Training</td>
<td>Senior Citizens/Homebound Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health and Physical Fitness</td>
<td>Community Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus Service Project</td>
<td>All Citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.9 Identify the system procedure for making participation opportunities available to the various population subdivisions.

4.91 Processes for making populations aware of opportunities

Communications procedures
   already cited

4.92Processes for facilitating involvement of populations

Section 5.0 -- Leadership

5.1 Indicate leadership perceptions about the operational importance of the following roles of the system. Identify each role as primary (P), secondary (S), or unimportant (U). Distinguish between the perceptions of the superintendent and the consensus of other administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(supt.)</th>
<th>(admin.)</th>
<th>(function)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>K-12 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Adult academic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Pre-school development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Enrichment development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Recreation development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Social programs development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>School facility usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.2 Indicate the specific leader(s) responsible for the following system functions. Indicate specific training or demonstration of skill in the functional area.

5.21 K-12 staff administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendents</strong></td>
<td>Ed.D. (School Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>M.A. (School Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>M.A. (School Administration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22 Curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>Former curriculum director in another district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>3 have had graduate work in curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.23 Client recruitment/counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 K-12 Counselors</td>
<td>All have M.A. degrees in counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>6 weeks internship with other community school directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.24 Facilities planning/management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Course work in facilities planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>General 6-weeks internships with other Community School Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>2 have had facilities planning courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.25 Educational resource development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Course work, past general experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>Graduate work in &quot;Community Resources&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 principals</td>
<td>No &quot;Community Resources&quot; training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.26 Group process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Course work, past general experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>Past general experience only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>Past general experience only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>3 have had graduate courses in group process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.27 Human Systems development/management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(leader)</th>
<th>(training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>No specific training, past general experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>No specific training, limited experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>No training or experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.28 Community decision-making/coordination

(leader) (training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>General experience only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>No experience prior to appointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.29 System Communication

(leader) (training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Graduate course in public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>Graduate course in public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>Graduate course in public relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.30 Assessment/evaluation

(leader) (training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses, general staff experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses, general experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community School Director</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses, no staff evaluation experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Principals</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses, one two-day workshop for principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6.0 -- Cross Check

6.1 Using the population subdivisions identified in 4.1, indicate the nature of the system interaction with each group by listing each group under the proper interaction categories.

6.11 No interaction (except as taxpayers)

None
6.12 Students, class members

All groups represented to some degree.

6.13 Activities participants

All groups represented to some degree.

6.14 Clients in problem-solving

All groups represented in general ways.

6.15 Educational resources

Some documented representation from each group. Varies in degree.

6.16 Informal sources of information

All groups are included in surveys and in casual contacts, proportional to group size.

6.17 Members of formal input/output council

One housing project not represented specifically; otherwise all major groupings are represented to some degree (by at least one person).
6.18 Activities planners/facilitators

All groups have been represented from time to time, depending upon the nature of activities and the interests of each group.

6.19 Participants in choosing system actions

None.

Only system leaders choose system actions.
An Analysis of the Data for Mapping

For purposes of mapping the operation which the CESAP data describe, it is necessary to summarize the data in each indicator area and draw some conclusions (at least tentative) from the summaries. The technique is to chart the data collected in terms of the relationship existing between the collection procedure items and the levels in the model. That is, where activity is indicated on an indicator item, activity is likewise being indicated at the operational level which that item represents. Inactivity at a level is indicated by an absence of responses under the items which represent that level. The following are the summaries and suggested conclusions for the sample data.

Section 1.0 - role assumptions

The information in 1.1 indicates extensive commitment to role activities in Levels 1, 2, and 3. The Level 4 role assumptions are limited to the areas of environment and energy usage, which have strong academic ties to the lower levels. There are no Level 5 assumptions.

The responses under 1.2 support the notion that the role assumptions basically represent the first three levels of operation. Local tax money would be spent for academics, pre-school, recreation, enrichment, and social activities, but not activities away from the school or community problem studies or consortium councils. Items under 1.3 and 1.4 show little reason to alter the initial impressions of a three level operation.
Section 2.0 - communications

Item 2.1 indicates a regular outflow of information, although there may be an overly strong emphasis on media techniques and the actions of the community school staff to the exclusion of other techniques and system people. Item 2.2 likewise indicates some regular feedback patterns. The outflow appears a bit more dominant, suggesting possibly a Level 4 relationship.

The content/function data describes communication patterns heavily oriented to enlightenment (informational) and perception alteration (intellectual). Level 2 is suggested, except for some limited persuasion activity (motivational). The benefit of the doubt might allow a Level 3 rating for function and content.

Section 3.0 - decision-making

The responses in this area show a decided limitation on the involvement of community in decision-making. In fact, there is no community involvement at all in the actual choosing of courses of action. There is some detector activity (3.2) with the community council or committee, with select social service agents, and with citizens-at-large, also some effector involvement (3.4) by the council and members of some of the social and recreational groups that use the school facilities. The data suggests Level 3 operations with citizens-at-large and the council, although the involvement cannot be described as extensive. The relationship with agencies may be Level 2 in the area of decision-making.
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Section 4.0 - programs/activities

The lists of representative programs and activities indicate a strong Level 3 operation and even entry into Level 4. Interestingly, more community problem solving is indicated in the activities rundown than in the role assumptions of 1.0. The community health and transportation involvement offer a contrast to the earlier seemingly academic orientation of the environment and energy roles which the system leadership accepts.

The programs and activities appear designed for wide population coverage. The health and transportation activity, of course, potentially relate to all community people.

In the area of programs and activities Level 5 does not mean different activities, but instead a variation in the methods of planning and administering. Consequently, the system operation would be Level 5 in its programming only if it were Level 5 in the role assumption, communication, and decision-making areas.

Section 5.0 - leadership

For all of the other elements which suggest Level 3 or Level 4, it is clear that the leadership in this system is operating under the assumption that the primary operational mandate (5.1) is Level 1. Everything else is either secondary or, as in the case of coordination, unimportant. This mandate assumption doesn't make the other operations impossible, but it does say something about priorities and the reserve strength in the system for maintaining upper level activity, partic-
ularly in times of extreme stress or economic crisis. It may even be assumed that the mandate assumptions also affect the everyday decisions in subtle ways.

The skills/training data indicate some unevenness in the areas of curriculum, resource development, and group process, and a probable deficiency in human systems development/management and in community decision-making. In addition, graduate courses in public relations and undergraduate courses in evaluation may or may not translate into the kind of skills needed for effective system communication and evaluation leadership respectively. More information is needed.

There is another problem which this system must face. Even where there is qualified leadership in the system, there seem to be instances in which someone other than the qualified person(s) becomes responsible for a particular action. For example, the community school director has some community coordination responsibilities and no experience.

There is also the probability that the director may not have the necessary status in his system to operate as a peer in any coordination effort with certain community leaders.

The leadership skills in this system probably indicate satisfactory leadership at Level 2 and reasonable success at Level 3.

Section 6.0 - cross check

The cross check data seem to support the basic findings in the indicator areas. Community people are involved as participants, clients, resources, detectors, and effectors. The representative
population coverage is broad. All actual choices or action selections are made within the system. There are no pretentions to a Level 5 operation.

A Visual Summary

A visual representation of the summary results of applying CESAP in the sample community can be seen in Figure 10. The shaded areas under each indicator heading indicate the estimate of significant operational activity in that area. In a sense, the total shaded area represents the amount of system openness that can be detected in the operation. The unshaded area represents the effort still to be made if the system is to become a Level 5 operation with maximum openness.

In general, Figure 10 indicates a level of programming slightly more extensive in scope than the role expectations would indicate. In this particular community the director is a highly motivated person who is given some freedom to pursue his own ideas, even where they do not necessarily coincide completely with the assumptions of other leaders. In a sense, he achieves beyond the system assumptions. The "leadership mandate" column with its Level 1 rating also relates to this overachievement phenomenon. The suggestion is that much of the output is the result of one person's actions. The actions do not necessarily have the support of the system itself. A change in directors, a financial pinch, or any of a variety of occurrences which would test the system's commitment to Community Education might result in some serious output consequences. Additionally, any hope of system or community people that the system might progress more in
the direction of Level 5 would seem to require increased broad leadership commitment and more appropriate operations in the communication and decision-making areas. It can be assumed that there is a limit to overachievement in terms of the time and skills limitations that one person has. Figure 10 should cause the leadership in this system to review seriously their priorities, assumptions, and operations. Figure 10 should also give the director pause to consider what may happen if the system is put to the test in its commitment. The CESAP results indicate the need for the director and the other system leaders to rethink the educational needs of the community, the priorities of the system, and the action alternatives that are available. A careful review of some of the CESAP data can help in that rethinking.
CHAPTER V

REVIEW, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review

The study on which this report is based was made in the hope of finding a systematic way to characterize Community Education so that every community might have a consistent basis for analyzing, planning, and evaluating in its own situation. The literature of Community Education and of human systems provided evidence, taken as worthy of application, that the concept of Community Education fits within the framework of the systems approach. Given the promise of producing important insights into the operationalizing of the Community Education concept, the study attempted to build a morphogenetic model for analyzing Community Education operations.

The structure of the model assumes that Community Education is typified by a morphogenic process, that the process always is in a relative state in an open/closed continuum, and that its position in the continuum can be estimated at any given time on the basis of five broad, but nevertheless discernible, levels of operation. The model further assumes that these levels can be differentiated on the basis of indicators which are common elements or characteristics of both open systems and Community Education operations. The indicators cited are leadership role assumptions for the system, communication patterns, decision-making patterns, program and activity output, and leadership mandates and skills in the system itself. The model identified
descriptors for the conditions of each indicator at each level.

The study included an application of the model in one community, using the Community Education System Analysis Procedure specifically created for that purpose. The results of that application are found in this report. These results are reported as a demonstration that the model can be used in a local situation to produce analysis data.

Conclusions

In drawing conclusions about the study reported here and the resulting model, one should understand that those conclusions of necessity will fall into two categories: (1) highly subjective conclusions about some of the ideas examined in the study and some possible applications of the model and (2) conclusions about the need for more empirical evidence and more thinking in various areas to pinpoint the degree of usefulness and reliability that the model, or some modified version of it, has in mapping local operations.

Given that one understands the tentative nature of the conclusions, the following are offered:

1. The model can be used to map local operations and will provide useful information about the local Community Education effort.

2. The mapping of the various factors (indicators) in the local situation is more important for what can be learned about what is happening in those indicator areas than for adding up the results to make a comprehensive operational level judgment. However, the temptation will be great in local
situations to use the model simply "to find out if the opera-
tion is really Level 3 or Level 4." The model's greatest
value lies in its effective use to learn about roles, communi-
cations functions, decision-making, etc., and how these factors
relate to each other and to the state of the system's inter-
action with its environment.

3. A serious, comprehensive application of the model will often
create the need for the local leadership to study one or more
of the factors in greater detail than the model provides.
The model may prove to be a problem area indicator in some
instances where further investigation will be necessary.

4. The model is a useful visual aid for anyone who wishes to
lay out the various Community Education options in a compact,
understandable format.

5. The model may be helpful in demonstrating to educational
leaders and others that Community Education is a concept
with implications for all aspects of schools and education,
rather than just an add-on collection of classes, programs,
and activities.

6. The model is designed to help identify levels of operation.
Such distinctions do carry evaluation implications. However,
it is clear that the model does not lend itself, except in-
directly, to making judgments about the relative success of
programs, activities, etc. Therefore, other means should
be found for program or activity evaluation.
7. Although the model is developed in terms of the school system and Community, it could be easily adapted to the operations of the other agencies, organizations, and institutions involved in the total educational effort in a community.

8. There is a need for more application and more empirical evidence in a number of areas before reliable parameters can be established for the model's use.

Recommendations for Further Development and Use

The review and conclusions in this chapter suggest a number of recommendations. Chief among them are the following:

1. Further research must be done on the matter of whether the five levels cited, as opposed to four or six or any other pattern, are the most accurate and reliable for describing the various Community Education operations.

2. Likewise, each indicator must be examined in terms of its reliability as an indicator and with respect to the descriptors used at each level.

3. The model should be adapted in one or more instances and tested with agencies other than the school.

4. A systematic effort should be made to use the model as a visual aid and some evidence collected about the effectiveness of its various uses in that regard.

5. Further techniques for analyzing each indicator in detail will be necessary if systems find that they need more information than the CESAP technique provides.
6. And, finally, the model and CESAP need widespread usage in communities of all kinds and sizes if there is to be any ultimate judgment about its adaptability and usefulness.
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