The Enduring Appeal of Community Schools

Education Has Always Been a Community Endeavor

MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The present movement for using the schoolhouse of a city for the promotion of neighborhood life is one that has a long history—as long as democracy.

—REV. SAMUEL M. CROTHERS,
POPULAR ESSAYIST AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH CENTURY[1]

By Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, Michael Johanek, and John Puckett

Community schools are an old American idea. They are based on two premises: that the purpose of schooling is to educate youth for democratic citizenship, and that schools and communities are inextricably intertwined and interdependent. Long before schools looked the way they do today, a nascent form of the community school idea was prevalent in the settlements of colonial America; it continued after the American Revolution in the farming communities and towns of the fledgling nation.

Throughout the 18th century, education was largely informal and rooted in agrarian and mercantile life. Seasonal and haphazard at best, formal schooling was a relatively marginal component of the education of the rising generation. Schooling typically involved an itinerant teacher who imparted rudimentary literacy skills in whatever ramshackle structure a community might designate for that purpose. The major sources of education, including moral development, were located in "a broad kinship community," a web of family, church, and neighborly relationships that "naturally extended instruction and discipline in work and in the conduct of life."[2]

Responsibility for education and socialization gradually shifted from the 18th century's informal community networks to the public schools of the rapidly industrializing 19th century. As a result, the nexus of family and community with education and socialization was increasingly attenuated. By the late 19th century, responsibility for these functions was firmly entrenched in the nation's public schools, especially city schools, which were expected to ameliorate the social problems spurred by burgeoning urbanization, industrialization, and immigration.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, FSA, MARION POST WOLCOTT

Far left, parents and students posed for the 1895 photo at Lakeland School in Minnesota. Left, at a rural school/community center in Gee's Bend, Alabama, in 1929, teacher Juanita Coleman listens to her 82-year-old student who has just learned to read. Below, in 1940, a young student receives typhoid antitoxin in a school clinic in Louisiana.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, FSA, MARION POST WOLCOTT

As urban school districts became larger bureaucratic systems, more compulsory, more centralized under stronger superintendents, and more thoroughly under professional control, concerned citizens organized themselves as community stakeholders, pressing their agendas on schools. These "women's organizations, parent associations, labor unions, Social Gospelers, and Populist and Socialist parties" recognized that schools and schoolchildren needed significant support from the external community to counter the harmful effects of negative social conditions. Municipal reformers, comprised of civic and political groups of diverse ideological suasions, rallied, often for contradictory reasons, behind such experimental schooling innovations as social workers, school playgrounds, visiting nurses, school health inspections, and the wider use of schools as social centers. Embodying tensions between democracy and efficiency, participation and expertise, and localism and centralism, these reforms, especially schools as social centers, contributed to the rise, by World War II, of what we would recognize today as community schools.[3]

The current resurgence of community-centered schooling draws upon these historical roots. As each generation of communities has struggled anew with how social problems affect children and youth, educators have struggled with what role makes most sense for schools in the mix. Today's community schools recognize that students' academic success depends in no small way upon factors beyond their walls. They present a range of pragmatic responses to the question of the appropriate relationship between school and community, echoing patterns and tensions evident across history. The governmental and community partnerships that sustain these diverse institutions, however, share a common purpose: providing and integrating the necessary additional supports and services that will enable all children to reach their highest potential.

Inspiration from Jane Addams and John Dewey

The general conceptions and social innovations that form today's community schools in the United States are traceable at least to 1889, when Jane Addams established Hull House in Chicago. Seeking to address the challenges of its poor immigrant neighbors in Chicago's Nineteenth Ward, Hull House took a multifaceted institutional approach.[4] Addams's work was influenced by

Lee Benson is an emeritus professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania whose most recent book, coauthored with Harkavy and Puckett, is Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform. *Ira Harkavy is the associate vice president and founding director of the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. His most recent book, coauthored with Francis Johnston, is* The Obesity Culture: Strategies for Change, Public Health, and University-Community Partnerships. *Michael Johanek is a senior fellow and the director of the Mid-Career Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, where John Puckett is a professor and the chair of the Policy, Management, and Education Division. Together, Johanek and Puckett wrote* Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin Franklin High School: Education as if Citizenship Mattered.

the Victorian-era settlement houses in England (mainly Toynbee Hall, founded by Canon Samuel Bennett in London's East End in 1884), and was based on the theory that social ills are interconnected and must be approached holistically. Her program included college extension classes, social clubs and literary offerings, ethnic festivals, art exhibits, recreational activities, kindergarten, visiting nurses, and legal services. The Chicago settlement house was also a center for labor union activities, public forums, social science research, and advocacy for progressive social change.[5] Originally settlement houses were based in homes; however Addams, as well as other leaders, soon came to recognize that "though there were very few settlement houses, there were very many public schools."[6]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, FSA, MARION POST WOLCOTT

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, FSA, MARION POST WOLCOTT

Above, Velma Patterson teaches an evening adult literacy class at the Mount Zion School in Coffee County, Alabama, in 1939. Left, also in Coffee County, a student receives a checkup in the Goodman School's health room. Below, in 1951, the Fairfield, Iowa, community turns out to repaint its school.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES (306-PS-51-15105)

Probably the most influential leader to recognize a central coordinating role for the public school was John Dewey, whose ideas about education and democracy were directly influenced by Addams and Hull House. In a 1902 address that proved to be a spur to the school-based social center movement, as well as a seminal document that still influences debates about schooling,[7] Dewey adapted the social change philosophy of settlement houses to schools. Drawing upon Addams's theories of education and democracy, he said, "The conception of the school as a social centre is born of our entire democratic movement. Everywhere we see signs of the growing recognition that the community owes to each one of its members the fullest opportunity for development."[8]

By 1913, 71 cities in 21 states reported having schools that functioned as social centers; by 1914, 17 states had enacted legislation allowing wider use of school facilities by communities.[9] In 1909–10, with 18 school-based social centers in operation, Rochester, New York, witnessed the first opening of a dental office inside a public school; the use of schoolhouses as art galleries, movie theaters, and local health offices; the establishment of employment bureaus in the libraries of the social centers; and the organization of school-based civic clubs and democratic forums.[10] The social center movement gave impetus to features of elementary schools that we now consider standard, such as auditoriums, gymnasiums, showers, school libraries, restrooms, and school health rooms.[11]

With the First World War, however, the progressive movement that had supported social change waned. Resonating with the ethic of "normalcy" that pervaded virtually every social institution in the conservative decade of the 1920s, school social centers abandoned their civic and social reform agendas to become

community recreation centers. It was not until the 1930s that approaches rooted in Addams's settlement house movement and Dewey's school as social center ideas were revived in enclaves of rural and urban America.[12]

Depression-Era Revival in East Harlem

In a Depression-era revival of the Addams-Dewey community school, Leonard Covello, principal of Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem, New York City, focused on the community as a starting point for learning. Covello emphasized the school as a means for social problem solving and for training students in effective democratic citizenship. Covello, a southern Italian immigrant[13] who believed in "education for social living,"[14] saw despair in East Harlem's diverse ethnic neighborhoods and worked to foster the community's social and democratic development. He believed that the school, which was for boys only, had to be "the leader and the coordinating agency in all educational enterprises" because "the surging life of the community as a whole, its motion-picture houses, its dance halls, its streets, its gangs, its churches, its community houses, its community codes of behavior and morals—these will either promote or destroy the work of the school."[15] Covello was an ethnic "insider" in East Harlem, educated in the New York City schools and at Columbia University, a longtime teacher of Romance languages at Manhattan's DeWitt Clinton High School, and a community organizer. He was also a trained sociologist who, as Franklin's principal, used "social-base" maps of East Harlem's neighborhoods that identified every apartment building (including the ethnicity of its residents), store, church, empty lot, park, school, social club, and so on, in order to understand the social geography in which Franklin students lived. He conceptualized community problem solving as a curricular and cocurricular means to prepare students to be active, publicly engaged citizens.[16] From a school site open continuously from 8:30 a.m. to 10 p.m. to several programs that operated off-site in street units (which we will describe shortly), Covello and his allies strove to build school-community partnerships in East Harlem. In a 1938 article for the journal *Progressive Education*, Covello wrote that his aims were as follows:

> 1. Adequate service to the community along educational civic, social, and welfare lines.
> 2. Restoration of communal living, as far as may be possible, in a congested city neighborhood.
> 3. Creation of more harmonious relationships between Americans of foreign stock and older Americans.
> 4. Training of local leaders qualified to guide and serve within the community itself in creating the finest background possible for the life of the community as a whole.
> 5. Development of a complete neighborhood program.[17]

Covello spearheaded a community organizing strategy that contemporary democratic theorists label "public work"—activity that harnesses the cooperative efforts of diverse categories and groups of people, ones that are often in conflict, to accomplish shared social and civic goals.[18] Covello and his allies recognized that for East Harlem to effectively press its claims on the city and state for housing reform, health care, education, and economic development, diverse ethnic and racial groups would have to speak with one voice.[19] To build a shared democratic vision (and the means to attain it) among East Harlem's 34 ethnic and racial groups, students and teachers at Franklin mobilized citizen action (public work) campaigns around education, health and sanitation, citizenship/naturalization, and housing. Students participated as researchers, essayists, peer teachers, demonstrators, and lobbyists (even arguing one case to Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia).

The most notable activity was the four-year housing campaign (1937–41) that brought the first low-income housing to East Harlem: the East River Houses. Covello recognized that the often squalid, congested, and dilapidated housing of East Harlem reduced the impact the school could have in the lives of its students. He also knew from personal experience the toll it could take on families; as a youth, he had watched his chronically depressed mother wither away amid the dark squalor of an East Harlem tenement, and had dropped out of school to help the family cover mounting bills. Coordinated by the school's housing committee—one of six school-community committees involving students, teachers, and community leaders—Franklin High School sponsored public exhibits and films of housing models; discussions in civics, economics, and history classes; essay contests through the English department; studies of local land values and use; public rallies; radio broadcasts; scale modeling of hous-

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA (HSP), LEONARD COVELLO PHOTOGRAPHS

Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem benefited from extensive community involvement from 1934 to 1956.

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA (HSP), LEONARD COVELLO PHOTOGRAPHS

Left, Franklin students lead a parade to build support for the East Harlem Sanitation Campaign in 1948. Below, principal Leonard Covello addresses a meeting of the Association of Parents, Teachers, and Friends.

ing options through the art department; forums with local experts; and translations in Italian and Spanish through the modern languages department.[20]

Students often played key roles in the campaigns targeting community problems, coordinated through the school. In 1948, a student group, reacting to a flurry of negative press accounts of East Harlem, took to the streets to determine the state of the community. They did not like what they saw: "frightful" sanitation levels (as described by the mayor) that only exacerbated high rates of illness in the neighborhood, diminishing student development in school and out. East Harlem "airmail delivery"—garbage sent flying from windows—was one infamous culprit. In the summer, complained one resident, "the flies are everywhere. They breed in the garbage in the gutters and backyards." "The truth is the truth," one student responded, "and instead of complaining about the press, we should see if we can do something to clean up our neighborhood." In conjunction with local agencies and community groups, the students organized a sanitation parade (complete with a 50-piece band and 5,000 leaflets), a conference led by the local congressional representative, a cleanup contest sponsored by the *Daily News*, an educational campaign complete with roving sound-truck broadcasts, a science and social science lesson plan for the school, and a successful effort to change the City Sanitary Code to enforce more frequent and effective garbage collection.[21]

Covello's approach to community problem solving tapped a multimethod urban sociological research tradition, a rather different forerunner to present-day "data-based decision making." He, staff, and students carried out surveys, case studies, home visits, interviews, photographs, and observations, all in an effort to understand the underlying dynamics of the community in which his students lived. They also used social-base maps that displayed rich local data, one of which adorned Covello's office, to provide a detailed picture of the environment in which these educational initiatives operated, and of the factors supporting or frustrating success. Every institution, from residence to deli, was labeled; the dominant ethnicity of each block identified; and every student residence represented by a pushpin indicating ethnicity and whether the student was a first-generation immigrant or not. Covello knew that such details mattered; when fights broke out along Third Avenue between Puerto Rican and Italian youth, with bricks tossed from rooftops, he not only knew which students lived where, but with whom he could work on those blocks to resolve tensions. The school serves as "diagnostician," claimed Covello, and must "penetrate … into the 'sphere of intimacy' of community life and … follow, as far as possible, changes in the emotional life, as well as changes of a more material nature." He knew this

depended upon deep respectful relationships with the community; such analysis, he claimed, "depends upon sincere friendliness in the approach, rather than upon sheer technical skill in making a physical or sociological survey."[22]

One distinguishing feature of Covello's community-centered approach was the "street unit, … a unit that functions literally in the street." Directly challenging and bridging the spatial distinction between school and community, the street units (which were often in storefronts) housed recreation, research, and educational activities that encouraged community members, business owners, parents, teachers, and students (including dropouts) to work together to improve the quality of neighborhood life. Covello tapped the off-site units to address issues embedded within the fabric of the community, and to do so in a manner that recognized that many in the immigrant community would never set foot in the school building. Informal leaders could be cultivated, and the relatively neutral ground allowed the school to establish a "sphere of intimacy" with the community it sought to understand and serve. One unit, the Association of Parents, Teachers, and Friends, had 240 members the fall the school opened (in 1934), and supported the growth of other units, such as the Friends and Neighbors Club. The latter was open to any reputable community organization, and held meetings of the housing committee, school social clubs, and adult education classes, which were part of an extensive Works Progress Administration* adult school program enrolling over 1,700 adults by early 1938. Another street unit housed the Old Friendship Club, an association of Franklin students and dropouts, part of the community web Covello wove to support youth development within and beyond school walls; it also handled overflow demand for meeting space when the Friends and Neighbors Club was filled. A third street unit, the Friends and Neighbors Library, staffed by community volunteers, experienced strong demand despite its original set of only 400 books.[23]

The street units housed recreation, research, and educational activities that encouraged community members, business owners, parents, teachers, and students (including dropouts) to improve the quality of neighborhood life.

Two other street units helped Covello organize local social research efforts while providing services to Italian- and Spanish-speaking community members—the Italo-American Educational Bureau and Hispano-American Educational Bureau. Over 25 research projects were carried out in the first eight years of the school. They included a block-by-block study of ethnic distribution, a study of motion pictures in the life of the school's students, a study of the home backgrounds of "problem" students, and a study of leisure-time patterns of high school students. As the research and services of the street units grew, Covello integrated them under an umbrella nonprofit, the East Harlem Educational and Research Bureau, also initiating the *East Harlem News*, a school-based local newspaper, staffed with faculty, community members, and students, as were all of the street units. Across research, support services, community outreach, and advocacy, the street units reflected Covello's effort to address the various factors affecting the education of the boys under his charge at Benjamin Franklin.[24]

Covello's community school project, which lasted from 1934 to 1956, focused on ensuring that community, and therefore student, needs were met. As part of the engagement process, it recognized that the curriculum could play a role in solving community problems. Unlike other reformers, Covello created a participatory mechanism—community advisory committees—for jointly involving community organizations, teachers, parents, students, and at-large community members in community problem-solving initiatives. To a certain extent, the work of these committees penetrated the academic curriculum, especially at crisis points in the life of East Harlem. Covello struggled with balancing disciplinary studies with his community problem-solving approach, which is a perennial tension in community schools. Ultimately, World War II and the social forces it unleashed were major factors in diminishing the East Harlem community school. In the 1950s, ethnic conflict in East Harlem and a staunchly conservative political climate combined to undermine Covello's experiment in civic education.[25]

Reflection on and critique of Covello's work at Benjamin Franklin High School can usefully inform our discussions today on such issues as the centrality of building democratic processes and mechanisms into all aspects of community schools; the deep, collaborative engagement of professionals, practitioners, students, and community members in articulating the visions and goals; and the development of culturally appropriate and inclusive programs. The Covello story, as well as those of other outstanding community school leaders such as Elsie Clapp at Arthurdale, West Virginia (1934–1936),[26] suggest that an innovative program, much less a movement, is not likely to be sustained beyond its charismatic leader unless a range of sustained supports are in place to nurture and expand the work over time. It is instructive that no larger partner anchored Covello's programs for the long haul.

One recurring lesson from the history of community schools concerns the implications for professionals within a community school. While many school staff members described the Depression-era community school work as visionary, inspirational, and career-changing—and the schools tended to attract those most interested in such work—some also expressed concern about overload and community intrusion. The sentiment "I'm an English teacher, not a social worker" has been expressed by overburdened teachers across many community school experiments, including Covello's. At Benjamin Franklin High School, for example, a math teacher resisted spending time in the commu-

* The Works Progress Administration (WPA) was part of the federal government's New Deal efforts to lift the country out of the Great Depression.

nity, considering it beyond her professional responsibilities. Similarly, at Elsie Clapp's Arthurdale School, an English and social studies teacher either celebrated or lamented, "You had to live in the community. We did something in the community almost every night. It was either a woman's club or a square dance or something up at the weaving room or something you participated in. You participated in all the community activities. You were just sort of a part of a family. I did something in the community every night. It wasn't just a day job."[27]

Covello understood community relationship building as critical to the work, and yet knew he had to find the resources to support this effort. Community school success depended upon addressing this potential overload for teachers directly, through additional staff and resources dedicated to coordination, research, and administration of afterschool programs. At Franklin, for example, federal funds lent a critical hand early on: in 1938, Works Progress Administration funds supported 69 staff, only 38 of whom were listed as teachers. Other staff picked up the sundry jobs required to run such an extensive set of community programs and to coordinate with existing agencies in East Harlem.

In the post–World War II era, much of the community schooling movement blended into a wider community education effort that included community-based educational programs operating outside schools. Charles Stewart Mott, a community school pioneer, argued as early as 1912 that schools should "be open for the use of the public, when not in use for school purposes."[28] School district educator Frank Manley enlisted Mott's support to fund the Flint, Michigan, city schools to be community centers for youth recreation and school-linked health and social services, the latter provided by the Genesee County Medical Society and the Children's Health Center at Flint's Hurley Hospital. A Mott-sponsored Flint community school construction program lasted from 1951 to 1960, when new elementary schools were built with special facilities to accommodate community programs and older buildings were upgraded with the addition of "community wings." The board of education hired physical education teachers to plan and direct the new "wider-use" programs. A 1961 report on the Flint community schools, authored by Manley and his associates, highlighted the city's myriad wider-use programs for recreation, drama, music, arts and crafts, social clubs, and adult education (basic and vocational).[29]

By the 1960s, though, community schools were subsumed under the broader community education movement, which centered on community education and adult education, with state-funded programs in Florida, Maryland, Michigan, and Utah in 1970, and federal support through the Community Schools Act of 1974. Government largess did not last. In the 1990s, funding priorities shifted from community education to specialized health and social services for schoolchildren.

Today's Community School Resurgence

In the last two decades, momentum has built on several fronts toward a more expansive and sustainable version of community schools. Beginning in the late 1980s, and expanding in the 1990s, new integrative approaches to wider use of school buildings and extended-day programs were developed. These initiatives focused on creating collaborative models for a broad range of programming and services needed by young people, families, and the broader community. The school was the locus for services, but outside partners helped deliver them and run programs. Described as "full-service schools" and "safe passage schools," they were responses to the new morbidities of substance abuse, unprotected sex, stress, school failure, and increasing levels of violence. As of the mid-1990s, some 500 school-based health and social services programs were in operation, largely funded through a creative packaging of state and federal categorical funds. (New York was the leading state, with 140 school-based clinics.) The range of these programs included school-based dental clinics, health centers, mental health centers, family resource centers, and afterschool centers; typically, the services were provided at a school center, but staffed by local health and social services agencies.[30]

> Schools have never been the sole source of the education of children and youth, and their work is mightily affected by health, social, and economic factors.

The last two decades also have seen an emergence of a vibrant literature and notable activity addressing the educational influences beyond school walls, under various related concepts including educational ecology, parent empowerment, civic capacity, social capital, collective efficacy, school-linked services, systemic reform, and community schools.[31] For many observers, closer school-community linkages seem increasingly pragmatic and promising given heightened pressures for accountability. Especially since the late 1990s, there's been recognition that all youth-serving professionals and leaders "must also become engaged in educational reform, family support, and community development."[32] Throughout the 1990s, community-school partnerships grew in response to:

- the call for improved educational quality and academic outcomes among young people;
- the demand for more efficient and effective health and social services delivery designed to meet the comprehensive needs of children and families;
- increased recognition of the developmental needs of young people and the importance of building on their assets; and
- expanded efforts to strengthen the human, social, and economic underpinnings of neighborhoods and communities.[33]

By the mid-2000s, cities such as Chicago, Indianapolis, and Tulsa, and counties such as Multnomah in Oregon were sponsoring community schools that provided health, family-support, and youth-development services. In each case, a nonprofit played a

lead role—removing the burden from the schools of developing partnerships, securing funding, and coordinating services. In Chicago alone by 2006, some 110 schools were working together with over 45 agencies that took the lead in expanding school facility use and enhancing health and social services.[34]

Marking, catalyzing, and promoting this resurgence of community schooling nationwide, the Coalition for Community Schools was formed in 1997. Some 160 education-related, family-support, and youth and community development organizations now comprise the coalition, which advances a "broad vision of a well-developed community school." Embracing a range of organizations (including the American Federation of Teachers), the coalition advocates for community schools as the vehicle for strengthening schools, families, and communities. Community activists, businesspeople, professionals (e.g., social workers, nurses, and physicians), and college students and faculty support curricular and cocurricular programs to strengthen students' academic learning and service activities. In addition, each community school works with a coordinator to ensure that all students have health, dental, and mental health services. According to the coalition, over time the community school should integrate "quality education, positive youth development, family support, family and community engagement in decision-making, and community development."[35]

Thomas Edison Elementary School in Port Chester, New York, provides one example of this community school vision, echoing the history we have presented above. Over a decade ago, students in the largely poor, immigrant community faced obstacles to learning from poor housing, health care, and other problems. Teachers were frustrated with teaching students who were often ill, and with trying to communicate with parents who could not understand English. Community leaders saw the physical and emotional stresses weighing down what their children could achieve, and parents expressed the need for improved child care, translation services, and guidance.

School staff and community leaders sought to understand these issues, going out into the community with surveys, focus groups, and interviews. They formed a community advisory board representing key stakeholders, meeting each month to plan, implement, and monitor the work. They hired a community coordinator to bring in dollars and partners, and to enhance linkages across the community organizations affecting their students. Partnership initiatives now include (1) a school-based health center, resulting in 94 percent of students having health insurance and receiving ongoing care; (2) therapy and family casework with the Guidance Center, a local mental health agency; (3) weekly bilingual parent gatherings; (4) afterschool enrichment programs; and (5) a partnership with Manhattanville College's teacher preparation program, including a two-year induction program run jointly by the school and college.[36]

Community schools also have been built through school-university-community partnerships, including a prominent example in Philadelphia. Since the late 1980s, activist faculty and students at the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) have been involved, with varying success, in collaborative projects to develop university-assisted community schools in Philadelphia, working under the aegis of Penn's Netter Center (directed by one of the authors, Ira Harkavy). One notable development is the Sayre High School Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Program, a school-based health care facility and emergent disease prevention curriculum sponsored by Penn's School of Medicine and supported on-site by hundreds of Sayre and Penn students as well as some 20 Penn faculty members. Integrating community needs and curriculum, Sayre high school students learn about key issues, like obesity and diabetes, while delivering needed health services to their community. Sayre students provide basic intake services—taking blood pressure, measuring glucose levels, and providing vision exams—and refer patients to other services when needed. In chemistry class, they learn about lead poisoning's impact on child development and identify lead "hotspots" while checking siblings' teeth for lead traces. Afterschool programs extend the lessons about health through athletic programs, nutrition guidance, and enrichment activities. Community needs in part drive the curriculum, and the curriculum broadens students' academic knowledge and skills, vocational interests, and public problem-solving competencies.[37]

From colonial New England towns to today's immigrant suburbs, Americans have faced the question of how schools and communities can best cooperate for the development of young people. As education evolved from family and community instruction to highly developed professional school systems—and as deep inequities shaped starkly different worlds for children across the nation—the need for school-community integration presented ever varied challenges. Recalling the history of community schools brings to bear the richness of yesterday's responses, inspiring solidarity to meet today's challenges, though with no easy panaceas for the present.

As this history reminds us, schools have never been the sole source of the education of children and youth, and their work is mightily affected by health, social, and economic factors. Further, school projects and student learning often have involved mutually beneficial work with the local community. We and other community school advocates insist, moreover, that the current milieu—from families in poverty to schools and youth development organizations with tight budgets—requires that schools serve as centers of community that provide and integrate health and human services, if students are to realize improved outcomes, including higher academic achievement and stronger democratic citizenship. ☐

Endnotes

1. Samuel M. Crothers, "The American Historic Antecedents of the Modern Social Center," cited in Lyda Judson Hanifan, *The Community Center* (Boston: Silver, Burdett, 1920), 8.

2. Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (New York: Norton, 1960), 16–18.

3. William J. Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986), quotes from p. xxi; see esp. chap. 7.

4. Ira Harkavy and John L. Puckett, "Lessons from Hull House for the Contemporary Urban University," *Social Service Review* 68, no. 3 (1994): 299–321.

5. Jane Addams, "The Objective Value of a Social Settlement" (1892), in *The Social Thought of Jane Addams*, ed. Christopher Lasch (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), 44–61.

6. Ira Harkavy and Lee Benson, "Truly Engaged and Truly Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic Universities, Community Schools, and Development of the Democratic Good Society in the 21st Century" (paper presented at the seminar "Research University as Local Citizen," University of California, San Diego, October 6–7, 2002), 54.

7. Michael C. Johanek and John L. Puckett, *Leonard Covello and the Making of Benjamin*

(Continued on page 47)

Enduring Appeal

(Continued from page 29)

Franklin High School: Education as if Citizenship Mattered (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007), 25.

8. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 93. For a detailed analysis of Dewey's influential 1902 address, "The School as Social Centre," see Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett, *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007), 33–40.

9. Edward W. Stevens Jr., "Social Centers, Politics, and Social Efficiency in the Progressive Era," *History of Education Quarterly* 12 (Spring 1972): 16–33.

10. Edward J. Ward, ed., *The Social Center* (New York: D. Appleton, 1913), 179–199; and Edward J. Ward, "The Rochester Civic and Social Centers," in *The Tenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, part 1, *The City School as a Community Center*, ed. S. Chester Parker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1911), 51–57.

11. See Clarence Arthur Perry, *Social Center Features in New Elementary School Architecture and the Plans of Sixteen Socialized Schools* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912).

12. See Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, 33–44.

13. The schools' main constituency was East Harlem's Italian population. The problems of these poor immigrants played a defining role in the high school's developing phase. See Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chap. 2.

14. Leonard Covello, "The Development of the Community-Centered School Idea," *Understanding the Child* 11, no. 3 (1942): 7.

15. Leonard Covello, "A High School and Its Immigrant Community–A Challenge and an Opportunity," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 9, no. 2 (1936): 336–337.

16. See Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chaps. 5–7.

17. Leonard Covello, "Neighborhood Growth through the School," *Progressive Education* 15, no. 2 (February 1938): 126–139.

18. For more on public work, see Harry C. Boyte and Nancy N. Kari, *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996); and Harry C. Boyte, *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). See also Benjamin R. Barber, *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998). Our analysis is richly informed by Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 109–42.

19. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chap. 6.

20. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chap. 6.

21. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chap. 7, quotes from pp. 213–14.

22. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chap. 3.

23. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chaps. 3–5 passim, quotes from pp. 125, 170.

24. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chaps. 3–5 passim.

25. Johanek and Puckett, *Leonard Covello*, chaps. 5–7 passim.

26. See Elsie R. Clapp, *Community Schools in Action* (New York: Viking, 1939).

27. Mary Wuenstel, "Participants in the Arthurdale Community Schools' Experiment in Progressive Education from the Years 1934–1938 Recount Their Experiences," *Education* 122, no. 4 (2002): 767.

28. William A. Quinn and Clarence H. Young, *Foundation for Living: The Story of Charles Stewart Mott and Flint* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), 47.

29. Peter L. Clancy, "The Contribution of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation in the Development of the Community School Program in Flint, Michigan" (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1963), 40–50; Quinn and Young, *Foundation for Living*; and Frank J. Manley, Bernard W. Reed, and Robert K. Burns, *The Community School in Action: The Flint Program* (Chicago: Education-Industry Service, 1961), 20–22.

30. Joy G. Dryfoos, *Full-Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth, and Families* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). See also Joy G. Dryfoos, *Safe Passage: Making It through Adolescence in a Risky Society; What Parents, Schools, and Communities Can Do* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); and Joy G. Dryfoos, Jane Quinn, and Carol Barkin, eds., *Community Schools in Action: Lessons from a Decade of Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

31. Among other sources, see esp. Dryfoos, *Full-Service Schools*; Lisbeth B. Schorr, *Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America* (New York: Anchor, 1997); Dennis Shirley, *Community Organizing for Urban School Reform* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1997); Paul T. Hill, Christine Campbell, and James Harvey, *It Takes a City: Getting Serious about Urban School Reform* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2000); Clarence N. Stone et al., *Building Civic Capacity—The Politics of Reforming Urban Schools* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2001); and Martin J. Blank, Atelia Melaville, and Bela P. Shah, *Making the Difference: Research and Practice in Community Schools* (Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools, 2003).

32. Hal Lawson and Katharine Briar-Lawson, *Connecting the Dots: Progress toward the Integration of School Reform, School-Linked Services, Parent Involvement and Community Schools* (Oxford, OH: Danforth Foundation/ Institute for Educational Renewal, Miami University, 1997).

33. Atelia Melaville and Martin J. Blank, *Learning Together: A Look at 20 School-Community Initiatives* (Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership/National Center for Community Education, 1998).

34. Samuel P. Whalen, *Three Years into Chicago's Community Schools Initiative (CSI): Progress, Challenges, and Emerging Lessons* (Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago, 2007), 1.

35. Coalition for Community Schools, *Community Schools: Partnerships for Excellence* (Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000), 2–3.

36. Eileen Santiago, JoAnne Ferrara, and Martin J. Blank, "A Full-Service School Fulfills Its Promise," *Educational Leadership* 65, no. 7 (April 2008): 44–47.

37. See Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett, *Dewey's Dream*, 99–103.