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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a historical analysis of a single-case case study. It is an exploration of the first de facto segregated all-Black school in Columbus, Ohio: Champion Avenue School from 1910 to 1996. The majority of the research on segregated schooling has focused on the South, and quantitative characteristics of such schools (Butchart, 1988; Siddle Walker, 1993). However, this research focuses on such a school in the urban North.

This research addresses the ascriptive characteristics of this school such as the context (urban), leadership, teachers, and organizational change and curriculum. Moreover, it examines the impact of change, particularly changes in social, political, and economic arenas and how those changes alter learning relationships in the school, and teachers, and administrators ways of knowing. Moreover, it examines how change altered the school's relationship with its historic African-American community. Consequently, this research is primarily concerned with two research questions: First, what were the past learning relationships existent in a de facto segregated school, and how were they developed, enhanced, and maintained despite a changing social, political, and economic environment?. Second, what are the current teachers' understandings of the historical learning relationships in the school, and how those relationships did or did not foster community and parental support? Both questions attempt to ascertain what has been the school’s past, and how has the past qualities of this school effects the present school ethos.
A single-case case study with the theoretical underpinnings of qualitative methodology, ethnographic history and interpretive and critical analysis was chosen as the methodology. A single-case case study was chosen primarily because of the richness and detail provided by such an approach as well as the degree of transferability that can be garnered in assessing similar cases with similar characteristics. The author contends that a single-case case study's primary significance is its ability to provide an almost holistic in-depth assessment, evaluation and interpretation of the historical, and current practices and dilemmas in this particular urban school.

This research is significant for three reasons: First, a historical analysis assesses the degree of change and/or continuity in this particular northern urban de facto segregated school, and how changes, or the lack thereof, impacted upon the learning environment in the school. Second, it is a study of a school that has primarily served an African-American population. Consequently, it provides insight into the northern urban educational experience of African Americans. Third, this research illuminates the educational philosophy and practices of northern urban African-American teachers, and principals. Moreover, it assesses how they maintained positive relationships with the African-American community and parents. Finally, this research promises to provide answers to how to effectively teach African-American urban youth given the changing atmosphere of urban centers. Consequently, policy implications, urban education theory, and urban teacher education curriculum postulates are garnered from the research. In essence, this research adds to the literature on effective urban education, and appraises the historic contributions of African American principals and teachers, and how their effective leadership and teaching developed, and maintained an exemplary all-Black urban northern school.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the establishment of schools in cities, many terms connote the essence of what we today call urban education. They have ranged from city schools to inner city education to of course the present term urban education. Regardless of the era of the term given to schooling within this heterogeneous geographic area, it has been historically difficult to provide a quality as well as equitable education to all children in urban centers (Havighurst, 1971; Kantor & Brenzel, 1992; Rothstein, 1993; Woock, 1970). While administrators, teachers, parents, and policy makers continually argue about the "best" way to provide educational services to the constituency in urban centers, the actual quality of learning provided to children has rarely been synonymous with "good" education (Ford, 1992; Kozol, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Rothstein, 1993; Ravitch, 1981; Weis & Fine, 1993; Wilson, 1989). This researcher contends that in Northern urban centers, urban education while not perfect has had better days and continues to provide to the best of its ability a solid foundation for the student population it serves despite the changing social, political and economic arenas (Boaz, 1991; Forsyth & Tallerico, 1993; Grant, 1988; Wang & Gordon, 1994).

In the twenty-first century and beyond, urban centers will continue to consist of a heterogenous racial and economic population—a population that can no longer be addressed as only Black and White (Harris & Wilkins, 1988; Ford, 1991; Gottidiener & Pickvance, 1991; Jennings, 1994; Parrillo, 1996; Wilson, 1989, 1980). The teaching force employed in these centers will continue to be racially as well as economically different from their students.
Teacher and student differences have been exacerbated by the politics of urban education as well as the historic patterns of inequitable access to quality education (Anderson, 1987; Anderson & Franklin, 1978; Butchart, 1988; Cibulka, Reed & Wong, 1993; Sprng, 1994).

This author is not arguing for a return to de jure segregation, nor a continuation of de facto segregated schooling even though resegregation has occurred in major metropolitan school districts such as Columbus. But, a critical analysis of those institutions existent in the era of de facto segregation in Northern cities that provided an "excellent" education to African American students is needed (Butchart, 1988; Finkelstein, 1992). An examination of these historical patterns, particularly in northern urban areas, may help to explain the persistence of segregated or resegregated schools despite the implementation of policy initiatives aimed at dismantling inequitable access to quality education.

This is a historical qualitative case study of the first de facto segregated school in the state capital of Columbus, Ohio. Central in this particular school's history, is the contributions of African American teachers, administrators and community, and what we can learn from those teachers, administrators, and the community (the context). The case explicated in this study may provide answers to some of the ills affecting urban schools with similar historical and geographical characteristics. However, this researcher's major concern centered around the intricacies of this particular case. While this researcher would not argue that urban education on the whole is excellent, I would argue that there are points of light. The historical analysis of this particular school represents one such point from which we can learn what qualities permitted northern de facto segregated African American teachers and administrators to provide a quality education to African American students.
Purpose of Study

The African American community has always been at odds over where or how to educate their children (Bell, 1987; Douglass, 1995; DuBois, 1903; Woodson, 1933; Ward, 1993). Historically, African Americans, however, have viewed education as a panacea from which to cure the ills caused by racism existent in the United States. African Americans have struggled to gain an equitable and quality education for their children in the North and the South (Anderson, 1988; Bond, 1966; Bullock, 1967; Franklin, 1979; Litwack, 1961; Mohhratz, 1979; Ward, 1993; Woodson, 1991). Historically, Black education has been a mixture of de jure and/or de facto schooling. While de jure refers to segregated schooling by law, de facto refers to segregated schooling as a result of custom or circumstance rather than legal mandates. The South legislated Black children to de jure segregated schools, and the North through custom and political maneuvers educated the majority of Black children in urban de facto segregated schools.

The southern de jure system of education has been well documented (Anderson, 1987; Butchart, 1988). On the other hand, some northern cities constructed de facto segregated schooling for its African American population (Butchart, 1988; Franklin, 1979; Litwack, 1976; Spring, 1994; Tyack, 1967; McCaul, 1993; Ward, 1993). These schools and their history have yet to be adequately researched. Recent research indicates “good” things developed in both of these politically and socially constructed segregated settings (Siddle Walker, 1993; Foster, 1992; Sowell, 1976). Yet, quality was not a term often associated with de jure or de facto segregated schools regardless of region. The dismantling of both systems cost Black teachers and administrators jobs. Moreover, it dislocated Black children from the families and their neighborhoods. However, recent studies have begun to reevaluate the role of Black teachers and administrators in these schools (Bodard Silver, 1973; Dilworth, 1989; Foster, 1992, 19910;
Irvine, 1989; King, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Siddle Walker, 1993). This research points out discrepancies between what was assumed about all Black institutions, and what was the actual learning context of such institutions. Thus, a historical analysis of a school that existed within such a contextual framework is paramount. This is not a romantic return to the "good ole' days," but an interpretative and critical analysis of the actual state of learning in such a school, and how the teachers working with the administrators and the community established a positive learning environment.

Scholarship focused on northern segregated schools has addressed the quantitative characteristics of these schools. In Dark Ghetto (1965), Kenneth Clark wrote,

... in the North, segregation has been supported by community custom and indifference. ... Segregation and inferior education reinforce each other.... The cycle of systematic neglect of Negro children must be broken, but the powerlessness of the Negro communities and the fear and indifference of the white community have combined so far to keep the cycle intact (Clark, 1965, 109-111).

Since 1965, few scholars have addressed the qualitative experiences of these schools regardless of region (Bell, 1987; Kozol, 1991; Lomotey, 1989; Siddle Walker, 1993). In the text Conservation, Dr. Johnetta Cole, the current president of Spellman University, identified the implicit curriculum in those segregated schools, and what has happened since the historic Brown decision. Cole notes,

In those "colored schools," more often than not there were African American teachers who believed in our children and their capacity to learn. With the so-called integrated schools, because of neighborhood segregation we often find African American students with White teachers, and many of our children are quickly and summarily labeled uneducable and left to fully underdevelop (Cole, 1993, 165).

Both authors' contentions speak to the need of research on the qualitative characteristics of these schools: the teachers, the principals, the community, and the macro structures that created such institutions. Moreover, they identify areas of present research such as the contributions of African American teachers, the implicit curriculum in the classroom, the
continuation of segregation in urban schools, the shortage of minority teachers, and the cultural mismatch existent in urban schools that contributes to the failure of Black and other children of color (Darder, 1993; Irvine, 1989)

Still, a majority of the recent scholarship into the qualitative characteristics of these schools has focused on the South (Lawrence Lightfoot, 1983; Siddle Walker, 1993). This inquiry focused on the existence of a de facto segregated school in Columbus, Ohio. Champion Avenue School was such a school. Its history from its inception in 1909 until the present day provide a glimpse into factors designed to inhibit education, but were overcome. This researcher argues against the quantitative methodology often historically utilized to define segregated schools as inferior. Some segregated schools were "good" schools despite their quantitative characteristics (Moody & Moody, 1987; Siddle Walker, 1993; Sowell, 1976). Thus, an examination of a northern urban de facto school's history, teachers, community, and leaders provides an understanding of the qualitative attributes of such a school. Moreover, this research identifies the contributions and success of African American teachers and administrators with African American children and their community.

In sum, the purpose of this study was a historical analysis of an northern urban de facto segregated school and its inherent qualities, and the explication of which qualities in its unique history led to the maintenance of the present school today. This researcher is aware that very few scholars have explicated the substantive qualities that existed in northern de facto segregated schools (Anderson, 1988; Harlan, 1956; Franklin, 1979; Butchart, 1988). This inquiry contributes to this genre of scholarship. It addressed four primary qualities existent in this school. They were:

1) Context - a northern urban de facto segregated school with a history of a majority African American faculty and student population.
2) Leadership - the role of the Black principal in northern urban de facto segregated schools.

3) Teachers - the role of Black teachers in northern urban de facto segregated schools especially as it relates to creating and maintaining healthy learning relationships with students, their family and the greater Black community. The contributions of African American teachers.

4) Curriculum - what has been and continues to be the curriculum policy for this urban school and what has actually been implemented in the school. This researcher addresses the implicit curriculum of the teachers often described as the "hidden curriculum" or emancipatory pedagogy (Foster, 1989; Gordon, 1993; Apple, 1983, 1981).

While these were the a priori themes chosen, emergent themes were addressed as well. This research was not concerned with explicating the totality of segregation that existed in this system of schooling even though it is a subject within this context. Other researchers can conduct such research. Nor was it concerned with just the school itself. At best, this research is concerned with what occurred inside the school walls as well as the surrounding context outside the school walls (Anyon, 1995; Liston & Zeichner, 1990). This inquiry examined and celebrates the success of the Black teachers, principals, and community to manifest and maintain an effective school despite the macro structures existent in the city.

Research Questions

Recent scholars address the positive changes occurring in urban schools (Boaz, 1991; Fine, 1994; Forsyth & Tallerico, 1993; Wang & Gordon, 1994). However, more research, particularly historical research, is still needed that embraces interpretative and theoretical frameworks (Finkelstein, 1992; Kaestle, 1992; Siddle Walker, 1994; Tyack & Hansot, 1992). More historical research will provide an enhanced understanding of the past and current urban school environment and context needed to reinforce quality education for urban youth. In order to address the concern of quality education for urban youth, this researcher employed the
following primary research questions:

What were the past learning relationships existent in a medium-sized Midwestern urban school, and how were they developed, enhanced and maintained despite changing social, political, and economic environment?

What are the current teachers' understandings of the historical learning relationships in the school, and how those relationships did and did not foster community and parental support?

These research questions were complex because they attempted to ascertain how to improve the urban teacher education curriculum in colleges of education, and how to improve teacher preparation for the current urban environment. Therefore, the primary objective of this research was to generate knowledge that provided a clearer understanding of those internal and external factors that impact on a teacher's ability to establish and to maintain effective learning relationships with children who are culturally, economically, and educationally different from themselves. But, in order to ascertain an even clearer understanding of what is needed in urban school teacher preparation, it is important to study an urban school within all of its complexities as well as its historical past. In addition, the social, political, cultural, and economic contest were interdependently related to the development of such a curriculum that may never be static. This inquiry promises to foster knowledge that will better serve the multifaceted cultural context of urban schools rather than just represent another "transitory educational quick fix" (Greenman, 1994, 4). Surely, urban schools deserve better. The goal of this study is not to just develop short-term reform initiatives, but to add to the literature on urban teacher education curriculum and foster long range permanent change in urban teacher education curricula.
Past Urban Educational Research

Urban education research has focused on a plethora of issues and themes. These studies have generally addressed either the politics of urban education or the schools themselves. Very few studies examined both simultaneously (Sutlles, 1986; Wirt, 1995). Within the field of urban education, African Americans' educational experiences in northern urban de facto segregated schools have rarely been studied (Finkelstein, 1992; Franklin, 1979; McCaul, 1993; Mohraz, 1979; Tyack, 1969). Few studies examined the historical antecedents of present conditions in urban schools, and the few that do pertain to southern schools (Finkelstein, 1992; Linden, 1995; Siddle Walker, 1993). Several scholars, however, argue for the utilization of history in such a way (Kaestle, 1992; Coulby, 1992). Scholars "need to examine the ways in which contemporary urban education institutions are the products of history" (Coulby, 1992, 215). Hence, ethnographic history is a major component in this case study approach. It is not just a history of the social, political, and economic macro structures that created the system, but a history "of the social and educational history of racial and cultural minorities in urban America" (Franklin, xiii). Thus, within the larger context of educational history, is the educational history of African Americans (Anderson, 1995). However, by no means is this a marginalized text because an analysis of powerful forces which allow growth despite negative physical, economic, and political masses will surely lead us closer to one of the answers to establishing a quality education "for all children." (Liston & Zeichner, 1990). In other words, why were these African American teachers, and this school considered "good" within its historical lifespan and what can we learn from it?
Significance of Study

In the present day rhetoric of success for all children, few researchers have addressed historic and contextual factors that have impeded success for all (Jones-Wilson, 1987; Liston & Zeichner, 1990; Ross Barnett, 1987; Siddle Walker, 1993). Moreover, even fewer scholars contend that anything has worked in the past particularly as it relates to the education of African American children. This study is significant because it provides a historical analysis of what has worked in a northern urban de facto segregated school. It speaks to the necessity of exemplary African American teachers and their cultural pedagogy often explicated in the implicit curriculum. It chronicles successive generations of Black principals and their leadership. Lastly, it underscores the need for the development and maintenance of community and parental support of educational institutions based on their culture and history. Thus, this research is significant for several reasons:

1) It analyzed the past in order to ascertain what past antecedents created the present school ethos.

2) It captured part of the African American educational fabric intrinsically woven into the American educational quilt.

3) It ascertained the contributions and educational philosophies of African American teachers as well as the leadership styles of African American principals. Moreover, it addressed the role that this history has played in the lives of present day teachers in the school.

4) It addressed the curriculum as issues of life and worthwhile experience in actual dilemmas often implicit in the hidden curriculum of such a context.

5) It focused on what was “good” within the structure despite the tumultuous context.

Few studies have focused on the social aspects of urban history or the educational aspects of urban history. Therefore, at center stage were the lives of the ordinary people who did extraordinary things rather than the often over indulged voices of the elite. It was really three stories in one: a story of educational excellence, a story of African American educational
history, a story of urban education. Each of these stories is important for explicating the historical patterns of change and continuity in this particular school. Consequently, it adds to the literature in three primary areas: educational history, pedagogy and curriculum, and urban education. In sum, unlike past urban education research, this dissertation integrates both aspects of urban education within a historical framework of analysis.

**Design of Study**

At the recent Midwest Political Science Association meeting in April, Dr. Fred Wirt from the University of Illinois-Champaign concluded that the research in urban education needs to consider both sides of the equation. Rather than focusing on either child games or adult games, urban education research should focus on both (Wirt, 1995; Sutcliffe, 1986). Consequently, another focus of this research is on the politics of urban schools, and the external factors that directly and indirectly alter the educational process, and hence, the learning relationships in urban schools. However, as noted earlier, it is a complex research question. Therefore, literature that is primarily fostered by researchers outside of education forms only one part of the theoretical paradigm, and educational research forms the other.

The aforementioned literature represents some new and old concerns in urban education. It is explicated in Chapter 2. But, there is little difference in the actual issues presented in either research circle. The differences, however, can be located in the theoretical and methodological approaches to the issues. While one genre clearly identifies the impact of social, political, and economic factors on education, the other genre based their research on the intricacies of internal schooling. Hence, a new model is needed which acknowledges the impact of both systems on urban education.
This research while sharing some of these same concerns and themes of the existent literature, presents a slightly different theoretical and methodological view. An interdisciplinary approach is utilized so that both agendas are addressed. Thus, an interdisciplinary theoretical and methodological approach will be utilized. Consequently, this research is not only concerned with improving urban education, but also with identifying those related factors that have historically altered the substantive structure of urban schools and urban school reform. This is a study of the historical learning relationships in an urban school. In addition, this study ascertains if the primary mission of urban schools have changed due to internal or external initiatives over the life cycle of the school. The changing status of the school over time will be obtained through such secondary questions as: How does the teacher understand the learning relationship between her students and herself? How is that learning relationship impacted by qualities of race, class and gender? These questions are related to the literature that identifies the impact of cultural difference on teaching and learning in urban schools, and how those differences affect teachers and students ways of knowing and understanding (Hale, 1994; Anderson, 1993; Irvine & York, 1993; Siddle Walker, 1994; Delpit, 1995).

Methodology

A historical single-case case study allowed the researcher to ascertain the complexities often associated with urban research. Moreover, a single-case case study permitted this researcher to "treat the micro social order of human interaction (broadly speaking), the shifting nature of historical processes, and the salient features of complex organizational structures" (Sjoberg, G., Williams, Vaughan, & Sjoberg, F., 1991, 52; Stake, 1995, 1994). This study
sought to understand the historical political process, and the development of the contemporary learning relationships in an urban setting (McAdams, 1982; Eisner, 1991; Hale, 1994).

The Role of History

The current neoconservative era has proceeded with educational reform that has mainly been ahistorical (Siddle Walker, 1993; Rothstein, 1993; Kantor & Brenzel, 1992). Yet, ahistorical approaches to school reform

... deprive reformers of important contextual information that could directly impact the success or failure of select school programs. Such oversight could well decrease opportunities for African-American children to succeed in today's schools” (Siddle Walker, 1993, 163).

Hence, this researcher utilization of a historical framework in urban educational research ensures the education of African American children, and hence, all children (Hale, 1994). At best, history is a “selective and systematic study of the past” (Hansot & Tyack, 1982, 1). For this scholar, like others before, history represents an attempt to provide a more inclusive map of our past. Since 1960, educational historians have focused on revisionist history. Within the genre of Black educational history, the themes over time have moved from stories of oppression to stories of victory. Thus, this inquiry acquires a new focus by reclaiming a part of our past as it relates to the education of African Americans in northern urban de facto segregated schools as it relates to the role of African American teachers and administrators played in creating and maintaining de facto segregated schools such as Champion. (Butchart, 1988). The focus, however, of this research is on the urban context in the North. It examined the actual experiences of Blacks in the medium-sized Midwestern city of Columbus. This case illuminates the taken for granted educational experiences of Black communities, teachers, and administrators in northern central cities. Recently, the work of Siddle Walker, Foster and others testifies to the quality of experiences of African-American
teachers and students prior to the era of desegregation. This study followed this genre of new educational scholarship while at the same time moving beyond it.

Many scholars may ask why a historical single-case case study? What is the significance of such a single-case case study? A single-case case study brings to bear all of the many parameters from which to gauge the totality of this particular context. It brings to the forefront several factors such as past teaching and socialization practices in a "ghetto" school, African America educational history, and the contributions of Black teachers and administrators. A historical single-case case study permitted this researcher to ascertain an almost complete rendering of the changing and complexities existent in an urban context in great depth.

Methods of Data Collection

This researcher obtained data about this school, the context, the teachers, and the curriculum from interviews, observations, dissertations, theses, personal papers, archives, journal articles, newspaper articles, documents, artifacts and other primary and secondary source material. Moreover, because this is an historical study, it was very important to this researcher that participants in the study understood the significance of the usage of their names as important to the development of social and cultural history. Consequently, real names are utilized unless otherwise indicated. Finally, this researcher utilized a continuum of positivist to critical theory because knowledge is constructed in social relationships. Thus, the theoretical approach that sustains this approach is not an either/or construct, but an and/both encapsulating consensus as well as conflict theory.

The primary methods employed in this research were document analysis, semi-structured interviews, backward mapping, and participant observation. These primary methods
were employed because they allowed depth as well as breadth in data collection. Theses, dissertations, primary and secondary sources, journal articles, monographs, surveys, personal papers, archival resources and newspaper articles were used. The three primary data sources permitted triangulation which allows for "three data points of sources: persons, situations and contexts, and time" (Denzin, 1989, 237-39). In this case study, participant observation was employed. It has often been defined as "observation carried out when the researcher is playing an established participant role in the scene studied" (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994, 248).

One of the key advantages of participant observation is that it allows the researcher to ascertain the significance of the cultural context of the setting that is being researched (Bodgewic, 1994; Patton, 1990). While interviews, document analysis and the such can be used, only participant observation can provide interpretations of the culture studied, particularly in urban schools and helped this researcher experience how the participants made "sense of their world" (Patton, 1990, 69; Bernstein, 1976). Therefore, life histories written in a narrative style allow the reader to understand the complexity of the researched as well as the context from which the observed operates.

Data Presentation and Analysis

The data gathered in this research is presented in a narrative format that follows historical chronology. The researcher attempted to "make sense of the situation without imposing preexisting expectations on the phenomenon or setting" (Patton, 1990, 44). Inductive analysis allowed this researcher to use specific observations and theory to build from general to the specific intricacies of this setting. Even though this school had been identified as a "good" school, the researcher explored and discovered emergent themes through inductive logic while specific theoretical frameworks provided means for understanding observations and
interviews (Patton, 1990). The interviews were analyzed for emergent themes and were utilized to define substantive categories related to teachers, principals, curriculum, culture and community relations. Follow-up interviews were conducted to ensure clarity of themes, gather additional information, and do member checks. Additionally, interviews provided insight into the history of the school system, the school, and whether or not the past history of the school was known by present day teachers. School documents, statistics, records, year books, newspapers and artifacts were gleaned for indicators of the social, economic, historical and cultural content of the school as well as to identify former students of the school. Participant observation provided insights into the use of historical and cultural knowledge in the implicit curriculum and teachers' usage of emancipatory pedagogy. Historical sources were utilized to provide the framework for the establishment of chapters in relationship to key events in the specific history of the school as it relates to internal and external significant changes in the school's leadership, teachers, community relations, student population or school structure. This school's particular history signified the uniqueness of this case and is in itself the concern of this researcher. Nonetheless, the quality and validity of the data was maintained through triangulation of methods and data collection.

Site Selection

According to Patton, "site selection or individual case sampling need to be carefully articulated and made explicit" (Patton, 1990, 181). This scholar's choice of site was informed by previous research (Ward, 1993). Moreover, the site chosen for this single-case case study was also informed by a process identified by Michele Foster and others know as community nomination (Foster, 1990; Siddle Walker, 1993).
Community Nomination

Community nomination is defined as a site "chosen by direct contact with African-American communities" (Foster, 1990, 141). E. Valerie Siddle Walker defines community nomination as a different factor than the standard measures for identifying "good" schools such as test scores, graduation rates and the such (Siddle Walker, 1993). Siddle Walker argues that because these measures are often used to indicate the goodness of a school.

Educators understand little of the emic perspective--that is, how and why communities considered their schools to be good... This lack of knowledge not only denies that thee are valuable lessons to be learned from principals and teachers who successfully schooled African-American children in the past (Siddle Walker, 163, 1993).

Finally, this case study is primarily the continuation of earlier research that was the direct result of collecting data through primary and secondary sources such as periodicals, community organizations, community historians and oral histories (Foster, 1990).

Champion represented the first step in the process of resegregating the public schools in Columbus through policy initiatives such as gerrymandering (Ward, 1993). This researcher encountered several constituencies from the Black community who deemed its contributions as exemplary. In essence, the community nominated this site as a historical example of a "good" school. Consequently, this school can be defined as one of the "community-defined good schools" (Siddle Walker, 1993, 163). Thus, the site selection was not random, but specific in intent. Moreover, this researcher was able to identify typically employed empirical measures of the school's goodness such as the success of its students (Hale, 1994; Hayes, 1995; Willis, E., 1995). Thus, these antecedents identified the substantive need for a detailed single-case case study of this particular urban school and its history (Foster, 1990; Irvine & Irvine, 1984; Siddle Walker, 1993; Sowell, 1976).
Limitations of the Study

Regardless of how carefully a researcher decides to choose their case, no design is perfect (Patton, 1993). The major limitations of this study are those often associated with qualitative research (Peshkin & Glesne, 1993; Stake, 1995; Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). As noted earlier, this is a historical qualitative urban single-case case study. While case studies can incorporate several methods in order to ascertain data, this study cannot capture a totally holistic picture of the case. While Yin and others argue that a single-case case study rarely provides room for generalization to other cases, this is not this author's intention (Yin, 1993). Consequently, this author has chosen to seek transferability rather than generalizability (Stake, 1995). Transferability is conceptualized based on the particularization of the case as it relates to other unique cases. Each case, however, is unique in its own right, and an explication of its uniqueness (particularization) is the goal. Thus, transferability is intended to help understand cases with similar ascriptive characteristics, but not define generalizations from case to case (Stake, 1995). This researcher, while understanding everything cannot be covered particularly by one researcher, still contends the single-case case study illuminates the particular qualities of this case, which is what this researcher sought to identify and explicate. Moreover, because this qualitative single-case case study utilized ethnographic history, it was important to identify names of respondents. Unless otherwise noted, no pseudonyms were utilized. While this is not traditional educational research practice, it is the practice of historians particularly when conducting social and cultural history to identify major characters and events. This phenomenon created a problem for this researcher because fewer respondents were willing to identify themselves in educational research. Thus, the historical record while substantively correct is factually flawed.
Few scholars would agree that "good" can be associated with segregated schools. Therefore, it was paramount to define good within this context as identified by the five factors presented previously. This author understands that typically researchers have identified "good" schools by quantitative measures such as graduation rates, and college attendance rates. Hence, the utilization of the community nomination concept. Some scholars may view this as a limitation of this study. Because this school evolved over time, this researcher argues that measures of graduation rates and the such particularly since it is not a high school would not provide a true indicator of the schools goodness or success. Therefore, this researcher chose to focus on the substantive qualities of a school that made it viable in the communities that it serves.

Other limitations of this study relate to the researcher's time frame and access to the school itself. These factors limited the totality of the single-case case study which is the major limitation of holistic case studies (Patton, 1990; Snow & Anderson, 1992). Participation by teachers and administrators was completely voluntary. Consequently, the number of teachers interviewed and observed did not depend solely on the researcher's discretion, but the subjects themselves. Thus, the researcher relied initially on the principal's identification of exemplary teachers in addition to the voluntary agreement of participation. Moreover, because this is a qualitative study, Peshkin and Glesne, Patton, and others note that the limitations of qualitative study are inherently related to the skill of the researcher conducting the study, gaining entree, and time. This researcher drew upon her experiential as well as theoretical knowledge base on teaching, culture, and history. The research was conducted over a period of ten months. Four months were spent at the site. Lastly, students present in the school were not interviewed, but only observed because access to students was difficult to ascertain. However, some teachers did allow more participation with students in terms of observational encounters (Denzin, 1989)
when they asked me to give lectures, hold discussions, and participate in school social activities. Whereas students' views provide another glimpse into the life of schools, structured access was not available (McLaren, 1994). This researcher deems this as a limitation because students' views on their school are often dissimilar to their teachers, but because of time, and access to the site, present student voices were absent from the interviews, and only present in observations. Thus, the study focused on the educational processes experienced by the students themselves through observation, and not through student disclosure.

Overall, the limitations of this study did not prevent the researcher from illuminating the complexities of this single-case case study. This researcher was able to "capture the culture of these schools, their essential features, their genetic character, the values that define their curricular goals and institutional structures, and their individual styles and rituals" (Lawrence Lightfoot, 1983, 6). This researcher contends that the historical qualitative single-case case study despite its limitations allowed this researcher to provide as holistic as possible rendering of the school, its teachers and administrators, and its history. In essence, the design and methodology despite limitations fit the purpose of the study, the resources available, and the research questions (Patton, 1990).

**Overview of Dissertation**

This study consists of eight chapters. Chapter one provides an introduction to the study and addressed the research questions that guided the study. Chapter two furnishes an overview of the interdisciplinary literature which served as a basis for this research. Chapter three explicates the methodological framework. Initially, chapters were structured based on major events in the timeline of this study. However, the research itself provided the themes for the subsequent chapters. In addition to the standard three chapters detailing research
questions, literature, and methodology, the a priori and emergent themes of the urban context, leadership, teachers, and organizational change and curriculum constitute the makeup of subsequent chapters.

Chapter four describes the political, social, and historical development of the urban context of Columbus and the development of the northern de facto segregated school system in Columbus from the turn of the century to the present. This author chronicles the political foundation particularly as it relates to the Board of Education policies and practices related to the development of the de facto segregated educational institutions and when the Board's policies and practices were challenged overtly by some constituents and organizations of the African-American community such as the NAACP, the Urban League and the Vanguard League. Additionally, it details what has happened to the school since desegregation. Finally, oral interviews of former students, teachers and administrators are included in this chapter.

Chapter five focuses on the historical and present day leadership of the school. Chapter six illuminates the lives and teaching philosophies of former Black educators of the school. Life histories and theories of the present heterogeneous staff is explicated as well. Additionally, it addresses what has occurred in the school since desegregation of the teaching force, its present ethos, and student population. Chapter seven analyzes the past and present curriculums, implicit, explicit and null, and how they are connected to organizational structure and change. Additionally, the school and community relationships are addressed. Chapter eight provides conclusive analysis of the history, development, and the future direction for the school, and garners what we have learned from a qualitative historical analysis of this particular school. Finally, theory generated, policy implications, and contributions of the study are detailed.

The historical analysis of the system of education was accomplished through the examination of relevant resources such as theses, dissertations, school board minutes, annual
reports, archival materials, personal papers, school year books, primary and secondary sources, newspaper and journal articles. Semi-structured informal and formal interviews were conducted with past and present teachers, administrators and students. Also, interviews were gathered from previous teachers, students, and administrators in the school system as a whole. Field observations of the present school teachers and administrators in the school context were undertaken. Follow-up interviews provided clarification of themes and served as member checks.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this is a single-case case study of an urban Midwestern-medium sized school. While the majority of the literature focuses on either the political or educational parameters of urban education, this study design employed here focused on both sides of the equation through the utilization of a historical qualitative single-case case study of a northern urban de facto segregated African American school. The significance of the study was its attempt to assess the many elements that positively and/or negatively affect urban schools, particularly their history. At the heart of this research was the search for an expanded understanding of how to prepare urban teachers. Moreover, the researcher sought an understanding of how culture and the context of urban schools not only affects the learning relationships in urban schools, but also alters the teacher's understanding of how learning relationships are built, and maintained in urban schools despite changing social, political and economic dynamics (Foster, 1990; Irvine, 1989; Siddle Walker, 1993).
CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE

Today, we live in an even greater global economy than ten years ago created by the advancement of technology, the end of the Cold War, and an ever increasing demographically diverse population. Historically, educational institutions' ideological foundations consisted of conceptual rhetoric based on meritocracy, progress and democracy. Yet, not all people or children have been the beneficiaries of this system. The recent reform era has ushered in yet another attempt at reform. Education governors, school boards, educational think tanks, and teachers speak of education "for all children" (Carnegie, 1986; Holmes, 1995). However, children residing in urban educational systems rarely benefit from these supposedly new educational initiatives. Has anything really changed in urban education? Or, if there is change, is it without substance?

The current reform movement has been largely ahistorical (Siddle Walker, 1993). It is clouded in everyday language with no substance. So, as educators, policy makers, and government officials articulate reforms, their ahistorical approach may eventually result in success for a few, but failure for many in urban schools. Without an explication of the many complexities that exist in urban education, no real progress can help the major urban constituents--children. Without a belief system genuinely grounded in the success of all children (Anderson, 1993; Foster, 1993; Delpit, 1987; Gomez, 1990; Darder, 1993), how will the mostly White female educators produce results for African American children whom have
historically been socially, culturally, economically, and linguistically different from themselves?

This dissertation was ultimately concerned with improving the education of one particular group of urban children, African American children. This author contends in improving the quality and access to education for this particular group of children, all children will be benefitted, especially the heterogeneous urban population existent in urban areas: the New Majority. Consequently, the literature utilized to assess previous research on the educational efficacy of urban African American children exists, but is not limited to four cognate areas of research: urban education, African American education history, teacher history/education, and urban curriculum. Within each of these fields, the literature is interdisciplinary, and it attempts to provide a holistically as possible picture of the historical and present state of education. Moreover, the literature identifies and explicates those factors that impede or enhance the educational achievement of African American children in urban contexts. Subsequently, this author began with the most salient factor not addressed in the most recent reform agenda, African American education history.

American Education History

The overriding principle in this research has been the role of history in educational policy studies. It is history that frames the foundation for the balance of this work whether it be the history of the context, or the history of teachers' lives.

Black education history was a significant component in this research. However, one cannot examine the genre without an understanding of education history in general. Education historians such as Ellwood P. Cubberley, Lawrence A. Cremin, Michael Katz, David Tyack, Carl Kaestle, Joel Spring and others constitute a continuum of change and continuity in the
focus, themes, and analyses of American education history. These education historians and others provided the author with a cognizance of the general movements in American education history.

**Past Research**

Ellwood P. Cubberley’s *Public Education in the United States: A Study And Interpretation of American Educational History* (1919) was a major work used at the turn of the century. Cubberley focused on the history of American education in the urban context, however, his work was predicated upon social history rather than the previous European tradition of educational philosophy and history (Cohen, 1984). Cubberley’s text provided the framework for the majority of educational scholarship related to the urban area until the 1950s. In the sixties, subsequent education history such as Lawrence Cremin’s *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1976-1957* (1960) challenged Cubberley’s interpretation of the roots of reform in education. However, Cremin did not focus entirely on the urban roots of reform. Yet, it was the advent of the turbulent sixties that returned the focus of education history back to an examination of urban education history. A new cadre of critical revisionist historians focused on the American education system in the urban context.

Michael Katz’s *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (1968) analyzed and critiqued the mythology associated with the goals of urban school reform. Katz argued that schools were agents of social control. His successive works such as *Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Change in America* (1971) continued to critique the philosophical underpinnings of education in the urban context. Katz was joined in his criticism of American education history by David Tyack’s *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (1974). Tyack provided an interpretive history of the changing organizational structure of urban school systems. He

**Recent Research**

Since the 1980s, education historians have focused on community and local education history rather than system wide analysis such as Diane Ravitch and Ronald K. Goodenow's edited text *Educating An Urban People: The New York City Experience* (1981). Ravitch's work, however, is the first work to focus on the diversity existent in urban communities. On the other hand, scholars like Julia Wrigley's *Class Politics and Public Schools: Chicago, 1900-1950* (1982) challenged Katz's interpretations and argued that schools were not imposed on the working class nor did labor oppose education. Wrigley utilized class as a salient factor in urban education history. Lastly, Joel Spring's *The American School: 1642-1993* (1994) illuminated the history of American education and its impact on different groups. In addition to the aforementioned scholarship, three authors provided a clear conceptual framework of past and current scholarship on urban education history (Goodenow & Marsden, 1992).

In the edited text *The City and Education in Four Nations* (1992), Ronald D. Cohen, William J. Reese, and Barbara Finkelstein collectively assessed the historiography of urban education. Moreover, they assessed the past trends and future analyses needed to address the complexity associated with the analysis of urban education history. In recent times, historians and others have focused their attention on what is "good" or "resilient" in urban schools. These texts are examined later in this chapter. This new scholarship on urban education,
however, may or may not maintain a historical focus. These works utilized by the author will be addressed later under the heading of urban education rather than education history.

It is important to note that the majority of the aforementioned research in American urban education history did not focus on the perplexity of African American education within the context of urban education history. The exception to this trend was that of Ravitch, Spring, Tyack, Cohen, Reese and Finkelstein. Although Spring provided an exhaustive examination of the many facets of American education, his text did not provide a substantive understanding of the African American educational experience. Consequently, we will turn our attention to African American education history. Yet, it is within this general framework that African American history was developed. African American education history did not occur in a vacuum. It was and continues to be a part of the fabric of the education history of America (Anderson, 1995). Subsequently, African American education history addressed the similar and different philosophical underpinnings. Moreover, African American education historians have supplied varying frameworks of analyses as exemplified in the works of American education history in general.

**African American Education History**

African American educational history has been beset by struggle, and it has been replete with successes. It is important to look for historical models of success before conjuring new models which do not account for the history of a people who attained a degree of success. Thus, it was critical for this researcher to understand the fullness of the historical educational experiences of African Americans, particularly northern urban African Americans. Before examining the literature related to northern urban African American education history, it is essential to assess the historiography of African American education.
The Beginning

African American education history has had three successive epochs each with its own characteristic focus, theme, issues, questions and analyses. From the turn of the century until the 1930s, Black education historians such as W. E. B. DuBois’s *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), Carter G. Woodson’s *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861* (1919) and *The Miseducation of the Negro* (1933) and others’ research was characterized by a self-help philosophy. These historians focused on the progress Blacks had made since the Civil War and Reconstruction. They viewed education as a panacea and worked to ameliorate the negative view of Black life and illuminate the ills of White supremacist ideology (Ward, 1993). While the next genre of scholars continued to emphasize self-help and racial uplift, they also documented the destructiveness of racism in social and economic arenas that address Black education.

From 1930 to 1960, Horace Mann Bond, Louis Harlan, and Henry Bullock and others approached education history from an integrationist interpretation constructed on the philosophical underpinnings of liberal Progressivism (Ward, 1993). In *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (1934), *Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915* (1958), and *A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present* (1967), Bond, Harlan and Bullock’s scholarship thoroughly chronicled the inequality existent in Black segregated education, particularly in the South. The next generation of scholars would focus on different themes and context.

In the 1960s, revisionist historians such as Vincent P. Franklin, James D. Anderson, and Linda Marie Perkins reexamined old themes, yet offered new topics, themes, interpretations and analyses. Moreover, revisionist scholars focused not on an integrationist
model, but on chronicling the actions of Blacks in determining their own education. Hence, Franklin and others placed "blacks as actor in their destiny rather than as passive victims of American racism" (Ward, 1993, 2). V. P. Franklin and James D. Anderson's *New Perspectives in Black Educational History* (1978) ushered in the new agenda in Black education history. While these three genres have existed, there was and continues to be overlap in themes, topics, characteristics and analyses. Nonetheless, recent African American education historians have shifted their analyses to even newer topics, themes and foci. One consistency across time has been the focus on Black southern education. The Black southern educational experience has dominated Black education history primarily because up until recently, the majority of African Americans resided in the South. Consequently, historians centered the majority of their scholarship on the efficacy of Black education in the South (Butchart, 1988). This dissertation represents the latest genre of post-revisionist education history which began to address the subject of this dissertation, northern urban *de facto* segregated educational institutions (Butchart, 1988).

**New Perspectives**

Since the 1960s, Black education historical research such as V. P. Franklin's *The Education of Black Philadelphia: The Social and Educational History of a Minority Community, 1900-1950* (1979), Judy Jolly Mohaz's *The Separate Problem: Case Studies of Black Education in the North, 1900-1930* (1979), Linda Marie Perkins' *Fannie Jackson Coppin and the Institute for Colored Youth, 1865-1902* (1987), Michael W. Homel's *Down from Equality: Black Chicagoans and the Public Schools, 1920-1941* (1984), Robert McCaul's *The Black Struggle for Public Schooling in Nineteenth-Century Illinois* (1987) and others in addition to numerous articles, theses and dissertations have begun to address the education of Blacks in the North. The majority of this scholarship while focused on the North, however,
has been either city-wide, state-wide, or case studies (Franklin, 1979; Gerber, 1984; Mohaz, 1979; McCaul, 1987). For instance, Franklin's treatise illuminated the self-help philosophy of Blacks which propelled them to seek and acquire educational institutions for their children and the Black community. Perkins detailed the life and political exigency of an exemplary African American female educator and her life-work of education at the Quaker organized education institution for Black youth in Philadelphia. Homel chronicled the growth of unequal educational access for Blacks caused by the in-migration of southern Blacks and others factors in Chicago. McCaul rendered an expansive state-wide study of Black access to education in Illinois. Besides Perkins' research, the overwhelming majority of this recent scholarship while exemplary has rarely addressed the history of one single educational institution (Perkins, 1979).


monograph on *Effective Schools Research: Practice and Promise* (1988) and lastly, Gerald Grant's *The World We Built at Hamilton High* (1988) all represent research into what is "good" and "effective" about schools across regions, class and race boundaries. Since the advent of effective school research, African American scholars such as Ron Edmonds, Thomas Sowell, and Emile V. Siddle Walker chronicle effective schools in the Black educational community regardless of region. Faustine Childress Jones' *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock Arkansas* (1981), Arnold Cooper's *Between Struggle and Hope: Four Black Educators in the South, 1894-1915* (1989), "Elements of Effective Black Schools" (1987) by Charles and Christella Moody, "Patterns of Black Excellence" (1986[1976]) by Thomas Sowell and "Caswell County Training School, 1933-1969: Relationships between Community and School" (1993) by Emile V. Siddle Walker all advance an assessment of quality and effective educational institutions existent in the Black community before desegregation. Furthermore, their scholarship illuminates the role and contributions of Black principals and teachers in the education of Black youth. Another component of African American education history is the education or the lack there of for African American children.

contemporary educational crisis facing African American children and families particularly in the urban context.

Walter R. Allen & Joseph O. Jewell address the Black education dilemma since the publication of Gunnar Myrdal’s *An American Dilemma* (1944). In “The Miseducation of Black America: Black Education Since *An American Dilemma*” the authors contend Myrdal’s assumption that education held the key to altering the experience and opportunities of Black Americans has not prevailed. In essence, they summatively argue that Black Americans have not had equal access to educational opportunities. Myrdal’s analysis of education as a panacea for Blacks failed to address the structural designs of schooling. While Blacks were able to alter this structure with the advent of Brown, on the other hand they were disempowered as a community to positively affect the education of Black children. Hence, desegregation efforts intended to benefit Blacks instead produced benefits to Whites. Subsequently, Myrdal misunderstood the competing parameters in the urban context for resources one of which was education. As indicated earlier in the recent literature, Black teachers in the past were mediators between the school system and Black children. We shift our focus to the literature detailing their history, contributions, lives and practices.

**African American Teachers**

According to Ronald Butchart, “Teachers in black schools have been virtually ignored except for the freedmen’s teachers” (Butchart, 361). While recent literature points to exemplary teachers who have been successful with African American teachers, none have addressed the historical and cultural relevance within the lives of these teachers from one single case study (Foster, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Consequently, it was important for this author to review the literature on the education and history of African Americans as
holistically as possible, particularly scholarship on African American teachers. It is important to note that African American teachers' realities occurred within as well as outside of mainstream American teacher education and practice.

**American Teachers**

Since the beginning, educational researchers have conducted inquiry related to the substance of the theory and practice of American teachers. Recently, several texts address the lives and experiential knowledge of teachers and the history of the teaching profession.

In 1989, Donald Warren compiled *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work*. Warren's edited text emphasized the complexity of history, issues and concepts related to teachers and to teaching as a profession. In one chapter, David Tyack "suggests how complex and nonlinear is the history of teachers and their work, and hence how complexity must be an assessment of "progress" (Tyack: 1989, 408). Tyack addressed the historical public policy concerning teachers and how that history might alter "the shape of new interpretive syntheses of the history of public school teachers and teaching" (Tyack, 409).

Warren's work, like that of Dennis Carlson in *Teachers in Crisis* (1992), viewed teaching from the conception of work primarily undertaken by women. Carlson's *Teachers and Crisis; Urban School Reform and Teacher's Work Culture* (1992) emphasized the theoretical conceptions related to the teachers' work culture and the present urban school reform movement. Moreover, Carlson examined urban teachers' work culture and teacher unionism within the context of the current school reform movement started in the 1980s. Carlson clearly views the "crisis" in urban education as related to the greater evolving urban context.

Although, both texts address many facets of teachers and teaching, another genre of research dealt with the actual lives and teaching practices of teachers. Carlson and Warren's works have contributed to our understanding of teachers, their history, their work, and a
historical and theoretical understanding of teacher education policy and reform. However, Carlson and Warren's analysis does not provide enough emphasis on life histories of teachers. *Hill Country Teacher* (1990), *Lives of Women Public Schoolteachers: Scenes from American Educational History* (1995), *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-American Children* (1994) and *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom* (1995) all emphasize first person qualitative accounts of the educational experiences, lives and practices of teachers. However, very few of these texts emphasize or even consider the contributions, practices, and philosophies of African American teachers in their studies.

Diane Manning in *Hill Country Teacher: Oral Histories from the One-Room School and Beyond* (1990) provides firsthand experiences and contributions of former teachers in Texas. Manning's scholarship assesses the memoirs of women who were the first generation of women teachers permitted through policy to "combine careers and family life" (Manning, 1990, xiii). Moreover, her retired teachers enhance our understanding of the historical changes in education policy related to gender and hiring practices in education. While Manning focused on teachers in Texas, Madelyn Holmes and Beverly J. Weiss illuminated the lives of teachers across regions and time.

While Manning utilized oral histories of living teachers, Holmes and Weiss relied on historical documents such as diaries, school reports and the such to grasp the former lived experiences, practices and contributions of deceased educators. In *Lives of Women Public Schoolteachers: Scenes from American Educational History* (1995), they researched the teaching practices and lives of twelve American school teachers from the nineteenth and twentieth century. Holmes and Weiss sought to "supplement the traditional accounts of educational movements with research documenting how teachers actually taught and lived" (Holmes & Weiss: 1995, vii). Holmes and Weiss, like Manning, succeed in providing a
clearer understanding of how the teaching profession benefitted from women teachers. While these accounts are primarily historical, Ladson-Billings, Delpit and Ward Randolph apply the lived practices of teachers to their efficacy in the actual diverse and complex setting of today’s classroom.

Gloria Ladson-Billings’s *Dreamkeepers* (1994) included life histories or profiles of the teachers she researched. However, Ladson-Billings’s purpose was to assess and gather information about how those factors did or did not impact their teaching practice. In essence, Ladson-Billings’s goal was to assess theories of action related to practice. Thus, she studied a group of excellent teachers to “provide exemplars of effective teaching for African American students” (Ladson-Billings, 1994; xi). Ladson-Billings’s work, like that of Delpit, argues for implementation of policy in teacher education colleges based on the findings of their research.

In *Other’s Peoples’ Children* (1995), Lisa Delpit addressed the ramifications of continuity in the teaching and training of teachers and how cultural conflict impacted and impacts on the teaching efficacy of culturally different teachers in diverse classrooms. Consequently, life histories or portraits of teachers served several purposes: one of which was to understand how education’s lack of sensitivity in reform policy in education has failed to address needed changes in the preparation of White female teachers who will undoubtedly teach “other people’s children” (Delpit, 1995). Moreover, Adah Ward Randolph’s “From Difference to Synchronization, a Model of an Urban Teacher’s Transformation,” (1996) explicated the process by which one White teacher altered her teaching practices and ways of knowing to effectively teach her students who were economically and culturally different from herself. From Warren to Ward Randolph, the literature has provided a continuum of education history related to the policies, practices, lives and experiences of teachers and how those factor
impact on their actual teaching practice. Yet, very few of these scholars directly accentuate the contributions of African American teachers.

Even though Delpit provides us with qualitative data related to the views and attitudes of teachers of color about teaching and teacher education, she does not focus entirely on the histories, contributions, practices or efficacy of African American teachers. Ladson-Billings's work, while exemplary, also does not exclusively pertain to the experiences of African American educators. However, Holmes and Weiss as well as Manning provide individual portraits of African American female teachers. On the other hand, Linda Perkins's chapter in *Histories of a Profession* (1989) pertains to the history of Blacks in teaching.

While Holmes and Weiss's exemplary portraits of twelve women covered diverse regional and geographic differences in America, they included only one Black woman. Marion P. Shadd was that Black woman. Ms. Shadd, however, had a cadre of contemporaries who were also educators. Consequently, Black women who attained education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were primarily educators (Giddings, 1984; Lerner, 1972; Perkins, 1989). Yet, their lives have historically been chronicled as activist rather than as educators (Harley & Terborg-Penn, 1978; Giddings, 1984; Guy-Sheftall, 1990; Lerner, 1972; Richardson, 1987). Manning, however, provided another account of Blacks in the teaching profession. Unlike Holmes and Weiss, however, she recorded the lives of a teaching couple, Mr. and Mrs. B. T. and Itasco Wilson. Manning notes "race created obstacles to achieving the Wilsons's career goals" (Manning, 151). Hence, a teacher's race, culture and class impacts upon his or her education and teaching experiences. Still, few scholars address racial differences in the history of the teacher profession. Consequently, Black teachers' experiences are rarely included.
Linda Perkins supplied a historical accounting of Blacks in the teaching profession since the Antebellum Era. She addressed the recent implications of historical policy and how changes in society and educational policy relates to the efficacy of present day Black teachers. Perkins, however, focused primarily on the experience of Black teachers in the South. Little research exists on Black teachers in the North (Foster, 1993, 1991; Ward, 1993). Former research on Black teachers, particularly during the era of desegregation, provided less than exemplary pictures of the practices of Black educators (Foster, 1993, 1991, 1990). Moreover, women's educational history rarely includes how educational philosophies and policies related to gender affected Black women (Butchart, 1988; Lindsay, 1991; Perkins, 1983; Roland Martin, 1985). Consequently, African American women educators were a part of and effected by reform initiatives in the teaching profession as much if not moreso than their white counterparts (Foster, 1990; Lerner, 1972; Lindsay, 1991, Perkins, 1983).

Overall, recent scholarship into the lives of teachers has produced historical accounts of the lives and teaching practices of European American women. While Black women have been included, they have not been the central focus of this new scholarship. Nonetheless, some researchers have sought to ascertain text related specifically to the experience of African American teachers not as margins, but as the central subject of their educational scholarship. Thus, Black women educators were and are part of the educational experience in America (Foster, 1991; Perkins, 1989).

African American Educators

As noted earlier, recent historical scholarship into the lives and practices of educators has focused primarily on the experiences of European American women (Holmes & Weiss, 1995; Manning, 1990). Women historians, education historians and even journalists have researched the contributions of Black women teachers who were activists, school founders,

Septima Clark's *Echo in My Soul* (1962), Karen Fields *Lemon Swamp and Other Places: A Carolina Memoir* (1983), Pauli Murray's *Proud Shoes: The Story of an American Family* (1978), Linda M. Perkins' *Fanny Jackson Coppin and The Institute For Colored Youth: 1865-1902* (1987) and Sarah Rice's *He Included Me: The Autobiography of Sarah Rice* (1989) were such texts. Only one work preceded this new scholarship which was Fannie Jackson Coppin's *Reminiscences of school life and hints on teaching* (1913). These authors and others enhanced our understanding of the education, teaching practices and activism in the lives of Black women educators. Perkins and others have chronicled that education was the primary profession chosen by Black women well into the sixties (Perkins, 1989). While these autobiographical sketches exist, the majority of recent scholarship on Black women has been in articles.

an analysis of the intersection of both the “cult of true domesticity” and Black women’s “race uplift” effect on the education of Black women and Black women educators. Perkins’s scholarship, however, represents the past as well as present emphasis in research related to education and the Black experience. Audrey Thomas McCluskey scholarship “We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: African-American Women School Founders and Their Mission” (1989) continued this line of research. On the other hand, Michele Foster while addressing similar issues and themes as Perkins, directed her scholarship towards elucidating the actual life histories of Black educators.

Foster has created extensive scholarship directed toward illuminating the exemplary practices of African American teachers. Unlike Perkins who focused primarily on one educator, Foster utilizes multiple cases from which to explicate the contributions of exemplary African American teachers across geographic and contextual parameters. Her articles and book chapters related to this research were: “African American Teachers and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy” (1995), “Resisting Racism: Personal Testimonies of African American Teachers” (1993), “Urban African-American Teacher’s View of Organizational Change: Specifications on the Experiences of Exemplary Teachers” (1992), Constancy, Connectedness, and Constraints in the Lives of African American Teachers” (1991a), “Just Got To Finda’ A Way’: Case Studies of the Lives and Practices of Exemplary Black High School Teachers” (1991b), and “The Politics of Race: Through the Eyes of African-American Teachers” (1990). Foster’s major contention is that the voices and experiences of African American teachers are missing from the literature. Educational research must address the differences in educational access, policies and practices not just across gender lines, but across racial lines as well. Foster provides historical as well as socio-political analysis of the experiences of Black educators. Moreover, she argues that their contributions and experiences are noteworthy and provide outstanding
accounts of how students particularly African American students have been and can be educated successfully. Foster's research, unlike Ladson-Billings, focused only on African American teachers. Ladson-Billings, however, seeks to provide exemplars of successful teachers of African American children regardless of race. Besides her text, *Dreamkeepers* (1995), Ladson-Billings has produced several articles.

Ladson-Billings's "Like lightning in a bottle: attempting to capture the pedagogical excellence of successful teachers of black students" (1990), and "Returning to the Source: Implications for Educating Teachers of Black Students" (1991) both are examples of exemplary teachers of African American teachers. Ladson-Billings' research is directed at elucidating practices that work with African American children who have been historically denied quality and effective education (Anderson, 1987). She includes the voices of teachers who are exemplary regardless of race. Nonetheless, her work is connected to Foster's and others in that she chronicles life-histories of Black teachers. While Perkins, Foster and Ladson-Billings have documented the positive and exemplary practices of African American teachers, other scholarship related to African American teachers address different issues.

Since the 1980s, scholarship into the lives of African American educators has chronicled not only their culturally relevant pedagogy, but also has provided personal portraits and noteworthy practices. In addition, the recent research has also focused on their roles as leaders in the African American community, the effects of desegregation on their employment, and the future of Blacks in the teaching profession in the age of reform (Dempsey & Noblit, 1991; Dilworth, 1989; Franklin, 1990; Futrell, 1986; Gordon, 1993; Hope King, 1993; Irvine & Irvine (1983), Larke, 1990; Lomotey, 1989, 1987; McCluskey, 1989; McCullough-Garrett, 1993; Sims, 1992; Stewart, Meier, & England, 1989). Mary Hatwood Futrell, Vincent P. Franklin and Kofi Lomotey provided historical interpretations of the importance of Black
teachers in the Black community. All authors contend that other than preachers, Black
teachers' and principals' leadership was significant within and outside of the Black community.
Moreover, Alice McCullough-Garrett documented that African Americans have historically
possessed a vision of teaching in her article entitled "Reclaiming the African American Vision
for Teaching: Toward an Educational Conversation" (1993). She detailed the effects of
desegregation on African American teaching philosophies and successful practices. Another
issue in recent scholarship has been concerned with ascertaining why Black teacher educators
have declined in the profession, left the profession, or have remained in the profession. Sabina
Kings's "Why Did We Choose Teaching Careers and What Will Enable Us to Stay? Insights
from One Cohort of the African American Teaching Pool" (1993), June Gordon's "Why Did
You Select Teaching as a Career? Teachers of Color Tell Their Stories" (1993), Stewart,
Meier, and England's "In Quest of Role Models: Change in Black Teacher Representation in
An Examination of Cultural Influences on the Pedagogical Perspectives of Black teachers"
(1989), Irvine and Irvine's "The impact of the desegregation process on the education of black
students" (1983), Van Dempsey and George Noblit's "The Demise of Caring in an African-
American Community: One Consequence of School Desegregation" (1991), Patricia Larke's
"Black Teachers: An Endangered Species in the 1990s" (1990) and Mary Dilworth's "Black
Teachers: A Vanishing Tradition" (1989) addressed these issues. Stewart, Meier and England's
article was the only article pertaining specifically to Black teachers in the urban context.
Other than Catherine Bodard Silver's Black Teachers in Urban Schools: The Case of
Washington D.C. (1973), no other book length manuscript was located on Black urban
teachers.
As noted earlier, Foster, Ladson-Billings, Irvine and others have addressed culturally relevant pedagogy. Their research has surfaced as a result of the reform initiative in teacher education. These scholars contend that reform initiatives fail to address these concerns in their attempts to create better prepared teachers particularly for our nation's urban schools (Dilworth, 1989; Irvine, 1989; Foster, 1995; Ward Randolph, 1996). The reform movement provided a framework from which to address the curriculum of teacher education institutions. However, the majority of this work was focused on altering the learning experiences of European American women teacher candidates (Coballes-Vega, 1992; Dunn, 1993; Gomez, 1994, 1993; Gordon, B., 1993; Hillard, 1989). Except for Delpit's "Education in a Multicultural Society: Our Future's Greatest Challenge" (1992), this inquiry focused almost exclusively on teacher education preparation rather than practice (King, 1991). While it was relevant to the overall goal of this research, it was not the major focus of this research and only provided a peripheral understanding of the context of reform as it related to this author's research. On the other hand, another caveat of research emphasized the preparation of teachers for urban schools.

"Restructuring Teacher's Knowledge for Urban Settings" (1989), Lois Weiner's Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools (1993), and the work of Martin Haberman such as "Selecting 'Star' Teachers for Children and Youth in Urban Poverty" (1995), "The Pedagogy of Poverty Versus Good Teaching" (1994) and Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools (1988) all focus on what needs to change in teacher preparation for urban contexts. It is related to earlier work on developing culturally relevant pedagogy. Again, while relevant, this research did not focus exclusively on Black educators. Yet, it is related to the overall implications and conclusions of this research.

Even though the scholarship related to Black educators has increased particularly within the past ten years, more scholarship is needed to examine the education, philosophies,
and practices of Black women teachers (Butchart, 1988). Consequently, this research detailed as much as possible the lives and contributions of Black women educators with the understanding that they were in fact part of the general structure of education history related to women educators.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, education scholars have noted the political, social, economic, and policy changes that created the American education system of which African Americans are a distinctive unit. It was within this framework of American education that African American education is situated. Moreover, Butchart contends

African American education history is and will remain an independent, autonomous field of research, the field must begin to enrich other fields with its insights and findings if it is to have any impact on the historical profession, on educational practice, and on the society. Historians of black education are in a position now to begin putting black education within larger intellectual, educational and social contexts (Butchart, 363).

Consequently, African American education historians must place the peculiarity of African American education history within the context of not only the movements of American education in general, but within the geographical parameters in which education takes place such as northern urban cities.

Urban Education

Several scholars contend that the problem with urban schools and thus education has been the lack of financial resources due to the decline in urban economics related to the politics of urban development (Orr, 1995; Jackson & Cibulka, 1992; Timar, 1992). Other researchers argue that the problem is the violence, the development and persistence of an underclass in urban centers due to disinvestment, underemployment and unemployment, and the persistence of fragile family structures (Wilson, 1993, 1992; Rothstein, 1993; Callison & Richards-Colocino, 1993). Still, other researchers point to the curriculum in urban schools as
the problem (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Apple, 1995; Hunkins, 1993). Lastly, scholars identify the cultural mismatch between urban student demographics and the urban teacher population which has not been adequately prepared to teach in urban schools (Delpit, 1995; Gomez, 1993; Dilworth, 1993; Larke, 1990).

Since the publication of Robert Woock’s *Education and the Urban Crisis* (1970), and Joseph Kretovic and Edward Nussel’s *Transforming Urban Education* (1994), it is apparent that many historical issues relate to urban education, and hence, urban schools. These issues have ranged from community aspects of urban education to the politics of urban education. Regardless of the causes of change or the problems in urban schools, it is clear urban schools are not effectively serving their constituency (Irvine, 1989; Sirotnik, 1991; Fine, 1994; Holmes, 1986). This section provides insight into the education literature that focuses on both schooling within the urban context, and external factors related to the implementation of urban education policy.

**Urban Education and the Schooling Experience: Historiography**

other books such as *The Politics of Urban Education in the United States* (1992), the 1991 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association, examined the multiplicity of variables affecting urban schools such as politics of urban education, school partnerships and compacts, and the impact of desegregation and resegregation on urban education. While desegregation takes place in schools, it is a policy initiative. Consequently, the literature on desegregation was viewed as a policy perspective related to the urban context. It will be addressed later. Yet, desegregation remains part of the recent research agenda in urban education.

Recent scholarship on urban education has shifted its focus away from addressing only the problems associated with urban schools to solutions for reforming urban schools. Consequently, David Boaz's *Liberating Schools: Education in the Inner City* (1991), *City Schools: Leading the Way* (1993), Joseph Kretovic's and Edward J. Nussel's *Transforming Urban Education* (1994), and *Resiliency in Urban Schools* (1994) all address positive aspects of change in urban schools.

Overall, Stanley Rothstein's *Handbook of Schooling in Urban America* (1993) addressed urban education as holistically as possible from a multitude of disciplines. Rothstein's work provided a recent framework for understanding the current as well as historical factors related to urban education. While Rothstein's edited text was summative, it did not address the major question in this research. What has been the history and legacy of a northern urban *de facto* segregated school? A major component of the school regardless of context is teachers. Rothstein, Irvine and York, Darder, Kane and Taylor researched teacher related issues in urban education. However, none of these perspectives presented a single-case case study of an urban school and its African American teachers.

Another component in the literature was the very context of urban itself and the nature of the social, political, racial, economic, and cultural context of schooling in an urban context.
A plethora of articles addressed issues from preparation of teachers in the urban setting to the socio-historical factors related to the present "crisis" in urban education (Kantor & Benzel, 1992). The literature concerned with the preparation of teachers for urban schools is discussed in the later section on teachers. Because this dissertation sought to ascertain the context of urban schooling within and outside of the walls, it was important to review the literature related to urban history, politics, sociology and the such.

Urban Politics, Policy, Sociology and History

Another focus of the literature was on the politics of urban schools, policy initiatives related to urban and Black education and the external factors that directly alter the educational process, and hence, the learning relationships in urban schools. However, as noted earlier in Chapter 1, it is a complex research question. Therefore, literature primarily fostered by researchers outside of education forms only one part of the theoretical paradigm and educational research previously addressed forms the other. These texts provided the author within an overview of the historical context and current state of the urban context. Moreover, this researcher sought to understand how these factors affected educational policy such as desegregation in urban schooling. Thus, the urban context constituted a significant aspect of analysis in this research. Consequently, this author read material pertaining to the development of the urban context, urban sociology, and urban politics.

In The Politics of American Cities: Private Power and Public Policy (1988), Dennis Judd argues that cities have historically been considered economic entities. Yet, the growth of cities and social disorder within cities required an established governmental structure (Judd, 1988). In City Politics: Private Power and Public Policy (1994), Judd and Todd Swanstrom argue further that "city politics can be understood as a complex interaction among the institutions, actors, and resources of both the public and the private spheres" (Judd &
Swanstrom, 1994, xiii). Moreover, competition over public resources from public and private entities has been historically manifested itself in tensions in urban politics between groups over urban resources such as education and housing (Judd & Kantor, 1992). Thus, education in the urban context is a public policy initiative which is "intended to serve the common good" (Herson & Bolland, 1990). Thus, Judd, Swanstrom, Judd and Kantor in *Enduring Tensions in Urban Politics* (1992) and Lawrence and Bolland in *The Urban Web: Politics, Policy and Theory* (1990) provided this researcher with a thorough understanding of the complexity and politics of urban settings in which education is a part of the public policy initiative. Even though education is a component of the public policy or service structure of cities, it was also important for this author to understand another aspect of public policy—housing.

Within cities, children have typically attended neighborhood schools. Before busing became an educational policy, neighborhood schools were for the most part the law of the land. Housing, particularly in urban contexts, is often defended as an enclave or represents what Suttles calls "ordered segmentation" (Suttles, 1968). Gerald D. Suttles in *The Social Order and the Slum* (1968) defined ordered segmentation as the "orderly relationship between groups and the sequential order in which groups are being formed and social relations are being cultivated" (Suttles, 1968, 10). Ordered segmentation, however, has resulted in differential learning experiences in schools within ethnic enclaves. Thus, housing is a resource often fought over by competing groups in urban centers. Consequently, education is also affected by housing policies in urban centers and suburban centers.

In Douglas A. Massey and Nancy A. Benton's *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (1993), and W. Dennis Keating's *The Suburban Racial Dilemma: Housing and Neighborhoods* (1994), both authors contend that the relationship
between quality schooling and housing are related to the factor of racial desegregation in housing. Racial segregation occurs as a result of ordered segmentation as people seek provincialism in the urban context. As urban centers's demographics changed and people defended their housing choices through policy initiative such as restricted covenants and redlining, so did access to quality services such as housing and education (Gottdiener & Pickvance, 1991; Massey & Denton, 1993; Keating, 1994). As Blacks and affluent members of other minority groups leave the central cities and gain suburban housing, the suburbs are more desegregated than the urban context (Katzman, 1983). Still, Massey and Denton maintain that no progress was made in residential segregation in major northern urban centers, and in fact, in some cities segregation actually increased (Massey & Denton, 1993). In "Inner-City Schools-Poverty and Segregation: Has the Picture Changed Since 1967?" James Parsons claims the major difference between segregation then and now rests in the concentration of exclusively minorities enclaves in urban settings such as in Chicago, Boston and Washington, D. C. (Parsons, 1990). Historically, Keating argues segregation took hold in urban northern centers during the migration of Blacks to these areas before and after World War I (Keating, 1994). He further declares policy initiatives such as the Fair Housing Act of 1968 has not altered this situation. Consequently, changes in housing access have not alleviated access to quality education for the majority of Blacks who have remained in urban centers because of economic or familial factors (Wilson, 1994; Gottdiener & Pickvance, 1991). Thus, busing, another policy initiatives sought to alter access for students in urban and later suburban districts.

Busing as a policy was intended to remedy unequal educational access and lead to the demise of residential segregation (Crain, 1969; Orfield, 1994; Orfield, Glass, Schley, & Reardon, 1994; Stuart Wells & Crain, 1994). Advocates of busing assumed it would alleviate
school segregation. The desegregation of urban schools, however, has been difficult (Metcalf, 1983). In fact, physical resegregation and second-generation educational discrimination have occurred since the Brown decision of 1954 (Meier, Stewart & England, 1989; Orfield, Schaley, Glass & Reardon, 1994). Researchers have recently begun to look at the long-term effects of school desegregation in the urban context, rather than short-term effects such as test scores.

Dempsey, Noblit, Stuart Well and Crain all argue that desegregation through such measures as busing altered the Black and the White community (Dempsey & Noblit, 1993; Stuart Wells & Crain, 1994). These scholars point to the changes in urban education caused by desegregation policy. On the other hand, other authors point to the failure of desegregation policy in urban school districts (Orfield, 1994; Williams, 1994). Overall, residential housing patterns in cities determine which constituency has access to quality services such as education. While housing policy has sought to alter access to suburban housing for Black and other minorities, educational policies such as busing sought direct impact on segregation in schools. Both policies were primarily ineffective in changing educational access for the majority of African American and other minority children in central cities (Clark, 1988; Rivkin, 1994). While some researchers contend that the roots of the present problems in urban schools are related to the failure of these two policy initiatives, other scholars view the problems in urban schools as a result of the historical change and continuity in urban schools.

Historical analysis permits researchers to ascertain change as well as continuity over time in the patterns of a person, a city, a state, a group or a school. Jesse Goodman clarifies three distinct periods which attempted to alter the content and structure of urban schooling. Goodman professes in “Change without Difference” that we are presently in our third wave of educational reform. Because reformers rarely address historical patterns, they often contend that what they are attempting to do is new. Yet, Goodman reminds us that a historical reform
initiatives usually enforce conventional educational conceptions. Rather than point to what reformers fail to address historically, Cynthia Ford addressed the historical roots of the contemporary crisis in urban education.

In "The Educational Dilemma in Contemporary Urban America" (1991), Cynthia Ford asserts the migration of Blacks to cities prior to and since World War I, historical racial discrimination in housing, employment and schooling, the migration of new minorities to urban areas such as Hispanics, and the failure of subsequent policy initiatives to remedy these problems in urban centers account for the contemporary situation in urban schools. Ford's historical arguments synthesize earlier arguments made by others such as Massey and Denton, Keating, and others. In "Urban Education and the "truly Disadvantaged": The Historical Roots of the Contemporary Crisis, 1945-1990" (1992), Harvey Kantor and Barbara Brenzel formulate similar arguments. In essence, they concluded "the postwar transformation of social space and the urban labor market has reshaped the urban landscape and changed the social and economic contours of urban education in ways that have made equal opportunity and popular control particularly difficult to cure" (Kantor & Benzel, 1992, 280). Kantor and Benzel also point to the changing demographics, failed implementation of policy initiatives and unchanging or inadequate institutional structures present in urban schools such as the curriculum. Moreover, the historically unchanging bureaucratic structures of these schools also impede educational progress and retention. In essence, Ford, Kantor and Benzel maintain like others that the present crisis in urban education has historical roots. Consequently, recent efforts at reform or restructuring should take these historical factors into account when suggesting changes in the structure of urban schooling.

Historically, reform or what is today called restructuring has been a constant impetus in urban education (Greenman, 1994). For the most part, policy initiatives or reforms are
implemented by politicians, school boards, superintendents, administrators, and lastly, teachers. A genre of work in urban education addresses the politics of urban education. Within this genre is an emergence of school partnerships in urban context. Of course, desegregation is a component, but it was addressed earlier. Also, the development of the middle school has been viewed by some as an organizational change related to the implementation of desegregation (McGlasson, 1973; Vatterott, 1991). Middle schools, however, have not escaped the new wave of urban reform, either (Lee Manning, Lucking & MacDonald, 1994). Nonetheless, this work is substantively concerned with forces outside the school walls which determine through politics educational policy.

George Michel maintains in ‘School Politics and Conflict in Racially Isolated Schools’ (1991) that “a relationship exists between the level of political conflict and the social composition, size, and other characteristics of a school district” (Michel, 1991, 503). Moreover, he asserts different levels of political conflict exist in racially isolated schools depending on the issues such as teacher-control issues (high), parental control issues (middle), and low conflict issues such as school athletics (Michel, 1991). Michel, however, concludes his research by contending that political issues in racially isolated schools are not different regardless of race. Others, however, have argued differently. In fact, Michel present a pluralistic understanding of politics and urban education. However, Parenti argues “those who do not share in decision making do not share power” (Parenti, 1970, 243). Consequently, the majority of constituents in urban policy arenas do not have access to the decision making or political process related to urban education.

Robinson, England, and Meier maintain that Black political representation on governing structures in urban schools makes a significant difference in Blacks’ ability to access quality services in urban schools (Robinson, England & Meier, 1985). Moreover, they contend
the at-large system of elections instituted during the Progressive Era limited the power base and resources available to Black residents in urban context, and thus urban schools (Hofstadder, 1963; Robinson, England & Meier, 1985; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Subsequently, educational policy is influenced by the cultural AI demographics of school boards historically (Marshall, Mitchell & Wirt, 1989).

In *Culture and Education Policy in the American States* (1989), the authors concur with Parenti. Marshall, Mitchell and Wirt insist the elite reformers' culture circumscribes the policy and politics in urban education. Moreover, because elites usually govern and establish urban education policy, it is often market driven rather than service oriented. Consequently, the business community which has access to the elite governing structure in urban schools often times establishes policy based on their needs. Marion Orr documents this intersection between policy and change in urban education in "Urban Regimes and School Compacts" (1993) and "Sources of Educational Reform: Changing Actors in Shifting Arenas," (1995). Moreover, Donald Dawson, William Pink and Kathryn Borman suggest the significance of the community and service organizations in urban education. Both articles "Community Participation in Urban Schooling: (1984) and "Building Community-School Programs in Two Cities" (1986) stress this point. In all, while some researchers blame school board members and superintendents for the problems in urban schools, urban school board members and superintendents contend that they, too, are suffering from the historical and persistent changes in urban school districts. In other words, they are in the middle (McCloud & Dukes McKenzie, 1994; Wilson, 1994). Regardless of who is in charge, urban politics affect urban education.

In conclusion, three themes resonate in the literature pertaining to urban education. First, the social, political, economic parameters existent in urban centers impact upon urban
education delivery. Second, African American, Hispanic and other minorities constitute the majority of students in urban schools. Third, community participation, parent participation and the business sector impact upon the success of urban schools. In all, the literature on urban education is extensive, complex and exhaustive. Moreover, this author decided to limit the search based on the factors that directly impact on the education of African American students. Thus, a section of the literature related to the efficacy of Black education in the urban context, its problems, issues, and suggested solutions. Another parameter existent in urban education has yet to be addressed—curriculum.

**Urban Curriculum**

Urban education and urban teachers are connected inherently by the urban curriculum. Curriculum is the substance which mediates learning. It underscores what children in urban schools, and what teachers in the same institutions have an opportunity to learn and teach, and what they do not (McCutcheon, 1995). In this dissertation, curriculum was viewed primarily through three foci: curriculum history, the two components of the actual lived curriculum in urban schools (implicit and explicit) and curriculum in colleges of education for the preparation of urban teachers.

**Curriculum History**

Since the turn of the century, policy makers in education have grappled over which curricular focus best suited the education of Americans (DuBois, 1903; Kliebard, 1986; Washington, 1893; [1901]1986; Watkins, 1993; Woodson, 1933). In the movement for common schools, Horace Mann and others contended that schools should stress moral education, good citizenship, unity, obedience, restraint, self-sacrifice and "the careful exercise of intelligence" (Kaestle, 81). Mann argued, however, "schools should not allow controversial
issues to be taught” (Kaestle, 90). This ideological framework determined the content of common school curriculum.

In *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958* (1987), Herbert Kliebard contends that curriculum reform movements swept the country in the 1890s. These movements, heralded by different ideological camps, sought to alter the content of schooling at all levels in order “to bring about a smoothly running socially efficient stable social order in which education was a major form of human engineering” (Tyack & Hansot, 107). Since that time, successive movements of curricular reform have occurred (Kliebard, 1987). Education and curricular reform has been the result of change in American society. According to Kliebard, these movements in curricular reform must be studied through an examination of “the leaders of the various interest groups.” These leaders and their ideas must be viewed “against the backdrop of the hard realities, not only of school practice and the bureaucratic structure of schooling in this country, but the political and social conditions of the time” (Kliebard, xi-xii). While Kliebard maintains three opposing groups fought for control over the content of the curriculum, only one of those ideological groups won: the social efficiency. The social efficiency school of thought has predominately guided curricular decision since the turn of the century. Hence, school curriculum has been tied to fulfilling the roles that citizens will play in an ordered society (Kliebard, 1986).

In essence, educators’ struggle over the curriculum has produced three primary ontological camps which still exist in curriculum theory, development and practice. At different times, however, different groups hold the reigns on defining what is curriculum.

**Curriculum Defined**

Curriculum has often been viewed as the subject content in schooling. A practical understanding, however, defines it as a course of study (Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981). It is in
essence all the experiences a student has in school (Eisner, 1985). Nonetheless, the definition of curriculum is mediated by how people define the purpose of the curriculum within the three primary conceptual traditions related to curriculum theory, development and purpose: traditional, conceptual-empiricist and reconceptualist (Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981). Each of these different theoretical underpinnings represent different understandings of the curriculum and pose different inquiry into the purpose of curriculum and the forces at work in curriculum theory, conception or deliberation (Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981; Reid, 1992; Schubert, 1986). Regardless of how curriculum is defined or conceptualized, it has a purpose in the process of schooling.

William Reid defines curriculum as a public interest pursuit related to schooling that is not fixed, but a process invariably bound by philosophical underpinnings of what we believe the purpose of curriculum should be (Reid, 1992). Hence, his definition of curriculum relates to the competing service tensions existent in urban centers (Reid, 1992). Reid also defines curriculum as related to the three primary conceptual camps framed by Giroux, Penna and Pinar and others (Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981; Kliebard, 1987; Reid, 1992; Schubert, 1986). Michael Apple elucidates further on Reid’s assertion concerning the philosophical underpinnings of curriculum. Apple views curriculum not just as a public interest initiative explicated by the explicit curriculum, but as a policy replete with ideology which is more static than Reid suggests (Apple, 1981). Apple and other critical theorists further contend curriculum has more than just an explicit purpose, but implicit ideals as well.

In Ideology and Curriculum (1990), Apple argues that the explicit curriculum is bound by an implicit ideology based on cultural capital. Thus, curriculum is explicit in subject and implicit in practice and policy. Cultural capital is defined as symbolic property which schools preserve and distribute through the explicit and implicit curriculum (Apple, 1990, 3). Cultural
capital is implicitly related to another ideological concept formulated by Apple: the concept of hegemony. Hegemony is related to power based on the cultural capital existent in the hidden (implicit) curriculum. Hegemony perpetuates the taken for granted assumptions in the explicit and implicit curriculum. Apple contends hegemony “refers to an organized assemblage of meanings and practices, the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions which are lived” (Apple, 1990, 5). It is lived within the curriculum. Hence, hegemony is gained through the cultural capital of the curriculum. Consequently, Shirley Grundy claims curriculum is not a concept, but it is a cultural construction, supports Apple’s assertions (Grundy, 1987). While Apple provides a theoretical understanding of the cultural capital within the curriculum and how it operates through the taken for granted assumptions of policy makers, teachers, and others, Peter McLaren provides an understanding of how it works through the curriculum in the schooling process.

Peter McLaren in Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education (1994) defines the implicit curriculum as “the unintended outcomes of the schooling process” (McLaren, 1994, 191). Moreover, it includes teaching and learning styles, messages from the structure of instruction, teacher expectations and so forth. In essence, the hidden curriculum is bounded by tacit ways knowledge and behavior are constructed (McLaren, 1994). The implicit or hidden curriculum reverberates around the ideological underpinnings of curriculum bound to issues of social class, race, culture, gender and power. It can have positive and/or negative affect on the process of schooling. Apple and McLaren denote issues related to curricular theory and practice. Curriculum, however, is also bound by the context in which it is practiced.

While many conceptual frameworks exist in regard to curriculum historically, and in turn these conceptions alter the definition of curriculum itself, curriculum is also mediated by
the context in which it is derived. William Schubert argues that “curriculum thoughts, decisions, and practices are socially, politically, and culturally constructed. They are powerfully governed by the economic and legal contexts in which they exist. Moreover, the values of the day exert profound influence on curriculum” (Schubert, 1986, 93). Within the urban context, curriculum was intended to complete specific educational objectives related to the public interest. Some authors suggest that the purpose has been related to class, race and other characteristics which are not challenged in the curriculum, but maintained by the curriculum. Jean Anyon, Michael Apple, Carter G. Woodson, William H. Watkins and others have asserted that curriculum has been specifically shaped to maintain the status quo of common places existent in urban centers (Anyon, 1981; Apple, 1981; Rothstein, 1993; Watkins, 1993; Woodson, 1933). Kliebard concurs that curriculum has been shaped historically by the different context and interpretations of the purpose of schooling. Again, these forces historically and contextual, change over time.

**Curriculum Policy and Urban Education**

In urban centers, the view of the curriculum has been historically bound by the context. Stanley Rothstein argues that historically, urban schools have not sought curricular or other methods by which urban students would be empowered. Within the context of urban schools, curricular decisions are inherently tied to urban politics. Curriculum is a public policy initiative. Policy makers determine in urban centers through formal procedures “what should be taught in schools” (Elmore & Sykes, 1992, 185), in essence, who gets what (Adler & Tellez, 1993). Louise Adler and Ky Tellez argue:

What students are taught and what they learn in urban schools are determined by a complex interplay between the forces that determine curriculum content in general and the political, economic and social forces that impact the urban setting (especially racial, class, and cultural issues) (Adler & Tellez, 1993, 91).
Hence, curricular decisions related to urban education have always been political (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Apple, 1990). Moreover, they have been unequally yoked to the receivers and their perceived possibilities as part of the general service structure of the city (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Judd & Kantor, 1992; Kliebard, 1987). Curriculum in urban schools has historically been linked to labor (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Kliebard, 1987; Rothstein, 1993; Tyack, 1973; Wrigley, 1982). Thus, curricular policy in urban centers is bound by the cultural capital and values of the policy makers rather than the constituents.

In order to have better schools, curricula need to be altered (Sirotnik, 1991). Curricular issues in urban schools must be strategic and guided by what constitutes a new vision of urban schooling (Hunkins, 1991). Moreover, Swartz contends that teachers in urban context should be trained to circumvent the hegemony existent in the master script consisting of classroom practices, pedagogy, textbooks, and other instructional matters are grounded in European ideologies (Swartz, 1992). Recently, reforms in curriculum have sought to alter the content of the curriculum in schools as well as the training of teachers (Swartz, 1993, 1992). In urban schools, however, there have been several attempts to change the curriculum.

A. Harry Passow professes we have attempted to alter the content of the curriculum for urban schools several times. These reforms have lead to compensatory, effective and presently quality curricular designs and implementations (Passow, 1991). Since the 1960s, however, reform in curriculum has addressed a multicultural curriculum. This policy initiative is directed at eradicating or altering the dominant theoretical position from curriculum in schools and in colleges of education. Passow contends curricular reform in urban education is not new. In fact, we have had compensatory curricular and effective curricular efforts in the past (Passow, 1991). However, multicultural curricula is addressed as a quality issue in urban schools. In "Contemporary Practices in Multicultural Approaches to Education Among the
Largest American School Districts" (1992), Zoliie Stevenson reports urban school districts across the country have begun to embrace curricular change aimed at improving the success of its students (Stevenson, 1992).

Stevenson's research indicates that urban and suburban districts are altering their curriculum base. Nonetheless, without teachers who are prepared to alter and challenge the curriculum, this curricular reform is not likely to be maintained in urban schools. School curriculum, however, is only one contested arena related to the curriculum. Colleges of education, however, have also initiated policy and reform initiatives to alter the content of their curriculum for teacher candidates.

Curriculum and Teacher Preparation

The implementation of curricula in schools, however, is related to teacher's theories of action or their tacit knowledge (McCutcheon, 1995). McCutcheon notes "practical theories of action are interrelated concepts, beliefs, and images teachers hold about their work" (McCutcheon, 1995, 34). The foundation, however, is their experiences. Thus, teachers' actions and decisions related to instruction and to the curriculum are guided by their practical theories. Consequently, theories of action, tacit and rational, are the processes by which teachers reach their intended outcomes in the classroom. In essence, teachers are mediators of the curriculum through this process (Grundy, 1987).

Adler and Tellez contend that teachers in urban schools should contextualize the curriculum explicit rather than implicitly. Moreover, teachers need to examine the curriculum for its inherent undergirding political nature. Consequently, teachers should view the curriculum as a social process requiring continual adjustments within the urban context rather than an unexamined and bound entity (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Huskins, 1991). They should be critically inquiring (Hunkins, 1991; Sirotnik, 1991). However, teachers often enter the urban
context of schooling unprepared to negotiate the curriculum.

Recent reforms in curriculum have attempted to adjust the knowledge base for teachers' theories of action and deliberation whereby they can serve as mediators in the urban classrooms. Narode, Rennie-Hill and Peterson argue for teach candidates to have more experience in the urban context (Narode, Rennie-Hill & Peterson, 1993). Actual urban experiences are advocated as part of the curriculum. Daniel Liston and Kenneth Zeichner argue that teacher education must reverberate around the social context of schooling. Hence, teacher education curriculum should prepare the teacher to be able to intellectually understand, comprehend and mediate the lived experiences of students who are different from themselves (Liston & Zeichner, 1990; Ward Randolph, 1996). Multicultural curriculum advocates attempt to alter the implicit as well as the explicit curriculum in teacher education colleges, and hence in schooling practices. However, the concept of altering the curriculum based on the context related to racial groups and classes is not new.

In 1933, Carter G. Woodson wrote The Miseducation of the Negro. Woodson argued that the present curriculum did not represent a pluralistic view of the world particularly as it related to Black Americans. Consequently, he argued "hold on to the real facts of history as they are, but complete such knowledge by studying also the history of races and nations which have been purposely ignored" (Woodson, 1990 [1933], 154). As a historian, Woodson applied his reform initiative to that specific discipline. Nonetheless, he advocated a reformed curriculum. At best, the present movement toward a coherent and culturally relevant curriculum originates in earlier movements such as the one heralded by Woodson and others (Apple, 1995; Banks, 1992; Cross, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Schubert, 1995; Watkins, 1993). James Banks supports this assertion and maintains that Woodson was only part of the movement to alter the curriculum. It began before him with the study of African Americans
by African American scholars such as DuBois, George Washington Williams, and others (Banks, 1992). Moreover, William H. Watkins in “Black Curriculum Orientations: A Preliminary Inquiry” (1993), provides a more extensive history of the evolution of Black curriculum orientation. Yet, Watkins links curriculum designed to educate Black Americans to their colonial experience as slaves. Consequently, curriculum orientations designed to supply the educational needs of African Americans have evolved based on the sociopolitical and historical context of the era (Watkins, 1993). Thus, in urban centers which are predominately African American, Hispanic, and Asian, a new curriculum which includes the lived experiences and voices of these groups needs to be included in teacher education curriculums. Cuban reminds us, however, actual change in schools is difficult (Cuban, 1992).

The majority of the literature addressed in this chapter regardless of whether it pertained to urban education, African American education history, the urban context, or even the curriculum did not specifically address the history, context or politics of education in the urban city in which Champion Avenue School exists. Consequently, it was imperative that this researcher address the literature pertaining specifically to Columbus, Ohio.

**African American Educational History in Columbus**

While several texts convey what has been the educational experience of Blacks in the North, the literature related to the Black education experience in Columbus, however, is scant (Ward, 1993). This research developed as a result of this author's scholarship on the Black education experience in Columbus in the nineteenth century (Ward, 1993). In *The African American Struggle for Education in Columbus, Ohio: 1803-1913* (1993), I concluded that several forces such as the influx of Blacks, the demise of the ward election system, and divided interests in the Black community over segregated schooling culminated in the building
of Champion Avenue School. After completing the thesis, this researcher was well versed in the history of the education of Blacks in Columbus and similar northern cities. Since 1993, only one thesis has been written that directly pertained to the Black education experience in Columbus. Although other studies have since been written, they have not dealt directly with education, but have provided the author with an understanding of the social, economic, and political spheres of influence in Columbus. Before addressing the thesis by Greg Jacobs which is problematic, I will first detail the literature used for this study.

David Gerber's *Black Ohio and the Color Line, 1860-1915* (1978), Bill Moss's *School Desegregation: Enough is Enough* (1992) and Richard Clyde Minor's *James Preston Poindexter: Elder Statesman of Columbus* (1947) were the major texts utilized for this research. Gerber provided an overview of Ohio and race relations. He included Columbus's history, political, social, economic and educational developments. Moss, on the other hand, concentrates on the advent of desegregation in Columbus. Minor chronicled the contributions of Reverend James Poindexter, and his political activism. These three books provided turn of the century and recent analyses of Black education in Ohio, and Columbus in particular. Previous works utilized provided a historical understanding of Columbus. However, these works are included in the thesis and are too numerous to cite. At present, theses and dissertations provided the bulk of the information on Black Columbus and its social, political, economic and educational endeavors for the current research.


Jacobs’s thesis elucidates what happened to Black education in Columbus from 1954-1994. However, Jacobs focuses on development policy with educational desegregation as a framework for his discussion. This is problematic. His analytical underpinnings stem from a top down model. Hence, Jacobs does not present a bottom up view of what desegregation actually meant in the Black community. While he does provide his own anecdotal knowledge about desegregation in Columbus, the majority of his informants were part of the local political elite. Furthermore, his sources appear inaccurate in his discussion of the desegregation process in the de facto segregated schools in Columbus. Furthermore, Jacobs’s use of development policy seems perplexing in relationship to education particularly because
he does not define his concepts. Nonetheless, Jacobs's thesis even though problematic in areas, does provide information about Columbus schools and the desegregation process.

The papers of the Vanguard League were used for this dissertation, specifically, their monograph entitled text *Which September?* (1944) and *Democracy In Education* (1941). Also, the *Annual Reports of the Columbus Public Schools*, and the Board of Education Minutes were used extensively. A *Curriculum Guide for Successful Teaching in a Desegregated Setting* (1984) by the Ohio Department of Education was the only monograph utilized. This guide evaluated the process of staff professional development in Columbus. The Ohio Civil Rights Commission also provided statistics on teacher distribution by race. Similar information was also provided by the Personnel Department of the Columbus Public Schools. *The Blackberry Patch* by Anna Bishop, a local historian, was also used. The private papers of Mrs. Juliet Saunders were also utilized. Lastly, Champion Archives were used.

Several papers and journals were used such as *The Ohio Sentinel, The Champion Chronicle, The Call and Post, The Columbus Dispatch, Citizens Journal, The Ohio State Journal* and *Crisis* were the primary newspapers used. Several articles, and unpublished papers related to the Black educational experience in Ohio, and Columbus in particular were used. Joseph Warras's "What Happened to Teachers during the Desegregation of Dayton City Schools (1968-1976)?" (1989) work was one such paper. Warras's research pertains to the effects of desegregation on Black teachers in Dayton. David Tyack, Vincent Franklin and David Gerber respectively portray the historical educational experience of Blacks in northern areas (Franklin, 1981, 1974; Gerber, 1979; Tyack, 1969). However, Himes in "Forty Years of Negro Life in Columbus, Ohio" (1942) chronicled Black life in Columbus since the turn of the century.
All of these, dissertation, articles and so forth provided the author with a thorough as possible comprehension of the social, political, economic, cultural and educational livelihood of Blacks in Columbus.

Conclusion

According to Eisner, the validity of educational research is based on its ability to improve present learning relationships in schools (Eisner, 1985). Thus, this researcher argues that the basis for research should be an extensive literature of cognate areas essential to the research questions. Therefore, the foundations of this research were related to the literature in several overlapping cognate areas such as urban education, urban politics, teacher education and reform, curriculum, African American teachers, and African American education history. These fields and subfields provided this researcher with depth and breadth from which to grasp an understanding of the educational setting in relationships to the qualitative characteristics of the study.

At the heart of this researcher's inquiry, was the issues of what has been the status of educational reform as it relates to issues of race, and in particular to the education history of African American children in urban areas. Moreover, my concern was related to how can this research improve upon what has been or is currently being practiced in such settings through teacher education programs? Consequently, six primary fields provided the ontological basis for this research. These were: urban education, urban curriculum, urban teacher education, African American teachers, African American educational history, and the politics of urban education. Furthermore, the researcher's approach to the literature was based on power relationships related to race, class, and gender. The theoretical underpinnings of the literature were consistent with conflict theory, but were phenomenological in nature. This researcher
utilized the literature as framework from which to operate theoretical and methodological foundations.

In all, scholars have researched teaching and teachers extensively. Yet, Black teachers have not been a major component in previous research agendas. However, recent research has sought to ascertain how schools of education recruit and maintain minority teachers, particularly Black teachers. Yet, very little of this research has given credence to the history of Black teachers, or their presence in northern urban de facto segregated schools. Consequently, more research is needed in this area. Teachers, however, must have a curriculum to teach. It is the content as well as the context of urban curriculum and education which was paramount to this research's foundation.

The majority of the research conducted on Columbus, however, does not detail a history of any particular school. Moreover, the information presented on the de facto segregated schools does not include first-hand life histories of teachers, students, principals, community participation or the curriculum of these schools. This work, unlike previous research, attempted to provide a qualitative view of the actual experiences of Champion Avenue School teachers, students, principals, and their community within the framework of the macro structure of Columbus, and Columbus Public Schools. In essence, more scholarship is needed on the Black educational experience of such de facto segregated school systems and its teachers.
CHAPTER 3

QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

History, anthropology, and other classical fields have typically utilized qualitative or ethnographic means from which to conduct research. However, it is a relatively new paradigm shift in the field of education (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991; Lather, 1990). Research in education in the past has been predicated on the legacy of the Progressive Era (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1994; Kliebard, 1986). Consequently, the scientific model or positivism has hailed as the dominate force in educational research since the turn of the century. Nonetheless, qualitative research methodology, and in particular case study, has become a valid research method in education (Patton, 1990, Schon, 1991). This chapter is designed to explicate the many layers of ascriptive parameters of qualitative methodology undertaken in this study.

This chapter details the depth and breadth of qualitative research methods undertaken in this research. Qualitative methods permitted the researcher “to study selected issues in depth and detail” (Patton, 1990, 13). Moreover, a qualitative research design developed upon a historical urban single-case case study allowed even further sagacity in the explication of the school studied and its context. Thus, this research predicated the design and implementation of this research upon qualitative methodology. An explanation of the many facets of qualitative methodology begins this chapter.
Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative research ideology and methodologies are one of many paradigmatic alternatives to positivist or quantitative research as indicated by the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predict</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Emancipate</th>
<th>Deconstruct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Poststructural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>Neo-Marxist</td>
<td>Postmodern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist</td>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
<td>Praxis-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
<td>Educatice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freirian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The Continuum of Research Ontology (Lincoln & Guba, 1988)

As noted by the continuum, it is obvious that "qualitative inquiry is an umbrella term for various philosophical orientations to interpretative research" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, 9). Eisner asserts that all research is interpretative, even quantitative research (Eisner, 1991, 5).

Ultimately, a researcher's choice of methodology is fundamentally founded on what question(s) they are attempting to answer with their research. At best, a researcher should choose a methodology that will best answer their research question(s). Furthermore, researchers' questions guide their research, and focus on gathering data through the right method in order to confirm their hypotheses. Thus, my choice of methodology reflected my research questions and was "embedded in our cultural and historical context" (Glesne & Peshkin, 8).

While different categories exist, qualitative research consists of a multitude of approaches, methodologies, and theories. In reality, there is no one best way. There are only
choices based on the philosophical underpinnings of the research or nature of reality (ontology), the nature of knowledge (epistemology), and how researcher obtain data (methodology). Qualitative or even quantitative research are both designed, and based on the intent of the research, the questions the research attempts to answer, and the theoretical perspective of the researcher. Nevertheless, qualitative research typically allows researchers a pluralistic framework from which to draw from to answer the question or questions that they are concerning with in their research. Therefore, qualitative researchers usually utilize a plethora of methods to ascertain data or knowledge in their research such as observation, participant observation, interviews, and case studies. Still, qualitative research has a unique nature.

The Nature of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is founded on the rhetorical mechanisms of describing, interpreting, and appraising the world (Eisner, 1991, 2). It is holistic, empirical, and interpretative (Stake, 1995, 47). Consequently, qualitative research is a socially constructed explication of the phenomena that we have either observed, analyzed, or heard through interviews, participant observation, observation, case studies, and/or document analysis (Eisner, 1991). While it can be holistic, no research methodology captures all the phenomena completely. Eisner notes that in order to understand the nature of qualitative research a researcher must understand that experience depends upon qualities and that all empirical inquiry is, at base, rooted in them. The consequence of this observation is not only that knowledge of the empirical world is qualitative, but also that we confront the formidable task of trying to represent what we have come to know through some medium. The most common medium we use is language (Eisner, 1991, 27).

Moreover, the authors “understanding of language is thus essential for any understanding of the reality of everyday life” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, 57). In essence, language rooted in
the everyday is essential in order to explicate understanding to the writer as well as to the reader. What language represents depends on two factors: form and conceptual framework. For example, the form can be exemplified through a graph, a picture, a story. On the other hand, the conceptual framework
directs our attention in particular ways and, therefore, what we experience is shaped by that framework. Thus, the questions we ask, the categories we employ, the theories we use guide our inquiry, indeed what we come to know about the world is influenced by the tools we have available (Eisner, 1991, 28).

Hence, language "shapes, focuses, and directs our attention, it transforms our experiences in the process of making it public" (Eisner, 1991, 28). Moreover, it is a product of our conceptual framework. The criteria we utilize, however, determine the quality of qualitative research. It is important to note that an essential element of qualitative research is the researcher.

Because the researcher is the primary instrument from which "thick description" or "interpretation" will be derived from, an acknowledged fundamental aspect of qualitative research is its subjective nature (Glesne & Peshkin; Eisner, 1991). Yet, Eisner contends that personal "unique ways of experiencing make possible new forms of knowledge that keep culture viable" (Eisner, 1991, 48). This researcher interpreted this culture through the utilization of a narrative language style. Qualitative researchers seek to understand and represent their interpretation through language (VanMaanen, 1988; Geertz, 1973). It is because of the subjectivity of qualitative research, as opposed to quantitative research objectivity, that validity is often an issue (Bernstein, 1983). Clearly, there is "no one way of seeing, hearing, or representing the world of others that is absolutely, universally valid or correct" (VanMaanen, 35). Yet, the very nature of qualitative research rest on "the centrality of interpretation" (Stake, 1995, 42). Thus, interpretation is the basis for the assertions or inferences made by qualitative research. These interpretations are based on the subjective
nature of qualitative research. Stake answers this potential problem associated with qualitative research by asserting that

the intent of qualitative researchers to promote a subjective research paradigm is a given. Subjectivity is not seen as a failing needing to be eliminated but as an essential element of understanding (Stake, 1995, 45.)

However, qualitative researchers typically present a multiplicity of voices as well as their own as part of the data (Stake, 1995; Guba & Lincoln, 1986; Denzin, 1991) while recognizing that these voices are a result of their constructed context (Stake, 1995, 42). Consequently, the very nature of qualitative research is complex because of its inherent subjective interpretive nature. A complex qualitative method is the case study.

Case Study

Case study has been defined as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (Stake, 1995, xi). The major strength of a case study lies in its almost holistic rendering of the cultural systems of action whereby the reader learns of the “interrelated activities and routines engaged in by one or more networks of actors within a social context that is bounded in time and space” (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 152). Moreover, case study allows the researcher to utilize a variety of methods as well as analysis from which to conduct and complete educational research (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994; Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991). Yet, a researcher must decide which case or cases to study. The decision should be predicated upon the research question(s).

Case study can either be qualitative or quantitative, and consist of single or multiple cases. Their strength, however, lies in their ability to explicate a greater understanding of the complexities of the context of the human condition. While case study has been criticized mainly because they are said to lack scientific rigor, and lack generalizability, case study
advocates maintain that the single-case case study can provide significant understanding into a particular case with and in itself. Generalization is not the goal.

**Characteristics of Case Study**

Robert Stake deems that the major characteristics of qualitative cases studies are that they are holistic, empirical, interpretive, and emphatic (Stake, 1995, 48). Snow and Anderson would agree with these characteristics. Snow and Anderson, however, distinguish similar characteristics of case studies.

Snow and Anderson (1991) identify several characteristic features of the case study. They are holistic analyses of bounded systems of action; multi-perspectival analyses that allows the presentation of many "voices"; triangulated research or multiple method, data, and theory usage; the capturing of social processes over time; open ended research and serendipitous findings (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 152-163). Case studies are emergent in design. Snow and Anderson affirm that "the quintessential characteristic of case studies is that they stress holistic understanding of cultural systems of action" (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 152). Yet, *cultural systems of action* refers to "sets of interrelated activities and routines engaged in by one or more networks of actors within a social context that is bounded in time and space" (Snow & Anderson, 152). Moreover, Snow and Anderson argue while the holistic approach is essential in case studies, it is impossible to ascertain and understand everything about a system. Therefore, case studies in reality tend to be "selective, focusing on one or two issues or processes that are fundamental to understanding the system being studied" (Snow & Anderson, 153).

Barr and Caplow utilize triangulation of three sources of data in urban case studies. Because this was an urban case study, this researcher utilized three primary characteristics of a case study: 1) field ethnography including interviews and participant observation, 2) urban
survey, and 3) archival and document analysis. These were the primary characteristics of this urban case study (Barr & Caplow, 1991). Urban case studies force the researcher to "confront rather than to retreat from complexity, it fosters multidisciplinary work . . . it necessarily attends to history . . . and to connections between local events and wider events" (Barr & Caplow, 90). Consequently, the case study design permitted this researcher to capture as much of the complexity of the schools micro and macro structures over time.

**Research Design**

Egon Guba defines "naturalistic inquiry as a discovery oriented approach that minimizes investigator manipulation of the study setting and places no prior constraints on what the outcomes of the research will be" (Patton, 41). This research was predicated upon such an emergent design. Corrine Glesne and Alan Peshkin contend that "qualitative researchers deal with multiple, socially constructed realities or "qualities" that are complex and indivisible into discrete variables" Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, 6). Thus, many interdependent qualities and the dimensions of power inherent in socially constructed relationships were addressed as well.

The design of this research was predicated upon the purpose of the research which was twofold: First, the goal was to obtain knowledge that allowed the researcher to understand the nature of learning relationships in a historical urban school and the nature of power relationships in the socially constructed relationships in school settings, and its historical context. Moreover, it was to ascertain the significance of history in the maintenance of a "good" urban school. Second, the goal was to ascertain a clearer comprehension of the methodology. In other words, the goal was to perfect and study the methodological choices possible within a qualitative single-case case study design.
As noted earlier, this researcher, like Eisner, contends "all empirical phenomena are qualitative." The difference between "qualitative inquiry" and "quantitative research" pertains mainly to the forms of representation that are emphasized in presenting a body of work. The difference is not that one addresses qualities and the other does not" (Eisner, 1991, 5). This researcher chose qualitative methodology and particularly a combination of phenomenology and critical theory because the methodology allowed this researcher to identify the knowledge that is part of the social construction of relations. The "socio-historical" context provided this researcher with an information rich case, and domains for understanding the observed experiences of the participants. Moreover, quantitative(positivist) research contends "society is a neutral datum" (Comstock, 371), that can be understood through "naturalizing social phenomena, addressing them as external to our understandings, and denying their socio-historical constructedness" (Comstock, 371). Unlike quantitative researchers who assert objectivity, this scholar sought to understand the subjective nature of the case explicated in this study--the socio-historical context. A qualitative case study, therefore, represents the major design of this study. The purpose of this design and all of the many facets was the descriptive beholding of the school, the teachers, the context, and last, but not least, the classroom. The research design was therefore framed as a result of the research problem.

The Research Problem

Why study an urban school? Of course, the easy answer would be why not. Nonetheless, the urban school has historically manifested inequities in terms of race, class and gender through its school curriculum (Rothstein, 1993; Kliebard, 1986; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1994). The urban school has been historically beset by the issues of poverty, violence, school failure, and so on, and so forth. Therefore, it represents a rich area of study in order to ascertain the causes as well as solutions to the historic problems that beset urban schools.
Within the past decade because of the increasing global complexities of the society we live in, educational reform or restructuring has been an issue. Nonetheless, "very little restructuring is actually taking place" (Greenman, 1994, 3) in urban schools, colleges of education, and in political arenas. Some scholars' research indicates that the problem with urban schools has been the lack of financial resources due to the decline in urban economies related to the politics of urban development (Orr, 1995; Jackson & Cibulka, 1992; Timar, 1992; Brown & Saks, 1985). Other researchers contend that the problem is the violence, the development and persistence of an underclass in urban centers due to disinvestment, underemployment, and unemployment, and fragile family structures (Wilson, 1993, 1992; Rothstein, 1992; Callison & Richards-Colocino, 1993). Still, other researchers point to the curriculum in urban schools as the problem (Adler & Tellez, 1993; Apple, 1995). Lastly, scholars point to the mismatch between urban student demographics and the urban teacher population that has not been adequately prepared to teach in urban schools (Garibaldi, 1992; Gomez, 1993; Dilworth, 1993; Larke, 1990).

While there have been some changes for the positive (Wang & Gordon, 1994), research is still needed in order to provide a better understanding of the urban context and urban schools in order to ensure a better quality of education for urban youth. Fundamentally, this research problem is a complex one because it is concerned with improving the teacher education curriculum in colleges of education in order to better prepare teachers for the urban school. All of the above factors are interdependent related to the development of such a curriculum. Some research questions might be; what are the pedagogical and curriculum needs of urban teachers? How much should pre-service teachers understand the dependent, independent, and interdependent qualities affecting urban schools? How should the urban context inform curriculum design in colleges of education? What can be learned from this
urban case study to inform practice? How does the ascriptive qualities of race (teacher and student), class (teacher and student), and gender (teacher and student) manifest themselves in urban classrooms, and urban curriculum? Yet, in order to ascertain an even better understanding for what is needed in urban school teacher preparation, it is important to study an urban school within all of its complexities. This inquiry was aimed at fostering knowledge that will better serve the cultural context of urban schools rather than just represent another “transitory educational quick fix” (Greenman, 1994, 4). Surely, urban schools deserve better. The goal was not to just develop short-term reform initiatives, but to add to the literature on teacher education curriculum and foster long range permanent change in urban teacher education curricula.

Sampling Decision

The most unique aspect of case study “is the selection of cases to study” (Stake, 1994, 243). Case study value lies in their ability to “understand some special people, particular problem, or unique situation in great depth and wherein one can identify cases rich in information” (Patton, 54). Stake argues that good case studies provide “valid portrayals, are better for personal understanding, and provide solid grounds for considering action” (Stake, 1994, 243). The sampling decision, therefore, is central to not only the design of the case study, but also to the significance of the study.

After deciding the research question, the second thing that a researcher does is decide on sample size (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, 161). The sampling decision was based on the research questions. Therefore, a single-case case study was chosen as the research methodology. For this researcher, the single-case case study exemplified purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990), and particularization (Stake, 1995), but not generalizability (Yin, 1994; Stake, 1994, 243).
According to Michael Patton, the intent of purposeful sampling is "to select information rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions under study" and to chose cases that allow for "in-depth study" (Patton, 169). Moreover, qualitative researchers typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples, even single cases (n=1), selected purposefully. Quantitative methods typically depend on larger samples, selected randomly. Not only are the techniques for sampling different, but the very logic of each approach is unique because the purpose of each strategy is different (Patton, 169).

Purposeful sampling value or power "lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth" (Patton, 169). Therefore, the sampling decision to choose a single-case case study where (n=1) is relevant to qualitative research because the purpose of most qualitative research is to "inform action, enhance decision making, and apply knowledge to solve human and societal problems" (Patton, 12). This researcher's goal was to render an understanding the case rather than generalization (Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). This researcher chose this particular school because it was information rich, accessible, and had not to her knowledge been studied before as a historical school in the city. Additionally, earlier research on the school system had indicated the uniqueness of this school would yield insight into the development and maintenance of historically de facto segregated Black northern schools. An area of research rarely explored.

Information rich cases are at the center of purposeful sampling regardless of the method used to determine the sample(s). This school was information rich. Ultimately, the sample or samples chosen should be worthy of in-depth study and provide the researcher an opportunity to learn a great deal about the particular case(s) (Patton 181). After the choice(s) has been made, the reasons for "site selections or individual case sampling need to be carefully articulated and made explicit" (Patton, 181). Within the explanation, limits of the site should also be explained in detail. Regardless of how researchers decide to choose their case(s),
Patton contends that there is no design that is perfect. At best, the researcher's "sampling strategy must be selected to fit the purpose of the study, the resources available, the questions being asked, and the constraints being faced" (Patton, 181-183). Because there are ambiguities in qualitative research, the sampling decision is based on the purpose of their research.

Sample size, however, "depends on what you want to find out, why you want to find it out, how the finding will be used, and what resources (including time) you have for the study" (Patton, 184). Moreover,

*the validity, meaningfulness, and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with sample size* (Patton, 185).

Single case studies are frequently used in qualitative research. Hence, single case studies are typically utilized in qualitative research whereas in quantitative research they would not be applicable since the major goal is usually generalization.

Yin contends that case study selection or the sampling decision is the most difficult decision that the researcher makes (Yin, 1993, 8). In fact, Yin views the whole process of case study design, selection, and so forth and so on as a challenge. Nonetheless, he contends that theory should provide the basis for case selection (Yin, 1993, 8). Yin's criteria for sampling is replication logic whereby each case "prior to final case selection" can demonstrate "the occurrence of exemplary outcomes" (Yin, 1993, 11). Therefore, Yin's basis for sample selection as well as size is based on the theory that drives the research. Robert Stake, however, has another approach.

Stake asserts that "understanding the critical phenomena may depend on choosing the case well" (Stake, 1994, 243). He contends that researchers should choose the case from which they can learn the most from (Stake, 1994, 243). He writes that,
... phenomena are given; the cases are opportunities to study the phenomena. ... The researcher examines various interests in the phenomenon, selecting a case of some typicality, but leaning toward those cases that seem to offer opportunity to learn. My choice would be to take that case from which we feel we can learn the most. That may mean taking the one that we can spend the most time with. Potential for learning is a different and sometimes superior criterion to representativeness. Often it is better to learn a lot from an atypical case than a little from a magnificently typical case (Stake, 1994, 243).

Stake differs from Yin, and others whose focus on case selection is concerned with upholding scientific generalizability or representativeness. In his recent text The Art of Case Study Research (1995), Stake maintains "we do not study a case primarily to understand other cases. Our first obligation is to understand the one case" (Stake, 1995, 4). Stake's criteria for case selection are related to maximizing the opportunity to learn from the case itself, time and access to the field, hospitality in the setting, and the uniqueness of alternative contexts.

Overall, Stake argues that,

The real business of case study is particularization, not generalization. We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does. There is emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself (Stake, 1995, 8).

Consequently, the sampling decision is related to the particularization of the case from which we wish to learn. Stake's conceptualization of particularization provides the criterion for sampling decisions. Case selection or sampling decisions, therefore, center around maximizing what we can learn, given the purpose of the research, the sampling decision is based on choosing a case that will provide us into further understanding to the point of being able to modify generalizations, select cases based on the ability to access the case, and lastly, "consider the uniqueness and context of the alternative selections, for these may aid or restrict our learning" (Stake, 1995, 4).

When a researcher chooses a single-case case study as their sampling decision, the researcher is interested in "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case,
coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995, xi). Yet, there are problems associated with the sampling decision. "A principal weakness of the case study method is the possibility that the case selected is, after all, less typical than the researcher assumes" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, 91). The chosen case, however, must be judged suitable for the work in question but suitable is a far cry from ideal. The question of how well the chosen case represent the designated family of cases is usually answered by assertion rather than evidence. Some researchers claim the question cannot be answered at all (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 92).

Nevertheless, the significance of the case maybe "valuable in and of itself as a study of urban social change" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 94).

Case sampling or selection is determined by the research's interest. Nonetheless, the case represents a bounded system "whereby a single actor, a single classroom, a single institution, or a single enterprise--usually under natural conditions--so as to understand it in its own habitat" (Stake, 1988, 206). Consequently, the "case study is valid to the reader when it gives an accurate and useful representation of the bounded system" (Stake, 1988, 263). Case selection was based on the kind of research, the goal of the research, the interest of the research, the questions of the research and the researcher's theoretical position. Moreover, the sampling size was based on the research questions, undergirding theory, and perceived outcomes. In all, this inquiry was predicated upon the interest of the research, the questions of the research, and the researcher's theoretical position. Consequently, the sample decision was based on the researcher's understanding of urban education from a conflict theory perspective. Therefore, the researcher recognized the need for a new model from which to address research in urban education to address both child and adult gains. This case study seeks to provide a better education for urban youth and future urban teachers through the explication of an urban single-case case historical study.
A Case for the Single-Case Case Study

As indicated earlier, case study is defined as "an in-depth, multifaceted investigation, using qualitative research methods, of a single social phenomenon" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, 2). Ethnography, life histories or biographies, and social histories are typically deemed as qualitative case studies. The advantages associated with case studies are their ability to study people in their real world or natural settings; their ability to provide holistic understandings of complex social networks, complexes of social action and social meanings; their ability to study dimensions of time and history in order to examine concepts of continuity and change; and their ability to generate theory construction (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). The disadvantages or criticism of case study will be addressed shortly. Nonetheless, what have others said about the benefits of the single-case case study?

According to Stake, case study is "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995, xi). Moreover, Stake contends that "the name case study is emphasized by some . . . because it draws attention to the questions of what specifically can be termed the single case" (Stake, 1994, 236). Therefore, case study is a detailed examination of a single site, subject, collection of documents, or event. It is concerned with the specific. (Stake, 1994, 236). Within that specificity, ""The case is a functioning specific. . . it is a bounded system. . . it is an integrated system" (Stake, 1994, 236). Because the case is a bounded system, its behavior is patterned. Moreover,

features are within the system, within the boundaries of the case, and other features outside. Some are significant as context . . . But the boundedness and behavior patterns of the system are key factors in understanding the case (Stake, 1994, 236-37). Important circumstances or qualities chosen within the case are, of course, determined by the researchers' questions as well as conceptual framework. Consequently, a single case case
study of a school system or school consists of an in-depth examination of the multiplicity of qualities existent within the boundaries of the school such as teachers actions, and those that exist outside of the school such as school board policies that effect its maintenance as well as effectiveness. In total, case studies provide researchers with the opportunity to understand the complexity of the interactions of these variables that contribute to the uniqueness of the case. Therefore, case studies attempt to explicate the relationships between specified qualities (Bernstein, 19, 9). Moreover, the conceptual framework of the researcher explains the main dimensions to be studied and their presumed relationship to each other.

Case studies are useful when a researcher seeks to “understand some special people, particular problem, or unique situation in great depth, and when one can identify cases rich in information” (Patton, 54). Stake asserts that good case studies can “provide some valid portrayals, better bases for personal understanding of what is going on, and solid grounds for considering action” (Patton, 54). Some case studies, however, are naturalistic while others are not. Stake contends that “as a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used” (Stake, 1994, 236).

The Setting: The Urban School

Since the publication of Woock's Education and the Urban Crisis (1970), Hummel and Nagles's Urban Education in America (1973), Ravitch and Goodenow's Educating an Urban People: The New York City Experience (1981), and Borman and Spring's Schools in Central Cities (1984), it is apparent that there are enduring issues related to urban education, and hence, urban schools (Stewart, 1988, 469). These issues have ranged from community aspects of urban education, children in urban schools, teachers in and teacher education for urban schools, school desegregation in urban schools, urban school curriculum, urban school renewal, effective urban schools, leadership in urban schools, and the politics of urban education.
These issues are enduring issues that have not changed since the historical development of urban school systems and are complicated by the intermingled issues of race, class and gender (Rothstein, 1993; Spring, 1994; Figueroa, 1991; Healey, 1995; Apple, 1995). Some of the dilemmas in urban schools are the result of changes in urban centers while others are the result of minority groups’ assertions for equitable and quality education (Judd and Swanstrom, 1994; Browning, Marshall & Tabb, 1994; Judd & Kantor, 1992; DeMarcell Smith & Wells Chunn, 1993).

According to recent reform initiatives in education (Holmes Group, 1991, 1990, 1986; Carnegie, 1986, Ravitch, 1983; National Commission for Excellence in Education, 1983; Bcaz, 1991), the conditions of urban schools have worsened. Nonetheless, the research that is contemporarily conducted on urban schools is primarily concerned with the issues that occur inside the school, or those that occur outside of the school. Gerald Suttles contends that there must be research on schools that focus not just on the inside walls of the school, but the outside of the school as well (Suttles, 1986). At the recent Midwest Political Science Association meeting in April, Dr. Fred Wirt from the University of Illinois-Chicago concluded that the research in urban education needs to consider both sides of the equation. Rather than focusing on either child games or adult games, urban education research should focus on both (Wirt, 1995). Consequently, the focus of this research is on the urban school, but it is also on the external factors that directly and indirectly alter the educational process in urban schools.

This researcher contends the research design of a single-case case study permitted the beholding of the complexities often associated with urban research, particularly urban research on education because "new principles and new methods are required which are more responsive to the practical decision-making process of educational lives" (VanMaanen, 1982, 44-45). Hence, a single-case case study permitted this researcher to "treat the micro social
order of human interaction (broadly speaking), the shifting nature of historical processes, and
the salient features of complex organizational structures" (Sjoberg, G., Williams, Vaughan,
Sjoberg, F., 1991, 52). Ultimately, this study sought to understand the socio-historical political
process and the development and current status of an urban school given the new reform
agendas in educational curriculum (Reid, 1992; Eisner, 1991; Apple, 1990: Cross, 1995;
Schubert, 1995; Banks & Banks, 1993), and teacher education (Holmes Group, 1995, 1990;

School Characteristics

The school is an urban school located in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area
(SMSA) of the city. It is located in the North/Midwestern urban city of Columbus, Ohio.
This situates the school as an urban school. After the turn of the century, the school was built
within the central proximity of the African American community. At the time the school was
opened, it was staffed with a completely African American teaching staff. The student
population was predominately, over ninety percent, African American. Since its inception, the
school has undergone several changes due to educational policies and practices such as
desegregation. Nonetheless, the school’s populace has remained predominately Black even
though the teaching staff is now predominately European American. In the past, the school
received students from the surrounding areas. Today, however, the school receives students
from all across the city. In terms of structure, the school has changed from and K-8 school to
its present day Alternative Middle School. In the past, the surrounding community supported
the school as part of the community. At the present time, the school receives little support
from the surrounding low socio-economic community. Additionally, the school is presently
classified as an Urban Professional Development School. The school presently serves around
300 students with 24 full-time teachers, 4 special education cohorts, and a cadre of support
staff. The present principal, Mr. Hayes, is a graduate of the school and has been the principal of the school for less than a year.

This school constituted a "normal" urban school in today's context. However, it has been anything but normal in its history and the configuration of the qualities addressed in this study such as race, class and gender. Several foreshadowing questions helped this researcher select and identify this school as an information rich case such as:

1) What kind of neighborhood is the school in?
2) Have the demographics (student, teacher, and community) changed over time?
3) What is the racial, gender and class composition of the school?
4) Are the majority of students bused or do they live in the neighborhood in which the school exists?
5) Is the school's history unique and information rich?
6) Is the city impacted by urban change factors associated with the old-industrial centers effecting this school?
7) Did the school encounter desegregation?
8) Is this school affected by reform initiatives?

Other questions were addressed as well concerning the curriculum, the teachers' education, and the school leadership. These questions and others provided a guide in initiating the data collection process.

Ascriptive Qualities

A single-case case study "holistic orientation manifests itself in a persistent commitment to the contextualization of social actions, events, and processes" (Snow & Anderson, 153). Therefore, the elements chosen for analysis in this study were factors related to context, social actions, and events of the school, and external factors that effect the school.

The urban school, however, is the focus of the single-case urban case study. Hence,

Qualitative procedures which are the type most often used in case study research seek to understand social action at a greater richness and depth and hence seek to record such action through a more complex, nuanced, and subtle set of interpretive categories (Orum, Feagin & Sjoberg, 17).

The categories chosen were leadership, teachers, and curriculum (implicit, explicit, and null)
explicated in the context. These qualities were addressed across time as they fostered change and continuity. Yet, change was an emergent ingredient manifested throughout the school's history.

The school's history was a significant part of the analysis employed. Historical analysis of the school, the leaders, the teachers, the students and the neighborhood identified emergent issues of change and continuity. Case studies privilege researchers to ascertain characteristics, interconnections, and relationships between major institutions in a city. The major institution in this study is the school. Several organizations, however, effect the urban school. They were: the Board of Education, Teacher Unions, Community Groups, Parent Teacher Associations, and so on and so forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Neighborhood Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Organizations</td>
<td>School board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Interactions Between Groups and School**

One of the recurrent themes in the education literature has been how business groups, community groups and urban regimes impact school policy (Orr, 1995, 1993; Borman & Spring, 1984; Schneider & Hood, 1994; Pink & Borman, 1986) This school has been adopted by two organizations: a business, and the Secretary of State. Historically, the impact of colleges of education have been felt by urban school systems (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Rothstein, 1993; Spring, 1994; Kliebard, 19886; Ravitch, 1983). This school is an urban 85
Professional Development School (PDS). Moreover, PTAs, student groups, and community or neighborhood groups affect the culture of the school as well as the status of the school (Dawson, 1984; Pink & Borman, 1986; Spring, 1994; Summerfield, 1971). This school's community participation has decreased significantly. Lastly, teacher unions, superintendents, politicians and school boards directly impact of teacher hiring practices, educational policy, and the curriculum (Cibulka, Reed & Wong, 1992; Rothstein, 1993; Borman & Greenman, 1994; Summerfield). The Columbus Public Schools were undergoing policy changes when I entered the school. These changed directly altered the substance of this school. For instance, the busing that ensued because of desegregation in the Penick decision was unsuccessful in acquiring quality education for Black youth who make up over 50% of the student population in Columbus Public Schools. Thus, the school system was returning to neighborhood schools. Change continued to be a factor in the life and history of this school. Either it created alterations in the school itself or the supportive context outside of the school. Therefore, these factors were chosen because that impacted upon the maintenance of the school over time. Moreover, these qualities could be observed or documented through artifacts and either indirectly or directly effected this particular urban school.

This author contends only a multidisciplinary approach combined with a multivariant methodology and theory could provide the researcher with insight into the culture, context, economics, history, and policies of the school. Therefore, historical analysis, urban, race, class and gender theory, and urban politics were conceptual fields from which the author would draw from in order to design, collect and analyze the research. It is important to note that these characteristics in and of themselves are independent. Yet, they form interesting interconnections between and across boundaries that effect urban schools (Hill & Jones, 1995).
Therefore, these factors were dependent, independent, and interdependent within the external and internal context of the urban school (Anhalt, Digaetano, Ragas, Henig, 1995).

Major components in the school that became part of the data set were: leadership, school culture, teachers, students, parents, community, historical documents, parent teacher association, curriculum (implicit, explicit and null), decision making in the school, pedagogy, school personnel and volunteer staff, neighborhood demographics, classroom practices, playground activities, lunch room activities, and lastly, any relationships the school has with public, private and governmental organizations. The researcher maintained open to all factors even though the inquiry originally addressed specific elements in the setting. Moreover, the interlocking elements effected each other in the status, maintenance, and culture of the school historically, socially, culturally, politically, and economically.

Data Collection

In qualitative research, data can be gathered from a plethora of resources. The actual data sources chosen were dependent on the research questions and design of the research. The research problem in this study centered around several qualities. They were urban school history, reform and change, Black teachers, teacher education and curriculum issues. Thus, the data sources were multiple which assured triangulation and varied consisting of oral interviews in addition to participant observation and archival research.

Data collection proceeded on many simultaneous, yet different levels. Because this was a historical study, the researcher acquired documentary data from archives, newspaper articles, school records, school yearbooks and personal papers of participants, previous teachers and community members. This caveat of the research has been ongoing for several years and resulted in a clear understanding of the context of the greater school system and the city.
These data resources were rich and provided the framework for conceptualizing the chapters of the dissertation. However, the researcher remained open to emergent themes that were disclosed in the two other data collection strategies.

Interviews of previous and present teachers as well as community members represented the second level of tertiary data collection established to maintain triangulation of research findings. Interviews were viewed as social events in which the interviewer was a participant observer (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, 126). Interviews were one of the principle methods in which this researcher was a participant in the research. The interviews were semi-structured in that some questions were *a priori* and based on the researcher's understanding of the historical context and theoretical underpinnings of the research while others were emergent and based on observations of the setting and the teachers' actual teaching practices. Semi-structured or what Denzin identifies as nonstandardized interviews were conducted of all participants throughout the lifetime of the research as clarity and validity measures (Denzin, 1989).

The last rubric in data collection was the observation of present teachers' teaching practices and implicit curriculum of the classroom. Kliebard notes knowledge "embedded in the curriculum of schools is a significant social and cultural artifact" (Kliebard, 1995, 157). The intermingling of the qualities of race, class and gender color the transmission of the curriculum in schools, particularly the implicit curriculum. Subsequently, the transformation of the knowledge base often known as curriculum is through the implicit curriculum as "subtly articulated preferences" other wise known as the implicit curriculum even though curriculum is a force proscribed by social and political forces interact with both openly articulated forces (p 157). Observations and interviews supplied this researcher with an understanding of the implicit curriculum of the classroom that was mediated by the issues of race, class, and gender.
(Noddings, 1995). Because researchers maintain culture impacts upon the deliverance of the curriculum (Irvine, 1989; Cuban, 1995), observation provided the means from which to assess the degree of cultural influence on the transmission of knowledge (curriculum). The exchange or the relationship between culture, and the explicit and implicit curriculum emerged as one of the researcher's theoretical hypothesis. The researcher participated in the study through interviews, in-service and classroom presentations, attendance at school events, and attendance and participation in staff meetings and participation in social activities in the teacher's lounge. Data collection was triangulated and based on a theoretical understanding of the social, political, social, and cultural greater contest of the city.

Field Methodology

This researcher maintained several field logs during data collection. They corresponded to different aspects of this research: interviews, observations and document analysis. Thus, three different interview logs for former teachers of the school and other schools, present teachers of the school, and community members and politicians were created. These logs provided the researcher with the "thick description" often associated with qualitative study. Classroom observations were kept separately (Ball, 1986). The researcher participated in the setting 20 to 30 hours a week gathering data at the school. At the same time, archives and documents were reviewed for substantive data. Lastly, the researcher interviewed past teachers, administrators and students of the school. Follow-up interviews for clarity were initiated when needed.

Before Entree in the Field

Before a researcher can enter the field, however, researcher must situate themselves methodologically as well as theoretically. Self as researcher as a concept includes not just the theoretical and methodological perspective of the researcher, but issues of trustworthiness,
ethics, gaining entree, and so on, and so forth. Overall, in order to assure “good” case study, researchers must know their methodology, their theoretical position, and how they provide conceptualization for the research design in a single-case case study.

This researcher gained entree into the field through the utilization of community and professional resources. This researcher sought out the principal in gaining entree into the school. The principal provided the researcher with entree through directing her to the proper professional channels of entree. Moreover, the principal indicated his support of the research, but required the necessary completion of entry paperwork. Thus, this researcher utilized the principal in entree and maintaining entree in the school.

This researcher requested a planning meeting with the principal in order to acquire more information about the present workings of the school. The researcher sought the nomination of participants in the research through the principal. After two weeks in the setting, the researcher was introduced at a staff meeting where teacher-participants were garnered. Prior to entree in the school, the researcher had previously interacted with one teacher through community channels which was also part of the sampling decision. Former work with this teacher in the community provided a relationship of trust and support founded on mutual interest in the development of African American children. Overall, this researcher relied upon the principal and teacher to gain entree.

As an African American woman, I entered the field understanding what this means to the respondents. Past experiences have indicated to me that the cooperation I received was because I was of such racial, gender and class background. Therefore, I suspected that the interviews with African American participants were very data rich as well as honest in their understanding of their teaching experiences and the context. On the other hand, I was unsure of what the response would be from European American teachers who did not share my
perceptions of race, class or gender. Michael Apple has often referred to the questions of race as the most complex because teachers are unwilling to view teaching as a political act bounded by the parameters of race, class, and gender (Apple, 1986). Consequently, this researcher entered the field with an awareness of my view of the interview as well as the observation may be different from the participants who were different racial, class, and gender backgrounds. Thus, this researcher encountered tensions caused by the differences in the researcher's experiences versus those of the participants across race, class and gender lines.

**Gaining Entree**

Gaining entree is a socially constructed parameter of field methodology. Again, gaining entree was accomplished through several parameters. First, it was important to locate past teachers of the school system, and past teachers of the research site. A majority of the former teachers were deceased which resulted in a small pool of resources for reconstructing the atmosphere and culture of the school. Moreover, some former teachers were also physically and mentally incapacitated. Lastly, the resultant pool consisted of retired teachers who had taught in the school and were still active, teachers from other schools primarily the elementary schools, and those who were still teaching in the school. This represented one level of entree that was mediated through personal contacts from community and church relations.

Gaining formal entree to the school itself was conducted through the bureaucracy of the school system. The researcher was required to submit a proposal that detailed the research questions, time of study, requirements of the school and administrators and so on and so forth. See Appendix A. This method of entree was the most difficult because it was not based on personal contact with any of the professionals who decided whether the research proposal was applicable.
Gaining entree at the school occurred on two levels: the administration and the teachers. Before writing the research proposal, the researcher visited the school twice. On one occasion the researcher met with the principal and he indicated his support of the research. Moreover, that session resulted in early data collection about the history of the school and the administrator as well as to other sources of data collection in terms of interviews and primary documents. After receiving written permission to seek participants in the study, the principal and the researcher held a planning session which entailed a design of the actual study, letters of introduction, introduction to some school personnel, and a preliminary interview of the principal of the school. The principal provided insight into who had been at the school the longest who were referred to as the “old guard” as well as insight into who he felt were “good” teachers. At this introductory meeting, time lines and interview schedules were created.

All participants who were interviewed were sent thank you cards in order to maintain entree for subsequent clarity checks on information. The majority of previous interviews were conducted in interviewees' homes. Only the present teachers required interviews on the actual school site even though the researcher left the site and time of the interview at the interviewee's discretion.

Entree was maintained through cordial relationships that developed with teachers, administrators, staff and other respondents. Reciprocity developed in these relationships to the degree that interviewers sought out sources of information from the researcher which led to presentations by the researcher and informal instruction of students. A major component of entree is understanding self as researcher.
Self as Researcher

In qualitative research, the issue of validity "hinges to a great extent on the skill, competence, and rigor of the person doing fieldwork" (Patton, 14). In essence, the researcher is the central instrument. Therefore, the researcher's assumptions, preconceptions, knowledge base, so on and so forth, are critical not only in the gathering of data, but in the analysis of the data, and the possible subsequent theory production.

At the center of the conceptualization of "self as researcher" was "the relationship of social scientists in their own social order and the one that is their focus of study" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, 35). Participant observation is a method employed by qualitative researchers that permits the researcher "to study selected issues in depth and detail" (Patton, 13). Because data is created in relationships, researchers who engages in participant observation must understand their position in the field as a participant observer, and their own theoretical position, and how their theoretical position determines the scope and depth of their research. For instance, if researchers situate themselves as a critical ethnographer, then the researcher is more likely to ask questions that attempt to ascertain power relationships in their research setting. In essence, a critical ethnographer "refer to the reflective process of choosing between conceptual alternatives and making value laden judgements of meaning and method to challenge research, policy, and other forms of human activity." (Thomas, 1993, 4). Ultimately, critical ethnographer would utilize participant observation in order to ascertain the hidden power relationships (hegemony) existent in the setting in order to reach a political end (Thomas, 4).

According to John VanMaanen, participant observation is "an amorphous representation of the researcher's situation during a study" (VanMaanen, 1988, 3). At the heart of this methodological choice was the author's theoretical position. Because positivism is no
longer the "one way" to conduct a study (Lather, 1992, 1991), the author's theoretical position was open to not only critique, but to issues of validity, credibility, and so on and so forth. Consequently, the researcher must situate him or herself not only in the method, but in the theoretical position guiding his or her choices. Because participant observation allows the researcher to gain knowledge firsthand through observation, one should remember regardless of the methodological or theoretical position chosen by the researcher to situate him or herself in the setting, all knowledge ultimately, gained from the setting reflects a set of norms and values about what is worth examining and how. Sometimes values are implicit in the questions we ask, in the operational definitions we use, or in how we conceptualize an act (Thomas, 21).

Hence, the qualitative continuum addressed the range of theoretical positions from which the researcher can situate themselves theoretically in the field. Nonetheless, the researcher's methodological choices were based on what is considered the "norm" within that theoretical position. For example, a positivist would not use participant observation as a method because he or she would assert that it would ultimately lead the researcher to utilize subjective design in their research which is less credible than an objective approach (Bernstein, 1976).

In essence, self as researcher is related primarily to the issues of theoretical and methodological choices the researcher makes when designing, collecting, interpreting, and analyzing their research. Regardless of which methodological or theoretical position that a researcher chooses,

The complexity and the 'becomingness' of social life belies the possibility of a single, exhaustive or definitive account. And both as an analytical decision-making process and as a social process, we should expect different researchers to pick their way through field work differently (Ball, 1990, 167).

Consequently, the choices that a researcher makes while conducting their research are related to "self as researcher," but, no two researchers will produce the same research. Nonetheless, the continuum provides researchers with choices. Ultimately, the researcher's choices inform
the reader of their position. As we move from the center to the margins of the concept of "self as researcher," there are other concerns that the researcher should address.

These concerns are intrinsic and extrinsic to the researcher such as issues of trustworthiness, gaining entree, ethics and politics to mention a few. These factors can directly alter the researcher's ability to produce "good" qualitative research, and hamper their ability to gather "thick description" from the field.

Erickson notes that "potentially good fieldwork can be compromised from the outset by inadequate negotiation of entry in the field setting" (Erickson, 1986, 14). Of course, before attempting to enter the field, the researcher would have situated him or herself theoretically and methodologically. However, if the researcher has not determined the research topic, research question, the purpose and significance of the proposed research, or reviewed the literature, then the researcher often finds it difficult to establish entree and trustworthiness in the setting (Glesne & Peshkin, 13-37). Once the researcher gains entree, then the researcher has to gain trustworthiness. To some degree, the level of trustworthiness achieved will be determined by how well the researcher has learned to talk the talk of research as well as to learn the role of a researcher.

One must remember that entree is a socially constructed process that must be established, monitored, maintained and reestablished over time in the course of the context of research (Zaharlick & Green, 44). This researcher found that gaining entree was the most difficult part of this research. Thus, it created limitations to the study because it compromised time spent in the field. The researcher did not contemplate that it would be as difficult as it was to gain entree. However, once entree was gained it was maintained through the personal relationships created in the field setting. Glesne and Peshkin assert that the researcher has two roles as a researcher once entree has been gained in the field: the role of researcher and the
role as learner (Glesne & Peshkin, 35-37). Both of these role effect the ability of the researcher to establish trustworthiness as a direct result of participant observation as a method. Research is developed in relationships. Moreover, “methodology, epistemology and ethics are couched, then, not in terms of the establishment of “rules for proceeding,” but in the exploration of research relations and relationships” (Nofke, 1990, 5). Relationships, therefore, became the basis of establishing trustworthiness in the field. Additionally, the researcher’s ethics either help or hinder the establishment of research relationships. Furthermore, Patton identifies several factors that effect the researcher's relationships to self, and others in the field also effect credibility or trustworthiness such as the politics of the setting, conflicts in the setting, prior relationships with participants in the setting, time in the setting, and of course the researcher's ethics (Patton, 250-256). Because qualitative methods such as participant observation are

highly personal and interpersonal, because naturalistic inquiry takes the researcher into the real world where people live and work,—qualitative inquiry may be more intrusive and involve greater reactivity than surveys, tests, and other quantitative approaches (Patton, 356).

Hence, some ethical issues are centered around the research's promises of reciprocity (what it in it for the participant), confidentiality, informed consent, data access and ownership (who will have access to the data), and advice given to participants in the study (Patton, 356-357). A researcher's code of ethics establishes trustworthiness and credibility in the setting because it ensures that the concept of “self as researcher” is not just bound by the researcher's theoretical and methodological choices, but a code to ensure respect for the “rights of others, fulfill obligations, avoid harm and augment benefits to” those who have agreed to allow researchers to form and maintain a research relationship. “In general, research codes of ethics address individual rights to dignity, privacy and confidentiality, and avoidance of harm” (Glesne & Peshkin, 110). As noted earlier, Patton identified several criteria related to the development of
research relationships. The researcher developed relationships, established trustworthiness through spending time in the setting, and respecting the rights of the participants, the staff and the students. This scholar was able to cement these affiliations in several ways: self disclosure, sharing of knowledge through conversations, guest lectures, and attendance at staff meetings and school functions (fairs, assemblies), establishment and maintenance of professional ethos, sharing of information for clarity with teachers and finally, respecting school rules, policies and practices.

While educational research is typically conducted through anonymity, historical research does not assume such a stance. This researcher requested the usage of the real names of participants unless the participant preferred otherwise. Moreover, it was important for social, educational and cultural history to illuminate the ordinary people who did extraordinary things. This researcher listened to respondents recall negative incidents and placed comments "off the record" when respondents chose this position. Yet, all respondents were fully aware of the usage of their names in this study, and were provided a waiver stating such (See Appendix C). When informants considered things "off the record", they remained off the record. Yet, they were part of the overall analysis of the case. Or if participants wanted an incident known, but not the participants in the incidents, this researcher presented the information anonymously. All in all, I respected the rights of the interviewees. Yet, this researcher used real names of participants as a part of the historical design of the study.

As we close this discussion on self as researcher, the author contends that the relationship between the researcher and the researched is critical. It is framed by the researcher's understanding of self as researcher that encompasses the researcher's theoretical as well as methodological baggage. The researcher was an element in the research as well because the researcher collects and analyzes the data (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 36; Patton,
1990). It has been determined that a researcher's race, class, gender, and even age determines the degree of success in the field particularly as it relates to interviews and participant observation (Labov, 1977). Moreover, the researcher's dialogue with the participants or as a participant with other participants is critical (Freire, 1970). These dialogues occurred in the classrooms, and the teachers' lounge. They consolidated entree and established trustworthiness. Moreover, because the researcher understood the language of teaching, had taught and researched the urban context, these experiences provided her with a degree of comfort and connoisseurship with the setting which was interracial. The inquiry relationships were center in this process. Consequently, the researcher's purpose, how they socially effect the context, build relationships and what they do with their research is also important.

Often times the politics of research does not demand that "practices undertaken in a critical mode necessitate recognizing the complexity of social relations and the researcher's own socially determined position within the reality that one is attempting to describe" (McLaren, 84). The politics of research that the researcher is part of must allow people to talk back from their own voice (Hooks, 1989) as represented hyphens of their reality (Fine, 1994). Therefore, one of the most critical questions of the self as researcher is to "begin to rethink the categories we use to shape the problematics of our research" (McLaren, 89). This is where self as researcher begins, but does not end. Self as researcher is a process that develops as the researcher develops. Nonetheless, the researcher should always question self as researcher. A part of the questioning that the researcher wrestles with are concerned with issues of representation. Race, class and gender characteristics also effect the researcher and the researched (Anderson, 1993; Fine, 1994). Inherent in the research relationships is positions of power (Thomas, 1993; McLaren, 1994; Nofke, 1990). How the researcher works the margins
and the centers is critical (Fine, 1994) particularly if participant observation is used in the inquiry.

**Participant Observation**

Participant observation is a qualitative method. It is historically derived from ethnography. Therefore, the researcher participates in the field. A key methodological component in qualitative research can be participant observation. Because participant observation was one of the methods of data collection employed in this research, let us begin with a definition of it.

Within particular epistemological fields such as cultural anthropology, feminist studies, cultural studies, and ethnography, participant observation is a method used to collect data. Unlike interviews, the researcher's participant observation permitted her to grasp the present relationships between teachers, administrators and students in the school. Moreover, it allowed the researcher to gain trustworthiness, define goals, and engage in reciprocity with participants in the research. Firsthand interpretations gathered through participant observation provided a clearer understanding of the current school context to compare it with past respondents' understandings of the school environment. While participant observation has been historically linked to ethnography as a method employed in the field (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; VanMaanen, 1988; Thomas, 1993), it has often been defined as "observation carried out when the researcher is playing an established participant role in the scene studied" (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; 248). In *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*, Corrine Glesne and Alan Peshkin argue that participant observation is a process whereby the researcher learns "to understand the research setting, its participants, and their behavior" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, 42). Michael Q. Patton defines participant observation as one of the qualitative methods by which a researcher "makes firsthand observations of activities and interactions,
sometimes engaging personally in those activities as a participant observer" (Patton, 1990, 10).

Lastly, Bogdan defines participant observation as

research characterized by a prolonged period of intense social interaction between the researcher and the subjects, in the milieu of the latter, during which time data, in the form of field notes, are unobtrusively and systematically collected (Bogdan, 1972, 3).

Regardless of how participant observation is defined, it is clear that it involves the researcher as the instrument of data collection. Consequently, the usage of participant observation as a method had implications for this researcher related to ethics and the degree of participation in the field setting. These factors will be addressed shortly. For this researcher, the first of these concerns was the processes of the field. Let us know turn away from the actual definition of participant observation to the process or stances of participant observation that researchers can hold while in the field.

While the definition of participant observation has been called oxymoronic (Bodgiewic, 1994, 166), participant observation as a qualitative method consist of a continuum (Bodgiewic, 1994; Glesne & Peshkin, 1988; Patton, 1990). Participant observation can range from the position of observer as participant to participant as observer to full participant (Glesne & Peshkin, 40). Jaeger defines three different positions which participant observers can hold in the field. Researchers can be an active participants, a privileged observer, or a limited observer (Bodgiewic, 174-175). Most researchers, however, view participant observation on a fourfold typology that consists of complete observer, observer as participant, participant as observer, and complete participant (Atkinson & Hammersley, 248; Junker, 1960; Patton, 1990). This continuum, however is a function of shifting process rather than all or none characterization.
Because participant observation is on a continuum, Glesne and Peshkin view it as a process. (Glesne & Peshkin, 40). When in the field, the researcher is continually negotiating, and renegotiating their position on the continuum (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Bodgwiec, 1994; Patton, 1990). In this examination, the investigator's access to the field ranged the full continuum. Participants moreso than the researcher determined the degree of participation. Some participants invited the researcher into the setting as equals, while others prevented access. Consequently, participant observation is a process that depends on several factors such as the purpose of the research, and the nature of the setting (Bodgwiec, 175). Yet, there are other considerations when participant observation is part of a case study.

Case Study and Participant Observation

As noted earlier, “the validity and reliability of qualitative data depends to a great extent on the methodological skill, sensitivity, and integrity of the researcher” (Patton, 11). Because case study is a multifaceted investigation using qualitative methods, several data sources can be used. Participant observation represents one of the choices of data collection whereby the researcher is the chief instrument for data collection. When participant observation is used in a case study, “the issue is whether one describes the world of the subjects as they interpret it (emics) or according to the conceptions of the observer (etics)” (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991, 101). Self as researcher, therefore, takes on another aspect in a case study. The researcher through participant observation furnishes the case with
"observations and concepts about social action and social structures" from a "number of sources" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 6).

According to Robert Stake, the goal of research when it uses a case study is not just to "map and conquer the world, but to sophisticate the beholding of it. Therefore, "thick description," "experiential understanding," and "multiple realities" are expected in qualitative case studies" (Stake, 1995, 43). This researcher supplied the reader an essence of multiple realities existent within this school and the context of the school through participant observation. As noted earlier, research is needed that encapsulates multiple realities of schooling. Therefore, this author's chosen methodology created a landscape from which to gauge the many aspects of complexity historically found in urban education. Moreover, participant observation provided "an ongoing interpretive role of the researcher is prominent in qualitative case study" (Stake, 43). Hence, participant observation was a critical method in this qualitative case study because it allowed the researcher to create a "thick description" of the context, the participants, and the actions of the participants. This researcher supplied such description through the utilization of interviews (the primary method of participation), observations (of actual classroom practices) and document and archival research (context-social, political and economic). Nonetheless, participant observation in case study has advantages as well as disadvantages that the researcher should be acquainted with before they enter the field.

One must remember that one of the advantages of participant observation is that it allows the researcher to portray a holistic understanding of the setting and allows greater attention to be given to "nuances, setting interdependencies, complexities, idiosyncrasies, and contest" (Patton, 51). Hence, this case study was designed to explore the complexities of the case through participant observation as part of its multimethod approach to ascertain a greater
understanding of the case. Moreover, good case studies like good qualitative research “provide more valid portrayals, better bases for personal understanding of what is going on, and solid grounds for considering action” (Stake, 1981, 32). In order to attain the richness that can be ascertained through case study, participant observation should be used as a method. In order to grasp the totality of benefits that can result from participant observation, this researcher developed an multiple level pattern of knowledge gathering that consisted of interviews from three different sources, observations of three different sources, and examination of three different primary documents. There are several other benefits associated with participant observation and case study, particularly in urban case studies.

Feagin, Orum and Sjoberg note that case studies, particularly urban case studies, consist of “detailed study of life and activities of a group of people” (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 4). Usually, this is from first hand observation through participant observation which provides “a rendering of the activities only by participating in those activities.” (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 4). Without participant observation, the research could hardly provide a view into the lives of the people researched (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 4). Participant observation is critical in urban case studies because it is one of the three major factors, the other two being interviews and surveys, archival and document analysis, that allow the researcher to grasp internal and external forces; to ascertain people’s attitudes and beliefs; the climate of the time, and the interaction of family interactions in the setting (Feagin-Bahr & Caplow, 85-88). Additionally, participant observation is the primary method employed by ethnographer that specialize at ascertaining the culture of a group (Patton, 67; Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994). Therefore, participant observation is an excellent method to employ to understand the “culture” of an urban case study. Robert K. Yin, however, notes that while there are benefits to the case
study approach, the usage of participant observation as a method in case study causes limitations in case study research.

Yin contends while many researchers argue that participant observation allows the researcher an invaluable opportunity to provide "an accurate portrayal of a case study phenomenon" (Yin, 1994, 88), the same perspective may lead to the major problems with participant observation; bias. He argues while participant observation may provide insight into the case that are otherwise scientifically impossible to gain, at the same time the major problem with this same method is the "potential biases produced" (Yin, 1994, 89).

Consequently, the biases are produced because the researcher lacks opportunity as an external observer, the research spends too little time in the observer role, the researcher's ability to manipulate events, and lastly, the researcher's support of the program (Yin, 89). Moreover, the researcher may not have enough time from which to take notes and raise questions relevant to the observed phenomenon like a "good observer might" (Yin, 1994, 89). In addition, participant observation is time consuming, suffers from selectivity and participant reflectivity whereby the participants may do something differently because they are being observed, and it requires a high cost to the observers (Yin, 1994, 80). Clearly, Yin asserts that the same advantages of participant observation in case study can also be disadvantageous. Yin's stance denotes positivist connotations of validity--objectivity is his concern. Hence, in order to attain "good" qualitative case study research, Yin urges case study researchers to utilize three principles of data collection such as multiple sources of evidence, create a case study database, and maintain a chain of evidence (Yin, 1994, 90-99). Moreover, Yin agrees with Patton's four types of triangulation: data, investigator, theory, and methodological triangulation. (Yin, 1994, 92). Yin contends that "with triangulation, the potential problems of construct validity also can be addressed, because the multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple
measures of the same phenomenon" (Yin, 1994, 92). In essence, Yin contends that the convergence of multiple sources of evidence ensures that the case study researcher will produce a "good" qualitative single case case study that uses participant observation.

As this discussion has shown, participant observation in qualitative research, and case study in particular has its advantages and disadvantages. Patton contends the usage of a variety of sources and resources "can build on the strengths of each type of data collection while minimizing the weaknesses of any single approach. A multimethod triangulation approach to fieldwork increases validity and the reliability of evaluative data" (Patton, 245). Consequently, to ensure "good" qualitative research, the building of triangulation through the inclusion of participant observation in the research design of case study provided validity to the single-case case study. Another characteristic of this study was interviews.

Interviews

Qualitative research has been defined along a continuum. Interviews have been defined in three distinctive categories such as the nonstandardized interview, the schedule standardized interview and the nonscheduled standardized interview. This scholar employed a continuum of interviews. The nonscheduled standardized interview seeks to focus on acquiring certain types of information from all respondents, yet "particular phrasing of questions and their order are redefined to fit the characteristics of each respondent" (Denzin, 1989, 105) were utilized. At the same time, nonstandardized interviews constituted the framework from which classroom interviews based on practice and observation were structured. These interviews constituted what Denzin refers to as observational encounters.

Denzin views interviews as observational encounters (Denzin, 1989). Consequently, the connoisseurship employed in this study in the classroom often turned into not only observational encounters but conversations that formed the basis of the reciprocal relationship.
fostered during the research. The interviews were “relational in form” rather than civil-legal or ceremonial in nature (Denzin, 1989). Moreover, these observational conversations maintained entree in the field as well as provided emergent data. While this researcher designed the interviews to ascertain a specific kind of data (nonscheduled interviews), they often produced emergent themes that lead to further questions. In these instances, follow-up conversations (nonstandardized interviews) were sought for clarification purposes.

Data Analysis

A single case study was chosen as the researcher's methodological choice for obtaining data. A single case study method was embraced because it permitted the researcher to utilize multiple methods as well as theory in the design, implementation, and analysis of the research. This research focused on an urban school as the primary unit of data collection and analysis. Urban and social theory, particularly the work of Paul Petersen, and Michael Parenti provided the theoretical basis for questions concerning the linkages between the primary institutions in urban areas that affect urban education. Urban and social theory, historical analysis, gender, class and race ideology as well as McAdams' explanatory model of conflict theory (political process) served as a basis for analyses and interpretation. Data was gathered primarily through participant observation, interviews, and document analysis. Of course, data analysis began at the same of data collection (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Hence, a multidisciplinary and theoretical models were used for data analyses. The theoretical and methodological underpinnings of this research also determined the questions, qualities analyzed, and the subsequent conclusions. The research questions were grounded in my theoretical position, and so were the qualities addressed and analyzed in this study that ultimately became the conceptual frameworks for the presentation of data in the chapters.
In subsequent chapters, data will be presented in a narrative style based upon the phenomenological interpretations and criticisms garnered through the researcher's connoisseurship (Eisner, 1985). Connoisseurship was defined as the seeing the nuances and subtleties inherent in classrooms rather than observing them (Eisner, 1985). The researcher's "desire to perceive subtleties, to become a student of human behavior, to focus one's perception" was accomplished through participant observation (Eisner, 1985, 220).

Connoissuership permitted the inquirer to interpret the "rules through which life is lived" in the school, thereby providing thick description (Eisner, 1985, 221). Ultimately, connoisseurship provided the researcher with the ability to "talk about essences and significance in the observations of educational events" (Eisner, 1985, 221). Of course, this method required "not only a sensitivity to the emerging qualities of classroom life, but also a set of ideas, theories, or models that enable one to distinguish the trivial and to place what one sees in an intelligible context" (Eisner, 198, 221-222; McLaren, 1994). Thus, connoissuership constituted a methodological component of this research.

To talk about essences and significance in the observation of educational events requires, of course, not only a sensitivity to the emerging qualities of classroom life, but also a set of ideas, theories, or models that enable one to distinguish the significant from the trivial and to place what one sees in an intelligible context (Eisner, 1985, 221-222).

Thus, my research design and methodology sought to behold the nuances. Consequently, theories/models were used in this research for data gathering and analysis.

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

Nagel defines theory as "any more or less systematic analysis of a set of related concerns" (Kliebard, 1982, 11). However, McAdams contends that "the utility of any theory ultimately depends less on the elegance and logical structure of that model than on how well it
predicts or describes concrete empirical phenomena” (McAdams, 1982, 60). Consequently, conflict or critical theory is the theoretical framework for this inquiry. Additionally, historical analysis, feminist, race, social, and urban theory serve as the foundation for analysis of the empirical phenomena collected in this research. The questions utilized in this inquiry were fundamentally concerned with issues of power, history, and learning relationships and understanding. Consequently, critical theory or ethnography also informs this inquiry because it grants researchers not only an understanding of the world of the participants, but also of the power relationships existent in cultures and ideology (Thomas, 1993). Moreover, this researcher contends that conflict/critical theory such as feminist or racial theory yielded explication of the complexities and conflicts historically present and persistent in urban school systems and urban schools.

Fundamentally, this study was concerned with the politics and history of urban education because politics and history, particularly urban redevelopment policy, play a critical role in urban areas in determining service decision such as financial allocations to schools (Cibulka, Reed & Wong, 1992; Judd & Swanstrom, 1994; Judd & Knator, 1992; Marshall, Browning & Tabb, 1994). Hence, “the urban case study seeks to grasp the characteristics of all major institutions in a city, the interconnections among these institutions, and their links to other systems and seeks to illuminate changes in all these characteristics over time” (Bahr & Caplow, 1991, 85). Nonetheless, Stake contends that within a single case study, a researcher can have multiple units of data (Stake, 1994). Consequently, the urban case study seeks to grasp the characteristics of all major institutions in a city, the interconnections among these institutions, and their links to other systems and seeks to illuminate changes in all these characteristics over time (Bahr & Caplow, 1991, 85).

Therefore, historical analysis will be utilized because it will provide a clear understanding of
change over time as well as indicate key factors of local historical change that directly or indirectly effected the school (Bahr & Caplow, 1991, 84).

While one of the methodological problems associated with single-case case study is the inability to generalize from the case, this is not this author's concern. Instead, this author was concerned with the particulars of this case, and what it can tell us in and of itself about urban schools historically, politically, and educationally. Additionally, the strength of the case study is its ability to provide a "relatively holistic understanding of cultural systems of action" is what attracts this researcher to this method. Hence, the researcher's goal was to add to the literature concerning the complexity of this case, and how "interrelated activities and routines engaged in by one or more networks of actors within a social context is bounded by time and space" (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 152). Another strength of the urban case study, is that is allows the researcher to use multiple variables, multiple theories of analysis as well as multi-methods for data collection (Stake, 1995; Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991; Patton, 1990). Yin maintains that the strength of the case study is contained within these "three essential aspects of case studies: they research (1) contemporary phenomena, (2) in a real-life context, (3) using multiple sources of evidence" (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 167). Lastly, Denzin deems participant observation as a key component in case studies. Nonetheless, Eisner succinctly sums up the totality of the methodological and theoretical design of this study. He asserts

For the development of educational connoisseurship, an understanding of different social sciences, different theories of education, and a grasp of the history of education is not simply an intellectual ornament to be acquired within a graduate program but an essential working tool for inquiry (Eisner, 1985, 222). Thus, many methods of data gathering and analysis were used in this research to assure thick description, interpretation and analyses.

The primary methods employed in this single-case case study were document analysis, semi-structured interviews (conversations) and of course, participant observation. These three
primary methods were employed because they allowed the researcher depth as well as breadth in data collection. Additionally, theses, dissertations, primary and secondary sources, journal articles, monographs, surveys, and newspaper articles were used. Moreover, the three primary data sources allowed triangulation which permitted "three data points of sources: persons, situations and contexts, and time" (Denzin, 1989, 237-39).

Theory and Methodology

Qualitative research can lend itself to the development of "theoretical generation and generalization. Theoretical generalization involves suggesting new interpretations and concepts or reexamining earlier concepts and interpretations in major and innovative ways " (Orum, Feagin & Sjoberg, 13). This researcher's utilization of a multidisciplinary and multivariant methodology allowed this researcher to reexamine past conceptions of the qualitative characteristics of de facto segregated all Black northern schools. It was this researcher's intent to behold the particulars of this case as well as provide new theoretical understandings of the context still remains in the majority of northern urban school systems even though policy initiatives have attempted to alter this construction (Orfield, 1994). Historians usage of theory or a model not only provides a framework for understanding the phenomena studied, but an explanation of the relationships existent in the particular setting. Regardless of the explanatory model, the usage of theory will ultimately shape the historical study. Educational historians usage of theory has been linked to what kind of education history they were conducting/constructing. Comparative history often lends itself to quantitative methods (Coulby, 1992). On the other hand, urban educational history has often utilized urban and social theories for explanatory and data gathering purposes. Thus, an examination of the major theoretical perspectives was paramount.
Models: Conflict and Consensus Models

Theoretical conceptual frameworks determine how social scientists, humanists, and others design their research. These conceptual frameworks form a continuum from consensus theory to conflict theory. Regardless of the actual name of the model, it determines who, how, when, why, what, length of the study, and through analysis, its significance. Moreover, these models possess conceptual differences, thereby they produce varying analysis of the same events. Their analysis is different because they subscribe to contrasting ideas about the same phenomena.

Consensus theorists argue norms and values are the basic elements of social life, that societies are necessarily cohesive and possess solidarity, that social systems are integrated and that society is based on reciprocity and cooperation, but at the same time society recognizes legitimate authority. In essence, “social systems rest on consensus” (Turner, 1974, 123).

Conflict theorists, however, contend that interest are the basic elements of life, and those interests are divisive, thereby interests are often coercive. Hence, social life creates differentiated power and is sectional. Social life creates opposition, exclusion, and hostility, and is therefore malintegrated and beset by contradictions. Lastly, “social systems tend to change” (Turner, 1974, 123). In other words, consensus theorists view society as a society based on accepted norms that are held by everybody, therefore, everybody has an opportunity to participate in society. It is an open system to participation. On the other hand, conflict theorists contend that society is constantly changing, and change creates differentiation and competition that produce conflicting interests. Power in the system rests in the hands of the few. Both theories are utilized to explicate the significance of the political process, and mass participation in that process in political, social, and educational arenas.
In the social sciences, political science in particular, there are two dominant models are found in the literature concerning citizen participation. The pluralist school which is a consensus model is epitomized by Robert Dahl's *Who Governs* (1961). On the other hand, Floyd Hunter's *Community Power Structure* represents a conflict model perspective of elite ideology. Both of these text discuss who actually had the power to participate fully in the democratic process. The consensus perspective holds that the process is open to everyone, while the conflict perspective, in particular, the elite model asserts that the process is not actually open, but controlled by a competing elite power structure. Because we live in a republic that holds democratic ideals, people are allowed to participate through the voting process in order to have their voices heard. Historically, however, this system has not always been open to all of us citizens. Consequently, mass participation is inherent in a republic with democratic ideals to ensure all voices can at least be heard. However, Parenti asserts that "we should directly investigate the less privileged elements of a community to determine why they are not active and what occurs when they attempt to become active" (Parenti, 245).

The theoretical framework chosen for this research emphasized the people who organized and gained power to effect change in the system. Education has served as a change agent in the Black community. Thus, a study of a school designed to serve the needs of a competing interest was necessary. Moreover, it presents a "view from the bottom" rather than a top down analysis of life and history in this particular urban school. This structure or model allowed this researcher to reference different sources of data rather than empirical statistics. This study utilized the actual voices of the participants (emics and etics) found in primary resources, interviews and historical archives. Subsequently, the historical framework allowed this researcher a wider and more in-depth lens from which to evaluate the causes of change and continuity in the school, the community and the city.
McAdams asserts that "power in America" is often the subject of academic research. He contends that theoretical models such as the conflict model exemplify power relationships (McAdam, 2). Thus, the conflict explicated the often taken for granted nuances of power in schools and inherent in personal relationships because of competing interests. Fundamentally, education is a process inherently linked to access and thus power (McAdams, 1982; McLaren, 1994).

Consensus ideology/theory has predicated the majority of scholarly work on the education of African Americans (Butchart, 1988; Holt, 1990). Most historians have utilized consensus theory in explicating their historical studies (Butchart, 1988; Kaestle, 1986). Kaestle refers to this choice of methodology as the "goodness" of educational history. However, revisionist and postrevisionist historians have challenged this interpretation (Butchart, 1988; Kaestle, 1992; Tyack, 1974). Society believes in a basic consensus model encapsulated with the democratic ideal. However, history illuminates the conflict existent between groups within society. While this research shares some of the consensus ideology, the philosophical underpinnings of this research is framed within the conflict theory/model paradigm.

Thus, one of the major philosophical underpinnings of this research design was conflict theory. This model explicated the conflicts/consensus nuances within and outside of the school walls. Because an interdisciplinary model can be utilized in a case study, urban social theory also served as a means from which to gather and analyze data, particularly since this was an urban single-case case study.

**Urban Social Theory (Social and Urban Theory)**

"Urban social theorist nevertheless offer a potential approach to urban education which emanates not from history but from a lively tradition of social theory" (Coulby, 1992, 211).
Several education historians framed their scholarship upon urban social theory (Castells, 1992; Coulby, 1992; Finkelstein, 1992). Urban theory is predicated upon the work of the Chicago school. Castells's premise rests upon Marxist ideology and argues "that urban contradictions are a spatial intensification of the consequences of a socio-political structure linked to the capitalist mode of production" (Coulby, 1992, 209). Louis Wirth defined urban as "population size, population density, social heterogeneity and permanence" (Angus, 1992, 223). Primarily, scholars identified three rubrics constituting theoretical approaches to urban educational history. Coulby identifies urban social theory, comparative and international approaches and historical approaches as the three dominant modes of approaching urban educational study (Coulby, 1992). Coulby concludes that "social theory approaches, historical approaches and international approaches all have their strengths" (Coulby, 1992, 218). On the other hand, Angus distinguishes three approaches to history as Neo-Marxists, quantitative, and anthropological (qualitative) approaches (Angus, 1992, 222). Any and all of these approaches are valid approaches to urban educational history.

This researcher utilized conflict theory as a model for developing this research as well as analysis. While this researcher contends that meritocracy is a salient value intrinsic in school curriculums and American society in general, conflict nor consensus theory concedes a qualitatively different analysis of conflict in schools other than to label groups often denied access and quality educational resources with intrinsic negative ascriptive characteristics. Thus, this researcher deemed conflict, social and urban theory as a framework for designing this study. Ultimately, the usage of theory in urban education history must "have a crucial part to play, provided it is informed by a concern for policy and practice" (Coulby, 1992, 218). Moreover, urban theory provided the researcher with tools from which to understand the macro
structures existent outside the school walls, but affecting the maintenance and survival of the school itself.

Both urban and conflict theorists utilize history as a framework for understanding cases. Together, both theories constituted the majority of theoretical underpinnings that guided the design of this research. Thus, the last significant resource was historical analysis.

**History and Case Study Methodology (Historical Methodology)**

One of the purposes of this researcher was to provide a bottom-up social history of an urban school. Case study allows the researcher to present a bottom-up view of the socio-cultural-historical context of this particular school (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991, 65). In practice, “historical data generally have been created from the vantage point of the powerful” (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 66). While this case study is not designed to give a voice to the disadvantaged, it does shed light on the positive situations of those rarely studied in educational context, Black teachers. At best, the author seeks to illuminate the voices of the ordinary people who have done extraordinary things--social history at its best (Kessler-Harris, 1990). Because the “national or regional processes experienced in local settings are invariably modified by local conditions” (Barr & Caplow, 1991, 84), local history particularly linked to educational change is an essential part of the case study. Thus, the historical development of the school system, housing patterns, political and social arenas represent a knowledge base that is part of the macro structure addressed in this case study. It provides the framework for the development of the city and the educational system within that developmental cycle. “Cities are made more knowable by theories that specify what should and should not be taken into account” (Barr & Caplow, 1991, 89). Thus, “urban educators cannot ignore the wider context.
of cities and must see their work as drawing from and contributing to practice” (Coulby, 1992, 205).

An urban case study seeks to “grasp the characteristics of all major institutions in a city . . . and seeks to illuminate changes in all these characteristics over time” (Barr & Caplow, 85). Hence, a historical analysis of a school allows a researcher to ascertain change over time not only in the school, but in the macro structures of the society in which it exists. Moreover, oral histories of people allow scholars to qualify quantitative representations of phenomena. Thus, while quantitative resources may provide the researcher with statistical counts of books and teachers, only oral histories can supply the researcher with an understanding of the “living people and to interpret” what quantitative measures “mean in context” (Barr & Caplow, 86). Qualitative resources “provide access to the texture of daily life” (Kessler-Harris, 1990, 172). “Social history of life within schools, especially studies of teachers and students, is surprisingly thin given the abundance of primary source materials generated since 1920” (Cohen & Reese, 1992, 64). Thus, an investigation into the structure of life and the social institutions such as the school that impact on everyday life constitutes social history (Kessler-Harris, 1990).

Urban, cultural, and educational history are disciplines under the rubric of social history. According to Alice Kessler-Harris,

The best social history attempts to integrate new research in institutional structures with consciousness and ideology as a way that creates understanding of broader political process and of the tensions that ultimately yield change. . . . to develop a complex interpretation of American society that rests on neither conflict nor consensus but on a subtle and changing construction of relationships between groups of people, their orientations to social reality, and the actions they take to defend the world that is theirs. (Kessler-Harris, 1990, 180).

Historical analysis provided the researcher with an interpretative understanding of the everyday relationships existent in the school’s past, the greater community over time and the degree of
change in those relationships as a resultant of the greater macro structures existent in the city and the micro structure of the school. Thus, the utilization of history in this case study created new understandings of the social, political, economic and cultural context as viewed from the vantage point of ordinary people's lives (Kessler-Harris, 1990).

"History is a challenging and creative interaction, part science, part art" (Kaestle, 1988, 61). Butchart notes, "if history is to have a value beyond a literary form of collecting antiques, it must provide a guide to action. . . . history must appraise the past to suggest political, social, and economic strategies for the present and future. Like schooling, history, too is inescapably political" (Butchart, 1988, 223). Moreover, "the historical role of schooling in America are encountered every day as arguments for educational policies" (Kaestle, 1988, 62). Kaestle points out four methodological concerns educational historians have encountered (Kaestle, 1988). However, it is the fourth concept that holds this researcher's attention. In the past, educational historians focused on "leadership and organization rather than on the educational behavior and attitudes of ordinary people" (Kaestle, 1988, 63). This researcher attempted to focus this inquiry on the lives, behaviors and attitudes of ordinary people. Therefore, the two strands of revisionist history that have developed since 1960 attempt to focus on 1) the history of schooling as viewed as the history of education and 2) see state-regulated schooling as not benign and desirable (Kaestle, 1988, 64). This researcher predicated the design of this study upon history in order to assess the case as holistically as possible. The scholar's scholarship, however, must be viewed within the greater context of historiography.

**Historiography**

"Historiography normally is retrospective, telling us in what diverse ways scholars have explained events" in our historical past (Tyack, 1988, 25). For the most part, three
interpretive lenses have been existent in the development of history regardless of whether the subfield is political, social, African American, women's or education history. Each of these eras, however, built on the successive epochs' themes and topical interest, interpretations and methods. The larger framework of historical research provided the framework for the study of the history of African Americans. Thus, this historiographical account follows in the traditions of scholars who have sought to explicate the history of African Americans' educational experiences while constructing new interpretations, themes and methods.

As noted earlier, there have been three consecutive yet overlapping periods of Black educational history each with its own focus. From the 1890s to the 1930s, the earliest historians of African American educational history chronicled the self-help philosophy of African Americans and concentrated their work on illuminating the achievements of African Americans. In essence, these scholars viewed education as a vehicle from which to rectify the effects of American racism on the Black community. Scholars sought to rectify the perceptions of African Americans perpetuated by white supremacist scholars (Butchart, 1988). From 1930s to the 1960s, scholars built upon these conceptual themes and added new forms of analysis and methods. This period's attributes were an integrationist focus which "documented the faults of segregation while pushing for civil rights and integration by utilizing progressive liberal ideals of consensus history" (Ward, 1993, 2). Historians focused on the social embeddedness of education (Butchart, 1988). From the 1960s to the present, African American education historian's scholarship has been characterized by a "revisionist trend that places blacks as actors in their destiny rather than as passive victims of American racism" (Ward, 1993, 2). Revisionism consisted of "great diversity in approaches, methodologies, foci, and premises" (Butchart, 1988, 352). Regardless of whether the epoch was characterized by triumphant or vindicationist history, the liberal progressive traditions, or iconoclastic revisionist
ideals, the overwhelming majority of this scholarship focused on Black educational history in the South (Butchart, 1988). However, northern Black education history, Black communities' responses to educational opportunity, and histories of Black teachers and students emerged in this era.

Revision continues today and continues to challenge past perceptions of history particularly as it relates to the education of the Black community, teachers, and students from a conflict theoretical perspective addressing issues of power and ascriptive qualities such as race, class, caste and gender. Current Black education history while building on past interpretations must develop new interpretations, utilize theories, and construct different methods for assessing the historical role of education in the lives of African Americans.

Ronald Butchart contends revisionism's

...main tendencies are in fact unique lines of interpretation, each leading to exclusive conclusions... Despite the richness and diversity of the history of black education in the past, a wide range of subjects have yet to be adequately explored... Yet in the service of the end, much more needs to be done (Butchart, 1988, 360).

In essence, revisionism was a period marked by scrutiny and challenge. However, "since African American life in the twentieth century has become an urban life, a complete history of Afro-American education must afford more insight into urban education" (Butchart, 1988, 360). Moreover, scholarship must furnish the field with pre-revisionism interpretations. (Butchart, 1988, 364-365).

As noted earlier, there have been three contiguous periods of history. Scholars focused on three key events in the lives of African Americans: slavery, emancipation, and northern migrations (Holt, 1990). Each of these eras represented different views of addressing the same phenomena through different questions and methodologies. It is within the era of postrevisionist history in which this author locates herself methodologically and theoretically. Yet, consensus theory is not dead in the evaluation of this author's analysis of the data.
gathered in this research. Consequently, this study engaged new ways, new methodologies, and new theories to explicate an understanding of the ordinary people who did extraordinary things. Therefore, central to this story is not victimization or oppression as previously noted by other historians, but success and victory (Franklin, 1979; Kaestle, 1988; Tyack, 1969).

The methods utilized in this approach were similar yet different to earlier periods of educational history. What differed, however, were the questions, methods, and insights extrapolated from the data. This historical ethnographic analysis of this school included a survey, interviews, participant observations, observations, archival research, etc. History in a case study allows the researcher to envision the past as well as the present setting. Consequently, this continuum provided the researcher with a tangible vehicle for understanding change and continuity in the school's history and the forces that shaped, altered, and configured change and/or continuity in this school.

**Theory and History**

Urban case studies can utilize history as a means for generating new theoretical understandings (Sjoberg, Orum & Feagin, 1992). "Because historical writing is selective and interpretive, it is necessarily guided by the individual historian's sense of what is important, where to find meaning, and how social change and human motivation work" (Kaestle, 1988, 68). Consequently, theories influence the choice of evidence historians gather and accept as well as interpretations of data. Thus, historians use of theory can advance the work of the field by allowing him or her to

... better identify their informal, personal theories. More important, they can shape their understanding of human experience by learning from other disciplines. Finally, historical work can reflect back in important ways on social theories, confirming, refitting, or modifying various theoretical statements (Kaestle, 1988, 68).

While it was not this researcher's intent to reify theory, the emergent design of this study does allow a framework from which it can evolve. However, the author's utilization of theory,
development of theory or the refining of present theories was dependent on the theoretical framework of the methodology. Historians usage of theory, however, will be addressed first.

Typically, educational historians have utilized theory in five summative ways that constitute a continuum. They have been:

1) producers of theory
2) users of theory
3) the eclectic user of theory
4) incidental users of theory, and lastly
5) the knowledgeable anti-theorist (Kaestle, 1992).

Where historians are on the continuum depends on their beliefs regarding the history-theory dilemma. On the other hand, historians have utilized models of explanation. These models can provide "metaphorical representations of some implicit or explicit theory" (Kaestle, 1992, 200) or they represent "schemes for organizing historical explanation" (Kaestle, 1992, 200). Thus, models can "embodey pieces of theory and provide an explanatory approach" (Kaestle, 1992, 201) particularly since the writing of history is an inductive process. Consequently, this research used conflict, urban and social theory (political process model) as major frameworks for explaining the context and the phenomena studied and observed.

As historians have conceptualized their framework of interpretation along the continuum, historians, like Kaestle who take the middle ground resulted in "incidental use of theory and a rather loose functionalist framework within which I expect to find conflict as well as consensus, persistent anomaly as well a adjustment, agency as well as oppression" (Kaestle, 1992, 202). Moreover, the historians' inclination toward consensus or critical theory/ideology determines which data, interpretations, etc., theory if any, what data, and what model the historian will use. Regardless of the position taken, there are methodological issues that must be considered.
Problems associated with historical methodology must be taken into account in the design of a historical study. Kaestle contends these are:

1) confusion of correlation and causes, a problem particularly salient in quantitative work (p69).

2) the problem of defining key terms particularly as it relates to vagueness and presentism (p69).

3) "idea about how people *should* behave, and evidence of how ordinary people *in fact* behaved. Do not assume that people did as they were told. (p70).

4) distinction between intent and consequences - hindsight view of their actions (p70).

Butchart notes that Bullock's *History of Negro Education in the South* (1967) "argued from an uncritical Hegelian idealism that the dialectical reaction of intended and unintended effects created historical change. Thus, the task of the historian was simply to identify the intended and the unintended" (Butchart, 1988, 351) particularly as it relates to bottom-up history.

An evaluation of the actions would lead to what Kaestle refers to as "hindsight view" (Kaestle, 1988). Butchart argues that historians must address consequences regardless of the intent of the actors. All of these concerns should be kept in mind when analyzing or making generalizations about our historical past. Historians must remember that there is no single methodology in history. In essence, historical methodology must lend itself to broader definition and scope, new questions, new methods, and new insights. (Kaestle, 1988, 80).

This researcher contends that the methodological design of this study produced such insights. However, there are always limitations in any study.

While history has its limits, methodology regardless of whether it is qualitative or quantitative has limitations. Thus, an explication of the limitations of the methodology is necessary.
Limitations of Study

All research has limitations. No research design is perfect (Yin, 1994; Patton, 1990; Stake, 1995). Thus, it is paramount that researchers understand the imposed limitations of the study as well as those of the researcher in qualitative research. The limitations are related to questions of validity or trustworthiness in reference to data collection, methods, analysis, and research design. Yet, one way to ensure good qualitative research is to adhere to criteria for establishing good qualitative research. Yet, there are ways of ensuring that the data collected is valid. There are several criteria that enable a researcher to design "good" qualitative research.

Criteria for Good Qualitative Research - Questions of Validity

According to Eisner, the test of "good" qualitative research in education "is the degree to which it illuminates and positively influences the educational experience of those who live and work in our schools" (Eisner, 2). Eisner denotes six criteria that must exist in order to conduct "good" qualitative research. These six features are: First, qualitative research is field focused. Secondly, qualitative research relates to the self as an instrument. Thirdly, it is interpretive. Fourth, qualitative research display the use of expressive language and the presence of voice in text. Fifth, it pays attention to particulars. And finally, the sixth quality of qualitative research, according to Eisner, are the criteria for judging success is based on its coherence, insight, and instrumental utility. In other words, Eisner's concern with the effect of the research on school's and the actual relationships between the people within the school walls, teachers and students.

Patton contends the "validity and reliability of qualitative data depend to a great extent on the methodological skill, sensitivity, and integrity of the researcher" (Patton, 11). Moreover, he asserts that the researcher can ensure that their research will be "good"
qualitative research by instituting rigor through the use of triangulation. Triangulation requires the researcher to use multiple methods of data collection. Denzin asserts that triangulation should include not just data triangulation, but also, investigator triangulation if possible (three investigators), and theory triangulation in order to best address issues of validity (Patton, 187). Still, it is important to remember the significance of the researcher as the primary “instrument” in qualitative inquiry (Patton, 1990, 14). A researcher’s connoisseurship, therefore, determines the effectiveness or validity of descriptions of life particularly in classroom research (Eisner, 1985, 219-222). Consequently, Guba and Lincoln contend that while there are limitations with this method, the benefits are “the ability to build on tacit knowledge that is the peculiar province of the human instrument” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, 113). Other qualitative researchers, however, answer the question of validity differently.

Stephen Ball argues “the problem of conceptualizing qualitative research increase when data, and the analysis and interpretation of data, are separated from the social process which generated them” (Ball, 1990, 170). Therefore, in order to ensure validity in qualitative research he contends that

it is the requirement for methodological rigour that every ethnography be accompanied by a research biography, that is a reflexive account of the conduct of the research which, by drawing on fieldnotes and reflections, recounts the processes, problems, choices, and errors which describe the fieldwork upon which the substantive account is based (Ball, 170).

Again, the notion of validity is built on the key instrument in the research, the researcher because “we should not expect to read qualitative research without some idea of the instrument employed—the researcher herself or himself” (Ball, 170). As noted earlier, one of the key components of qualitative research is the researcher. Therefore, Ball’s conception of validity is directed at the key component in qualitative research, the researcher, rather than the method of
data collection. Glesne and Peshkin, however, use trustworthiness as the criteria for establishing "good" qualitative research.

According to Glesne and Peshkin, "time is a major factor in the acquisition of trustworthy data. Time at the research site, time spent interviewing, time to build relationships with respondents—all contribute to trustworthy data" (Glesne & Peshkin, 146). Stake (1995) defines good qualitative research as possessing observations validated through traingulative means, it is nonhortatory, sensitive to risks of human subjects, and is versed in the relevant discipline (Stake, 1995, 48). Glesne and Peshkin's view parallels the view of Joseph Maxwell.

Maxwell notes "validity has been a key issue in debates over the legitimacy of qualitative research" (Maxwell, 1994, 279). Moreover, he contends that qualitative researchers have generally responded either by denying the relevance of the quantitative or scientific paradigm for what they do (for example, Guba & Lincoln, 1989), or by arguing that qualitative research has its own procedures for attaining validity that are simple different from those of quantitative approaches (for example, Kirk & Miller, 1986) (Maxwell, 280).

However, Maxwell proposes that questions of validity in qualitative research rest on "a realist conception of validity that sees the validity of an account as inherent, not in the procedures used to produce and validate it, but in its relationship to those things that it is intended to be an account of (Maxwell, 281). Consequently, he warrants that "understanding is a more fundamental concept for qualitative research than validity" that is based on how "qualitative researchers think about and deal with validity in their actual practice" (Maxwell, 281-282). In essence, Maxwell is arguing that the basis for validity in qualitative research be extracted from the researchers's understanding of validity through their understanding of the relationships between the described accounts and their context (Maxwell, 283). Therefore, validity "refers to accounts, not to data or methods" because "validity is relative to purposes and circumstances", and the inferences that we draw from our data (Maxwell, 283).
Maxwell contends that “validity is not an inherent property of a particular method, but pertains to the data, accounts or conclusions reached by using that method in a particular context for a particular purpose” (Maxwell, 284). Overall, validity is related to the “kinds of understandings that accounts can embody” (Maxwell, 284) and are related to descriptive, interpretive, theoretical, generalizability and evaluative validity. Maxwell raises the issue of evaluative validity in order to demonstrate its connections to the other kinds of validity. However, he asserts that questions of evaluative validity “creates issues of an account’s evaluative validity, and no account is immune to such questions” (Maxwell, 295).

Guba and Lincoln (1989 maintain that there are three different approaches to considering the quality of goodness of qualitative research. They are

1. *parallel* or quasi-foundational criteria, which we have typically termed the *trustworthiness* criteria; considering the unique contribution made to goodness or quality by the *nature of the hermeneutic process itself*; and invoking a new set of non-foundational criteria— but criteria embedded in the basic belief system of constructivism itself—which we have termed the *authenticity* criteria" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 233).

In order to create quality research, however, Guba and Lincoln defined seven aspects that should be present in the process such as prolonged engagement, persistent observation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, progressive subjectivity, and member check. While Guba and Lincoln note that triangulation has positivist notions, they contend that quality or "goodness" can be maintained in the process itself. Consequently, their assertions parallel those of Glesne and Peshkin to some degree as well as Maxwell.

Qualitative validity represent a continuum just as qualitative research is a continuum. Issues of validity are asked of single-case case studies as well.

**Questions of Validity and the Single Case Case Study - Problems and Issues**

There are several views concerning the limitations, and advantages of case studies in general. Robert Stake provides criteria for establishing "good" case studies.
As noted earlier, Stake contends that the major characteristics of qualitative cases studies are that they are holistic, empirical, Interpretive, and emphatic. "Good" qualitative research and hence, qualitative case studies utilize triangulation in order to validate observations and interpretations, is nonhortatory, sensitive to risks to human subjects, and researchers are versed in relevant disciplines. (Stake, 1995, 35-48). Other characteristics of qualitative case study is its subjectivity. Of course, the major limiting characteristic of qualitative case studies is its subjective nature. It is the major criticism of the method. Others are: its production of no answers and only more questions, their failure to add to disciplined scientific generalization, and their failure to provide resources for social practice (Stake, 1995, 45).

While subjectivity is viewed as its major limitation, Stake does not agree, and counteracts the issue of subjectivity as a problem with the method. He argues that qualitative inquiry by nature is subjective, but it is the very nature of its subjectivity that produces the understanding into the complexities of the case. Therefore, he states that it is "the intent of qualitative research to promote a subjective research is a given. Subjectivity is not seen as a failing needed to be eliminated, but as an essential element of understanding" (Stake, 1995, 45). Moreover, qualitative researchers can choose between intrinsic cases (interest) or instrumental cases (insights), the "real business of qualitative case study is particularization" (Stake, 1995, 8). In fact, qualitative researchers because the nature of the work is subjective, qualitative case study methodology has related to "self as researcher,"as well.

Because it is the researcher who decides what to report in the particular case in order to tell its story. Additionally, it is the researcher who decides the criteria of representation. Therefore, the knowledge presented by the case is socially constructed, and represents case study researchers"construction of knowledge" (Stake, 1994, 240). Therefore, another way to
ensure "good" qualitative case studies is through the researcher who must spend substantial
time in the context of the case, maintain personal contact with the activities and operations of
the case, reflecting, revising meanings of what is going on. (Stake, 1994, 242). Additionally,
this is done because researchers have a responsibility to minimize misinterpretation and
misunderstanding. This is considered consequent validity by Stake (Stake, 1995, 109).
Additionally, he argues that triangulation as defined by Denzin (investigator, theory, data, and
methodological) as well as member checking serve as the guarantor of not only consequential
validity, but insures "good" qualitative research. (Stake, 1995, 107-115).

Yin maintains that case studies can be qualitative or quantitative, he notes that their are
advantages as well as problems with the method or design of case study, particularly single-
case case studies. Yin does not require participant observation as a necessary method in
qualitative case studies while Stake and others such as Denzin view it as a necessity (Snow &
Anderson, 167). Overall, Yin contends that "good case studies are very difficult to do" (Yin,
1994, 11). In single-case case studies, however, Yin avows that the problem is related
primarily to the inability to generalize from single case studies (Yin, 1994, 10). Nonetheless,
there are different understandings of generalizability as it refers to qualitative research.

As noted earlier in this paper, Maxwell contends that generalizability in qualitative
research is different from the kind of generalizability associated with scientific or positivist
measures. In fact, Snow and Anderson argue for a different conceptualization of
generalization that

includes the standard kind of abstract, aggregate-level generalization as well as the
kinds associated with the notions of analytic generalization and naturalistic
generalization and the kindred processes of thick description and interpretive
interactionism (Snow & Anderson, 166).

as a basis of "good" qualitative research (Snow & Anderson, 166). Consequently, Snow and
Anderson like Maxwell frame the question of validity or "good" qualitative research around
what qualitative researchers identify as their process as research such as thick description (Geertz, 1973), naturalistic generalization (Stake, 1995), and interpretive interactionism (Denzin, 1989). As noted earlier, Stake argues a little differently concerning the issues of “good” qualitative research, and, hence, “good” single-case case study.

Stake argues the significance of the single-case case study, is not related to its ability to provide generalization. While he argues that “case studies are of value in refining theory and suggesting complexities for further investigation as well as helping to establish the limits of generalizability” (Stake, 1994, 245), but in its ability to represent the particulars of the case in order to create understanding about the particular case that has value in and of itself. In other words, the essence of a single-case case study is that it maximizes learning about the particular case--effective particularization (Stake, 1994, 242, 245).

Overall, qualitative research is a valid research paradigm with its own criteria of what constitutes “good” research regardless of the method employed.

Advantages and Limitations of Participant Observation

One of the key advantages of participant observation is that it allows the researcher to ascertain the significance of the cultural context of the setting that is being researched (Bodgewic, 167). The “culture is expressed (constituted) only by the actions and words of its members and must be interpreted by, not given to, a fieldworker” (VanMaanen, 1988, 3). Consequently, one can see the significance of participant observation as a useful method in qualitative research. While interviews, document analysis and the such can be used, only participant observation allows researchers to provide their interpretation of the culture being studied. Participant observation has other advantages as well.

Patton contends that participant observation has several advantages. First, direct observation allows the researcher “to understand the context within which the program
operates which is essential to a holistic perspective (Patton, 203). Second, firsthand experience provides the researcher with an open, discovery oriented, inductive approach (Patton, 203). Third, the researcher "has the opportunity to see things that may routinely escape conscious awareness among participants and staff" (Patton, 204). Therefore, the researcher may discover things that others have not paid attention to. Fourth, the researcher can learn things about the program that people are unwilling to talk about in interviews (Patton, 204). Fifth, by being within the setting itself, the researcher gains an evaluation beyond the selective perception of others (Patton, 204) which is essential because interviews represent selective perceptions of the phenomena being researched. Finally, the researcher gains "firsthand experience and access to personal knowledge and direct experience as resources to aid in understanding and interpreting the program" (Patton, 205). Of course, the last advantage of observational data is related to the concept of self as researcher wherein the researcher's "impressions and feeling of the observer become part of the data to be useful in attempting to understand a program and its effects" (Patton, 205). The researcher as instrument is part of the research. Research is a dance whereby a relationship exist between the dancers, the dancers being the participants and the researcher who has become a participant. Reciprocity, therefore, is critical as well as the ethics of the researcher. A researcher's stance determines whether the site will remain open or change over time.

Patton contends that "direct participation in and observation of the phenomenon of interest may be the best research method" (Patton, 25). Moreover, "participant observation is the most comprehensive of all types of research strategies" (Patton, 25). Patton argues that,

Observational data, especially participant observation, permits the evaluation researcher to understand a program or treatment to an extent not entirely possible using only insights of others obtained through interviews (Patton, 25).
In addition, Patton asserts that the purpose of observational analysis is "to take the reader into the setting that was observed" (Patton, 25). Consequently, the data gathered through participant observation should "have depth and detail... be descriptive... sufficiently descriptive that the reader can understand what occurred and how it occurred" (Patton, 26). In essence, the "observation permits the reader to enter the situation under study" (Patton, 26). Observational data is gathered through participant observation. Its value lies in its ability to allow the reader and the observer "to understand program activities and impacts through detailed description information about what has occurred in a program and how the people in the program have reacted to what has occurred" (Patton, 203). Moreover, the nature of participant observation is interpretive where by the "interpretation is essential to an understanding of experience and experience involves interpretation" (Patton, 69; Stake, 1995).

In other words, understandings gained from participant observation which is experiential helps the researcher experience how the participant "makes sense of their world" (Patton, 69; Bernstein, 1976). Therefore, life histories written in a narrative style allow the reader to understand the complexity of the researched as well as the context from which the observed operates. Yet, their are limitation to the method.

Because participant observation is a process ranging from full participation to complete observation, Glesne and Peshkin caution researchers to always question their assumptions and perceptions in order to maintain a learner's stance. This questioning provided "new ways of thinking about some aspect of social interaction" (Glesne & Peshkin, 42). Consequently, the outcome of participant observation, according to Glesne and Peshkin, is a new understanding of the situation and the actors in the situation that is gained over time in the setting.

According to Patton, a limitation for the observer, however, is "to seek the essence of the life of the observed, to sum up, to find a central unifying principle" (Patton, 51). While
“full participant observation over an extended period of time is the qualitative ideal” (Patton, 194), this can be expensive and labor intensive (Patton, 25). Moreover, because the researcher is the “instrument of data collection”, the researcher must utilize multiple methods from which to collect the data in order to limit personal biases. The researcher must continually “reflect on deal with, and report potential sources of bias and error” (Patton, 56).

While funding, time limit, access to the setting, etc., may cause difficulty in the process of qualitative data gathering, the principle limitations in qualitative research are related to the principle of “self as researcher.”

While it is important to understand the ramifications of participant observation for the researcher as one of the choices of method, it is more important that the researcher situate herself theoretically as well as methodologically before entering the field. Because the researcher is the key instrument in qualitative methodology, this locating of self is essential to providing “good” qualitative research and prevents problems associated with “going Native.”

Participant observation can either be with consent or without consent which is related to the question of whether the researcher should have full disclosure of their research, partial disclosure, or no disclosure. There are critical questions that impact the length as well as depth of participant observation in qualitative research. For instance, how long should the researcher stay in the field? How does a researcher gain entree? How much should the researcher participate in the setting? Some of these questions and concerns are related to self as researcher. Others are related to the researcher’s impact on the environment that they are researching, and have political as well as ethical implications. In a case study, participant observation can be employed. Hence, the researcher must not just answer the implications of participant observation, good or bad, in qualitative research, but also address how the method operates within the context of case study research.
Again, triangulation is utilized as a strategy to ensure that the inquiry will be a "good" qualitative case study, a concern that will now address as well as the weaknesses or disadvantages of case study. Thus, this researcher designed this study to ascertain the fullness of possibility associated with case study despite its limitations.

Presentation of Data

The data is presented in this study in four subsequent chapters. These chapters correspond to chronological sequences, but the conceptual framework is based on the ascriptive attributes chosen and emergent in this study. These were: leaders, teachers, the implicit curriculum and change. A narrative style is utilized.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research demonstrated how a qualitative single-case case study situated within an urban historical context can be explicated. The many aspects of qualitative research represents a continuum from which the complexities of urban schools can be located, analyzed and presented. While qualitative research has been ridiculed because of its utilization of subjectivity, qualitative researches contend that they can produce "good" research through triangulation, or other measures of quality that are not established within positivistic inquiry, but qualitative inquiry.

Qualitative researchers employ a plethora of methods from which to collect data. One such method, is the case study. Case study was chosen as the dominant method of data collection and analyses based on the research questions, the purpose of the study, interest and access to the chosen school site. This researcher found that case study permitted an emergent design within a theoretical framework. In all, the usage of a qualitative case study was in itself a study of the method while explicating the particular case chosen.
CHAPTER 4

THE URBAN CONTEXT

In the past, Black education historians have focused on three successive yet integrated
epochs of research. These eras were fully explicated in Chapter 3. However, the majority of
this scholarship regardless of era has focused on the Black southern education experience
(Butchart, 1988). In 1969, David Tyack contended “we definitely need an appraisal of the
history of education in northern black ghettos” (Tyack, 1969, 287). Since that time, several
scholars have provided such studies (Butchart, 1988; Franklin, 1979). However, more studies
are needed. As we approach the end of this century, “what is needed in the history of Afro-
American education is an end to the segregation of its interpretive insights by placing it in the
broader context in which black education was practiced” (Butchart, 364). Moreover, “African
American life in the twentieth century has become an urban life, a complete history of Afro-
American education must afford more insight into urban education” (Butchart, 364). It is the
northern or Midwestern urban context in which schooling and education takes place in
Champion Avenue School. Consequently, this research seeks to provide further illumination
of the Black education experience in the urban North.

In the urban context, four major factors have historically determined access to
education for African Americans and other minority groups: the political process, social
service organizations, demographics, and housing (Franklin, 1979; Gerber, 1978; Herson &
Bolland, 1990; Judd & Swanstrom, 1994; Keating, 1994; Massey & Denton, 1993; Perlmann,
1988). This chapter chronicles the politics, organizations, demographics, and housing patterns;
and how they impacted on educational access in the medium-sized Midwestern city of Columbus. Therefore, this author asserts urban education can be almost holistically understood within this broader perspective.

Chapter four provides a working definition of urban and the political process. Additionally, it offers an analysis of the political organizations such as the Columbus Board of Education, and other civic and social organizations such as the Urban League, the NAACP and the Vanguard League. All of these organizations or political entities indirectly or directly shaped education policy in Columbus. Moreover, this chapter explicates specific factors such as the impact of the Great Migration, WWI, WWII and the Brown decision on Columbus, and the Black community in particular. Furthermore, this chapter details the service and civic organizations and their relationships to fostering academic access for Black students and teachers. Finally, the impact of the neighborhood school concept in the urban context is also examined in this chapter. Chapter four begins with defining the theoretical and practical concepts related to the urban context.

**Defining Urban**

Urban is defined as "communities of concentrated populations that coordinate and control large-scale activities" (Herson & Belland, 1990, 6). These activities are characterized and directed towards four goals: population density; economic focal points that centralize and disperse of goods, and services; a communication complex and specialized relationships; and urban dwellers who display urban habits and shared interests (Herson & Belland, 1990, 5). Although city and urban have typically been used interchangeably, city "incorporates the idea of government and administration and urban carries the idea of a densely populated place and the lifestyles of those who live there" (Herson & Belland, 5). Urban dwellers within the urban
context are dependent upon "services provided by the city's government." Consequently, within urban cities, the governmental structure "provides the key service of education" (Herson & Belland, 6). Consequently, research on urban education should be enmeshed in the study of the urban politics and the political process as the dispensers of educational services. This chapter examines the external context of urban education which influences the efficacy of urban education for African Americans through policy initiatives, and implementations that are based on the changing context of urban areas.

The Urban Political Process

Paul Peterson contends that urban political processes permit or "allow for the expression of nearly all the particular interests within the city" (Peterson, 1990, 21). Parenti contends, however, that the decision making process in cities is primarily made by a small group of elites (Parenti, 1970). The emergence of the Progressive Era initiated reform in the political processes of cities whereby an elite governing structure was instituted in most cities (Hofstadter, 1955; Judd & Kanotor, 1992; Judd & Swanstrom, 1994; Wiebe, 1967). Consequently, the movement for "good" government altered the political landscape of cities including Columbus (Ward, 1993). The adoption of changes in the political management, and the political process in Columbus had a debilitating effect on the political efficacy of one particular group, the African American community.

Tyack argues "political meddling was precisely what the elite reformers wanted, but for blacks and other newly arrived migrants such bureaucratization may well have blocked access to teaching jobs and policy making" (Tyack, 1969, 290). Hence, city politics and processes determined Black's ability to gain access to the decision making arena of the city, to jobs, housing and quality education (Parenti, 19). Thus, "city politics has come to be
understood as a continuous, complex interaction between public and private institutions, between the marketplace and the public sphere, between private goals and collective purpose” (Judd & Kantor, 1992, 1). In Columbus, this occurred when the organization of the school board, city council and other governing structures were changed.

**Urban Politics in Columbus**

Prior to the twentieth century, Blacks' collective and private needs and goals in Columbus were mediated through the Ward system. David Gerber writes “the Black vote could be even more influential in local contexts, for depending on the size of the local black electorate, political power would increase as the size of the district decreased” (Gerber, 1976, 212). This was true in Columbus.

Reverend James Poindexter secured the first seat on the city council in 1880 when he was elected councilman for the Ninth Ward. His position provided entry for other Blacks to similar political positions. Later in 1884, he became the first Black to attain a seat on the Columbus Board of Education (Minor, 1947; Ward, 1993). It was the first time Blacks appeared on the ballot for city council in both political parties (Gerber, 1976). Had it not been for the Ward system, Poindexter probably would not have attained such a position. He had tried previously to attain a position as Senator for Ohio, but he had failed. Yet, the ward system of election in Columbus enabled him to secure a political position that allowed Blacks access to the services of the city, especially education (Minor, 1947; Ward, 1993).

Thus, the ward system allowed Blacks to engage in the political processes of the city because it rested on geographic representation of a particular area rather than the city at-large. At best, the Ward system was predicated upon “the practices and idea of representative government, involved wide latitude for the expression of grass-roots impulses and their
involvement in the political process” (Hays, 1992, 226). Thus, all ethnic and racial groups in a city theoretically had the opportunity to engage in the political process. Hence, each Ward had a representative to the City Council and the Columbus Board of Education. Although Blacks comprised about 30% of the Ninth Ward, their efforts were supported by the majority of the Republican constituency in the Ward because they focused on improving the area for all residents (Gerber, 1976). Thus, Blacks were able to secure through Poindexter, and other Black elected officials in the complex political processes of Columbus services such as education. Moreover, their growth in population from 1880 to 1910 allowed for the emergence of other Black politicians such as J. J. Lee and Wilbur King. Both of these individuals would later be elected to the city council and the school board. However, Black access to the political process would change shortly after the turn of the century.

According to Richard Hofstadder “from about 1890 to the second World War can be considered the age of reform” (Hofstadder, 1955, 3). Yet, historians typically classify the Progressive Era from 1870 to 1920. It was an era of change in government, industry, and society in general. Reform was the major objective of this era. Nonetheless, historian Robert Wiebe considers it an era when a distended society was in search of an ordered core (Wiebe, 1967). Because of the changes in society at the time such as urbanization, industrialization, immigration, and migration, Samuel Hays notes that it is simply not enough to recall the intellectual ideology of the era that proselytized reform. Hays argues that while historians like Hofstadder chronicle the ideals of the Progressive Era, and the reformers that pushed for reforms in government, schools, and industry, it is important to weigh the ideals against the reality of the reformers' actions (Hays, 1992, 209).

As noted earlier, the Columbus Board of Education and the City council membership was determined through the Ward system in place in Columbus. In Columbus, reformers
changed the mechanisms by which citizens of Columbus gained seats and representations of their concerns on the Columbus Board of Education and the City Council. They reformed both political organizations in the name of good government (Hays, 1992). Several factors precipitated the need for reformers to alter political mechanisms of cities: the advent of the industrial revolution, the immigration of southern and eastern Europeans and the migration of Blacks to central cities. In essence, migration, immigration, industrialization and urbanization altered the city’s texture. Yet, one factor related directly to the opinion towards Blacks in cities. Black population growth coupled with the passage of Plessy v. Ferguson, however, added to the sentiment in Columbus and in other cities that they were in a state of disorder (Wiebe, 1967).

The direct primary was instituted as mandatory in Ohio political elections in 1904. It was the first movement of reform in the political structure of Ohio, and later in Columbus. As reforms ensued in municipalities across the nation, they were fed by social and political ferment. An indicator of change in racial sentiment in the country was the Plessy v Ferguson decision of 1896. Plessy marked the beginning of institutional Jim Crow. However, Blacks in Ohio and in general remained ambivalent toward the new reforms. Gerber maintains Columbus

Blacks had special fears. The new municipal charter contained provisions for at-large elections for all local offices and municipal boards; reformers hoped these would check the political power of the easily corruptible inner-city poor and the ward leaders who controlled their votes, instead guaranteeing the hegemony of the respectable middle class (Gerber, 1976, 344).

Consequently, the new elite began to dominate over the political policy making arenas of Columbus. After 1912, Blacks would not attain political positions. Reformers’ initiatives in Columbus resulted in the most comprehensive political centralization in the state (Gerber, 1976). Even though a new cadre of Black leaders emerged in Columbus, unlike their political
predecessor, Poindexter, they were more concerned with the delivery of social services for Blacks in Columbus rather than acquiring political power. This new leadership was more concerned with civic, business and economic opportunities created by the influx of migrating Blacks who badly needed these services. Thus, when the political changes were made in the city charter, Black leaders were unable to influence the delivery of social services to Blacks because they lacked political power. Moreover, the old cadre of leadership including Poindexter who died in 1907 exercised very little power in the reformed city. The newly emergent middle-class or elites controlled and voted in measures which transformed Black access to the political process in Columbus (Moreland, 1977). The Columbus Board of Education was altered as part of the new reforms, and from this time onward, the political process in Columbus would be significantly altered.

**The Columbus Board of Education (BOE)**

As indicated earlier, reformers altered the political structure of Columbus. However, the most important political organization which impacts on education, was and continues to be the Columbus Board of Education.

In 1912, the Columbus Board of Education (BOE) changed its charter. The 1902 direct primary initiative had also allowed for municipalities to alter their system from Ward to at-large electoral policies. At the same time, the constituency of the BOE had changed. Before the turn of the century, the composition of the school board had prevented the restructuring and the dismissal of one Black teacher, Ms. Celia Davis (Ward, 1993). Additionally, the Black population in Columbus was growing, yet at the same time, its political representation and leadership was declining. While a new cadre of Black leaders were surfacing, none were as politically influential as Poindexter. Thus, the BOE's vote to
amend its charter significantly impeded the ability of Blacks to obtain political representation on the BOE, and the city council for more than fifty years (Giffin, 1968; Moreland, 1977; Murphy, 1970). The BOE organizational structure was switched from a ward to at-large representation. Thus, the establishment of at-large system of representation for the BOE appealed to elite reformers because this system of representation allowed the elite reformers to exclude Blacks and other ethnic minorities interests and control the urban school system (Hofstadder, 1955; Wiebe, 1967). Consequently, the African American's community ability to influence or determine educational policy was limited.

As Columbus demographics changed and housing was circumscribed to a particular geographic location, Blacks were relegated to the East side of the city. However, Blacks could be found within four distinct areas outside of the East End Area: West Goodale, South 7th (Bad Lands), East 5th, and the Southgate areas (Murphy, 1970). Even though Blacks were dispersed throughout the city, the majority were still concentrated in the eastern part of Columbus. This population grew as southern rural Blacks migrated to the city primarily from three states: Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. Also, rural Ohio Blacks emigrated to urban centers such as Columbus. The Columbus BOE was well aware of the increase in the Black population in Columbus, particularly in the schools. They were also aware of the growing sentiment against the mixed schools that existed in Columbus. Prior to the amending of the state Charter in 1907, the BOE had already began to institute new policies related to Black educational access and Black teachers. In fact, W. O. Thompson, the president of The Ohio State University, placed a motion on the floor to determine whether or not the BOE had "the power . . . to establish separate schools for the white and black races and to compel the children . . . to attend" (Ward, 113). Thompson's motion was approved, and his motion would eventually turn into BOE policy.
Board Policy

At the turn of the century, America as a whole was being challenged by many internal forces. Three events altered Whites' racial attitudes towards Blacks at the turn of the century in the U. S., the Plessy decision in 1896, the subsequent Cummings decision in 1899 which extended the "separate but equal" doctrine to schools, and the migration of Blacks to urban centers such as Columbus. The White Man's Burden ideology coupled with these and other factors altered the content and context of race relations in Columbus and other cities.

In 1897, Black students' increased enrollments and one Black teacher's placement in the Twenty-Third and Medary Avenue Schools respectively met with opposition by some White citizens (Ward, 1993). The citizens demanded that White students in the Twenty-Third Street area be allowed to transfer out of the school or that the number of Black students be limited at the school. In the Medary School, Ms. Celia Davis had been appointed as a teacher. The Medary constituents were "opposed to the teaching of their school by a colored instructor" (Ward, 1993, 84), and demanded that Ms. Davis be reassigned to another school which had a greater Black student population. Particular members of the Board saw no reason why both resolutions could not be granted. However, separate schools had been outlawed with the passage of the Arnett Law in 1887. Moreover, Reverend Joshua Jones who became a BOE member when Poindexter retired in 1894 was the only Black member of the Board. Reverend Jones and other members protested against these measures and required that the Board investigate the matter. While Reverend Jones was supported by some of the members of the Board, it was evident that he advocated against these measures. Moreover, it was apparent particular members of the BOE such as Mr. Thompson desired the return of segregated schools. Consequently, two factions began to emerge in the BOE.
In 1898, Charles E. Morris, the President of the BOE indicated that the closure of separate schools had "the effect of keeping out of employment many intelligent colored people who were fully competent to manage and instruct any school" (Ward, 88). Still, Morris alluded to the racial animosity in the city which prevented this from occurring. Morris advocated for separate schools under the premise that such schools would increase the number of opportunities for Black teacher employment in the city. From 1900 to 1910, BOE members argued and lamented over how to establish a "separate school" despite the state charter against it. At first, they attempted to alter the relationship between Black teachers and the schools.

The Building of Champion

After 1903, the BOE began to activate policy which would create a de facto segregated school with a Black teaching staff and pupils through gerrymandering and the reassignment of Black teachers. Champion Avenue Elementary school would be that school.

In 1900, the board began to discuss in earnest the problem associated with African American teachers (Ward, 1993). Specific board members sought to abolish Black teachers' employment in the schools, limit their placement to two per school (a quota), and finally, to establish a separate school (Ward, 1993). Time and time again, the factional splits within the board argued. For a detailed discussion of their debates see "The African American Struggle for Education in Columbus, Ohio" (Ward, 1993). Despite these debates, the BOE's policies would eventually lead to the establishment of a separate school for Black teachers and students. Clearly, the reforms advocated for the BOE would provide its members with the political power to implement their reforms initiatives in the Columbus schools.

The BOE was able to accomplish their reforms because they represented an at-large constituency and divisions within the Black community over segregated versus mixed schools (Ward, 1993). Reformers' revision of the BOE charter, along with the absence of Black
representation on the BOE, resulted in the denial of Black access to educational policy and decision making. Moreover, as Tyack indicated, the implementation of the reformer’s initiatives, led to the immediate curtailment of opportunities for Black teachers rather than the proposed increase in relative positions advocated by Morris in 1899 and later P. D. Shriner in 1904. Hence, the building of Champion in 1909 and its subsequent opening in 1910 represented the beginning of the establishment of a de facto segregated school system. It is important to note that within this urban context the political process had been summarily closed to Blacks. Subsequently, they did not have access to educational policy. In 1910, the Columbus Dispatch headline stated “Negroes to Have Fine New School: Champion Avenue Structure Will Be For Use of Colored Children-Expected to Provide Places for 10 Teachers and a Janitor of That Race” (Columbus Dispatch, 1/6/1910). The article indicated while the BOE had not officially stated that the school was exclusively for the use of Blacks, residents of the area believed “the new school building, now in the course of construction on Champion Avenue, near Long Street will be used exclusively for colored children, with colored teachers in charge” (Columbus Dispatch, 1910). The BOE could not officially state that the school was being built for that purpose. It was against state law. In fact, the court ruled later against a suit filed by Mr. Smith because the building of Champion would decrease the crowded conditions at surrounding schools such as Felton, Twenty-third, Garfield and Eastwood schools (Ward, 1993; BOE Minutes, 1911). Yet, their placement of Champion would accomplish the goal desired by the majority of the BOE. Hence, the BOE’s new structure allowed the new ruling elite to control the efficacy of Black education in Columbus.

During the Progressive Era, Blacks in Columbus began to reorganize as well. A new leadership emerged. This leadership set about establishing organizations, civil and social, whose goal was to support the development, maintenance and growth of the Black community.
Thus, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League were founded in Columbus. Later, the Vanguard League emerged as the most radical of Black organizations in Columbus (Ross, 1992). All of these organizations formed as a result of changes in the demographics and social relations in Columbus. Moreover, each in their own way attempted to challenge the de facto segregated school system established as a result of BOE policy. However, at the turn of the century, the first of these groups, the Urban League was primarily concerned with the growing Black migrant population.

**Black Migration and Changing Demographics**

From 1900 on, the Black population in Columbus increased steadily. At times it even doubled. Columbus, however, had the largest percentage of Blacks than most Midwestern cities except Indianapolis (Gerber, 1976). The Black community's growth, however, affected the Black community both positively and negatively. Historically, Blacks resided in all sectors of Columbus (Ward, 1993). However, as migration ensued, Blacks became concentrated in the East end of the city. The Champion Avenue area was the most densely populated as Blacks secured housing in the area through covert means. Eventually, the area was marked by the Blackberry Bach and the more affluent Bronzeville section which housed the most prominent Blacks in Columbus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Number of Blacks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>51,647</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>88,150</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>125,560</td>
<td>8,201</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>181,511</td>
<td>12,739</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>237,031</td>
<td>22,181</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Columbus Demographics from 1880-1920
As the figures indicate, Columbus's Black population increased significantly between the period of 1880 to 1920. Its greatest increase came within the ten-year period between 1910 to 1920. It increased by 74.1%. The increase in the Black population in Columbus during the period from 1910 to 1920, can be attributed to the following factors: the "Great Migration" of southern Blacks to urban centers in search of employment during the first World War, the repressive system of Jim Crow along with the reign of terror by the Ku Klux Klan against southern Blacks, and Black newspaper's daily accounts of the progress being made by northern urban Blacks. All of these factors served as push/pull factors that eventually led to the migration of Blacks to cities such as Columbus (Bryant, 1983).

Columbus's Black population has continued to increase. In turn, its Black school-aged population increased as well. As the majority of Blacks became circumscribed to the East section of the city, the neighborhood concept required their attendance at Champion. However, in later years the restructuring of Champion to a Junior High School permitted the BOE to relegate students from across the city to the school (Carter, 1976). To deal with the increase in Black school-aged children, the BOE erected schools that would provide educational services to the Black community within the confines of the Black context that was determined by segregation in housing opportunities. The "neighborhood school concept" regulated the overwhelming majority of Blacks to de facto segregated schooling. Thus, the number of Black schools increased. Champion's opening had only been the beginning for the BOE. However, the BOE's placement of Champion had been determined by where Blacks lived in the city.
Changing Demographics and Board Reactions

By the time Columbus experienced the full effect of the “Great Migration,” the BOE was completely reformed and acted accordingly. While Champion had opened in 1910, the next school to become all Black was not built and positioned squarely in the Black community. It had become a Black school because of the increase of Blacks in the neighborhood. Thus, the board responded to changing demographics which increased the number of Blacks in the schools and changes in the housing patterns of the Black community. Between the Depression and World War II, the Columbus BOE exercised their policy of de facto segregation. Between 1921 when it made Champion into an Intermediate School exclusively until 1943, four more schools became all Black and summarily segregated. The first school, however, to be resegregated was the Twenty-third Street School.

Twenty-third Street becomes Mt. Vernon Avenue

While the Twenty-Third Street school was the first school which experienced an increase in its African American student population, it did not have any Black teachers. In 1911, it was renamed the Mt. Vernon Avenue School (BOE Minutes, No. 17, 1911, 391). As early as 1915, the superintendent, J. E. Roudebush, reported that the school was crowded (BOE Minutes, No. 17, 1915, 307). He later wrote in September of 1915, “all of the elementary schools are now full, and the registration is increasing everywhere, except in the downtown buildings” (BOE Minutes, No. 19, 1915, 307). From 1915 through 1919, Mt. Vernon’s overcrowding increased. Portable buildings were installed to meet the increased student population, however, the enrollment continued to grow and led to overcrowding at the school (BOE Minutes, Nos. 19-20). Finally, in 1930, the BOE redrew the boundaries of the school. People within the Black community complained and organized. However, they only succeeded in postponing the BOE’s actions for one year. The NAACP, however, was the
organization which lead the movement to alter the decisions of the Board. Their efforts will be discussed shortly. Eventually, in 1931, almost thirty-five years later, the Twenty-third Street School, now named the Mt. Vernon Elementary School, was changed into an all Black school (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1931, 447). The Superintendent was questioned concerning the change in the school. He responded

Don't you know why it was done? It was not for economy but to get rid of so many Colored children in the schools. We are tired of complaints and it is an injustice to white people to have to go to the expense of sending their children to private schools because of Colored children being in the public schools. We had a case of complaint because of Italians in one school and we adjusted it (Giffin, 1968, 343-344).

Moreover, earlier in the year, the Superintendent reported to the BOE that the new organization order had been planned "with the educational interests of the pupils carefully safeguarded" and would save the school system "more than $72,000" (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1931, 412). However, when the superintendent Collicott was confronted by the Black community, he provided different reasons for the change in the district. His reasons cited for Mt. Vernon's redistricting were similar to the complaints petitioners leveled at the BOE in 1897. The Depression, the BOE's financial crisis, and the growing resentment of mixed schools created the Mt. Vernon School. Hence, Mt. Vernon became the second all Black school. But, it was the first school to have its staff changed from all White to all Black.

Ms. Nell Moffitt who had been a teacher in the Columbus school system for years became the principal of the newly organized Mt. Vernon Elementary School. She would serve there until 1946 when she retired. The BOE had succeeded in making Mt. Vernon an all Black school by gerrymandering and by allowing White students in the area to transfer out. In fact, they had exercised their authority to do what the BOE had wanted to do in 1898. But, the BOE was not finished.
Garfield Changes

Before the beginning of the 1932 school year, because of financial strain, the BOE discontinued kindergartens (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 546). Later that year, the BOE changed the boundaries of three other Columbus schools: Garfield Avenue Elementary School, Franklin Junior High and the Pilgrim Junior High School. While Garfield would become the next all Black school, Black citizens fought against the BOE's actions.

Robert C. Myers initiated a lawsuit against the BOE on January 18, 1932. His lawyer, Attorney William E. McKinley, asked for a temporary restraining order whereby

... enjoining the defendant from requiring the children of the plaintiff to attend CAS [Champion Avenue School] in order. Directing the defendant to permit said children of the plaintiff to attend the Eastwood School, pending the hearing of thus cause upon its merits (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 485).

The Board's minutes do not indicate what happened in this case. It was heard two days later by Honorable John R. King. Despite Myers's efforts and the NAACP protests, Garfield became the second school to change its teaching staff.

Mr. Charles P. Blackburn was appointed as the principal (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 546). He had been a teacher at Champion since 1920. Blackburn attained his B. S. from Temple University in 1917 in Physical Education. Moreover, he had attended the University of Wisconsin, Northwestern University, Capital University and Ohio State (Saunders Papers). When it became apparent that Garfield was going to be an all Black school, the BOE received "several communications commending the Board in its selection of" Blackburn (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 549). Thus, Garfield became the third school to have an all Black staff and students (Griffin, 1968). Still, the BOE was not through.

The Making of Pilgrim Elementary School: End of a Decade

Pilgrim Junior High was built on Taylor Avenue in 1921 (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1921, 481). As early as 1924, portables were being used at the school to accommodate enrollment
increases (BOE Minutes, No. 21, 1924, 437). By 1938, it was clear that Pilgrim, because of the overcrowding, would be altered in an attempt to maintain Columbus's dual system of education.

In 1931, Mt. Vernon, Champion and Pilgrim were both closed due to an outbreak of spinal meningitis (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1931, 344). Clearly, the schools were overcrowded. Moreover, they were also in close proximity to each other (See Map, Appendix A). At the same time, the BOE began altering Pilgrim's boundary lines. By the end of the school year, it was clear that change in the composition of the school was about to occur. Mrs. E. W. Moore and a contingency of women protested the changes in the district lines for Pilgrim which was a Junior High at the time. Even though a vote was taken to reconsider the boundary changes, the motion failed (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 559). Citizens and the NAACP were ineffective in preventing the BOE's impending intentions to alter the school's composition and teaching staff. The BOE, however, could alter the student, teacher composition and organization of the schools because Blacks had been excluded from the political process through the implementation of the at-large system some twenty odd years earlier. In essence, Blacks played no role in the decision making process of the BOE. Parents, citizens and organizations protested throughout the period by sending letters, personal appearances and such; they were unable to persuade the BOE to alter its policy. Ironically, Whites had protested as well, but not in favor of mixed schools.

Mr. Wright noted "Black children were everywhere. Whites never had to go to Champion, Felton or Pilgrim if they lived in the area" (Wright, 1996). White parents opposed desegregated schooling and despite the 1887 law against school segregation, they advocated a return to segregated schools through gerrymandering. Thus, Pilgrim was the last school in the 1930s to be changed by the BOE.
In 1939, Pilgrim became the third to become all Black. Mr. Lucien Wright, whose father built their house in 1912 on Long Street, had attended Eastwood School, Pilgrim and Franklin Junior High and East High School. When he attended Eastwood the teachers were all White. Mr. Wright went to school with children of the most prominent Whites in the city such as the editor of the Dispatch, Mr. DeHayes and others' children. He recalled what occurred when Pilgrim was changed. He stated:

Pilgrim was the third school to have its teachers changed. However, it was the first school to be changed in organizational structure from a Junior High to an elementary school (Wright, 1996).

He stated further that "the Board gerrymandered kids right out of Eastwood and East. In fact, they gerrymandered Eastwood right out of children" (Wright, 1996). Later, when the Vanguard League complained about the conditions of the schools and requested that Eastwood be reopened, the board refused. However, Eastwood's closure would eventually precipitate other changes in the school system. Hence, Pilgrim opened in the Fall of 1939 as an all Black school. Mr. Harold Thomas was assigned as its principal.

In the decade, three schools had been changed from mixed student populations and White staffs, to all Black student and teacher populations. One school, Eastwood, whose boundaries lines had been redrawn to exclude Black students, however, would close at the turn of the next decade. Its closure would result in overcrowded conditions at Pilgrim, now a elementary school, Mt. Vernon and Garfield. The BOE was able to increase the number of all-Black schools because of the absence of Black representation on the school board. In addition, the BOE was successful in segregating Black children because of its racist held beliefs toward Blacks. For instance, the BOE justified its need for all-Black schools by stereotyping southern Blacks (Ward, 1993). The BOE stigmatized southern Blacks by categorizing the children as grade retarded. Moreover, Mitchell's article in 1923 addressed the
grade retardation of southern Black children as a result of environment. Thus, the BOE used the stereotyping of Black students as another justification to maintain a dual system of education. Another reason why the BOE was successful in implementing and establishing all-Black schools was residential patterns (Carter, 1976; Giffin, 1968; Murphy, 1970).

**Demographic Change and Housing: Between WWI and Post WWII**

Himes notes "with this growth of the large Negro community there appeared the familiar pattern of urban differentiation both social and spatial and by 1930 a typical northern urban Negro community emerged" (Himes, 1942, 142). This typical northern urban Black community in Columbus was structurally ripe for the establishment of de facto segregated schools.

On April 17, 1931, the BOE passed a motion which required "adjustments be made permitting pupils living within a reasonable distance of a nearby building to attend school in this building" (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1931, 403. After passing the motion, they summarily altered Eastwood, Champion, Mt. Vernon, Pilgrim and Shephard school boundaries. This was the institutionalization of their "neighborhood school" policy. However, the policy was not applied equally. Whereas Blacks students attended the schools within their neighborhoods, as indicated earlier by Mr. Wright, white students did not (Giffin, 1968; Wright, 1996). The neighborhood school concept seemed to have been applied to Blacks only. White families in the district could transfer out (VL papers). Moreover, the Black population increased, and so did the resentment to their social relations with Whites. By 1930, racial isolation had occurred in the city to the degree that Blacks "couldn't go to the theaters or restaurants downtown or on Ohio State's campus" (Wright, 1996). However, racial isolation did not just exist in public accommodations, it existed in housing as well. Keating argues,

The pattern of racial segregation in residential housing and neighborhoods took hold as the mass black migration from the South to northern cities occurred, during
and after World War I. This was the era of the formulation of black urban ghettos in northern cities such as Chicago, Cleveland and New York. (Keating, 1994, 8-9).

Housing segregation occurred in Columbus as well. Ghettos had started forming in Columbus with the migration of southern Blacks. In *Frontiers of America* (1954), it's noted:

> The Negro migrant was inducted into the North by industries which needed him to produce ammunition and munitions of war. The resentment he met ran all the way from tolerance to hostility. He received very little welcome to the city. He was the marginal worker. The Negro migrant was both frustrated and disappointed. Discrimination forced him to live under the most undesirable and overcrowded circumstances. Ghettos began to be formed in different areas of the city, but the majority of the migrants found refuge in the East and most of which was then and is today known as blighted areas (*Frontiers of America*, 1954, 15).

Moreover,

> Housing has been and is today the number one problem of Negro adjustments. The Negro migrants had to live somewhere. The traditional Negro boundaries were bursting at the seams and Negro communities were springing up in many areas within the city which itself became framed with other Negro communities. Hanford Village on the southeast, the American Addition on the northeast, Lincoln Heights Addition on the northwest, Southgate on the southwest, the Burnside addition on the west, and Urbancrest on the extreme southwest (*Frontiers of America*, 15).

Moreover, it was caused by the increased migration of Blacks to the city as the table below indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Number of Blacks</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>290,564</td>
<td>32,774</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>306,087</td>
<td>35,904</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>375,901</td>
<td>46,692</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>682,962</td>
<td>80,235</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>916,228</td>
<td>106,401</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Columbus Demographics from 1930 to 1970*

According to Carter, Murphy, and others this increase in population limited Black access to
quality housing. Moreover, the resultant housing patterns determined school composition (Carter, 1976; Murphy, 1970; Jacobs, 1994).

The migration of Blacks increased in Columbus and it led to the fear of racial contact. Moreover, increased migration led to the possibility of racial contact. The increased migration of Blacks met with increased racial intolerance in Columbus, and thus isolation in housing, social arenas and schooling. Keating maintains housing patterns signify "prevailing patterns of racial separatism" (Keating, 1994, 4). Thus, the BOE's actions correlate with the increased fear and lack of tolerance of Blacks. Consequently, the Black population growth over the years led to the establishment of policies such as racial steering, restricted covenants and redlining (Keating, 1994). Again, this occurred in Columbus.

To prevent Negroes from purchasing in areas where they were not wanted, restrictive covenants which prohibited them from use of the land other than as a servant was accentuated and a surprisingly large proportion of the old communities and practically all of the new additions had restrictive covenants (Frontiers of America, 15).

In Columbus, these policies ensured racial isolation in housing, and consequently in schools through the neighborhood school concept. Moreover, coupled with the neighborhood school concept they supported the rationale for segregated schools based on fact, rather than law. Eventually, these policies fostered the development of the de facto segregated schools in Columbus through the concept of neighborhood schools. The Board's policies parallel the general movement in Columbus which preferred racial isolation rather than integration.

As noted earlier, however, the NAACP, Urban League, and later the Vanguard League attempted to alter these policies. The three groups worked to change the housing conditions for Blacks in Columbus. They focused on securing housing for migrants and improving the bleak conditions of housing in the areas where Blacks lived. Their failure may be linked to their lack of insight into how other policies such as redlining, restricted covenants and the such
curtailed Blacks' movement into housing outside of the designated Black areas. Moreover, housing patterns created the rationale for the BOE's establishment of de facto segregated schools. During this period, there were no that effectively dealt with discriminatory housing practices. While Whites had lived within proximity of Blacks, they had historically been allowed not to attend schools with them (Ward, 1993). This practice had existed as early as 1897 (Ward, 1993). As the Black population grew and expanded, the White population in the city was declining because of the suburbanization movement. According to Judd, Swanstrom, and Keating, the suburbanization movement was aided in part by the federal government after World War II (Judd & Kantor, 1992; Judd & Swanstrom, 1994; Keating, 1994). Keating states,

Since WWII, the spatial and demographic patterns of metropolitan America have fundamentally changed. The overall population of central cities has generally declined, while the percentage of their inhabitants who belong to racial minorities in most cases has increased (Keating, 9).

The last school to be affected by the changing demographics, housing policies and board policies was the Felton Avenue School.

**Felton Avenue School: The Last to Turn**

Two organizations in Columbus had actively attempted to alter the BOE's policies: The NAACP and the Vanguard League (Carter, 1976; Giffin, 1968; Ross, 1992). Their goals and efforts will be discussed shortly. Yet, neither group was able to prevent the opening of Felton Avenue School. It was the last school to be turned into an all Black educational facility. The BOE utilized the same measures it had in altering the composition of the three previous schools. They redraw the district lines and appointed a new staff. Felton, Champion, Garfield and Pilgrim were all within close proximity to each other. Moreover, Felton and Garfield were feeder schools for Champion and Pilgrim. Again, the NAACP and the newly emergent
Vanguard League protested, but to no avail. Their protest were futile. The neighborhood concept of school placement had made the schools all Black. Yet, other schools would follow.

While some of the literature points to BOE's creation of segregated schools, none of it addresses other schools which were also all-Black. Several interviews indicate that Felton was not the last all-Black school. In fact, other schools such as Beatty Park, Eastgate, Leonard Avenue and Clearbrook were also all Black schools with all Black staffs (Butler, J. 1992; Nelson, 1994; Stewart, 1996; Wright, 1996). Clearbrook and Eastgate are further East of Champion while Beatty Park is a stone's throw away. These schools will be researched at a later time to ascertain if the processes for their creation was identical to the process that established the previously mentioned five schools.

In September of 1943, Mr. Lucien Wright became principal of Felton school. He had been recommended by Ms. Nell Moffitt. Wright had attended Columbus schools and graduated from The Ohio State University in 1935. He started teaching at the age of twenty (Wright, 1996). Because Wright was the person selected for the school, it was not picketed. He was a well respected member of the Black community. Consequently, under his direction the school flourished. In fact, his legacy would tie him to the subject of this study: Champion Avenue School.

On the eve of the Brown decision, the Columbus BOE had instituted five de facto segregated schools in Columbus; Champion was only one of them. The elementary schools such as Mt. Vernon, Felton, Garfield, and Pilgrim when it became an elementary school and Mt. Vernon were feeder schools for Champion, and later Pilgrim. East and Central high school were the next schools in the educational pipeline for the majority of Blacks in Columbus. However, as the generation of Black insurgency developed momentum and
evolved from a calm current to a raging river in Columbus, two particular groups sought to turn the tide in school segregation and alter the school board's policies.

**A Generation of Black Insurgency**

Doug McAdam contends the political process model maintains three things must be in place for a generation of insurgency to ensue. They are: organization with the aggrieved population, collective belief in the success of the venture and political alignment of groups within the larger political environment (McAdam, 1982). To some degree, Columbus had achieved this. The local organizational groups were connected to their national affiliates. Moreover, a new cadre of leadership had developed in Columbus as a result of migration (Himes, 1942). Lastly, all of the groups believed they could effect change in the system. In other words, they all believed they could affect the BOE's policies, and to some extent, they all did.

In Columbus, the political process of Black insurgency did not start in mass. Several groups were organized, but not necessarily as a mass movement at first. Himes wrote "No longer can life of the group be told in terms of the activities of the "great leader," for the population was differentiating into specialized interest groups and leadership became a characteristic of this new group life" (Himes, 1942, 133). Yet, some group members shared membership in other groups and shared resources. Consequently, the three groups detailed in this research each had a predominately different focus, but their goals all coalesced in attempting to alter the educational system and the policies of the Board of Education. None of the groups believed that the BOE had "an immutable structure of political life" (McAdam, 40). They collectively, and individually struggled to mediate the structure of the BOE.
Consequently, they did not accept that the lack of representation on the BOE precluded them from assessing the decision making process of the Board.

In Columbus, three groups sought to alter educational policy: the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People (NAACP), the Vanguard League (VL) and the Urban League (UL). By the 1940s, Columbus had an established middle-class, Black-owned and operated businesses, and a fairly well-to-do Black community (Himes, 1942). These constituents made up the majority of the membership in the three organizations. Each group, however, had and would respond differently to changes in the urban context of Columbus. Since Poindexter, no real significant political leader in Columbus had emerged who could alter the conservative political policies of the city, hence, the emergence of different groups with different people as their leaders. Of the three groups, the Vanguard League was the most radical. Nonetheless, it was the NAACP who first sought to alter the BOE's educational policy.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

The NAACP was the first politically minded organization established in Columbus (Murphy, 1970). Besides fighting against public discrimination, it had been first to advocate a social organization to address the needs of the new migrants in Columbus (Carter, 1973; Gerber, 1976; Murphy, 1970). It began as early as 1916 to advocate Black members of the Board of Education.

In 1916, the NAACP wrote to the BOE and requested that they consider a Mr. Issac D. Ross for the impending vacancy on the BOE (BOE Minutes, No. 19, 1916, 480). Ross was also supported by St. Phillips Episcopal church. Over the years, the NAACP and other organizations would send many correspondences when vacancies occurred on the BOE (BOE Minutes). Their assertions, however, were never fulfilled. By the time the BOE began to alter
school boundaries, the NAACP was an established organization in Columbus. Hence, it began to challenge policy changes in the schools.

In 1930, the NAACP challenged redrawing the boundary lines of Mt. Vernon school. Reverend J. S. Jackson, president of the NAACP, and the Black community protested. Because of their activism, they were able to alter the BOE's decision. The next year, however, the BOE instituted the boundary changes. Even though they were aware that the BOE might officially gerrymander the school, they were unable to stop them. Black parents learned of the changes when their children attended school and were informed that they were to attend another district, the newly formed Mt. Vernon school. In a letter to Walter White, C. E. Dickinson recalls the sentiments of Whites which caused the change at Mt. Vernon. He wrote:

\[
\ldots \text{Colored parents became aware that the cowardly Board of Education had surrendered to the demands of the unscrupulous whites in east Columbus many of whom had sent their children to private schools in order to avoid being in a class with Colored children. The financial depression had made it impossible for these prejudices whites to continue to send their children to private schools, hence, the School Board felt it incumbent upon them to eliminate the undesirable element and save the whites the unnecessary expense (Giffin, 1968, 342-343).}
\]

Dickinson's reasons for the gerrymandering of the schools, racial intolerance and financial difficulties, parallel the same reasons White patrons of the same school wanted the BOE in 1897 to alter its boundaries (Ward, 1993). As noted earlier, the Superintendent had pointed to the complaints of parents. Social relations had become more openly hostile. Reverend Henry W. Cooper complained to the BOE concerning racial discrimination leveled at Black children during an outing sponsored by the PTA (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1932, 519). The Board did not address the matter. The incident confirmed racial intolerance had increased in the schools.

One year after Mt. Vernon was made into an all Black school, Garfield was made into an all Black school. When Garfield was made into an all Black school, Walter White, Secretary of the National NAACP, sent a letter and telegram to the Board. White sent
attorney, Harry E. Davis to speak to the board on September 19, 1932. At the meeting, Davis protested against the creation of separate schools for colored in Columbus. He stated it was "illegal to have anything like separate schools in the State of Ohio and that the public policy of Ohio is opposed to any sort of racial discrimination." Davis appealed to "good sense, justice and fair play." Moreover, if necessary, he indicated "they [NAACP] would take legal action" (BOE Minutes, No. 24, 1932, 9). Davis was thanked for his presentation. The BOE, however, did not change their policy. As noted above, racial intolerance had increased and caused the conversion of and subsequent opening of the all-Black Garfield School.

The NAACP did not lessen their protest on the BOE's policy. Two weeks later, Walter White again sent another communication thanking the BOE for the reception of Mr. Davis. The BOE explained to Mr. White that no action had been taken in the matter of changes in school boundaries (BOE Minutes, No. 24, 1932, 14). They were right. They did not alter the school district any more. The Board had already succeeded in establishing the third all Black school. Again, the Board's policy would not be circumvented.

In 1943, Walter White sent correspondence to the BOE regarding the impending segregation of the Felton Avenue School. Mr. Wright explains what happened:

Felton was the last school to change from an all white school faculty at the junior high level to an all Black elementary school. I was assigned as principal based on the word of Ms. Moffitt. Mr. Barbee said to me the only reason why I did not picket the school was because you were made principal of it. If anyone else was made principal of it, I would have picketed it. This was in 1943 (Wright, 1996).

While the NAACP was unsuccessful in preventing the opening of Felton, they continued to exert pressure on the decision making process of the BOE. In 1949, they sent the BOE a copy of the "intergroup educational processes in Detroit public schools" (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1949, 465). When Brown was decided on May 17, 1954, Barbee Durham appeared before the BOE and addressed them concerning the "teacher hiring policy of the Columbus Public
Schools" (BOE Minutes, No. 29, 1954, 102). Barbee had worked with the VL and was at the same time a member of the NAACP. Consequently, his actions demonstrate that the different groups were aware of each other's activities and shared resources. This interconnection would eventually allow the NAACP to overcome the BOE's policy.

Even through the Brown decision was rendered in 1954, the schooling policy in Columbus would not change significantly until 1979. Between 1954 and the Penick decision in 1979, Columbus created voluntary mechanisms in an attempt to alter the de facto segregated schooling policy. In one dissertation, some Blacks were satisfied with the program, but Whites were not (Dutton, 1981; Simpson, 1981). Nevertheless, twenty-five years after Brown, the Penick decision instituted busing policy in Columbus schools to desegregate the schools. Between 1954 and 1979, the Urban League joined in the protest against the BOE's policies.

The Urban League (UL)

The Urban League (UL) emerged during the era of reform in Columbus as did the NAACP. The UL began in 1918. "In 1918, a newly created Negro Welfare Movement was found for the purpose of aiding migrants to the city of Columbus" (Murphy, 1970, 2). They were originally organized as the Federated Social and Industrial Movement for Negroes. Later, they became the Urban League (UL). The UL organized to address the increased migration of southern Blacks to the city and the resultant problems associated with their presence (Murphy, 1970; Ross, 1992). Thus, their primary purpose was to secure housing, employment, and to provide assistance to newly arriving Black migrants from the South (Murphy, 1970). In essence, the UL welcomed migrants to the city and helped them adjust to urban life. Shortly after their incorporation in 1920, the UL under the leadership of Nimrod B. Allen sought to meet the problems created in the city as a result of the massive Black exodus from the South during and after World War I. The UL provided services for the migrants.
related to adjustment, employment and housing. A small portion of their activities were
directly related to education.

Prior to World War II, the UL education activities focused on providing emergency
nursery schools. However, after the war, its education activities pertained to developing "long-
range programs for workers' education and to encourage Negroes in the efficient use of these
skills" (Murphy, 3). After Brown, the league assumed more responsibility for education in its
local planning initiative. It had shifted its focus from direct social service to a broader
political advocacy which addressed quality education and educational access.

During their first forty years, the UL did not focus on altering the growing
resegregation of the schools. It focused instead on improving race relations. The Executive
Director Mr. Nimrod B. Allen's aim was to establish good race relations. He was known as
"Mr. Integrationist" (Frontiers of America, 1954). Consequently, the UL formulated its
program around "the cooperative work of members of both races in the areas of health,
housing, recreation, employment, school life, home economics, clubs for boys and girls, and
the prevention of crime and delinquency in black communities" (Murphy, 30). Even though
its focus was not on education, it did support the establishment of services related to civic and
social education such as day cares, community clubs and organizations and recreational
activities. One of the leadership organizations of the UL which became national was the
Frontiers of America. In their publication, the editors commented on the status of the schools.
They wrote:

There are no segregated Negro schools. Champion Avenue Junior High and Pilgrim
Junior High, and Felton, Garfield and Mt. Vernon Elementary Schools have all Negro
staffs and Negro pupils. But they serve an-all Negro population in their areas
(Frontiers of America, 23).

The leadership of the UL obviously did not view the schools as segregated. However, it was
only after a change in leadership, the advent of the modern day Civil Rights Movement, and
the Brown decision of 1954 that the UL changed its focus toward direct action related to school desegregation. Prior to the Brown and the Fair Housing Act, the UL was unwilling under Allen's leadership to challenge segregated schooling and housing. Nimrod Allen retired in 1954. Under new leadership, the Urban League subsequently entered the ring to champion desegregated schooling.

When the leadership changed, so did the philosophy of the UL. Under the leadership of Andrew Freeman, the UL's philosophy attempted

. . . to begin with the ghetto of the mind. Remove the intellectual and psychological walls of racism surrounding job opportunities and economic development, as well as housing and social relations, and begin with education in the public schools. Education to change attitudes, to teach and develop skills (Murphy, 79).

Their purpose still included their historical emphasis on housing, the economy and jobs, but, they now began with the emphasis in the schools. This was a departure from their previous policy under Allen. Freeman, however, did not stop there.

In 1954, he advocated seven steps which needed to be taken to address desegregation in Columbus. They were: meetings with the BOE which had never been done before, consolidation of community leaders, a conference with leaders of influential groups, meetings with police, schedule activities in the neighborhoods, youth mediation, and work with the newspapers (Murphy, 1970). Throughout the fifties, the UL actively sought to advance school desegregation. The most critical impact on the BOE, however, came in the 1960s. Again, the UL's leadership had changed. Chester Jones succeeded Freeman. Jones pushed the UL's agenda even further.

Under Jones, the UL continued its focus on successfully implementing desegregation in Columbus. In 1964, two years after he assumed leadership of UL, he wrote a position paper entitled "Factual Report on Race Relations in Columbus" (Murphy, 1970). He concluded that "leaders who planned the strategy of progress are being shoved aside by others
who want no compromise. This movement has not reached the North yet" (Murphy, 111). Jones along with Chester Jones and Whitney Young represented a “New Thrust” in the UL nationally and locally (Murphy, 1970) The “New Thrust” had eight concerns: integrating society, equal life results or self-determination, ghetto power, problem solving for permanent change in the community, service, systemic changes in organizations, confrontation of inequality and coalition building (Murphy, 1970). While Jones was able to positively affect the community view of the UL, he soon left the position. His replacement, Robert D. Brown continued his efforts. It was under Brown’s leadership that the BOE received a comprehensive report outlining policy changes related to desegregation.

On May 16, 1967, the UL sent a comprehensive report on their position on desegregation in the schools to the BOE entitled “Quality-Integrated Schools For Columbus, Ohio” (Murphy, 1970) The UL’s document suggested several changes in the BOE policy arena. They were:

1. The creation of a Division of Planning and Development
2. A change in feeder patterns for junior and senior high schools.
3. Redistricting of attendance zones to attain better racial balance.
4. Closure of several elementary schools within the inner-city over time.
5. Alter the purpose of several schools and reassign pupils as necessary.

After three conferences between the UL and the BOE administration, on September 3, 1967, the Superintendent, Dr. Harold H. Eibling, presented his analysis of the report to the BOE. After commending the UL for their report, Dr. Eibling noted wrote:

Any new proposal—regardless of the aspect of public education to which it pertains—has potential impact on all areas of school operations. . . .

Because the report of the Urban League is of such great importance, because problems described by the League are so urgent, and because the school administration at present does not have sufficient staff to explore fully all of the promises and consequences inherent in each proposal developed by the League, I propose the following course of action for the consideration of the Columbus Board of Education:
1. That consultants of national stature in urban education be engaged by the Board to explore fully the promises and consequences of each proposal admitted by the Urban League, with the exception of Proposal 3, which already has been adopted by the Board.

2. That a panel of four persons representing the school administration and the League be constituted before September 8 to develop specifications to guide such consultants (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1967, 530).

Clearly, the Board felt compelled to address and study the effect of the League's proposals. However, their agreement would mean no substantive changes would occur in the BOE's present policy. Thus, the UL had officially become an active participant on school desegregation. However, this advent had only come about as a result of changes in its leadership, changes in the country and the Brown decision. The NAACP had been there all along. The most radical group, the Vanguard League, emerged between the two groups.

The Vanguard League (VL)

The Vanguard League (VL) developed in Columbus as a result of the WWII Double V campaign heralded by such advocates as A. Phillip Randolph and others. African Americans asserted for victory at home and victory abroad: Double V. The desegregation of the armed forces and other events created an atmosphere of change for Blacks. Consequently, in 1940, eight African Americans organized the VL. Originally, the VL sought change in "the discriminatory practices of downtown movie theaters" (Ross, 1992, 31). Their focus soon shifted to discriminatory restaurants, employers and realtors. While the majority of their activism addressed discriminatory practices related to social and economic endeavors, they also advocated desegregated teaching staff and eventually against the de facto segregation in the Columbus schools. Their "goal was to change the Columbus Board of Education's discriminatory hiring and placement practices" (Ross, 45). Before actively protesting against the segregation of Felton school to the school board, the VL researched several aspects of the school system such as the percentage of Black teachers in the school system, the percentage of
Black student enrollment, the percentage of Black students who attended "colored" schools and the conditions of "colored" schools (Ross, 1992). Their results were recorded in the pamphlet *Democracy in Education* (VL papers).

The VL's purpose in *Democracy in Education* was "to effect the Integration of Negro Teachers Into the Entire Columbus Public School System and Abolish All Attendant Segregation* (Democracy in Education, 1941). In 1941, they sent the results of the study to the Columbus BOE and recommended more Black teachers be hired in the schools, the physical plants of the colored schools be brought up to standard and Eastwood School be reopened to relieve congestion at Mt. Vernon and Garfield schools (VL Papers). The Columbus BOE did respond to some of the VL's recommendations such as the improvement of the physical plants at Garfield and Mt. Vernon. However, their request that "more Negro teachers be hired in the school system without further segregation"(Which September, 1943, 4) went unfulfilled. Nonetheless, the VL continued to pursue their goal. In fact, Ms. Constance Nichols sent correspondence to the BOE thanking them for the repairs to the schools. However, she indicated they were not finished with the BOE. In fact, they were going to "watch the progress of improvement in school conditions and will not be satisfied until every recommendation has been fulfilled" (BOE Minutes, No. 25, 1942, 315). They believed as an organization that they could alter the decision making process of the BOE. Consequently, they were part of the generation of Black insurgency.

Between 1941 and 1943, they held many conferences with the Superintendent and addressed the BOE concerning their position in *Democracy in Education*. In January, the VL protested the exclusion of Black students at an event at East High (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1943, 417). Later that year on May 18, 1943, Mr. Frank Shearer, President of the Vanguard League petitioned before the Board concerning "mixed faculties in the Columbus schools and
requested that more negro teachers be hired in the public schools" (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1943). In July, Mr. Barbee Durham, Chairman of the Education committee, attempted to have the Board address the VL's recommendations on the same subject which were outlined in _Democracy in Education_ (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1943, 46). Finally, on August 3, 1943, Frank Shearer and Ms. Iva Jones presented letters of support from citizens concerning their recommendations. Other members of the community such as Reverend R. F. Hairston, Reverend Marshall Scott, Reverend Brown, Mr. Ralph Powell, Mrs. Howard and Mrs. Wilson all addressed the Board. After reminding the group that they had met several times in conference with himself and the Board, Roudebush responded to the group for the BOE. He declared:

> The Board of Education and the Superintendent have granted many conferences to representatives of the League. We have heard the requests courteously and considerately and have given fair consideration to them in light of the problems confronting the whole school system. . . . The problems in which you are directly interested are involved and difficult. The Board of Education realizes its responsibility for the education of the children of Columbus and to this end the Board will continue to assign teachers through its administrative officers according to its best judgement.

In accordance with the request that additional Negro teachers be employed in Columbus, the member of the Board and Administration are unanimous in their approval of the assignment of Negro teachers to Felton School this September. . . . the Board and administration have given earnest consideration to the request that additional negro teachers be assigned to other schools. The members of the Board and Administration are unanimous in the opinion that such assignments cannot be made this September.

We hope that we can count on your continued cooperation as citizens in helping to promote the educational program for all children in the most satisfactory manner possible (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1943, 465).

The VL had intended to increase the number of Black teachers in Columbus. However, they wanted them assigned without consideration of race. In one way, the VL had succeeded. More African American teachers were hired. Nevertheless, their impetus had been turned on its head. The Board used the opportunity in hiring more Black teachers to establish the fifth segregated school, Felton Avenue Elementary School. Clearly, the BOE contended their
policy and actions promoted the "education of all children" (BOE Minutes, No. 25, 1943, 465). Even though Barbee Durham requested a public hearing on "mixed faculty," the BOE responded that they had already made their decision at the past meeting for September. In September, more Negro teachers were hired and placed in the segregated Felton school. The VL did not protest against the school because it did provide more employment opportunities for Black teachers. As noted earlier, Mr. Durham had said he would protest the opening of Felton. However, he did not protest because of who they hired, Mr. Wright. The VL did not retreat from their position concerning desegregated faculty.

At the request of the Superintendent, the VL undertook a study of cities with desegregated teaching faculties, which culminated in the publication of another pamphlet: Which September (VL Papers). Almost one year since the BOE had opened Felton, they were presented with the research conducted by the VL. On August 1, 1944, the VL presented to the BOE Which September (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1944, 57; VL Papers). The report had surveyed 20 major cities in the U. S. where co-employment of Black and White teachers were employed. Their summative recommendations to the BOE were:

1. That Columbus Public School System place Negro teachers in schools other than "Negro" schools.

2. That race no longer be a factor in the employing, placing, and promoting of teachers in the Columbus Public Schools.

3. That The Board of Education refrain from maintaining any existing segregated school or from opening another segregated school, and that all plans for re-districting any area which will segregate Negro children, or give singular advantages to the white children, be IMMEDIATELY and PERMANENTLY abandoned. Any policy on this matter determined by the Vanguard League to be an undemocratic variation of a truly democratic policy will meet with stern opposition by this organization (Which September, 27).

The VL's efforts were commendable. However, they met with limited success. How their research affected the eventual desegregation of Columbus schools and its teaching force. The
relevance of this research, will be discussed later. Moreover, the VL understood the BOE had utilized their support of hiring more Black teachers to continue to segregate the schools. Hence, they took a position against racially based placement and schooling policies.

In the beginning, the VL’s purpose was primarily concerned with desegregating the hiring practices, and thus securing more employment for Black teachers. After Felton changed to an all Black school, they changed their focus to inform “the average citizens attention to the embarrassments, injustices and derisive implications attending the acceptance of the segregated school system” (Which September, 1943). After they were not able to convince the BOE to alter their policies, they sought support from the State Department of Education. They were unsuccessful (Ross, 1992). However, they continued in their efforts. Throughout 1944, Barbee Durham sent letter after letter and made appearances in an attempt to alter the BOE’s placements policies. His efforts were ignored.

Over the next three years the VL attempted to change the BOE’s policies. In 1947, they sought an audience with the BOE by requesting a radio roundtable in order to address “How Can Columbus Schools Be Organized For Democracy?” (BOE Minutes, No. 26, 1947, 243). Barbee Durham attempted to establish such an activity from March through October of 1947. They met with no success. In 1947, the group officially disbanded. They shifted their support and financial funds to the NAACP. They had had their greatest success in opening up patronage for Blacks at downtown theaters and restaurants. Nonetheless, their research, however, would support the next massive effort to alter the BOE’s policies: the courts.

During the 1930 and the 1940s, the NAACP and the Vanguard League both actively sought to alter the policies of the BOE. While the VL met with some success, they were unable to alter the implementation of the de facto segregated schools in Columbus. Both organizations were ineffective in changing the BOE’s policies because Blacks at large did not
have access to the decision making processes. Still, their actions represented the growth of the
generation of Black insurgency in Columbus (Jacobs, 1994). By the later part of the 1960s,
the NAACP, Urban League and citizens all pushed for reforms in Columbus (Jacobs, 1994).
While they had met with limited success in the past, the future, however, would be different.

Desegregation and Board Policy: 1954-1979

For fifty years, the BOE had created de facto segregated schools. Three factors
allowed them to do so: the inability of Blacks to influence the decision making process of the
BOE, the increased migration and continual migration of Blacks to the city, and discriminatory
practices in housing, teacher hiring policy and school placement. The Brown decision,
however, was not enough to alter this policy because it addressed de jure segregated schools.
Other factors, however, allowed the BOE to continue its historical position toward the Black
community.

National Policy and the Columbus Context

The Highway Act of 1944, the Housing Act of 1949, the subsequent Fair Housing Act
of 1968, and urban renewal initiatives did very little to alter the conditions of the majority of
Blacks in the nation and Columbus in particular. Judd and Swanstrom attested in City Politics
(1994) that:

Urban renewal displaced inner-city minorities and poor people who lived in the path of
the bulldozer, and because more low-income housing was torn down than was built,
the renewal programs acutely contributed to worsening housing conditions in the
cities” (Judd & Swanstrom, 1994, 11-12).

In Columbus, Poindexter Village and other housing initiatives were built. However, they
displaced Black residents. Furthermore, Poindexter Village was built around Champion
Avenue School. Consequently, it did not alter the housing patterns in Columbus. Moreover,
the Highway Act eventually created the present day Interstate 70 and 71. Again, Black
residents in Hanford Village and Urbancrest were displaced. Columbus's implementation of urban renewal did more to harm the Black community by the development of Interstates 70 and 71 which displaced significant parts of the Black community. In fact, both highways were built right through the middle of the Black community. In essence, federal policies actually supported the movement of Whites to the emerging suburbs through the development of highways and housing initiatives which were steered from the central city (Judd & Swanstrom, 1994). Consequently,

Columbus, Ohio as just one of the northern cities experiencing difficulties with regard to the 1954 Supreme Court Decision. As whites moved to the suburbs, building new schools as they went, blacks continued to live in the city forming an inner-city with predominately all-black schools (Murphy, 76).

Moreover, "Federal lending policies funneled billions of dollars away from older areas to new subdivisions, from which Blacks were almost solidly excluded (Massey & Denton, 1993). While the UL advocated redistricting, and the BOE attempted to implement changes in boundary lines, the Board's redistricting efforts were difficult to implement because students were no longer in the inner-city schools, but in the newly built and growing suburban schools which excluded the majority of Blacks in Columbus. Consequently, the BOE ear-marked the majority of the funds being brought into the city under urban renewal projects away from blighted majority Black schools and towards the newly developing suburban schools.

Even though Dr. Watson Walker, the first Black since the turn of the century was elected to the BOE in 1961, the BOE did not alter its policies. Dr. Watson, through covert means, however, was able to direct some attention toward the majority Black schools. By 1964, ten years after Brown, more schools in Columbus had become majority Black in student composition (Carter, 1976). The Board opened schools in all-Black areas and built new schools in all-White areas. Moreover, optional attendance and discontiguous attendance zones were escape options for Whites still living in majority Black areas. Whereas Brown should
have curtailed segregation, it appeared to strengthen it (Jacobs, 1994). In essence, the BOE and the present Superintendent, Dr. Harold H. Eibling resisted change in the status quo operations of the Board which had existed since the change of the charter in 1912. Dr. Luvern Cunningham, Ohio State University professor, when he analyzed the BOE, reported:

The Superintendent does most of the talking and his recommendations are virtually always approved by unanimous vote. . . . The Board was not accustomed to dealing with any organized opposition, and certainly not from the ranks of Negroes and the disadvantaged” (Jacobs, 1994, 43).

Regardless of the BOE’s temperament, Blacks did protest. They protested the opening of an all-Black Monroe Junior High and other decisions of the BOE. Yet,

Critics of the schools who have taken the trouble to bring their criticism to their elected representatives often leave Board meetings angry and frustrated because they perceive their appearance was treated with resentment and disrespect or, at best, indifference (Jacobs, 44).

Regardless of how they felt, Black protest escalated throughout the ’60s and into the ’70s over Board decisions related to school desegregation. Mr. Frank Lomax, former Director of the UL commented:

We saw [integration] as a way to improve the quality of education for all children. In the minority schools in Columbus, we saw an unevenness in terms of achievement as well as resources. We felt an integrated system would begin to even that out, because if people were making decisions on the basis of race, then they couldn’t very well discriminate if white kids and black kids were in the same environment (Jacobs, 37).

So, the UL and other organizations protested, and continued to protest throughout the sixties and into the seventies (BOE Minutes; Jacobs, 1994). While the BOE did shift some resources to the Black schools related to Title I implementation, they only made piecemeal actions toward altering “staffing, curricula, and student assignment” (Jacobs, 44). Hence, the BOE and the Black community were in a battle over the quality of education of Black children in Columbus. The Swann v Mecklenberg decision of 1971, the new Superintendent John Ellis and Blacks’ continued activism altered the battle field.
Courts and Schools: Board of Education Reactions

In 1971, the Swann decision permitted busing as a tool for desegregating schools. The Columbus BOE, however, did not want busing to address segregation in the city. Moreover, Swann again had been directed at de jure segregation. As the BOE's membership changed, it became polarized over impending desegregation. Two factions developed in the BOE which were very reminiscent of the BOE in 1904 (Ward, 1993). Thus, some BOE members after the Swann decision pushed for voluntary desegregation plans (Jacobs, 1994). These plans, however, were never fully implemented. Another impetus, the Keyes v School District, No. 1 Denver, Colorado decision in 1973 signaled another change in national school desegregation policy. Keyes was more significant than Brown and Swann because it specifically addressed de facto dual school systems existent in the North and the West. De facto systems could now be challenged in the courts. The Penick v Columbus Board of Education, et. al. ensued in 1975. It would desegregate the student population in Columbus. It will be addressed shortly. Staff desegregation, however, occurred before student desegregation.

Staff Desegregation and BOE Policy

In Frontiers of America, the editors indicated the "Board of Education has started integration of teachers on the elementary level" (Frontiers of America, 23). Thus, it can be assumed that ten years after VL advocated "mixed faculties" that the BOE was actually implementing such a policy. Dr. Mary Claytor recalls, "I was the first teacher to desegregate the schools. I went to Olentangy Park in 1954" (Claytor, 1992). Claytor was an exemplary teacher who had more credentials than some of her White counterparts. She was the first Black teacher to desegregate the staff at the elementary level. Still, staff desegregation occurred slowly and not without obstacles. Mr. Don Pierce a teacher at Roosevelt recalled to Greg Jacobs what happened in the school when a Black teacher was assigned there. All
teachers received a letter stating "We are hiring a Black teacher in your school and if any of you are upset about this, you have the right to transfer to another school" (Jacobs, 34). Whites resisted desegregation of the teaching staff (Dutton, 1981). Blacks, however, were not united on the issue either.

Whereas some Whites were against changes in the system, the Black community was divided as well. Before and after the Loving School had been razed to gain integration in the schools, Mr. James E. Waring, the principal and others in the community were concerned about how the policy change would impact Black students and Black teachers (Ward, 1993). Moreover, when Champion was built in 1909 and opened in 1910, the African American community was divided over the issue of school desegregation. Furthermore, when Felton became the last school before Brown to attain an all Black teaching force and student population, it was not picketed because it allowed some of the best teachers in the city such as Mr. Wright to assume leadership roles which affected the efficacy of Black children's education. Consequently, the Black community in Columbus has historically been split over the best avenue to pursue to gain education for their children and the effects of educational policy on Black children and Black educators. Thus, the Black community was divided over desegregation as it always had been, and how it would effect Black students and teachers.

The Negroes of Columbus are divided between a desire for a segregated school system and a mixed school system. There are numbers of Negroes in Columbus who believe that Negro teachers are best for their children in that they would be more sympathetic. Some fear, however, that it would not be as well equipped as the present school system (Minor, 1936).

The most vocal opponent to school desegregation was Bill Moss who became a BOE member in 1977. Moss met with Duncan concerning the effects of staff desegregation in the schools. He wrote:

At one point in our conversation I protested the fact that just a year before in Columbus Schools, [1976] Black teachers had been dispersed throughout the system,
which had the effect of removing them from classrooms having significant numbers of
black children (Moss, 1992, 70).

More than thirty years after *Democracy in Education*, teacher desegregation occurred. Black
schools, however, were not given the best teachers in place of the exemplary and often
overqualified Black teachers who went to predominately White schools (Willis, E., 1995;
Willis, I., 1996; Wright, 1996). For instance, Charles Allen was sent to West High School
where he taught subjects such as algebra and trigonometry (Wright, 1996). In essence, he
taught in classes where very few if any Black students were enrolled. Hence, Moss's greatest
complaint against the policy and its effects on Black students and teachers was well grounded
and would continue to be until the next decade (Moss, 1992; 1995).

As noted earlier, the Vanguard League's primary goal was to increase the employment
of Black teachers. They wanted the placement policy to be altered in Columbus so more
Black teachers could be hired because then their employment opportunities would not be
limited if placement policy did not limit them to only Black schools. When the VL disbanded,
the NAACP took up the call where they left off, especially after the *Brown* decision.

However, it is important to gauge whether the VL's intention, the increase in Black teachers,
actually occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Black Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>894*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: African American Teachers in Columbus (* includes all Black staff).*
While the number of Black teachers had increased, was it because of the growth of desegregated schools rather than the desegregation of the teaching force? Thus, one must ask the question of how the numbers particularly after 1968 really reflected increases in Black teachers because other staff members were included in these numbers.

It was only after Brown that the BOE began to alter its policies, however, slowly. While individual teachers desegregated the schools, it was not until 1976 that the BOE “dispersed Black teachers throughout the system” (Moss, 1992, 70). Consequently, staff desegregation did occur before pupil desegregation. Pupil desegregation required the passage of Penick.

**Penick: 1979 and Beyond**

On March 8, 1977, District Judge Robert Duncan, who had student taught at Champion Avenue School, decided the Penick case. Before stating his ruling, Duncan wrote

The Court is quick to admit that the litigation model is not the most efficient way to solve problems of far reaching social impact, but our courts must always protect the constitutional rights of all our citizens (Jacobs, 93).

Consequently, he ruled:

While the plaintiffs must, and will receive vindication for the deprivation of their constitutional rights, the social costs should not be forgotten in the formulation of a remedy. A desegregated remedy that may be so burdensome upon a school system as to impair its basic ability to provide the best possible educational opportunities, is not remedy at all. . . . The Brown principle still quite valid today, that unlawfully segregated schools are inherently unequal. Because black children are expected and required to grow up, live and work in a majority white society, it is not only unlawful, it is unfair for public officials, by their actions or inactions, to promote with segregative intent racially imbalanced schools (Jacobs, 96-98).

Duncan ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, and based his ruling on the preponderance of historical evidence presented by the plaintiffs. Moreover, he concurred with this author’s analysis that the BOE had engaged in conscious practices such as gerrymandering boundaries, new school
placements, optional and discontinuous attendance zones, and race-based teacher placement
and hiring practices to maintain the dual-system of education in Columbus. He further
indicated in his decision that the BOE's voluntary desegregation plan would not cure the ills of
the present system. Consequently, he ordered busing as the solution to desegregating the
schools. His decision, however, was appealed to the Supreme Court who later agreed with
Duncan's ruling. Busing started in Columbus, in 1979. It would be a court driven public
policy imposed upon the BOE to ensure school desegregation in the former de facto segregated
Columbus schools.

Despite the uproar over busing implementation including the threatened bombing of
the school which Judge Duncan's children attended, busing would be the court mandated
policy of the BOE for the next fifteen years (Integrated Education, 1980, 86). Even though
White flight did ensue, so did Black flight. As Columbus has grown to be bigger in area than
Cleveland, the ability of busing to maintain racial balance has declined. Duncan wrote in 1977
that:

. . . the school authorities do not control the housing segregation in Columbus, but the
Court also finds that the actions of the school authorities have had a significant impact
upon the housing patterns. The interaction of housing and the schools operates to
promote segregation in each (Jacobs, 101).

Hence, the advent of continued urban renewal initiatives such as the building of City Center,
the development of more highways, the continued migration of Whites to Dublin, Grove City
and other areas has had the effect of encircling Columbus schools, and continues to erode the
already declining tax base of the city. Moreover, proposals such as WIN-WIN has allowed
Whites to access services of the city without having to send their children to Columbus
schools which are predominately African American. Consequently, resegregation has occurred
in Columbus schools. However, what the future holds for Columbus Schools, the African
American community, and the BOE is unknown.
Recent Board Educational Policy and the Urban Context

On January 30, 1996, *The Columbus Dispatch*, headline read "Forced busing nears an end" (*Columbus Dispatch*, 1996, 1). The aim of *Penick* quality education for African American children has failed in Columbus as in other cities (Orfield, 1996). While it is clear that the efficacy of Black education in urban contexts, it is indirectly tied to the politics of the urban context. Members of the school board as well as the a proportion of the general Black and White community view the switch back to "neighborhood schools" as a positive change (*Booster, 1996; Call and Post, 1996; Columbus Dispatch, 1996*). Again, neither community, White or Black, is in total agreement. However, the Black neighborhood that once was strong has been altered and what remains in particular tenets of the Black community is no longer as strong. The BOE, however, has agreed to establish its first Afrocentric School (*Columbus Dispatch, 1996; Booster, 1996*). It is important to note, however, that without the present composition of the BOE, this policy would not have been implemented. Moreover, the present Superintendent, Dr. Larry Mixon, supports the concept of an Afrocentric School. Furthermore, as Columbus returns to the neighborhood school concept, Champion, the topic of this research, will again be subject to changes caused by the political context of the urban school. These changes will be discussed later in this dissertation. Nonetheless, one change that has already occurred in Champion has been the return of a vision-directed African American male principal, Mr. William Hayes.

Conclusion

As indicated in this chapter, the political processes of cities, and the organizations of cites which govern the dispersal of services impact on the development, maintenance and quality of urban education. Columbus's changing urban context has determined not only the efficacy of Champion, but all schools in the city. Changes in population, housing and
economics drive competition over these resources in cities. Consequently, the urban context has a direct impact on the quality of urban schooling.

Yet, these factors exist outside of the school and often mediate the boundaries between school and community. Nonetheless, another significant factor in urban schools, is the leadership of the school (Grady, Wayson & Zirkel, 1989; Lomotey, 1989). Our attention is now turned to an examination of the historical leadership of Champion.
CHAPTER 5

LEADERSHIP

It is the responsibility of strong leadership to represent the common good—not only because it is right, but because the despair of the weak in the end threatens the stability of the whole - Kenneth Clark, *Dark Ghetto* (1965, 152).

In the African American community, teachers and preachers have been viewed as leaders (DuBois, 1903; Frankin, 1990; Perkins, 1989). V. P. Franklin notes:

... from the 19th century through the 1950s, other African American professionals, especially ministers, journalists, lawyers, and educators served as the leading spokesperson for the social, political, and economic interest of African Americans in the United States (Franklin, 1990).

Thus, African American teachers and particularly principals were leaders within and outside of the African American community (Franklin, 1990; Lomotey, 1989; Siddle Walker, 1993).

Moreover, education represents one of the cultural “core values” within the African American community. Consequently, people who were most responsible for educating the community, principals and teachers, were held in high esteem and viewed as leaders (Franklin, 1992, 1990; Futrell, 1986). Yet, W. E. DuBois critiques Black leadership. DuBois argued:

If the best of the American Negroes receive by outer pressure a leader whom they had not recognized before, manifestly there is here a certain palpable gain. Yet there is also irreparable loss—a loss of that peculiarity valuable education which a group receives when by search and criticism it finds and commissions its own leaders (DuBois, 1903, 83).

Historically, preachers and teachers were commissioned by the Black community. Community leadership was bestowed on those who exemplified the core values of the Black community. According to Ella Baker, “movements and their organizations should be centered around
group-centered leadership” (Morris, 1984, 104). Thus, if the group had “leaders they
functioned as the vanguard of the movement” (Morris, 1984, 106), but they had been
nominated to that position from within the group.

Recently, politicians have come to the forefront as leaders in the Black community
(Franklin, 1990; White, 1990). Nonetheless, Black leadership “occupied tenuous and
vulnerable positions in their own and surrounding white community. They were initially at
least, self-styled exemplars of their race” (White, 1990, 2).

Before the turn of the century, Columbus’s Black community was led by a preacher,
the Reverend James P. Poindexter. As noted in Chapter 4, Poindexter was responsible for
establishing mixed schools and securing employment for Black teachers in Columbus. Thus,
Poindexter’s leadership provided the impetus for the other traditional cohort of leadership in
the Black community: teachers and principals. From this first cadre of Black teachers who
taught in mixed schools in Columbus, Champion would receive its first principal.

This chapter explicates the evolution of leadership at Champion Avenue School.
Three successive epochs of leadership have emerged since Champion Avenue School opened
in 1910. These eras can be characterized chronologically as well as descriptively into three
portraits: A Woman Shall Lead Them, 1910-1921; Rock of Ages, 1921-1959; and The Times
Are A Changing, 1959-1996. This chapter details these periods of leadership and explicates
the external leadership that created, maintained and continues today to alter the leadership at
Champion Avenue School.

Social, political and economic changes led to the building of Champion Avenue
School. The Progressive Era ushered in new leadership in the name of “good government”
and charted a new direction for Black education in Columbus (Hofstadder, 1955; Moreland,
1977; Ward, 1993; Wiebe, 1967). Even though Loving School had existed from 1871-1881,
the principal had been a Black man, James Waring (Ward, 1993). When Champion opened in 1910, a woman was to lead.

**And A Woman Shall Lead Them: 1910-1920**

The 1890s were viewed as the decade of the woman. Educated African American women pushed to uplift themselves and their race through the development of educational institutions and women’s clubs (Giddings 1987; Perkins, 1989; Tate, 1990). Prior to this time, European American women had been hired as principals in Columbus Public Schools as an experiment (Ward, 1993). Until 1910, however, no Black woman had ever been hired in such a position.

**The First Principal of Champion: Maud C. Baker**

Ms. Maud C. Baker was a Columbus native. She graduated from the high school in 1886. Baker had earned 16 years of teaching experience in Columbus schools and credentials qualifying her to teach in a junior high school. She had begun her “teaching earlier in Columbus in 1893 at the Stevenson school, having first been placed on the reserve list of teachers in September of 1892” (Ward, 1993, 100). It appears that she had not only Normal School certification, but had her college degree as well. Before her appointment as principal, she taught 7th grade at the Mound Street School at the corner of Mound and Third streets *(Annual Report Board of Education (ARBOE), 1900, 267).*

Rev. Poindexter was a member of the BOE when Baker was hired. Rev. Poindexter's political leverage and representation provided the power to secure not only an appointment for Ms. Baker, but for ten other African American female teachers of high standing (Minor, 1947; Moreland; Robinson, England & Meier, 1985; Ward, 1993). These women and their contributions will be discussed later. However, Baker and her colleagues represented a cadre
of the "25,000 colored teachers in the United States and of this number the women are largely in the majority" (Steward, 1911, 229; Crisis, 1911). Thus, Baker was a leader not just because she was a principal, but because she represented the ideal of Black womanhood.

**Lifting As We Climb**

Baker was not just a principal. She was the first African American principal since James E. Waring, the principal of the de jure segregated Loving School (Ward, 1993). Baker not only broke the color line, but also the gender line for African American women in Columbus. Her position at Champion indicated that in Columbus like in other urban areas reformers contended women "were essential for reform and progress" (Giddings, 1984, 81). A cadre of Black women had created the club movement among black women, and they believed that "their moral standing was a steady rock upon which the race could lean" (Giddings, 1984, 81).

The National Association of Colored Woman's (NACW) motto was "Lifting As We Climb" (Giddings, 97-98). Consequently, when Baker assumed the principalship of Champion, she was assuming a leadership position whereby "Only the Black Woman can say when and where I enter . . . then and there the whole Negro race enters with me" (Giddings, 82). In 1911, Mary Church Terrell, president of NACW, spoke in Columbus at the World's Purity Federation (Crisis, 1911, 57). Subsequently, her presence leads the author to contend that Baker was well aware of the ideals of the Black Women's Club movement. Black women, particularly middle-class educated women, were determined to better the race. In *When and Where I Enter*, Paula Giddings writes,

> Black women many of them "cramped for lack of opportunity"... but theirs was based on problems of the race rather than those of any particular class... The fact was they understood that their fate was bound with that of the masses (Giddings, 97).

Baker was in the best position to effect the upliftment of the race because she had earned
through schooling the opportunity to lead. Beverly Guy-Sheftall writes about the opportunities for Black women during this era. She contended:

Nothing in the present century is more noticeable than the tendency of women to enter every hopeful field of wage-earning and philanthropy, and attempt to reach a place in every intellectual arena (Guy-Sheftall, 1990, 91).

Consequently, Baker found "herself in the presence of responsibilities which ramify through the profoundest and most varied interest of her country and race" (Guy-Sheftall, 1990, 91). Baker's position was in the public sphere of influence, a sphere in which Black women were often under attack (Giddings, 1984; Guy-Sheftall, 1990).

While Baker was the first African American woman to serve in the role of principal in Columbus at Champion, she was well situated among her contemporaries (Giddings, 1987; Guy-Sheftall, 1990; Perkins, 1989). Consequently, Baker not only represented the role of leadership within the African American community, she represented power in a school that would have an all Black faculty. Other cities such as Washington D.C. and Philadelphia had Black women as principals of exemplary segregated schools (Giddings, 1984; Holmes & Weiss, 1995; Lerner, 1972; Perkins, 1989). Baker, therefore, was no anomaly. As noted earlier, she was not new to the teaching profession. Black women had been appointed as principals or they had built educational institutions (Giddings, 1984; Harley & Terborg-Penn, 1978; Lerner, 1972; Perkins, 1989).

Baker's ascendency into the principalship of such a school came at a price—the resegregation of Black educators. Moreover, Black women were fighting against a notion that they were immoral (Giddings, 1984; Guy-Sheftall, 1990). Baker and her colleagues's presence at the Mound Street School had been objectionable to some members of the BOE (Ward, 1993). Consequently, her placement at Champion would accomplish several things: First, it would establish an all "colored" school. Second, it would relegate all future Black teachers to
employment in Champion. And lastly, the placement of Baker as the principal would provide the BOE with control of the school. Hence, “white Northerners were also involved in the paternalistic control of black education” (Allen & Jeweli, 1996, 171). Consequently, “Black instructors and administrators were often beholden to those who supported their institutions, dependent upon the charity of others not only for the education of their people but also for their livelihood” (Allen & Jeweli, 171). Because the BOE could not establish policy that affected just Black teachers, they had to establish a school in which to place them. Champion was that school. Moreover, the BOE would be in control of not only the policy of the school, but its principal as well.

Earlier, particular BOE members such as Pinckney D. Shriner, August Brandes, Fred J. Heer, Conrad A. Howell, H. B. Herron and Charles E. Morris feared two things in regard to Black women as teachers in the school system: 1) Their moral character and 2) race-mixing (Ward, 1993). Clearly, Baker must have represented the ideal of “True Womanhood” to attain the position as principal (Perkins, 1987). As mentioned earlier, Rev. Poindexter had a lot to do with who was hired as teachers when the schools became desegregated. Earlier, Poindexter had vouched for the morality of Baker and other Black women who would be hired into the Columbus Public Schools. He argued:

Parents of colored youth, like parents of white youth, demand that those appointed to teach their children shall have the requisite educational qualifications; be pure in their lives; orderly in deportment; devoted to their work, and successful, because capable and devoted. And they demand further, that the schools for their children, in their whole make-up, be the freest possible from sectarian taint. (Minor, 1947, 10).

Thus, Baker who was one of the first Black women educators to be hired in Columbus after the closing of Loving School, must have fit this profile. Moreover, she must have been well thought of in the minds of the “elite” governing structure that emphasized “good” government in the city.
When Baker assumed the helm of the first all Black school in Columbus since Loving, she commanded a tight ship. In her first year as principal, she was recognized for her ability to control the atmosphere of the school. Superintendent Francis stated:

Attention was called to the acts of vandalism at the Champion Avenue building and the action of the Principal in refusing to admit certain boys to the building: Mr. W. O. Thompson moved that Miss Baker, the Principal be commended for her action and fidelity to the interests of the Board, and the Clerk be instructed to so notify her, which was agreed to (BOE Minutes, No. 17, 1911, 326).

The tone had been set by Baker, and her actions were approved by the Board. Baker’s action proved to the BOE she was the right person for the position of principal. It also proved that she could lead.

Under Baker’s leadership, Champion had an Evening school. She was also the principal of the Evening School. The Evening School, however, was for adults. Two years later in 1912, a kindergarten was added to the school. Also, a Half-play School was begun at Champion with Mary Cardwell, one of Champion’s teacher, as the principal. The community also utilized Champion while Baker was the principal for social, civic and other educational activities. The Evening school would exist well into the 1960s.

Champion’s service as a night school allowed it to emphasize the values of the growing Black middle-class and help incoming migrants from the South adjust to the city through the Americanization classes that were offered. Time and time again, the community petitioned the BOE to maintain the Evening School for a longer length of time. However, any activities deemed inappropriate were not allowed to occur in the school (BOE Minutes).

Champion was beginning to be established as a place for community education and activities. Chapter 7 details this activity in detail. Consequently, Champion with Baker at the helm contributed to the upliftment of the race (Franklin, 1990, 79).
In September of 1920, the Superintendent, recommended that the "Champion Avenue School be made an intermediate School instead of an Elementary School" (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1920, 347). The motion was agreed to by the BOE members. No changes in principal, however, were made at that time. Shortly thereafter, Baker retired. The BOE had attempted to hire a Mr. Fouse, but he could not "report as principal of the school at Champion" (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1920, 358). Consequently, on October 4, Ms. Nell Moffitt was installed as the interim principal (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1920, 358).

Baker was principal of Champion Avenue School from 1910 to 1920 when she retired. On November 15, she retired and was placed on the pension list. She had served Columbus schools for 34 years. Her last communication with the BOE was in regard to her salary. She asked to receive her last year salary at Champion (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1920, 379). During her years of service, she upheld the standards of strict discipline that coincided with the teaching of the Cardinal Principals of the time. Baker and her staff also provided Americanization classes at Champion. From the beginning, Champion was not just an elementary school, but a significant part of the Black community's education. Because of the era's emphasis on the "Negro Problem" re-education of the southern migrant was critical. In 1921, the BOE reported that during the year Baker retired, the three night schools for Blacks had attracted 220 students. One of those schools was Champion. Baker and her staff undertook educating the migrants who were coming to Columbus. Thus, Champion's Americanization classes and Evening School played a key role. Her legacy of help, however, would be transferred to the interim principal of Champion, Ms. Nell Moffitt.

Changing of the Guard: Ms. Nellie Butler Moffitt

Baker's retirement coincided with a growth in Columbus's Black population due to the migration of Blacks from the South. Moreover, women were being replaced in the schools in
order to provide gainful employment for men. Furthermore, Champion was about to be organizationally changed as well (BOE Minutes, 1920). During the interim, however, Ms. Nell Moffitt, who later became the principal of Mt. Vernon Elementary, was the acting principal.

Moffitt, like Baker, was a Columbus native. Ms. Moffitt had been a teacher in Columbus when schools were mixed in student population and staff placement policy. Moffitt and Baker had both taught at the Mound Street School together (Annual Report, Board of Education, 267). Moffitt "graduated from the general literacy course at Central High School in 1894 at which time she gave a presentation entitled 'Three Writers of Today'" (Ward, 100). At the time of her interim placement as principal, Moffitt had taught in Columbus Schools for twenty-six years (Ward, 1993). She was an exemplary teacher with friends in both circles, White and Black, who would be crucial to her eventual placement as principal of Mt. Vernon Elementary School. Mr. Lucien Wright, former teacher at Mt. Vernon and later principal of Felton school, stated:

Ms. Moffitt was strict. I remember one time she sent a teacher home whom she felt wore her neckline to short. There wasn't anything that she wouldn't do for the children, particularly if she liked the family. She lived next door to my family. She had a mother and a brother (Wright, 1996).

Because Moffitt had been hired in Columbus when the requirement for teachers were a Normal School credential, she was unable to assume principalship of Champion (Wright, 1996). Yet, Moffitt's position as a former teacher in mixed schools which had provided her with opportunities to form relationships with well-known European American women. Consequently, she possessed a great deal of influence which would be felt for the next 25 years. She would one day be able to affect hiring practices of the BOE (Wright, 1996). The next principal of Champion, however, Mr. John Arnett Mitchell would leave an indelible print on the school.
Rock of Ages: 1921-1959

As noted earlier, many scholars have analyzed the "debate" between W. E. B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington concerning Black education (Anderson, 1988; Franklin, 1979; Kliebard, 1987; Watkins, 1993). Regardless of how the debate has been dichotomized, Black Americans needed leaders. Again, the chosen leaders were teachers and preachers (Franklin, 1990; Perkins, 1987; Hatwood Futrell, 1986). When Poindexter died in 1907, his death created a void in the leadership of the Black community. No African American would come into political power until the 1960s. The "Golden Age" of Black male political activity came to a close in 1912 in Columbus (Moreland, 1977). Thus, who would lead? Even though Poindexter's death represented an end of one form of leadership, political, it would appear that Columbus preferred Washingtonians in position of power (Ward, 1993). J. Arnett Mitchell, however, would come to be known as a mixture of both DuBois's and Washington's philosophies.

Mitchell was a member of the talented tenth (DuBois, 1903; Franklin, 1984). W. E. DuBois articulated six concepts related to the "talented tenth." According to Georgia A. Parsons, the talented tenth constituted leadership as

... solely the responsibility of the college-educated; (2) teachers, or at the very least, teachers of teachers, are, ipso facto, part of the black leadership structure; (3) college or classroom teaching is primarily a leadership function; (4) leaders are particularly prepared to guide and direct the African-American masses; (5) African-American leaders must think in terms of racial uplift; and (6) African-American leadership-as distinct from other American leadership--has a specific role in dealing with the particular problems faced by African-American people (Parsons, G. A., 1993, 23).

Mitchell exemplified DuBois's ideal of the classically trained and education portion of the Black community which would serve as leaders of the race. In essence, he was the talented tenth. On the other hand, others would classify him as an accommodationist (Anderson, 1987; Saunders, 1992). He belonged to the Frontiers of America Club, an organization which sought
to develop leadership within the Black community, and Sigma Pi Phi the oldest Black Fraternity whose criteria for admission was distinction in educational and professional endeavors. Additionally, Mitchell was known to socialize with the leaders of the Black community such as Nimrod Allen and the White community such as Novice Fawcett, former president of Ohio State University, J. G. Roudebusch, Superintendent of Columbus Public Schools, and others. At best, Mr. Mitchell would represent the one point that DuBois and Washington agreed upon—the upliftment of the Black community through any means necessary, and that means for Mitchell would not just be education, but educational excellence (Franklin, 1995). He was symbolic of Peter, a foundation upon which Blacks built educational attainment.

The Talented Tenth: J. A. Mitchell

On April 4, 1921, Collicott, the Superintendent, hired James Arnett Mitchell to replace the retiring Ms. Baker. He was given a salary of $2,125.00 a year. He was to report to Champion May 1st (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1921, 404). As noted earlier, Moffitt was among the early Black teachers of Columbus. Consequently, she was not a college graduate and she could not become principal of Champion because standards had changed. Moreover, when Moffitt became a teacher in the school system, all that was required was a Normal School certificate. Mr. Wright recalled that "Ms. Moffitt could not become the principal because she was Normal school. However, Ms. Moffitt had her people, and Mitchell had his. There was no congeniality between Mitchell and Moffitt (Wright, 1996). Moffitt would, however, become assistant principal under Mitchell's leadership and retain her Evening School responsibilities (BOE Minutes). In the community, the principal of Champion would represent DuBois's ideal of the "talented tenth" (Franklin, 1990; Gatewood, 1990).
J. Arnett Mitchell was a graduate of Bowdoin College in 1912. He graduated from the four year program in three years. He was known for proudly wearing his Phi Beta Kappa key earned at Bowdoin for graduating with honors. He always wore his key at Champion. After graduating from Bowdoin, Mitchell studied at the University of Berlin in Germany for a year. He returned to the States and taught German at Howard University. Eventually, he attained his Master's degree in educational administration from the Ohio State University in 1923, and at the time of his retirement, Mitchell had almost completed requirements for a doctorate degree (Mitchell, 1925; *The Ohio Sentinel*, 1959). Besides teaching at Howard University, Mitchell taught at several institutions including Tuskegee Institute and Summer High School in St. Louis, Missouri. During an interview, Mitchell recalled his time at Tuskegee and his relationship and admiration toward Booker T. Washington. He stated:

I was a teacher under Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee. He rode a horse and one day stopped and looked at me and asked if I were not the young man he had seen at Bowdoin. I told him "yes" and he rode on. I recalled then the day he spoke at Bowdoin when it was 30 below (Columbus Dispatch, 1959).

While Mitchell had taught at Tuskegee and Howard Universities, and had been the first Dean at Southern University in Baton Rouge, he was a native Ohioan.

Mitchell and his wife Lulu Gee were from Gallipolis, Ohio. His wife was a teacher and graduated from Ohio University (Columbus Dispatch, 1959). As noted earlier, before coming to Columbus to serve as principal of Champion he was the first Dean of Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Even though Mitchell had taught at Tuskegee, at best, Mitchell represented DuBois's ideal of the "talented tenth" (DuBois, 1903). In 1906, DuBois spoke at Hampton University. He argued his position on industrial education and higher education. He contended:

But the attitude that we as Negroes must take toward these two kinds of training is this; just as far as the race can afford it we must give to our youth a training designed above all to make them men of power, of thought, of trained and
cultivated taste; men who know whither civilization is tending and what it means. The ideal training would be to train every man in this way, and toward this ideal we tend. But today only a few can have such training. . . . Send these talented boys to college—urge them and push them through, remembering that never in God's world is this Negro race going to hold its place in the world, until it shows by its fully developed and carefully trained powers its undoubted ability to do so (DuBois, 1973 [1906], 14).

Six years later, Mitchell would graduate from Bowdoin and come to represent such a leader in Columbus in both the European and African American communities. According to DuBois's philosophy, he had been prepared to lead, and lead he did. But, Mitchell's respect and admiration for Washington's philosophy would also serve as part of his leadership style and character. Consequently, Mitchell straddled the fence and advocated education as a tool of self-determination as the crucible from which future African American youth would be trained to heed. Thus, Mitchell represented the historical leadership role in the Black community as well as exemplified the core values of African American culture—resistance, freedom, self-determination and education (Franklin, 1984).

While Mitchell admired Washington, he obviously understood and agreed with DuBois's position. In his thesis entitled "An Analytical Study of Nine Land Grant Institutions (Mitchell, 1925), he wrote:

For a long time the writer has had the feeling that one of the serious problems before the American people is that of Negro education. For the past fifteen years or so, there has been a growing tendency to subject educational problems to the microscope of scientific analysis. . . . Our ideas with reference to this field are still largely nebulous, largely subjective.

The purpose of this study, then is twofold: (a) generally, to pioneer in an unlimited, but sadly neglected field, which stands greatly in need of scientific analysis; (b) specifically, to obtain objective data with reference to nine land, grant schools for Negroes, with an evaluation of the service rendered by these schools (Mitchell, 1925, i).

Mitchell's thesis was quite impressive. He concluded several things, one of which was these schools needed more financial support to increase their effectiveness. Moreover, in the cities where they were located, elementary and secondary schools should be improved so the
institutions could concentrate on higher education. Finally, Mitchell concluded these institutions should continue to offer college work and the college work provided be standardized (Mitchell, 1925). Mitchell's educational achievements qualified him for membership in Sigma Pi Phi and inclusion in *Who's Who in Colored America* (Boris, 1929). His 109-page thesis proved he was worthy even by today's standards.

Mitchell came of age in an era when Blacks demonstrated an overarching commitment to "race vindication." Given the overwhelmingly negative conceptions in the larger society about African and African American character and capacity, these intellectuals lived lives that were personal vindications of racist notions about black people. When white racists claimed that Africans were incapable of mastering Greek, Latin, or higher mathematics an science, these individuals not only mastered these subjects, but excelled in them. When these highly intelligent individuals sought additional training beyond that available within the black community, and were barred from white institutions, they often left the country and studied at European colleges and universities. . . thus, the personal experiences undermined racist perceptions about the "educability of the Negro" (Franklin, 1995, 15).

Consequently, Mitchell was the perfect role model. He exemplified success over racism through the acquirement of education.

When Mr. Mitchell assumed the principalship at Champion the communication between the school administration and central office increased. He began to send the BOE requests on improvements on the building. Prior to his appointment, Ms. Baker had to request any usage of the school through central office. Mitchell was given control of the school building and allowed to decide who would teach there when he was hired. He was also given control over the hiring of teachers not just for Champion, but eventually system-wide in the developing *de facto* school system.

In the beginning of his principalship, Mitchell was very stern. Mrs. Harris, a 1923 graduate of Champion had this to say about Mitchell, "He had such great authority. He could offer to be fair or unfair. He had the potential and the power to be good or mean. Often, he
chose to be mean (Harris, 1996). Mrs. Harris remembers both Mitchell and Moffitt as very strict. She recalled "Ms. Moffitt was the kind of a woman that ran an English prison. She wore high laced shoes. She always wore straight long black dresses. She was the picture of the old school marm" (Harris, 1996). Mrs. Barbara Dorsey Sanford who attended Champion in the late 30s recalled "Mitchell was the meanest man I ever met" (Dorsey Sanford, 1996). Mitchell continued the pattern of discipline initiated by Ms. Baker. However, Mitchell as a Phi Beta Kappan and Sigma Pi Phi would stress educational excellence.

Mitchell viewed education as means from which the African American could achieve one of their key cultural values-self-determination (Franklin, 1984). However, in an interview, he was clear on two points: the issues of race were not his concern and what his educational philosophy at Champion had been. Concerning the latter, he recited:

As a student of Champion, I shall strive to be: Courteous in manner, obedient to rules, a protector of our building, proud of our school! Careful with textbooks, cheap literature scorning. Correcting bad habits which serve as a warning; Soft-spoken and orderly, clean in my speech. Kind and considerate toward all whom I meet; Regular and punctual to school day by day. Cooperative and helpful in every way; Studious, persistent, attentive in class; Prompt with assignments, determined to pass! Courageous, respectful, honest, confident. Cool-tempered and calm, in no wise impudent; Neat in appearance, ashamed of my gum, without sweets or popcorn when in class I come; Absent if quarrels or fights should take place, present when students assemble with grace; Polite toward the girls; if a boy I may be commanding respect, if a girl, naturally; A truly grand sport when our team plays a gam, that I may be worthy to boast her great name; An outstanding citizen, reliable and fine; That others may pattern their conduct by mine (Columbus Dispatch, 1959).

This decree was the motto of the school. Mitchell demanded this creed from his students even in his later years. Mr. Jones who interviewed Mitchell, also commented on the behavior of students in the school. He noted that:

Mike Mendenhall opened the door for me and carried my camera bag and conducted me to the office. When classes were changing the boys and girls saw me in his company as a visitor they immediately became quiet. They have been taught to be courteous (Jones, 1959).
In another interview with Ted Coleman of The Ohio Sentinel, Mitchell elaborated further on his educational philosophy. Coleman accentuated Mitchell's formula for success in education was an emphasis on preparing students to accept the challenge of a fast changing world. Equip them with the necessary tools to solve the many problems they will encounter in life, not as Negroes, but as citizens.

Again, Mitchell demonstrated his belief that education alone would solve the "race problem."

Coleman paraphrased Mitchell's position. He said he always eliminated the stress of race and the obstacles of color. He believes that qualifications serve as the strongest wedge into a growing, complex society.

IN RELATION TO this, he quoted a line from one of Longfellow's famous poems, "Daily we Sinais climb and knoweth not."

A former student, Mrs. Brown remembered "You did not want to do anything to have to go to the office to see Mitchell" (Ogbachie-Hunter, 1996). Another student, a world renowned musician, Eugene Walker, stated:

Mitchell had a voice. I can still remember that voice [He imitates Mitchell]. He commanded respect. He was not a real tall man, but you got the idea that you did not want to go up against him. So, you towed the line (Walker, 1996).

The present principal of Champion, also commented on Mitchell's voice. Mr. Hayes noted "It had a distinctive sound. Sort of Southern, but not a drawl." In his interview, Mr. Coleman also wrote about Mitchell's voice. He stated:

I GATHERED THAT J.A. Mitchell's magic voice had a lot to do with his success in influencing pupils who might have had ideas to the contrary of Champion discipline. He speaks in a clear tone, pleasant but firm (Coleman, 1959).

When Mitchell retired, the school had 700 students. Even though Mitchell was an exceptional principal who set the tone for students and teachers of the school, he did not view issues of race as matters that should concern the school.

During his retirement interview with Jones, Mitchell further explicated his position on race. He stated:
We have not stressed the race problem here in any way. You know freedom will not come to any people including our own, until it is earned. Any attempts to thwart that progress defeats the thing nearest to our hearts (Mitchell, 1959).

Mitchell’s word are reminiscent of Washington in the famous Atlanta Compromise.

Washington wrote:

No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities. (Washington, 1893). Washington went on to ask White Americans to “Cast down y our bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these ground, and to education of head, hand and heart. . . .

There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and envelopment of all (Washington, 1893).

Since Washington’s famous Atlanta Compromise speech, many things have been written about his educational philosophy. Regardless of scholars’ perception of Washington, it can be said that he did leave institutions which have continued to provide education and business resources for African American people. The same can be said for Mitchell. And like Washington, Mitchell emphasized progress through education rather than agitation. Yet, one has to wonder why Washington hired Mitchell to teach German if his philosophy was strictly related to industrial education. Could Washington and later Mitchell through indirect means accomplish their ultimate goal, the upliftment of the of African American race through education? While Mitchell did not face the “race problem” directly, he did so indirectly in several ways.

In 1924, he wrote an article that appeared in Educational Research Bulletin entitled “The Problems of the Negro Child of School Age in the Light of Mental Tests.” This article was published shortly after he assumed principalship at Champion. As noted in Chapter 4, Columbus had recently experienced an influx of southern Negroes (Himes, 1942). In fact, when Mitchell assumed leadership at Champion, the city’s race relations were in a period of transition due to the increase in the African American population and other factors (Himes,
1942). In the article, Mitchell argued against the "general, hazy impression that the Negro is intellectually inferior" (Mitchell, 1924, 322). He wrote:

Barley speaks of the "tremendous influence of good schools in stimulating the growth of intelligence." and it is merely coincidence that in nearly every case the median Negro intelligence was higher in states where educational opportunity was better.

Moreover, Mitchell asserted "in so far as it applies to large social groups the army alpha appears to be a test of what had been learned rather than a test of what can be learned" (Mitchell, 1924, 323). Mitchell was clearly aware of the present arguments utilized against providing intellectual education to Blacks in the North and South. He agreed with Mr. A. M. Jordan and contended that

... the overlapping of scores between the colored and white children for 20-26 percent of the Negroes reach or exceed the median of the Whites, but he notes that the Negroes seem to be divided into two groups, one very backward and the other quite bright. One may question as to whether this last finding may not indicate that the general trend of mental levels does not run coincidental with the types of homes from which the children come and the environmental situation in which they find themselves (Mitchell, 1924, 324).

Thus, his article concluded along the lines of nurture rather than nature. Mitchell's major points were:

1) Northern Negroes, with superior educational advantages, invariably some higher than southern Negroes, with poor school opportunity, to a great extent [test] measure educational opportunity (Mitchell, 1924, 325).

2) Class makes a difference.

3) Some Blacks are brighter than certain immigrant groups.

4) Some Blacks "score in the highest reaches of intelligence... the colored score is heavily weighted in the lower limits of the scale" (Mitchell, 1924, 325).

Mitchell's goal was to make a study to ascertain how racial differences might "determine just how these differences effect classroom practice" (Mitchell, 1924, 322). Clearly, Mitchell believed that African American children were not intellectually inferior to whites.
V. P. Franklin further contends Black intellectuals, particularly those who had studied abroad, to prove their ability to achieve intellectually,

then engaged in activities to vindicate the race from the distortions and misconceptions about people of African descent rampant throughout American society. Through their scholarly research and writing, African-American intellectuals challenged the white "experts" on the Negro and the "Negro Problem" by presenting what they considered was "the truth" about the race. Their well-documented articles and books were a marked contrast to the works produced by white researchers that many times were built almost entirely upon racist assumptions (Franklin, 1995, 15).

Mitchell's scholarship exemplified this understanding. Ultimately, he argued for good schools to ameliorate the differences in classes associated with environment rather than nature.

Champion would become such a school under his leadership.

Perceptions of Leadership

According to the former principal of Felton Avenue School, the last school to be changed from an all-White to an all-Black staff in 1943, Mr. Lucien Wright "Mitchell had to walk a fine line. Otherwise, they would have thrown him out of there" (Wright, 1996).

Some people in the community considered him an Uncle Tom. Again, Walker contends:

Some people did. But, we didn't. We just tried to walk straight when we walked by him. He used diplomacy. He had a mild opinion, but firm stand. There is a difference in being an Uncle Tom and a diplomat. Yet, he was a visionary. He saw the long range got thus, he was not a rebel. Otherwise, he would have been out of there (Walker, 1996).

People's perceptions of his leadership were based on their position and relationship to him.

The time when Mitchell was principal was critical because he had to be one thing to the external forces outside of the school, and another to the internal forces inside the school walls.

Walker noted:

Because of his qualifications, the whole community, I mean the white community looked to him for insight. They would come see Mitchell and find out his views like Martin Luther King. He was like the Superintendent of the Black schools. He had this Black school and he said what was what (Walker, 1996).

Wright adds, "it was rare for a Black man to have run both an elementary school and a junior
high. Not many had that" (Wright, 1996). Consequently, Mitchell was featured in *Who's Who in Colored America: A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Living Persons of African Descent in America* (1929) as early as 1928 shortly after receiving his Masters from Ohio State (Boris, 1928). Still, he walked an intellectual tight rope where he paid a price in the community to some degree because he did not advocate change. Ultimately, he was respected by both communities. However, as a human being, he paid a price because he could not overtly advocate against educational segregated practices. Mitchell, however, chose another arena, one in which he felt more than adequately prepared to address: the academic arena.

Mitchell utilized his article and his thesis to state his position on his beliefs on the capabilities of African Americans. Ultimately, he heralded education as the mediator of racism. He was a pragmatic intellectual. He chose where to voice his opinions. Consequently, the rock of ages work was circumscribed by the political and social temper of the times. Thus,

... the problem of Negro leadership ... has always been extremely delicate, dangerous and complex. The term itself becomes remarkably difficult to define, the moment one realizes that the real role of the Negro leader, in the eyes of the American Republic, was not to make the Negro a first-class citizen, but to keep him content as a second-class one (White, 1990, 2).

Mitchell was therefore caught between a rock and a hard place. His vision stressed the opposite of his actions at times. Consequently, he looked for other places besides academia from which to complement his role as principal. Again, Columbus's greater community provided the impetus for change.

**Community Activities: Leadership in the Field**

The Frontiers Club was organized in 1933 and incorporated in 1934 in Columbus, Ohio. Mitchell was a member of the organization. Moreover, he had served as president of the organization. The Frontiers' purpose was to develop "effective leadership for the group
[African Americans] and stimulating a unity of purpose and technique demanded by the changing situation in Columbus (Himes, 1942, 154). Moreover, their motto was “Advancement through Service” (Frontiers, 1954).

The Frontiers Club hosted Mrs. Daisy Bates in February of 1959. Mrs. Bates spoke on the issues confronting African Americans at the time—school integration. Mrs. Bates stated, “Take a stand during this crucial period. The cause of the Negro is the ultimate cause of America" (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959, 3). Later that year, members of the Columbus Frontiers such as Allen and other notables attended the Midwest regional conference of the Frontiers. The conference theme was “Adequate Leadership in Areas of Greatest Needs" (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959, 7). During the 1953-54 year, Mitchell was a member of the Board of Directors of the Frontiers of America and served as a member of the Research Committee which published a text dedicated to the organization's sesquicentennial and the contributions of African Americans of Columbus. Consequently, Mitchell stressed racial uplift through means such as the Frontiers Club and his membership in Sigma Pi Phi (Wright, 1996).

Sigma Phi Pi was organized in 1904 in Philadelphia by African American men who were “aristocrats of color” (Gatewood, 1990). Contrary to popular belief, it was the first Black Greek-letter organization and not Alpha Phi Alpha (Gatewood, 1990). The organization was limited to “men of qualities, tastes, and attainments” (Gatewood, 1990, 103). The Boule', as it was better known, represented African American men who were forthright, elitist and consistently exercised great care in enforcing rigorous standards of admission. It was a conscious attempt to bring together Negroes who had “demonstrated outstanding ability to compete successfully with whites.” Boule’s members adhered to a code of unimpeachable personal conduct and in fact constituted a model of the genteel society. . . Boule' represented, in the words of one member, “the flower of the race” (Gatewood, 234).

Mitchell belonged to the Lambda Chapter of the Boule' here in Columbus. Membership in the Boule' in Columbus was not only guaranteed by the attainment of the Bachelor's degree. Mr.
Wright indicated "Mitchell never took that stand in the community. He could have done more. In Sigma Pi Phi, he was more active" (Wright, 1996). Consequently, Mitchell often did not socialized with the majority of the Black community in socially significant ways. Yet, his membership in such organizations as Sigma Pi Phi, Frontiers of America, the Urban League and other numerous professional organizations provided Mitchell with leadership status in both communities in Columbus. Moreover, it established him as the person from which social mobility for up and coming Black professionals would have to pass. While he voted for Wright to gain entrance into the Boule', "He wouldn't hire me" (Wright, 1996). Moreover, Mr. Willis indicated Mitchell was also responsible for his entrance into the Boule' (Willis, 1995). Thus, Mitchell was the channel from which Black college-educated men gained entree into the elite power structure of the Black community. Consequently, his service and membership in these organizations alongside his role as principal of Champion made him a leader. He pushed for educational attainment more by example, than by word outside of the confines of Champion where he stressed educational excellence for 39 years. The students at Champion followed his model.

Mitchell was viewed differently by the people whose life he really had the most impact on: children. His own children went on to be successful in their own right as they earned medical and philosophical doctorate degrees (Frontiers, 1954; The Ohio Sentinel, 1959). Consequently, he taught the children of Champion what he also taught his own. Furthermore, a last component of Mitchell's educational leadership was sports.

Mitchell argued "Athletics has been a great leveler throughout the years" (Mitchell, 1959). He went on to say to Jones that he was "proud of his teams" and introduced Cy Butler. As early as 1926, Champion claimed championships in city-wide sports league (Champion Archives). Champion was indeed known for its athletes and its academics in the community.
Such football greats as Archie Griffin attended Champion. Moreover, several athletes from the school such as Archie Griffin, Bernie Casey, and others went on to be prominent athletes.

In essence, Mitchell's creed or ideological base for education was composed of several components: educational excellence, citizenship and community service, and athletic excellence. In the year that he retired, the American Legion presented an American flag to Mitchell and his students. Mitchell "expressed appreciation of teachers and pupils for "this patriotic encouragement gift by Charles Bloce unit" (Ohio Sentinel, 2/14/1959). Mitchell exemplified and instilled the basic rubric of the Cardinal Principals at Champion. Of the three, education, service, and sports, he believed in the whole education of the person as well as educational excellence as vehicles to eradicate the race issue.

Mitchell also believed in the usage of sports as an ameliorator in social situations. Thus, his ideology complimented the leadership at the time of Allen who sought to discipline youth through his YMCA and UL activities and prepare them for the world as competent workers. Mitchell, therefore, fit in with the prevailing leadership in Columbus. He would remain in such a position until 1959. His relationships with teachers and students, however, were different.

**Perceptions of Leadership: Remembrances**

From all accounts, Mitchell was an exemplary principal who demanded not only excellence of his students, but of his staff. Mrs. Irene Willis, a former teacher at Champion recalled that Mitchell "was a tyrant" (Willis, I., 1996). Another former teacher, Mr. Edward J. Willis, who would later become principal of the school, asserted that he "followed two excellent leaders: Mitchell and Wade" (Willis, 1995). Former students viewed Mitchell as stern, yet approachable and determined to make the best out of the students at Champion (Brooks, 1996; Ransom, 1996; Stewart, 1996; Walker, 1996). Former teachers, students and
community members extrapolated their interpretations of Mitchell based on the context in which they knew him. Yet, regardless of the differences in interpretation by colleagues, teachers and students, the Black community viewed Mitchell as a leader.

Mr. Edward J. Willis stated "under Mitchell, Champion was a good school" (Willis, 1995). Moreover, members of the Black community understood that Mitchell could not be on the frontlines and retain his position (Walker, 1996; Wright, 1996). Eugene Walker noted "When the white community wanted to know the Black community’s position, they asked Mitchell. It was as if they were asking Martin Luther King" (Walker, 1996). Mitchell was given the power and authority to decide who would teach at Champion. Mr. Wright recalls that "Yes, Mitchell could decide who he wanted as a teacher at Champion. I had that kind of power too, at first" (Wright, 1996). Thus, Mitchell became the gatekeeper of the Black community while at the same time, he was viewed as a leader outside the community as well. Hence, Mitchell controlled not only the actions of his teachers, but he also controlled hiring practices of other teachers in the developing de facto segregated school system. Mrs. Juliette Saunders explains how she got her position at an elementary school. She recalled:

While you went over and saw Roudebush, it was Mitchell who really made the decision. You did not get a job in Columbus without his approval. I almost didn’t get my position. I got my job because my brother was a Republican, and he threatened to use his resources to cause a fuss if I did not gain a position. They only wanted certain kinds of teachers (Saunders, 1992).

Mitchell had become the gatekeeper not only at his school, but at other all-Black elementary feeder schools. Despite his idiosyncracies, he was an exemplary principal at Champion. The Hall of Champion attests not only to his demand of excellence, but to the strength of his faculty.

At the end of his reign, however, Mitchell’s health was deteriorating. Mrs. Irene Willis who taught at the school during these years, clarified how things changed in the school.
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between Mitchell and the female teachers. She stated:

Mr. Mitchell was a tyrant. He did not allow us to wear pants. In the winter, we would have no heat and we couldn't wear pants. One day, Mrs. X and myself decided we were going to wear pants. We did. He didn't say anything and that was the end of the dress only rule (Willis Interview, 1996).

Mr. Ed Willis remembered “We had a saying. The bear is on the move” (Willis, 1996).

While Mr. Mitchell was viewed as a tyrant and a gatekeeper, he was viewed quite differently by his students. One former student, Mrs. Brooks, had this to say about Mr. Mitchell:

You could talk to him. One day I didn't want to go outside for recess and I went into his office and was writing on the floor. He said “you didn't want to go outside.” I said, “No.” he said, “Okay.” He was approachable. (Brooks Interview, 1996).

Another view came from Mr. Hayes.

In the day to day operation of the school, you rarely saw him. But, you actually knew who he was and what he stood for. The only time you saw him was at assembly or when dignitaries came. But, in terms of coming down and sitting at the tables in the cafeteria, we didn't see that much. Now, maybe in his younger years, yes. But, I can remember him with a limp. But you knew you definitely did not want to go see Mr. Mitchell up close. He was even intimidating to my mother who was on the PTA (Hayes, 1996).

While Mitchell was a tow-the-line professional, he was also impressive. He and the other male teachers at Champion were lauded by Anna Bishop, a retired teacher. In the Blackberry Patch (1990), she wrote;

How can anyone who lived in the area EVER FORGET the STALWART MEN of CHAMPION JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL . . . John Burrell, wood and metals teacher; W. “Mirt” Wood, who followed Mr. Burrell; ‘Jere’ Stanfield, who joined “Mirt”; Coach “Cy’ Butler; C. P. Blackburn (who became the Principal of Garfield Elementary School when it changed to “colored”.) and Dr. J. Arnett Mitchell, Principal? These were all heavy-handed men, but they had hearts so soft as cotton. Dedicated to the boys who came to them, they were looked upon as heroes when the boys became men! (Bishop, Blackberry Patch, 76).

Clearly, no more needs to be said about not only Mitchell, but his staff's commitment to the education of the African American youth who attended Champion. At his testimonial, over
400 people attended. Dr Harold H. Eibling, superintendent of Columbus Public Schools, was
the primary speaker. The Ohio Sentinel captured the event:

Representatives of universities, learned societies, businesses and organizations
will be present during the testimonial banquet Prof. J. Arnett Mitchell. . . .

Major event of the evening is presentation of a plaque reading In recognition
of his outstanding contribution to education and community service during his 38 years
as principal of Champion Av. Elementary and Champion Jr. High schools from 1921
to 1959. The service we render to humanity is immortal (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959,
30).

Indeed, Mitchell's retirement brought to an end of the most stable periods in the leadership at
Champion since its inception. The next thirty-seven years would be characterized as years of
change.

Mitchell was indeed a "self-styled exemplar of" the race (White, 1990, 2). He led
within the school walls and outside in the African American and European American
communities. He was called upon by the powers that be when they wanted to assess the
position of the Black community. On the other hand, he was not vocal on the race issue, but
exercised his influence through service and educational endeavors. Thus, Mitchell represented
the "talented tenth", but on the other hand he was no DuBois in forcing the acquisition of
political and social rights for the Black community. Mitchell was a pragmatic intellectual. He
often exhibited tenants of Washington's philosophy. Consequently, Mitchell was a leader
propelled by a different kind of "twoness" whereby he walked the fence in order to achieve
entrance for his students, but not for the entire Black community, nor himself. He chose his
battles. The analysis of Mitchell attests to the idea of another interpretation of Black
leadership.

Historically, historians have classified Black leadership within a context of either
accomodationist or integrationist. Mitchell's example begs for a new interpretation of Black
leadership. It is this author's contention that African American leadership must be viewed
from a continuum rather than a dichotomous position often associated with the tenets of positivism. Mitchell displayed both characteristics. Moreover, he was a pragmatic intellectual. Consequently, he understood himself differently in the world. He believed and had proven that he could compete in the White man's world. It was that world to which he pushed his students. On the other hand, Mitchell chose where to speak. In his last year at Champion, he delivered the commencement speech at Wilberforce University. At the commencement, he spoke of "his dreams, experiences and the goals that he reached" (Ohio Sentinel, 1959). His speech concluded with a discussion of dreams and goals. Thus, included in leadership is a conception of goals and dreams: a vision. Leaders attain their visions through actions and inactions. Consequently, the dichotomization of African American leaders cannot continue to be based on the perception that Black leaders are either/or, but never both.

In essence, Mitchell was a man driven by the possibilities of the future and bound by the boundaries of the period, place and time. The new leadership that entered Champion was of another time. They too would meet different challenges, and would do so differently than Mitchell had. In 1959, the U. S. was about to experience the full rage of a once calm river. Thus, the context of the time altered the leadership at Champion.


Since the historic Brown decision in 1954 and subsequent desegregation cases, Black education whether North, South, East or West would never be the same. As the boundaries of school access changed in America, Black men in the North in cities like Columbus were finally hired in leadership positions other than those they had previously held—as principals of all Black de facto segregated schools. From 1959 to the present, Black men would continue to serve as principals at Champion until busing changed the educational landscape of Columbus.
After desegregation gained momentum in Columbus, only then would European American men attain leadership positions in what had been a bastion for Black men—the principalship of Champion. As time would proceed forward, however, the leadership of Champion would return to a Black male. The torch, however, would be passed first to a Black man who knew Champion well.

**Stalwart Men**

Mr. John Wade succeeded Mr. Mitchell as principal of Champion Avenue School. Wade had taught industrial arts, math and science at Champion for 13 and 1/2 years from 1941 to 1954. He recalled how he attained his position after graduating from West Virginia State College, a historically Black institution.

I was unable to get employment in West Virginia because most of the Black teachers stayed there until they died or retired. Quite naturally, there were few openings. I came to Columbus and worked on the Pennsylvania railroad. One night, I came in and I had a letter from the Board of Education stating I had to make an appointment for an interview. . . . I took the place of a man who was drafted into the service. I started off on substitute and then I was made permanent the next year. The school was all Black. It was about 30 of us. (Wade, 1991).

At the time Wade was hired, incoming teachers had to have a B.A. degree, not less than a B in student teaching, and three years experience (Wade, 1992). Because of the war, Mr. Wade was able to attain his position even though he did not have the required experience.

As a teacher at Champion from 1941 to 1954, he taught industrial arts, science and math. He also coached the football and basketball team (Wade, 1992). In 1954, he “was selected as the first Black to teach at a high school staff when I was transferred to East” (Wade, 1992). When he was given the assignment at East, Dr. Novice Fawcett Superintendent of Columbus Schools at the time said to him that he “was not being moved as the first Black teacher, but as a teacher. And that’s the way I started out and it worked fine” (Wade, 1991). Wade credits Dr. Fawcett who later became president of The Ohio State University as the
person who started to alter the educational placement policy in Columbus which “believed in keeping them [Black students and teachers] separate” (Wade, 1991). Wade was on staff at East for two years. He left in 1957 to be part of a mentoring or cadet program for assistant principals. Wade moved on to Franklin Junior High. After two years of being the assistant principal there, he was selected as the new principal of Champion. The newspaper read “Wade New Champion Principal, Succeeded at Franklin By Nicklaus” (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959). Wade was about to assume principalship at Champion. He did it with style.

As indicated earlier, Mr. Wade had been a teacher at Champion from 1941 to 1953 (Wade, 1992; The Ohio Sentinel, 1959). He then worked at East for two years, and later served as Vice Principal of Franklin for two years from 1957-1959. He was a graduate of a historically Black school, West Virginia State College, but when he graduated there were no jobs for teachers. “I was unable to find employment in West Virginia. The teachers there stayed until they retired, so I left” (Wade, 1992). He attained his M.A. from Ohio State University. In the year he was appointed principal of Champion, Wade attended a professional concentration courses institute at Central State University (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959). He would go on to study at the University of Chicago and attain hours beyond the master’s degree. Mr. Edward J. Willis described the difference in leadership styles between the men.

Mr. Mitchell was good. You have to remember that when I came to the school he was in his later years. But, Wade was excellent. He publicized what we were doing at Champion (Willis, 1995).

The Ohio Sentinel from 1959 until its end carried the majority of events of prominence at Champion as well as the successes of the students and teachers. One newspaper article covered the educational programming and curricular changes at Champion: television classes. In the year he retired from Champion, Mitchell delivered the graduation speech at Wilberforce that year, but, he was not a high profile person. In fact, as a member of Sigma Pi Phi,
Mitchell had demonstrated outstanding ability to compete successfully with Whites. His membership in the organization precluded him from seeking publicity. In fact, the organization "shunned publicity" during the time Mitchell was a member (Gatewood, 234). Its members were supposed to represent the genteel tradition. All accounts of Mitchell support this view. Mr. Wright commented that "he could have done more in the community, than he did, but that was not his thing. He could have projected himself more in the community, but he wouldn't take that stand. In Sigma Pi Phi, he was more active" (Wright, 1996). Regardless of the differences in interpretation of Mitchell, he was remembered in the community as an excellent education more than twenty-five years after his retirement (Call and Post, 1985).

Wade, however, was a public relations minded administrator.

Wade's tenure at Champion was short; yet, he did phenomenal work. Under his leadership, he began a science fair and other activities which supported "Emphasis on Excellence," which was his idea. He brought curricular and technological innovations to the school. When Wade was the principal, the school was all Black. When he left, he was replaced by a White teacher. He also indicated "some White kids were bused past Champion to Franklin which was integrated" (Wade, 1992). However, the system of segregation had begun to break down.

As a teacher and principal, he made no differentiation between students. When he went to Franklin, there were already Black teachers there (Wade, 1992). He declared this speech to the 9th grade class of Champion in 1964. He stated:

The success of our 1963-1964 school year has been, in the main, due to your splendid cooperation. In general you have worked hard and been dedicated in order for Champion to maintain its good name in the city. We have received many letters, telephone calls, and other expressions of the outstanding work being accomplished by our teachers along with the boys and girls of our school.

During this school year there were more pupils enrolled, more student teachers, more visitors, more observations and honors to our school, and more participating by you. For all of this, on behalf of the staff, we are grateful to you.
We wish each of you many, many happy and successful days in the future. Always remember you are welcome at Champion because you are on the team (Champion Chronicle, 1964).

Mr. Wade would soon leave the school. But, while he was there he had improved on Mitchell’s “good” school. According to Willis, “under Mitchell it was a good school. Under Wade, it was great” (Willis, 1992). Wade and later Willis, however, did keep some of Mitchell’s practices. Willis commented:

One of the strengths of the school’s organization Wade and I kept was when the bell rang every teacher came out into the hall. There was no, I’m busy. Every teacher when the bell rang you shut your door. We didn’t go back into our rooms until every child was out of the hall. In other words, we didn’t go back into the classroom until the hall was empty (Willis, 1995).

Willis had been the assistant principal after Mr. Wade. Another assistant principal, Mr. Will Anderson also provided insight into the everyday structure of life in Champion.

Mr. Will Anderson who was a teacher at Champion, the assistant principal at Champion, and later became the principal of Linden-McKinley had a similar interpretation of Champion’s excellent teachers. While quality education existed at Champion, Mr. Anderson’s first thoughts were on the physical structure of the building. He had this to say about Champion when he arrived there in 1953:

I had never seen anything like it. The school was falling down around them. Yet, it had an excellent staff and an administrator in Mr. Mitchell. I really appreciated my experience there. Where I was from [Cincinnati], I had never seen anything like it (Anderson, 1992).

Anderson served as the track coach. Under his leadership, his team had won the state championship. Anderson was part of the new teaching staff at the school, the relatively new teaching staff that Wade, then Willis, inherited. Mitchell established the excellent teachers which was how Wade, and later, Willis were able to continue the legacy. It became the strength upon which Willis built.
After Wade left in 1966, Mr. Edward J. Willis, a Columbus native, became principal of Champion. Willis believed in strong leadership:

My theory is that the school can never be any stronger than the principal because the principal sets the tone, and people are such that they don't perform unless there is a certain amount of pressure to perform (Willis, 1995).

Willis was a Columbus native. His father had been the sheriff of Hanford Village, an all Black settlement. He attended Delaware State University, a historically Black institution for two years. He then completed his B.A. at Ohio State. He was the math teacher at Champion. Willis went on later to attain his Master’s in math and administration. He had his own philosophy on leadership. Willis contended “A school is only as good as its curriculum. A school is only as good as its teachers. A school is only as good as its leader” (Willis Interview, 1995). As noted earlier, Willis graduated from Ohio State. He attained a teaching position in Columbus in 1953, after teaching in Cleveland for a year. He noted:

Before you could teach in Columbus, you had to teach somewhere else. This practice had been ruled out as policy in the ’40s. However, it was still applied to Black applicants (Willis, 1995).

Willis would eventually leave the school because of desegregation to lead the principalship of East High School. He was featured on CBS when East’s student body was desegregated. He said:

Black people are not going back to Africa, and White people are not going back to Europe. We’re going to East High School, and we’re going to respect each other. I don’t want to hear the word ‘nigger,’ and I don’t want to hear the word ‘honky,’ or I’m going to deal with you (Citizen Journal, 1979; Willis, 1996).

Willis was no J. Arnett Mitchell. He had been a former football player. Willis approached leadership as a team, but he was the head man in charge. “Willis led with a strong hand just as the principals before him” (Mrs. Welch, 1996). Mrs. Welch contends:

A school takes its leadership from the head. If you have a strong leader, you have a strong school. Mr. Willis was a strong leader, but a personable person as well (Welch, 1996).
Mrs. Helms spoke of Mr. Willis’s leadership. Mr. Helms and Mrs. Welch had both been hired by Willis. Mrs. Helms indicated that it was a funny story how she was hired. She stated,

Willis wanted to hire Black teachers for Champion. He sounded distant on the phone when I had talked with him. Not like everyone had told me about how friendly he was. He said that I could interview for the job and asked if I knew where Champion was. I told him I attended Champion. Only then, he laughed. He must have thought I was White since I had taught at Buckeye Junior High (Helms, 1996).

When Willis was at Champion to some degree, he, like Mitchell, had the power to decide who would be hired there. He had a definite conviction about the effects of race on the learning relationship between student and teacher. In 1977, in the Columbus Dispatch, the headline read “East High Principal Hits Teacher Quota.” In the article, Willis was quoted as having said,

... three out of five white teachers can’t do the job in a black school. THERE is such a thing as black experience, and white teachers just don’t understand what it means to be black—what the needs are. ... There are many good white teachers, and some very good white teachers at East. But when there is a predominately black school, such as East, at least 40 percent of the teachers ought to be black—and that figure might a little low. of East 81 teachers, principals and assistant principals at East, 53 are white and 28, less than 35 percent, are black (Columbus Dispatch, 1974).

The article concluded by noting that East had one year to “replace 18 black professionals with 18 whites (Columbus Dispatch, 1974).” Willis understood the significance of the OCRC plan.

It was going to alter the teacher composition of the school. In fact, it was moving it back toward an all white faculty. At that time, however, Penick had not been decided.

Consequently, the Brown decision had begun to cost Black teachers jobs in Columbus as it had done almost twenty years previously after Brown was instituted in the South (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959). However, the times in Columbus were changing, and a change was about to come to Columbus.

Even though Champion had a succession of Black male principals after Mitchell, that was about to be altered. Three years after hiring Helms and Welch, Willis became principal of
East High. The changes that occurred at Champion were due to desegregation policy. Black
men in particular were gaining administrative positions in the school system outside of
Champion in desegregated buildings. Staff desegregation at the administrative level occurred
in conjunction with teacher desegregation. When Mr. Anderson went to Linden-McKinley, he
recalled "that there was only one Black teacher there. That was in 1966" (Anderson, 1992).
Moreover, African American teachers would be hired at high schools. Mr. Wade had been the
first Black teacher placed at East under Superintendent Novice Fawcett in 1954. The glass
ceiling for employment that limited qualified Blacks to the five (historically de facto)
segregated schools had been shattered. However, Champion was about to change not only in
student body, but in administration. It would have its first European American principal in
Mr. Frank Foreman. From 1971 to 1995, the principalship of Champion would be held by
White men. Champion would have a desegregated teaching and administrative staff. It
would no longer be an all Black school in any shape or form.

Desegregation and School Leadership

As noted in Chapter 4, teaching staffs in the Columbus schools were desegregated
before the student population. VL had initiated this process as early as 1941. Shortly before
Brown, staff integration began with the closing of the portables which housed American
Addition students and teachers who were all Black. They were transferred to Leonard Avenue
School which eventually gained Wright as its principal (Wright, 1996). This was the official
start of "integration" of the teaching staff (Columbus Dispatch, 1976; BOE Minutes, 1949).
Administrative staff soon followed. However, Black administrators went through an internship
process. Mr. Wade was the first administrator to be mentored for leadership in the Columbus
schools (The Ohio Sentinel, 1959; Wade, 1992). From 1957 when Wade went to Frankiin
until the present, staffs of Columbus schools has been desegregated. Desegregation came to the Champion Administrative staff in 1971, when Mr. Willis became principal of East High School. The staff that succeeded him was integrated. However, Blacks were usually relegated to serve as assistant principals after Champion was desegregated (Champion Archives).

Between, 1971 and 1995, three European American males served as principals of Champion. From all accounts of their leadership, they understood and were aware of the historical significance of Champion and stressed educational excellence. Moreover, they initiated support services and activities supporting that goal (Brooks, 1996; Kraham, 1996; Murray, 1996; Nelson, 1996; Polomik, 1996; Welch, 1996). From 1971 to 1981, Mr. Frank Foreman was the principal of the school. He was followed by Mr. Duane Pelkey who served as principal from 1981 to 1987. Lastly, Mr. Andrew Meilton was principal of the school from 1987 to 1995. During this period, the school continued to be acknowledged for its academic excellence. The majority of the praise goes to teachers. But, credit should also be given to the principals who maintained the legacy of Champion.

From 1971 to 1995, Champion was recognized time and time again for their participation in academics and community service. For example, in 1978 the students were recognized for "The Best Participation in Central District Science Day" under Foreman's leadership. In 1987, under Pelkey, the school was recognized for its commitment to science preparation and their community service. Mr. Andrew Meilton continued the legacy.

Andrew Meilton

Andrew Meilton was a kind man. He stressed academics, but less so discipline. When teachers would talk to him concerning the behavior of students, he would say "You just have to love them more" (Interview, 1996). Mrs. Brooks contends that he was not a disciplinarian. In fact, she recalled, "If you told a student you were going to the office, they
would beat you there" (Brooks, 1996). Yet, Meilton was a hard worker. According to Mrs Nelson, "Mr. Meilton is a very kind man. He took on a lot himself. He was often there early and left late" (Nelson, 1996). Yet, the staff of Champion who were under Meilton had different responses to his leadership. Mrs. Helms, Mr. Murray and Mr. Welch all concurred that Meilton stressed academics over activity (Helms, 1996; Murray, 1996; Welch, 1996). While teachers of the school have similar and differing interpretations of Meilton, particularly related to his lack of discipline toward the children, they contend he made a difference in the academic lives and opportunities provided to the students.

Meilton continued to focus on educational excellence (Brooks, 1996; Nelson, 1996; Welch, 1996). The EOE (Our Emphasis is On Excellence) philosophical underpinning continued. In the 1987-1988 Yearbook, "Emphasis on Excellence" is the motto. Also, the new school mascot, the Griffin is featured. Meilton had a competition for the new mascot of Champion which symbolized its change from an middle school to an Alternative Regional Middle School (Baranco, 1996; Cuban, 1996; Taft, 1996). As a Regional Alternative Middle School (RAM) Champion drew from all over the city as well as its designated northern area of students (Baranco, 1996). Furthermore, Meilton sought out support for the school from the community, business and governmental agencies (Champion Archives). Mr. Robert Taft, the Secretary of State, stated that "They had a program installing the Griffin as the school mascot" (Taft, 1996). Taft showed me his Griffin that was given to him by Mr. Meilton when he became a school partner. Meilton stressed academics and sought assistance for resources through the Adopt-A-School Program. Consequently, it was during Mr. Meilton's reign as principal that the school started its "Adopt a School" program. As indicated earlier, Robert Taft, Secretary of State, adopted Champion in 1991. Tafts's influence in the school, however, has been phenomenal. His influence will be discussed in Chapter 7. In conclusion, Meilton
worked to maintain the public focus initiated by Wade, the people focus by Willis, and the academic focus of Mitchell. In essence, he continued the legacy of Champion.

While Meilton and his predecessors stressed academic excellence, Meilton’s position on discipline was somewhat problematic for teachers. Mrs. Brooks stated “Meilton stressed academics, but not discipline” (Brooks, 1996). Meilton left the school in 1995. Now, that the guard has changed, according to Mrs. Brooks “Since Hayes has been here, the students don’t want to go to the office” (Brooks, 1996). This author contends that the placement of Hayes was due to his exemplary administrative ability and another important factor in the school: change.

In 1995, it was announced that the BOE was considering going back to the “neighborhood school” concept. As noted in Chapter 4, Champion resides in a predominately Black community. In fact, it is surrounded by the historic Poindexter Village. The students living in Poindexter Village, however, were sent to the West side under desegregation much to the consternation of parents in the area. In fact, Mrs. Brooks informed me that parents in Poindexter village have tried to have their children attend Champion. Because of the zones of attendance and its alternative status, “We had to turn them away” (Brooks, 1996). While the school had success in desegregating its teaching and student population throughout the ’70s and into the early ’90s, at the present, the student population is over 90% Black. The BOE’s movement toward neighborhood schools has switched the principalship back to an African American male. Enter Meilton’s successor, Mr. William “Bill” Hayes, Jr.

Gaining Entree: Clearing Red Tape

In my first attempt to meet the principal, Mr. Hayes, I failed. He had been called away to a meeting. I waited for an hour, however, he did not return. It appeared as if he was
going to be down town longer than I expected. I did not know if he was Black or White.

Moreover, I was afraid to ask. So, I decided to come back.

The next time, I went to see him, I was successful in gaining entree. He had not been called away. However, life in schools is busy. There is always something going on. I waited. While I was sitting there observing the going-ons in the school, he entered. He was a small-framed man, with a caramel complexion. I relaxed a little, and hoped I could gain entree. Yet, Mr. Hayes immediately impressed me with his welcoming “What can I do for you?” and the strength in his handshake. He was definitely a man who was about the business of taking care of business. In other words, he reverberated energy of doing rather than talking. Moreover, he reminded me of Black men in my own church community who truly served the people of the church: men who were busy, but never too busy to provide support and encouragement.

As we sat in his office, I explained to him the purpose of my being there and what I wanted to accomplish if given permission to conduct research in the school. He immediately pledged his support, and stated “I will do anything I can to help you. But, there are some channels you have to go through first. Once you do that, I will be more than happy to help you with your research” (Hayes, 1995). Mr. Hayes pulled out the requirements stipulated by the BOE, and copied them for me himself. He made sure before I left that I understood what I needed to do by going through the document with me. Then he sent me on my way. But, before doing so, he informed me that he had attended the school and talked some of its history and even began to give names of people to interview. Clearly, I would gain entree if he could make the decision. I left the school feeling good even though I did not know how long it would take. I was beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel.
Three months later with letter in hand, I went to the school again to meet with Mr. Hayes. I had received permission in record time to conduct my study. Moreover, I had learned from my interview with Mr. Willis that the person responsible for clearing through the red tape was a former teacher at Champion, Ms. Lucretia Williams. That day, I set out officially to begin my observations of the school. I didn't know what I would find. I just hoped it would be something good.

**Footsteps: The Present Principal**

I had scheduled an appointment with Hayes to discuss what I needed to do the study. We went over the logistics of my research. I informed him that I was only doing teacher and administrator observations and interviews, and that I had not secured permission to do student interviews. Moreover, I told him that I wanted his assistance and insight on who he believed were "good" teachers. He gave me a few names which included Mr. Lehman, Mrs. Helms and others in addition to Mrs. Welch whom I already knew through community activities. But, he also left the decision up to me on whom to chose. I further informed him I would like to attend staff meetings if possible and provide service to the school as well. Mr. Hayes provided me an outline of the teacher organizations of the school such as BLISS, an informal teacher initiated brainstorming group which attempts to solve administrative procedural, policy and other issues on a semi-formal basis in the school before they become problems and have to be solved by the ABC (Association and Building Council), mandated under the union contract. After giving me the school's daily schedule, we both pulled out our calendars and began to map out when teachers were going not going to be available because of the Proficiency Test and Spring Break. We then set a date for me to do an in-service on urban
education. In twenty minutes, we had effectively planned the logistics of my research and time schedule. Clearly, Hayes is an exemplary administrator.

During the meeting, we began to talk of his experiences at Champion. Moreover, we began to talk about Mitchell who was principal for the year and a half that he went to Champion. We also discussed his relationship with other principals of the school such as Mr. Willis who had tutored him in math after he left Champion and was a student at East. Hayes was well aware of the legacy he was following.

After meeting with Hayes, I learned that both Mrs. Brooks, the librarian, and Mrs. Helms had been students of the school. While Mr. Hayes had only set an hour aside for our meeting that day, he asked if I wanted to see if Mrs. Brooks had some time so I could either talk with her or set up a time for an interview. He assessed she could give an interesting and different view about the school. Moreover, she could inform me about “the Post-Willis years” (Hayes, 1996). Already, I had my first interview. Mr. Hayes demonstrated his support of my research. He, too, felt it was important. As Mr. Hayes and I walked up the stairs to the library, I asked him how it felt to be back in a school in which he had been a student. Hayes commented on how he wanted to do well at Champion because he had attended there. “My being here is special. It is important for me to do well. I really believe I can do some good here” (Hayes, 1996). His facial expression revealed his commitment and understanding of the footsteps he was now following. Moreover, he knew the school’s history. He had been a part of it.

**Developing a Portrait of an African American Principal: A Biography**

Mr. Hayes had attended the segregated schools of Columbus and was a Columbus native. He had lived “over on St. Clair Avenue” (Hayes, 1996). Hayes attended Felton Elementary School where he was a student of Mr. Lucien Wright. He suggested that I
interview Wright who could give me more information about Mitchell. He also attended Champion and Franklin Jr. High Schools, and later East High. At the time he attended Champion and then Franklin, they contained 7th through 9th grades. During his educational process, Hayes received the tutelage of Mr. Wright, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Willis. These men were his mentors. He had others.

Mr. Hayes was an only child. His parents had him later in life. In fact, “they didn’t expect to have me. They thought they couldn’t have children” (Hayes, 1996). Consequently,

They wanted to give me all kinds of experiences in the community and beyond it. They wanted to expose me to as many different experiences as possible. They wanted me to be shaped by a total of experiences (Hayes, 1996).

Hayes’s father had two years of college before dropping out to help take care of his grandmother. His mother had one year of college. He contends:

... they both were unique individuals. Even though my father did not go on and get his bachelor’s degree, I can remember when I went to Ohio University and we were being selected to participate in the desegregation experiment, they talked to our parents. I can remember how my father did not have his bachelor’s degree, but he always acquired knowledge. They were always, always acquiring knowledge. They believed in education (Hayes, 1996).

He respected his parents. His father was his first role model, and served as his primary mentor. However, the aforementioned men Wright, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Cliff Tyree, Martin Luther King, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, the teachers at Felton especially, Mr. Horton who was his first Black male teacher were his role models as well. These men helped to shape his theories of action. These people provided for him a sense of efficacy in his ability to empower and change his reality and the reality others. They had supplied him with the tacit knowledge or reasons why he did what he did. In an earlier conversation, Hayes indicated “I would say that gentleman [Mr. Wright] along with a couple of others that I met as I moved from elementary to East High School which was also a feeder for Champion had a profound
effect on me” (Hayes, 1996). Hayes had been gifted with exemplars of different leadership styles. He described their attributes of leadership:

Mr. Wright made his presence known, but did not put himself above the teachers. Mr. Mitchell was good. When I was at the school, he had such a sense of power even though he walked with a limp and had a cane. You still felt fearful of the man. Mr. Willis was an assistant principal when I was here. Quite. At East, however, he was bigger than life in the eyes of the community. Mr. Jim Stewart the principal of Central High School was quietly effective and very professional. He ran a top notch school. I admired Dr. Martin Luther King, my ultimate role model. Thurgood Marshall provided leadership. Cliff Tyree deals with the community. A man of character (Hayes, 1996).

Thus, besides his father, Hayes had several very different models of leaders and very different administrators.

Hayes came of age when things in Columbus were changing. Even things at Champion were changing. Mr Wright recalled the period: “The faculty of Champion had changed and they started to push Mitchell more on the policies of the school” (Wright, 1996). Nonetheless, Hayes would benefit from the voluntary desegregation that was beginning in Columbus. He stated:

I decided to integrate Franklin Junior High School. It is now called Franklin Middle School. So, I along with about 25 others kids were asked if we would voluntarily integrate the school... A couple of years ago, when we had the big to do over busing... because we didn't have any choice. They just decided.

Thus, Hayes was a recipient of changes in the system which gave him exposure to different educational opportunities and experiences than other Black students that came before him, and after. Hayes continued and provided more information on his high school years.

From there, I went to East High School which was a Black high school, but with a 99% White faculty. We had a lot of teachers there who were good, but we had some who were not. I decided then to go to Ohio University. It had one of the top photography programs or one of the better ones anyway.

Hayes, however, did not let the faculty at East who according to Eugene Walker “didn't care if you showed up” (Walker, 1996) impede his educational process which is why after leaving
East he would go over to Champion and be tutored by Mr. Willis in algebra. Because of the
time in which he lived, Hayes had more educational opportunities. One such opportunity was
his attendance at Ohio University in Athens. He recalled his education at OU and how it
affected his perspective on race relations.

As a Freshman, I entered Ohio University. That experience was just as
important. I was selected to participate in desegregating the dorms. One thing it
seems like I have always been a part of change. We had activities such as reading,
etc. that we did together. I felt like a lot of others that desegregation would allow
more understanding of your fellow man amongst the participants, and not only that but
the opportunity to really get to know one another. So, for one year I was part of a
study at OU (Hayes, 1996).

This experience would indeed provide Hayes with people skills that would serve him well in
the future. Hayes earned his B. A. in Special Education from Ohio University. He would go
on to attain his Master in Special Education which he started at OU, and finished at Xavier
University in Cincinnati. He presently has hours beyond the Master's. However, he has no
intention of pursuing a Ph.D. Yet, Hayes's educational opportunities and experiences prepared
him to teach effectively in a desegregated school setting.

After finishing his degree, Hayes attained a teaching position at Central High School
in the Special Education Department. He recalled "I will always have a place in my heart for
special education" (Hayes, 1996). While a teacher at the school, he began to reorganize the
structure of the Special Education Team. He felt he "wanted to do more than the structure
permitted" (Hayes, 1996). In his zeal to really teach his students and provide for them better
educational opportunities, his efforts were noticed. Eventually, the principal asked him if he
ever considered administration. He had not thought about it. He recounts the conversation.
"He said to me, "Well, you are doing a good job. It is not any different from what you are
doing now" (Hayes, 1996). Eventually, the program was organized according to Hayes’s plan.
Hence, early on in his teaching career, Hayes demonstrated his leadership and organizational
abilities. Even though he did not know it at the time, he was headed for the administrative fast track. His innovation and desire to assist his students in achieving would eventually cause him to leave the classroom after ten years. Most often, good teachers are pulled into administration. Hayes became one of them.

For the past twenty-eight years, Hayes has been a teacher, a supervisor for the Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) program, Counselor, Assistant Principal and now Principal of Champion. Time and time again, Hayes was on the front line in desegregating the Columbus Public Schools. But, now he was not a student, but a member of the staff. He recalled these events:

When Columbus annexed Beechcroft, I helped open it up. The staff was hand picked. The first year of deseg, I was assigned to McGuffey Junior High. It was my first administrative position. Then I went to Johnson Park for one year, and from there to Mifflin. Then I was appointed Supervisor of EMR (Educable Mentally Retarded). But, I felt I wanted to serve more of the population. Thus, I went to Eastmoor. I was there for 6 and 1/2 years (Hayes, 1996).

Hayes professed:

I believe that everything, all of the experiences that I have had from secondary school, to OU, to my work at Central, as Supervisor of Elementary Special Education, Beechcroft, McGuffey, my experiences in the leadership trainee position at Mifflin, and my time at Eastmoor all helped to prepare me to deal with the next obstacle. My experiences prepared me to deal with this previous year at Champion. I was ready to assume the responsibility (Hayes, 1996).

Indeed, they had. Mr. Hayes had spent his last six and 1/2 years at Eastmoor. He explained how he left the position at Eastmoor and attained the principalship at Champion.

I left Eastmoor abruptly. I was in the middle of a major revision of the schedule. It was a week before school. It was my own implementation. I was at the school working on it. I got a call at 7:30 p.m. from Mr. Blake offering me the principalship here at Champion. I explained what I was in the process of doing and asked if I could finish the process. Mr. Blake figured that I would. So, I divided myself between Eastmoor and Champion. School was only a few days away (Hayes, 1996).
Obviously, Hayes would not leave Eastmoor high and dry, particularly since the changes in their schedule were his design. Consequently, he worked at both institutions until he had fully implemented his work for Eastmoor. He is goal directed. His ability to get things done organizationally is what had started him down the administrative path. Unfortunately, he did not have much time to prepare for his role as principal of Champion: less than a week. I believe this affected his ability to assess, implement and share his goals and vision for the school early on. He really did not have time to develop it before entering the field. Yet, Hayes is an innovator. Moreover, he was a consensus builder. From the first time I met him in November, to the end of the year in June, he had made the transition from assistant principal of Eastmoor to the principal of Champion. He had claimed his role as leader and was moving on to the next year. While at the beginning of the year, he had been split between Eastmoor and Champion, he was now Champion’s principal full time. Despite the complexities involved in his endeavors, Hayes did not become bewildered. Instead, he hit the ground running to build consensus.

A Consensus Builder: Rebuilding

The form of power that is most significant in the understanding of social change is that combination of energies required to determine and to translate goals into a desired social reality - Kenneth Clark, Dark Ghetto (1965, 199).

In Where Do WE Go from Here: Chaos or Community?, Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote

Ultimately, a genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus but a molder of consensus. I said on one occasion, “If every Negro in the United States turns to violence, I will choose to be that one lone voice preaching that this is the wrong way.” Maybe this sounded like arrogance. But it was not intended that way. It was simply my way of saying that I would rather be a man of conviction than a man of conformity. Occasionally in life one develops a conviction so precious and meaningful that he will stand on it till the end (King, 1967, 63-64).

Hayes admired King. Little did he know, that he was similar to him in his leadership style, and similar in educational and community experiences. Moreover, Hayes is a religious man.
His father was as well. He recalled his father teaching concerning convictions: He remembered:

When I think about my leadership, I think about my father. He really led by example. My father really influenced me a lot. They pushed me into a lot of experiences (Hayes, 1996).

Hayes was not just a product, however, of his parents, but his church and the community.

He stated:

One of the most remarkable aspects of my upbringing was being in church. At an early age, I was involved in church activities, and the connection of or outreach portion of the church was that we had a Boy Scouts Troop. Also, I was affiliated at an early age with other experiences. I felt that all of those experiences helped round me into the person that I was. We’re back to that saying “It takes a whole village to raise a child.” Well, that’s a characteristic of the way I was raised. The community had eyes and ears. When I would walk East on Mt. Vernon Avenue, people would say “You’re Hayes aren’t you?” Not that I had the desire, but if you wanted to kind of stray, it was almost impossible because you never knew who was watching or listening to what you said. I wish that many more of our young people today, had an idea of the total community involvement. The fact that I had participated in the Scouts, and other activities. The fact that I lived in the Black community, a predominately Black community, did not limit me. In fact, those two things more than adequately prepared me to deal with anything. Those experiences adequately prepared me for life . . .

His experiences in the church and the community also helped to develop his ascriptive characteristics. Consequently, his leadership style was developed from these experiences as well. His experiences in the church and the community had empowered him with the convictions that he could foster positive change through his own visions and goals.

Hayes was convinced from the beginning that not only he, but his staff could make a difference in the lives of the children at Champion. Consequently, he tried to provide experiences for them like his parents had provided for him which fostered positive convictions. One such event was a skit by Al Porter, a inspirational speaker who spoke about education, dreams, goals and choices. From November to June, Hayes had not changed his mind. He did not believe that the problems they had could not be overcome. Moreover, he believed
Champion was doing good work as well. He had a sense of efficacy. I contend that this sense of efficacy came from all of his experiences and from the time in which he lived.

Hayes is a product of one of the most turbulent times in this country's history: the modern day Civil Rights Movement. Historically, African Americans have not been defeated by problems such as racism or sexism within the community. Instead, our religious foundations have taught us to understand that oppression is meant to be overcome. Consequently, Mr. Hayes's hopes and aspirations for Champion remained high even when incidents occurred which could have shattered a person with fewer convictions. For example, on my first day back to the school after the death of my grandmother, an incident had happened to a substitute teacher. She had had a can of soda thrown inches from her face. She was upset. However, Hayes did no respond to the incident with an attitude of failure. Nor did he resign himself to joining "Oh, ain't it awful group." Instead, he provided the substitute with support and encouragement. Moreover, he set in motion policy and practices which would keep the entire teaching staff safe. What he said to the substitute worked. She came back the next day. Moreover, he took the opportunity to rally the teachers toward a positive end rather than a state of inertia. He said at the faculty meeting,

"These things happen, but we cannot become despondent. We must take measures to make sure it doesn't happen again. We can have a safe school. But, it is going to take all of us to make it work (Hayes, 1996)."

I never saw Mr. Hayes respond to anything negatively. He always used the obstacle to the benefit of the school, and the staff. Hayes worked to facilitate and build a consensus of his vision. If he had not held his convictions on the utility of his vision of the school, then he would have failed. But, he did not.
The Last Conversation: Looking to the Future

As noted earlier, Hayes's similarity to Mitchell was that he had been prepared to lead. He had been prepared through the efforts of his parents, his teachers, his community, and his educational and professional experiences. During our last conversation, I asked him for his view of what had happened in his first year as principalship of Champion. He responded:

Even though I had been assistant principal at Eastmoor, I had practically run the building because the principal was often in Washington. But, when he wanted things done, I was the person who did it. And, I would go around and gather the troops and say “we got to do this.” I would work to get the dissenters on line because whatever it was that needed to be done, we were going to do it (Hayes, 1996).

Even though Hayes worked under an effective administrator, he felt he was ready to have more responsibility. So, when Mr. Blake reached him on that warm August evening at 7:30 p.m. at Eastmoor, he picked up the phone on the second ring. He recalled:

Mr. Blake said that my wife had said to try me at the school. And sure enough, I had picked up on the second ring. He said, “I was amazed that you were there on a warm summer night at 7:30 p.m.” (Hayes, 1996).

Even though his shift from Assistant Principal of a High School, to Principal of a Middle School was going to be complex, given the responsibilities, he wanted to finish at Eastmoor. When he received his notice of the position, a week before school, he welcomed the opportunity. He professed:

I really wanted the satisfaction of doing things for myself. If they were successful of if they were not successful. It would be mine (Hayes, 1996).

He was ready for the challenge at Champion. He looked to the future with expectation.

During the past year, Mr. Hayes has gotten a handle on all the issues at the school, what needs to be done, and has plan for getting it done. He noted how he felt when he first started at Champion:

When I walked into Champion. I knew I had my work cut out for me. At any school, you have agendas. At Champion we had everything from age to gender. Moreover, people were opposed to change. I would get “We have always done it this
way.” And that first day they are waiting for something prophetic and wondering if there is going to be change and at the same time, they are sizing you up and looking for clues as to who you are. And right on top of that, I had to reduce the staff members by two. This year kind of took a toll on my health. Yet, I feel some satisfaction.

I knew personally of the toll it took on his health. He was often at the school very early, an left very late. Often times, I wondered if he was hyper because he was always so busy and into everything at the school. He was there working side by side with the teachers, staff, and the assistant principal. He missed several of our conversations because of health related problems. Still, he remained undaunted. He looked to the future.

I think we are on the verge of some major breakthroughs. We are on the verge of some opportunities to make some major breakthroughs. We are getting the community kids back. That is a double-edged sword, I realize that. I want to give something back to the community. I want to help our Black children. You have seen what the lack of guidance, lack of parenting has created (Hayes, 1996).

Truly, I had seen it. And it ain’t pretty. But, at the same time, I saw students who were courteous, conscientious, dedicated and disciplined. There was good in them as well.

However, it only takes one apple to spoil the whole bunch. Needless to say, Mr. Hayes pressed on. He stated:

We have to get the kids ready for reality. . . . This year was just a tune-up for what’s in line next year. This is just a beginning. I see 3 to 4 years to really make a change. Turning out children is not like turning out an automobile. an automobile has some 20,000 parts. But, still a human being is far more complex. But, us in the field of education profession are put in an untenable position. WE HAVE NO OTHER CHOICE. And as human beings, we have no other choice, but to try to turn this thing around.

Hayes understood,

the reason for deseg was to provide opportunities, but at the same time, more experienced Black teachers were replaced with inexperienced White teachers. You had a lot of inexperienced teachers replacing experienced teachers. And I can tell you, as a counselor, I got a lot of them in my office (Hayes, 1996).

Moreover, Hayes recognized the significance of Champion. He knew its history because he had been part of it. He responded from his musing that “Champion. It testifies to the memory
of the traditionally predominately Black elementary and secondary schools that were exceptional" (Hayes, 1996). Overall, he viewed desegregation as a mixed bag. However, he contended educators have to "turn this thing around" (Hayes, 1996).

During the 1995-1996 school year, Hayes had done just that. He had worked with the staff so that they together could build a vision. He believed:

People have to have ownership. And what I did was try to give them an opportunity for ownership in the direction of the school. You can't lord over people particularly in schools where your power is limited" (Hayes, 1996).

Consequently, he built consensus around his vision and gave them ownership and the power to adjust that vision. At one staff meeting, they reviewed their mission statement with him to see if it was still their vision. Consequently, Hayes's vision became their vision for the future of the school.

Indeed, change had occurred in the school. But, even more changes would occur in Champion's future. At the beginning of the year, Hayes recalled:

Everyone was concerned over whether or not we were going to stay open, so concerned that I had Mr. Blake out. Now, that we are getting the community kids back, people are wondering what we are going to do? How will we survive? " (Hayes, 1996).

In spite of the impending changes which will double the student population of Champion, and bringing in nine new teachers, Hayes has an even clearer vision. Hayes wanted to accomplish six things in his next year at Champion.

1. Continue working together with the staff to co-author how we solve problems, plan and promote our vision.

2. Seek outside support services to help the students build self-discipline, and self-esteem through the Ebony and Egypt program. Ebony is for boys, and Egypt is for girls.

3. Deal with the discipline

4. Prepare 6th and 7th grade with skills for Proficiency Test and beyond.
5. Bring the new staff and old staff on line.

6. Seek out a cadre of parents who can help support the school and promote the school and its activities.

These six items constituted Hayes's vision for the school.

In an earlier conversation, two months earlier, Hayes had talked about his retirement. He said "I have no desire to get a doctorate. When I retire, and I think I will when I am 52, I am fifty now, I want to do other things. Maybe prepare taxes" (Hayes, 1996). I asked him jokingly if he was following in Mr. Willis's footsteps. He indicated "Numbers were fascinating to me. A kind of hobby" (Hayes, 1996). Yet, Hayes could retire in two years. He would have the required 30 years of service to do so. However, between then and now, he had changed his mind. He said,

Like I said, this next year we will juggle a series of balls. I see 3 to 4 years to really make a change. I know I said I wanted to retire, but I really want to see it through (Hayes, 1996).

I believe he will.

Closure

In building consensus, Hayes gave the staff ownership. He did not lord over them. He recognized that they were just as important as he was if Champion was to continue its legacy. He stated "Champion represented your historically Black elementary and secondary school" (Hayes, 1996). Champion, however, was exemplary. It was a good school because of its leadership, its teachers, and its community support. As a product of an segregated system to some degree, Hayes has models of excellence from that experience. His vision for the upcoming year includes a historic component at Champion: the community. Moreover, his vision had seen the leadership model of several principals of the segregated system such as Wright, Willis, and of course, Mitchell.
At the end of the year, Hayes still had the same tenacity and energy as when he had started. Even though the experience had challenged him physically, he had built consensus and forged a new vision for the school. Another chapter in Champion's history had begun. This chapter chronicled the changing leadership over the lifetime of the school, and that leadership's impact on the efficacy of the school. The leadership has changed from a woman in the beginning to a long line of men who have followed her. Thus, Maud Baker, J. Arnett Mitchell, James Wade, Edward J. Willis, James Foreman, Duane Pelkey, Andrew Meilton and the present Hayes represent almost 90 years of leadership. The leadership of the school whether Black or White, male or female has stressed academic excellence. Mr. Hayes is a product of the school's legacy. While he represents change, he also represents continuity. Consequently, I contend Hayes will follow in the footsteps of those before him: the new principal will continue the legacy.
CHAPTER 6

TEACHERS

Teachers are viewed as mothers, fathers, and miracle workers. As parents, we place our children from the age of 3 into the hands of people called teachers. These people are charged with the responsibility of teaching our children the three R’s of reading, writing, and arithmetic. However, they teach so much more.

From its inception until the 1960s, Champion had an all Black teaching staff. In 1964, Champion received its first European American teacher (Wade, 1992; Willis, 1995). Consequently, a central part of this chapter was to chronicle the lives of successive generations of teachers at Champion Avenue School, particularly the lives of African American teachers.

As noted above, the teacher composition of Champion has changed. Today, it has a majority European American faculty. However, it has seven African American teachers. Thus, this chapter also chronicles not only the lives of teachers, past and present, but illuminates external policies which determined teacher qualifications, teacher hiring practices, and teacher placement. As a historical analysis, it further provides an understanding of the state of Black teachers nationally and in the school system of Columbus. Subsequently, it elucidates the process by which Black teachers were subjugated to de facto segregated schools well until the 1960s. Also, the author presents past and present voices of African American teachers who provide insight into the daily workings of the students, the staff, the community, and the curriculum at Champion Avenue School from 1921 to 1996. Lastly, it addresses the impact
desegregation policy on the teaching staff have had on the learning relationships between Champion's teachers and the students, parents, the principal, and the community at-large.

**Historical Context and Teaching**

Education for whom and for what has been the predominant question regarding the implementation of schools which includes curriculum policy, organization and structure of the school, and even the composition of the teaching force (Kliebard, 1987; Anderson, 1988; Roland Martin, 1985; Kaestle, 1983). One parameter other than race which has determined the kind of education children receive has been gender (Bernard Powers, 1992; Rury, 1982; Gordon, 1990). Prior to the 20th century, men constituted the majority of teachers. By the turn of the century, women particularly in elementary schools, became the primary educators. Gender ideology was responsible for this shift in the composition of teaching staffs.

**Gender Ideology and the Progressive Era**

Through the common school movement, and into the Progressive Era, women's expected role in society shaped the basis of educational opportunities offered to girls and women in educational institutions (Rury, 1982; Spring, 1994; Bernard Powers, 1992; Kelly & Slaughter, 1992; Gordon, 1990). Gender ideology established not only the opportunities of women to attain an education, but altered to what degree they could be educated in order to maintain the structure of a changing society, particularly in urban centers (Bernard Powers, 1992; Rury, 1982). Therefore, gender ideology resulted in a different educational opportunities for girls and women regardless of race and class (Kliebard, 1986; Evans McClelland, 1992; Spring, 1994). Moreover, religious ideology coupled with gender ideology during the era, and became a vehicle from which to circumscribe women's educational opportunities (Ayim, 1985; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1994; Firor Scott, 1971; Kraditor, 1965). In essence, women
were to be educated to support their role in society in relationship to their subordinate status to men. Thus, the ideology of "hereditary determinism" represented in the ideal of the "republican mother," and "the cult of true domesticity" defined the educational opportunities of women through the establishment of a differentiated curriculum (Perkins, 1983; Evans McClelland, 1992; Spring, 1994).

During the Progressive Era, gender ideology was firmly established in educational institutions through a differentiated curriculum which predominately trained women as teachers (Kliebard, 1986; Rury, 1982; Gordon, 1990). Yet, class and racial differences were represented in the curriculum as well effecting different classes, and races of women differently (Evans McClelland, 1992; Bernard Powers, 1992; Perkins, 1983; Rury, 1982).

While women have been prescribed a gender-based education, that education was based on norms for European-American women. However, African-American women and other women of color were affected differently by this model that was built on the "cult of true domesticity" prescribed for middle-class white women (DuBois & Ruiz, 1990; Perkins, 1983; Evans McClelland, 1992). African-American girls' and women's' opportunities for an education, however, were more limited in any form compared to their white counterparts (Perkins, 1983; Miller Solomon, 1985; Lerner, 1972; Giddings, 1986). Additionally, educational opportunities for Black women and girls differed across geographical, and class boundaries (Anderson, 1987; Perlmann, 1988; Giddings, 1984). Nonetheless, African American women desired an education for similar, but different reasons than white women (Perkins, 1983; Giddings, 1984; Lerner, 1972). They desired an education to become teachers.

**A Historical Understanding of African American Teachers**

In *A Voice From the South* (1894), Cooper advocated the higher education of Black women that would not be based on gender ideology. She argued that society needed "women
who can think as well as feel” (Cooper, 50). In sum, Cooper’s views represented an alternative view to the progressive administrative view of the education of women, and Black women in particular. Overall, women did have more opportunities during the Progressive Era regardless of race or class. However, those opportunities were still determined by gender and race ideology (Bernard Powers, 1992; Houston, 1985; Perkins, 1983; Sinclair Deckard, 1975).

Historically, Black women have been pushed by their families and communities to attain an education at any cost (Perkins, 1983; Giddings, 1984). They were urged to attain an education in order to escape the drudgeries of domestic service and as a means to promote “racial uplift” (Giddings, 1986; Guy-Sheftall, 1990; Perkins, 1983). Paula Giddings writes that “going to school was considered important for both men and women, and essential for the latter” (Giddings, 1984, 100-101). Moreover,

... the great desire for education, combined with the status of teaching provided an escape from the limitations that the society imposed on women. ... Negro women should be trained to teach in order to uplift the masses (Giddings, 1984, 101).

Thus, Black women because they were not as heavily scrutinized as white women, were able to seek education in other professions than those related to the prescribed gender roles of women (Giddings, 1984; Lemer, 1972; Brooks Barnett, 1978). Nonetheless, they predominantly became teachers (Perkins, 1983).

**Historical Origins of Black Teachers in Columbus**

In Columbus, the first Black teachers were hired as early as 1830 to teach at St. Paul A.M.E. church in a church-supported school which provided the cultural marriage of education and religion in Columbus's early Black community (Franklin, 1978; Ward, 1993). In Columbus, before the turn of the century, Black teachers taught in a separate system which was the result of exclusion in the general education system, in a segregated system as a
product of the Black laws, and finally in a mixed system. By the end of the nineteenth century, eleven African American teachers taught in the city-wide system in Columbus.

**At the Turn of the Century: 1898-1909**

It has often been noted in the literature that "the only thing a college-educated Negro can do is teach or preach" (Foster, 1993, 273). This was particularly true of the few college-educated African American women found in Columbus. Educated Black women, however, did not just teach. They built educational institutions, organized women's clubs, and raised children all in the name of "uplift." (Giddings, 1984; Lerner, 1972). Consequently, the later half of the nineteenth century brought forth such Black women as Ida B. Wells Barnett, Fannie Jackson Coppin, March Church Terrell, Hattie Q. Brown and so many other Black women who were more than just educators. In the Black community, they were leaders (Franklin, 1990; Futrell, 1986). Yet, in 1899, "more than 28,500 black teachers were employed in the nation" (Perkins, 1983, 23). Of that number, eleven African American women were employed in Columbus Public Schools. Even though these Black women were of the highest character, graduated at the top of their classes, and were considered competent, they were not wanted to teach system wide in Columbus (Ward, 1993).

Two years after the **Plessy v Ferguson** (1896) decision, Ms. Celia Davis was the first Black woman scorned as a teacher of "white children" (Ward, 1996, 1993). Even though Davis was of high credentials, had graduated from North High School and the Normal School in Columbus, the constituency of the Medary Avenue School did not "want no colored teacher" in their school (Ward, 1993). Davis, however, retained her position at Medary because of Reverend Jones who was a Black school board member (Robinson, England & Meier, 1985; Moreland, 1977; Ward, 1993). But, what had happened to Davis would soon happen to other Black female teachers. They were not wanted in the Columbus Public
Schools if they were teaching white children. Davis and her Black cohorts had been "trained to teach in order to uplift the masses" regardless of race (Giddings, 1984, 101). Yet, particular members of the BOE sought time and time again, however, to remove or segregate them into a separate school. A constituency on the BOE attested to the idea that "colored teachers" were for "colored students" (Ward, 1993).

... young women of color, educated in our schools and graduates of our Normal schools have been employed as teachers in the schools. These women have been competent and faithful and are capable instructors, but their employment as teachers for white children, meets with most strenuous objection in almost every school where they are located (Ward, 1993, 111).

Consequently, members of the BOE attempted to resegregate the eleven Black women teachers to a separate colored school. They were unable to do so. Thus, they reverted to policy an established a quota system for the placement and hiring of Black teachers in Columbus.

Eventually, Champion would provide the BOE with a mechanism through which to accomplish their feat and segregate Black faculty.

When Champion opened, it was maintained by "Black teachers who, though not historically significant, nonetheless played an important role in education of Black children" (Foster, 1993, 273). These women were not only circumscribed by their race, but by their gender (Perkins, 1983).

**Champion's Early Black Teachers: 1910-1921**

On June 6, 1910, the following teachers were hired for the opening of Champion Avenue School. Mr. J. A. Shawan, the Superintendent, presented the following report:

To the Board of Education: The following appointments are made subject to your approval and confirmation and assigned to Champion Avenue School.
## Table 4: Champion Avenue School Teachers in 1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maud Baker</td>
<td>16 Years</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitman E. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheyney Institute</td>
<td>Manual Training (6th Gr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheyney Institute</td>
<td>Dom. Sci. &amp; Sewing (6th Gr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Moffitt</td>
<td>13 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>5th Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Smith</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>4th Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Isabel</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>3rd and 4th Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel Scott</td>
<td>3 Year</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>3rd Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Patterson</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>3rd Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renetta Monmouth</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>1st and 2nd. Gr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Cardwell</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>1st. Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie McFarland</td>
<td>15 Years</td>
<td>Columbus Normal</td>
<td>1st. Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These appointments were made on the condition “that all who do not now hold city certificates will secure them in June (BOE Minutes, 1910, 14). As indicated by the table, these teachers were qualified to teach at Champion, and the majority had teaching experience. Whether or not Stewart, Smith and Patterson had teaching experience is unknown at this time. The BOE records indicated the number of years experience in Columbus schools. Scott, however, petitioned the BOE to receive credit for her three years of previous teaching experience outside of Columbus. The BOE, however, only granted her one year of that experience.

In 1909, the BOE developed a Committee on Educational Policy which determined qualifications for teachers. At the time of these teachers' appointments, the BOE required that a potential teacher only attain certification through the Board of Examiners of the city in order to secure a teaching position. Champion's teachers had met and some had even surpassed these requirements. Moreover, they exceeded the requirements for Junior High qualifications which were: the attainment of a High School certificate and advanced work “under approved instructors” (BOE Minutes, No. 17, 1910, 30-31). The BOE based their qualifications on the
North Central Association of College and Secondary Schools guidelines. Hence, the maximum qualification of elementary teachers was the completion of Normal School. Thus, Champion's teachers probably were just as qualified if not more qualified than the majority of their White counterparts. However, the BOE's actions set a precedent. Black teachers were required to be more qualified than their White counterparts. This practice would continue well into the 1960s. Hence, these appointments were approved and these eleven teachers constituted the all Black teaching staff at Champion.

For the next ten years, some change occurred in the teaching force of Champion. In 1912, a kindergarten was added which increased the teaching force by two persons: Ms. C. Mae Immel and Ms. Julia Miller, her assistant. Even though an Evening School was started in 1910, by 1914, more teachers other than just the primary staff were hired specifically to teach the Evening School course. By 1916, Champion's Evening School courses were also held at the YMCA which included manual training, domestic science and millinery training (BOE Minutes, No. 19, 488, 494).

During the 1910-1920 period, some teachers retired or resigned. However, in 1920, Champion began to receive even more qualified Black teachers given the requirements of the era for teachers. Mr. Charles P. Blackburn, an Ohio native, was one of them. Blackburn had attained his degree in Physical Education from Temple University. Before his position at Champion, he had taught three years at Combined Normal and Industrial Department (now Central State University) in Wilberforce, Ohio. Blackburn's entrance coincided with the increased population of Black students, and the changing of the Compulsory School Law in Ohio which required boys to finish 6th grade, and girls, 7th grade. The most significant change in this epoch, was the retirement of Maud Baker.
After thirty-four years of service in Columbus Schools, Baker retired in November of 1920. In September of that year, the Superintendent recommended that Champion Avenue School “be made an Intermediate School instead of an Elementary School” which meant that it would now have K-9 grades (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1920, 347). After some protest by the Black community who did not want to become even more segregated, Champion was made into an Intermediate School in 1922. By that time, teacher qualifications had changed to the attainment of “one year of approved training in a normal school or college including the subjects of Psychology, History of Education, English, American History, Art, Botany, Zoology and Geography" (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1921, 474). Also, John Arnett Mitchell was now the principal of Champion Intermediate School. Because of his own qualifications, Mitchell would require more than the BOE in the selection of the teachers he hired for Champion.

Mitchell and His Teachers

From the beginning, Mitchell demanded excellence from his teaching staff. He indeed ran a tight ship. Consequently, as former teachers retired who only had required Normal School qualifications, Mitchell hired Black teachers with exemplary qualifications. One such teacher was Mr. Charles Elijah Pieters.

Mr. C. E. Pieters like Mitchell was recognized in Who's Who In Colored America (1930). Pieters was from New Amsterdam, British Guiana. In 1915, he attained his B.A. degree from Lincoln University in Chester, Pennsylvania and received the distinction of Cum Laude. Pieters also undertook additional study at Tuskegee Institute, La Salle Extension University Law degree in 1917, University of Chicago and eventually earned his M.A. from the Ohio State University in 1926. He had taught in British Guiana, served as Head master to
two different schools, and lastly, he served as head of the Math Department at Southern University from 1917-1922 which is where he met Mitchell who was the Dean. Pieters taught math and biology until his retirement from Champion. One former student, Mrs. Barbara Dorsey Sanford remembered:

Mr. Pieters was a brilliant man. He should have been a professor at Ohio State. The only thing that stopped him, was the color of his skin. He was brilliant (Dorsey Sanford, 1996).

Mrs. Dorsey Sanford’s testimonial of Pieters indicates just how exemplary Champion teachers were becoming. Mitchell was hiring people in his own image. In his own way, Mitchell fought against the perception that Black children needed only one kind of education. In essence, he set out to prove the theory he postulated in his 1923 article (Mitchell, 1923). By hiring exemplary and competent teachers, Mitchell was about to prove exemplary educators could ameliorate racism by providing a “good” environment from which to nurture educational attainment. He himself had overcome racist stereotypes concerning the education of the race. Consequently, his students would have quality educators from which to overcome racism as well. And they did.

In 1922, the Superintendent, noted the changes in the teaching staff at Champion. He wrote:

All the teachers in the Champion Avenue School are either college graduates or are normal school graduates now working toward their degrees by taking approved teacher training courses during the summer and doing university extension work during the school year. In my judgement, the junior high school teachers in the Champion Avenue School meet the same standards in scholarship, training and professional spirit as those of our other junior high schools (BOE Minutes, No. 21, 1922, 56).

Whereas the Superintendent’s praises are noteworthy, it remains evident that Champion’s teachers had more than the necessary qualifications for their positions. In fact, several of the staff should have been high school teachers. Mrs. Evelyn Harris who attended the school in 1931 recalled:
Mr. & Mrs. Pieters were excellent teachers. He taught Math. She taught Art. Mrs. Arnold was the music teacher. She was exceptional. The Champion Glee Club even toured. Also, she taught math. She was a strict disciplinarian. In all, the teachers were pretty good (Harris, 1996).

In 1929, teacher qualifications were altered again. The teacher requirements for each level are listed below.

Level I: Elementary and Kindergarten-Graduate from 1st grade four-year high school, grade approved teacher training school (at least 2 years) and 2 years successful teaching.

Level II: Junior and Senior High-Graduate from an approved college or university with A, B or equivalent credit for fifteen semester hours or twenty-three quarter hours in education.

Level III: Principals-Graduate from an approved college or university with A, B or equivalent credit for twenty-four semester hours or thirty-six quarter hours, four years of successful teaching experience.

Table 5: Teacher Qualifications-1929 (BOE Minutes, No. 23, 1929, 175).

By 1936, Champion had five teachers who had attained their Master's degrees, and very few of normal school graduates were left at Champion except Nell Moffitt, Mabel Scott and Abbie McFarland (BOE Minutes, No. 24, 1936, 366). The rest of the teachers had their B.A. degrees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. P Burrell</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Porter</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nella Stewart</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Adell Jackson</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Taylor</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Atkinson</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Patterson</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Roman</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Lucas</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Wyatt</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattie Brooks</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Pieters</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Smith</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Powell</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Partial List of Champion's Teachers-1936 (BOE Minutes, No. 24, 1936, 367)

In 1929, teacher qualifications only required teachers at the elementary level to have a minimum of 2 years from an accredited teacher training school. Secondary teachers needed a Bachelor's degree. Mitchell required more from his teachers. In 1937, Champion was turned into only a Junior High school. The majority of its teachers had already surpassed the qualifications. Yet, they were still required to surpass the qualifications.

As World War II began, Champion lost some of its male teachers. Mr. J. P. Burrell who taught Manual Training and History who was a Major Colonel in the Army, enlisted in the war. Mr. John Wade took his place. Mr. Wade who was mentioned earlier in Chapter 5 had graduated from college. For the most part, Blacks did not attain positions in Champion except for two reasons: They had to meet the criteria of Mr. Mitchell, and second, unless someone died, retired, or resigned, the school had no openings. Champion's strength was the stability and dedication of its teaching force. Mitchell required them to do more. In essence, Mitchell only hired teachers who shared his vision. His actions were subversive, yet were
parallel to those of DuBois. Thus, Mitchell demanded of Champion's teacher a shared vision whereby

We are going to force ourselves in by organized far-seeing effort--be out thinking and out flanking the owners of the world who are too drunk with their own arrogance and power to successfully oppose us (Watkins, 1993, 334).

Mitchell continued to demand high standards of himself and his staff in order to "outhink and "outflank" the world intellectually. Consequently, Willis only attained his position at Champion in 1952 because he had taught in Cleveland Schools for two years, and someone retired. Although the policy requiring teachers to have two years experience outside of Columbus was struck down in 1935, Mitchell still applied it to Black teachers. Therefore, Willis had taught in Cleveland and before him, Mr. William "Cy" Butler who graduated from OSU in 1938 had to go all the way to Texas and teach two years before Mitchell would hire him at Champion, even though he was a Columbus native and OSU trained. Hence, Mitchell held his teachers to a higher standard than the BOE. Mr. Wright who started teaching at Mt. Vernon when he was twenty because he graduated from high school, and thus, college early recalled:

Mitchell had the power to decide who was hired at schools. When the school went to a Junior High, he would not hire me even though I met the requirements and our families came from the same city in Gallipolis, Ohio. But, he did vote for me to be a member of Sigma Pi Phi. Only one Black ball and you could not get in (Wright, 1996).

Needless to say, teacher positions at Champion were limited and competitive. After it became a secondary school in 1937, Mitchell held even tighter reins on who was selected for the teaching force at Champion as well as in the developing de facto segregated schools (Saunders, 1992).

Champion, however, had the most stable, highly educated teaching force in the city. Willis recalls, "It was the best school in the city. I know Black parents sent their kids to
Franklin, but Franklin compared to Champion was like comparing a Volkswagen to a Cadillac" (Willis, 1995). By 1959, fourteen of the school's now thirty teachers had Master's degrees which gave Champion "a high rating in the city for the educational training of its staff" (Jacobs, 36). Moreover, Mr. Will Anderson who attained his position at Champion in 1955 speaks about the significance of Champion's teachers. He recalled:

It was the only Black school in Columbus at that time where Black secondary teachers could work. Its staff was some what of a great thing because so many people wanted to teach. . . . Through that group, I became aware of a very positive role model. Role models in the sense that I never had experienced being raised in Cincinnati, I never had a Black teacher. . . . that school over at Champion had more Masters plus teachers than any of the high schools in Columbus. So, you can tell when you got a small group of teachers and people got those jobs, they didn't readily leave. Also, there were very select people that were picked (Anderson, 1992).

It was probably the best teaching force in the city because it had teachers who could have easily been High School teachers, but because of BOE policy, they were limited to Champion. However, their students benefitted from it. Champion came to represent strength, quality and excellence.

Remembrances of Champion: Teacher Practices and Student Learning

In the May, 1964 Champion Chronicle, teachers, students, school activities and accomplishments were featured. They included the voices of Mr. Willis who was the assistant principal at the time, and Mr. Wade who was the principal. However, the paper illuminated the richness of Champion's history. For example, Mrs. Young's thoughts on the two things that impressed her during the school year were that:

Out of the 11,908 general science students who took the Ohio Preliminary District-State Scholarship test, Philip Green ranked in the 95th percentile. Also, the strong showing being made by our baseball team to be in contention for the Championship for the first time in more than thirty years.

Mr. W. Smith was impressed by "the high ratings of achievements the different departments have received, and even with the increased enrollment, the school program has moved along
very smoothly.” Also, Mr. Crosby commented on “the fine spirit, cooperation, and attendance of the parents in our PTA, and the cooperation of the student-body in putting over many programs for the year.” Lastly, Miss Stribling commented “the good behavior of the pupils which has resulted in excellent publicity in the news media. Also, the friendly atmosphere existing between the student-body and the faculty” (Champion Chronicle, 1964). Obviously, Champion was still a exemplary school as indicated by Mr. Willis.

During the 1963-1964 school year, Champion had other accomplishments as well. Mr. Wade and Mr. Feaster even acquired $1000 in grant money that year (Champion Chronicle, 1964). Champion maintained strong ties within the student body and the community. Even by the time Mr. Murray joined the faculty in 1977, Champion was still connected to the community. It was still an academically oriented school with strong discipline. Murray recalled “Parents would come over and ask if school was in. It was so quiet.” (Murray, 1996). Although some Blacks had moved away from Champion, others sent their children to Champion who did not live in the area. Mr. Willis recalls “Reverend Hale who lived in Franklin sent his children to Champion.” Rev. Hale probably sent his children to Champion because he believed in its teachers and their practices.

Mr. Willis indicated “Often times we would be over there at the school on weekends. We had mandatory meetings.” Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Wade and Mr. Willis continued mandatory meetings on Mondays. Mrs. Irene Willis recalls “We had teacher’s meetings every Monday from 4 to 5 p.m. or later. No body said anything, but me. Eventually, Mr. Mitchell called me to his office and told me to say what I had to say later” (Willis, I., 1996). She continues, “He was a disciplinarian. He checked off your name when you came in the meeting. It was like the military. You didn’t have no freedom.” (Willis, I., 1996). While Mrs. Willis maintains that Mitchell was a tyrant who limited school supplies and the such, she also contends
"Champion was a good school. Students were dealt with. The students could not chew gum. The could not wear hats. We had to dress professionally. I taught six classes a day under Mr. Wade. We were not allowed to wear pants. But, one winter we did." (Willis, I., 1996).

Mr. Butler stated, "it was the best teaching force in the city" (Butler, 1992). Champion won city championships in all sports under Atkinson, Butler, and later Anderson. Mrs. Brooks recalls her memories of the school.

It was like family. There was no difference between what they expected from you and what your parents expected from you. Our parents respected the teachers. When we had activities, it would be full because not just your parents went. Your aunts, uncles and even neighbors went to see how you were doing at school. There was no need of a difference in the curriculum. Culture was embedded in the contest. It was always there" (Brooks, 1996).

As these voices attest, Champion was an exemplary school. Mitchell had created a cadre of Black teachers who "probably were the best teaching staff that was ever assembled [in Columbus] was the team of people who were at Champion Junior High during the late '50s through the mid '60s (Amos, 1991; in Jacobs, 36). Its teachers were also involved in the community through their fraternal and sorority organizations (The Ohio Sentinel). Still, as early as 1941, however, the context of America had set in motion forces which would eventually alter the composition of Champion's teaching staff.

The Double V Campaign of WWII prompted the protest of the unofficial hiring policy of the BOE (Ross, 1992). As noted in Chapter 4, the Vanguard League (VL) an African American organization, sought to alter the placement policy of the BOE and increase the employment and number of Black teachers in Columbus. In 1943, the VL conducted a survey on the "co-employment of teachers" in school districts across the country. They presented their results to the BOE. Their efforts, however, did not alter the policy of the BOE. It would be several years before the BOE would consider co-employing African American and European American teachers in the same school. The year for Champion came in 1964.
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A Desegregated Faculty in a Time of Change: 1964-1995

As noted previously in this dissertation, Columbus schools at-large had begun slowly to desegregate its teaching shortly after Novice Fawcett became Superintendent (Columbus Dispatch, 1974). In 1964 when James Wade left the principalship of Champion to become the Director of the Intercultural Department, Champion received its first White teacher. It is ironic, however, that Wade himself had been the first teacher to desegregate the teaching staff at East High (Wade, 1992). The BOE's decision finally to place a White teacher in the school, however, was a mixed blessing. It was the beginning of the end of early BOE's policy related to teacher hiring and placement for the de facto segregated school system. It was also the beginning of a major shift in Champion's teacher composition.

Desegregation's Effects on Black Teachers

In 1964, the Champion Chronicle celebrated the work of a teachers at the school.

Mrs. Williams was recognized as "This Issue's Favorite Teacher." The article read;

Mrs. Williams is the favorite teacher for this issue. She is a graduate of Columbus East High School, received her B.A., B. Sc. in Education and M.A. degrees from Ohio State University. She has done additional study from time to time in order to increase her knowledge and to keep abreast of new developments and teaching methods in her field. Mr. Williams is a teacher of Spanish, French, and English. She has also studied Latin, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Russian.

Before coming to Champion eleven years ago, Mrs. Williams had been employed as a social case worker for the Ohio State Welfare Department, and had taught at Albany Georgia State Teachers' College, Florida A and M College, and at Booker T. Washington High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma. She is an ordained elder, choir member, and chairman of the Christian Education Committee of Session at the Bethany Presbyterian Church. She is, also, a member of the Columbus Presbyterians.

Mrs. Williams has served as advisor to Y-Teens at our school for the past nine years.

Mrs. Williams states that she is especially concerned with the moral and spiritual growth of teenage boys and girls. She lists her favorite sport as archery. She enjoys watching basketball, baseball, and track. Her major interests are music, art, reading of non-fiction writing, participating in prize-winning contests, gardening, and attending concerts and theatrical productions. She spends much time studying languages by using tapes and recordings at home. (Champion Chronicle, 1964).
The paper also featured an interview with another teacher, Miss Oliver who stated;

My first year at teaching has, at times been very hectic. Without the help of the faculty, administration, and kind students, I would not have been able to last the year. Champion is a very friendly school, and its students are typical of the junior high age. I have enjoyed all my classes, and I have had some very rewarding experiences (Champion Chronicle, 1964).

These interviews elucidate the lives of Champion teachers and their views on the school and their teaching philosophy. Moreover, it indicates their success with maintaining positive learning relationships with students. It was the last year that the school would have an all Black teaching force. In the fall, their first White teacher would be appointed. A legacy had changed.

Even though Black teachers had begun to be dispersed throughout the school system, it was not an easy process (Claytor, 1992; Jacobs, 1995; Murray, 1996; Welch, 1996). Teachers who had been in the system for years were summarily sent to predominantly White schools. Mr. Wright recalled: When we began to have trouble in the schools, Mr. Charles Allen, one of the first Blacks to desegregate the high schools was at West High, but he could not help us. They had him teaching calculus and trigonometry. He didn't have any of the Black students” (Wright, 1966). Moreover, the teachers who replaced the experienced Black teachers were not experienced nor very qualified for the positions. Mr. Willis noted, “I was told that if you get a good teacher in a Black school, then it is a mistake.” Mr. Willis continued, “The kids would give them such a terrible time. They would treat them something awful. It was really hard on them” (Willis, 1995). Moreover, Mrs. Irene Willis who taught all business and typing courses at Champion remembered one of the white teachers who came to Champion.

He was teaching typing. He didn't even know how to change a typewriter ribbon. He never had typing. He was not qualified to teach the course. Moreover, when his kids gave him problems, he would take the whole class to the office. His class was always a mess. Papers all over the floor (Willis, I., 1996).

These accounts verify to some degree two conceptions about Black schools: First, they do not
need competent teachers. Moreover, they are sent teachers who have very little if any experience with Black children or teaching regardless of the context. This was how Champion was desegregated. Consequently, when Mrs. Helms applied, Mr. Willis was cautious until he knew that she was Black and had attended Champion (Helms, 1996). According to Mrs. Helms, “He wanted Black teachers at Champion” (Helms, 1996). Consequently, Champion changed particularly after Willis left in 1971. When the OCR (Ohio Civil Rights Commission) ordered the desegregation of the staff in 1977, Champion would revert to a predominately White teaching force.

Today, Champion has 24 teachers. Its staff is majority White and almost equally split along gender lines. There characteristics are listed in table 7 on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Degree(s) Earned</th>
<th>Yrs at Champion</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Music/Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sci.- Soc. Std.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. Ed., M. Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>L.A - French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S., M. A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Special Educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S., M. S.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Math/Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sci/Mth/Hlth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S. Ed., M. Ed.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Spec. Ed(DH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S. Ed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Mth/Hlth/SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. A. Ed., M. A., Ed.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Reading/LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Phys. ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Phys. Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Soc.Std/Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>SS/Hlth/Mth/Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S., M. A.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Spec Ed(DH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. S. CIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. A., M. A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>La/Hlth/Read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>LA/Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Champion’s Teachers 1995-1996 School Year Survey Results

Fifteen of Champion’s teachers have been there for ten year or less. Seven of Champion’s teachers have been there for ten years or more. Only two teachers at Champion have been there for more than twenty years. However, 17 teachers had prior teaching experience before coming to Champion. In terms of race, Champion has seven teachers who are African American. Lastly, the school has ten male teachers. This researcher chose to observe the entire staff, but six teachers in particular were chosen for further observation and interviews.

---

*Out of 24 teachers, twenty-two teachers returned their surveys. Two teachers’ surveys were lost. However, from conversations I was able to include their information. The stars designate these two teachers.
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The six exemplars constitute a representative sample of the teaching force by race, gender and
time at school.

Champion's staff has changed since 1964 considerably. Its present staff is younger.
Nonetheless, the "old guard" provides a point of reference for newer teachers. This author
must contend that yes, there are problems in the teaching staff. In the past, Champion has
stood for educational excellence and service. It is important to note that these individual
portraits indicate that the legacy of Champion still continues. However, I am happy to report
that the six exemplars being explicated are not the only "good" teachers in the school. Hence,
we begin with the first teacher I observed, Mr. Lehman.

The Legacy Continues

While it is important to note that some things are wrong in our schools, it is equally
important if not more so to bring to light the "goodness" that exists in places where schooling
occurs in our urban schools. A major component of this research emerged as a continuation of
"goodness." This author argues that even though there is mediocrity, the legacy of Champion
continues. Lawrence Lightfoot notes that too often teachers are denigrated and not applauded
for their efforts (Lawrence Lightfoot, 1987). This author celebrates the continuation of a
legacy of excellence. Thus, those voices of exemplary teaching or "goodness" are the focus of
this section.

The six teachers chronicled here are exemplary teachers. They represent the
continuation of the former teachers of Champion who were dedicated and determined to help
their students to succeed. They were chosen because of five criteria that they all met;

1. Is there effective teaching going on?
2. Are the children engaged in the process?
3. Is there order?

4. Are life skills being taught?

5. Is rapport or a learning relationship with students present?

Effective teachers demonstrated when children were engaged in their learning. They had order and discipline in their classrooms. They taught beyond the explicit curriculum and they had existing learning relationships with students. All of these teachers met this criterion. Thus, all of these teachers were successful in teaching, engaging the students in learning, providing order in the process, connected their lessons to the real world and life long learning, and had genuine relationships which facilitated trust and hence, learning with the students. Moreover, the principal had initially nominated these six exemplars. Consequently, they were chosen.

**An Extraordinary Person Doing Extraordinary Things: Mr. Lehman**

When I originally went to Champion to achieve entree, two White men spoke to me. One of them was Mr. Lehman. At the time, I was wondering about the racial composition of the teaching force of the school. I had seen Black and White students, so I knew at least two races made up the student population. But, I was intrigued by him. He seemed interesting.

Mr. Lehman is about six feet tall, has brown hair and has a lean build. Over the time of my tenure in the school, he grew a moustache which altered his look, but not his demeanor. He is natural reflector and thinker. Moreover, he is a process person. Out of all the teachers, he sought me out first. He was interested.

During our first encounter when I was looking through the scrapbook, I learned that he had a wife and children whom he loved, and he loved teaching. What struck me the most about Lehman was what you saw was what you got. He was consistent in demeanor. He cared about his kids and demonstrated if often regardless of where they were. In fact, he stated at that time, “I love my kids” (Lehman, 1996), meaning his students. It was obvious in
our conversations that he spent a lot of time away from the school just thinking about his teaching, his students, and their life choices. While Lehman's general character was easy going, the one thing he took seriously was learning.

In his classroom he had prepared it for learning. He just facilitated the learning relationship between the students and himself. But, it was a cooperative effort. They had to take ownership in it as well. He stressed "we are" in all of his instructional directives. While there is often chaos in schools, Mr Lehman had established a room that was calm regardless of what was occurring outside his door in the hall. It was another world once you entered the door. He worked to maintain the learning relationship and the learning environment. Over my five months in the school, he changed some things to show the growth of his students over the past year.

Observations

On the door, is a poster which reads, "Knowledge is your best defense." Mr. Lehman's class was the first class I observed. It was also the only class where I did a presentation on African American History. I emphasized that history, particularly social history is about telling stories about "ordinary people who do extraordinary things." Mr. Lehman was a extraordinary person, however, who did extraordinary things.

As you walk through the door, it is quiet. Even when the children are busy in group, individual or class activities the underriding current is calm. The reason was, I believe, planning and the ground work for behavior and expectations was clearly laid out in the beginning and reinforced constantly over time. Mr. Lehman always corrected students. He always asked them a question, that he knew they had the answer for, and just waited. For example, a student asked him about the classroom assignment, he responded, "What do you think? While the student answers correctly, Mr. Lehman is nodding in agreement during the
whole exchange in an encouraging manner and his arms are folded. After the student finished, Mr. Lehman commented, "Right. I thought we knew what we were doing." Over and over again, Mr. Lehman never directly answered questions unless it was for clarity and explication of the process to ensue, but not after the process began. Moreover, Lehman is a good listener, and has taught his children how to listen as well. For example, students listened quietly to instruction. In turn, when they worked in groups, they needed to listen to each other to complete the experiment because they both had a role which required listening and cooperation. Consequently, his students respect each other, they take turns, they raise their hands, and they cooperate with and support each other in classroom activities. For example, a new student had come into the class, Mr. Lehman asked one of the students to help the new student get acclimated to the way "we do things around here." (Lehman, 1996). Thus, the student as well as others helped that student throughout the day. When they were having a problem, they solved it with Lehman's support, but they questioned the student like Mr. Lehman. For instance, "Why did you do that?" was asked and when the forthcoming answer was not sufficient, classroom rules were discussed with the offending student. In essence, Mr. Lehman's style is conversational in nature. For example, Mr. Lehman and his students were engaged in a conversation on Mozambique. He listened to their understanding about the subject rather than just provided information without discussion. Consequently, his tendency to answer a question with a question signals dialogue and extended thinking beyond rote memorization.

Mr. Lehman has been teaching at Champion for the past seven years. Prior to his career in teaching, he was a social worker then a counselor. He describes one key event in his life as "a big important part of my life that caused me to become a really quality person."

I was working as a social worker her in Columbus, and I was told that I would be terminated in 8 months because of budget cuts... A friend of mine, told me about
this job as a social worker in an elementary school. I was interviewed and hired for the position. She had this extremely unique way of intern me. For two hours a day from 10-12 with another person and herself we talked about why I act the way I act, who I am, how my parents raised me, what my beliefs are, it helped. It was the most enlightening experience. It helped me to see where I was, what I wanted, where I was going. I just came to all of these realizations. It was a reflective thing. I was clear on what my beliefs are and what I believe in. It was an efficacy outlook on things. I mean, why do you want to improve? Where do you want to go, and how are you going to do it?. (Lehman, 1996).

Mr. Lehman approaches his students from this perspective. He constantly questions them in a non-threatening manner. “Well, how are you going to do that. Why is that important? Why do you believe that?” His goal is to get them to understand why they are doing and why it is or isn’t appropriate. Because of his background, his approach to teaching revolved around the whole child. He believes it is “the most important thing.”

I want to do a good job because it is the most important thing. And how did I find that out? When I was a social worker and I worked with children, kindergarten through sixth grade, I was very successful at it. I had a success rate of 90% with kids. Everyone referred them to me. I thought this is so easy. Why don’t people get this. I thought all you do is work with people, make them feel good. . . . It was so meaningful. In one conversation, or three or ten, I helped that child to go from having real serious emotional difficulty to being successful. Yet, it seems so simplistic in principle doesn’t it? If you can help people be successful, they’ll be successful (Lehman, 1996).

While Lehman’s experience provides the cornerstone of his philosophy, there are other pieces as well.

A major piece for building success for Lehman, is expectation. Mr. Lehman, who is from northeast Ohio comes from a “blue-collar lower middle-class” background, attests, “my parents had high expectations of me.“ (Lehman, 1996). Even though his father did not complete college, they had high expectations of him to do so. Consequently, he has high expectations of his students.

I just don’t want my children to be good in my class. I can’t control everything, and I don’t want to. They need to control everything, but I want everything they do to be connected. If they are respectful to me, I want them to be respectful to the teacher down the hall. I just think that you can make people lives so
much better... I found that people can really impact people and that sort of motivated me.

I just try to do whatever needs to be done with whatever group of students I have. They can do so much and why shouldn't they? Why should I have them sit here and page through books, and discuss things that are really rather mundane to them when they should be challenged more (Lehman, 1996).

And Mr. Lehman challenges them inside and outside of class. He challenges them on everything, the same way he was challenged during his life altering experience. In other words, he challenges his students to think critically about the content of the curriculum inside and outside of the classroom. He asks often after a lesson, "And why is that important, what does it all mean and why should it be important to you" (Lehman, 1996)? Moreover, he bases those challenges on his own personal theory of action which are related to his experiences and belief system concerning the purpose of education.

My observation of his classroom practices has led me to believe that he believes in discipline and order, communication, reflection on his and his students practices, building success through the completion of goals, and most of all he believes in the education of our children. He confirmed these conceptions during our last conversation. Lehman's success, however, is through process. He admits "We have to decide what our priorities are, and I did say WE. Because they have to buy into this system too or I'll have a disastrous class everyday where learning gets interrupted" (Lehman, 1996). By the time, I observed Mr. Lehman's class, the priorities had been decided. In fact, they were in process of completing their goal of learning. Consequently, I began to wonder how he got them to be so involved in their own learning process. How he got them to "buy in" to it. It was simple. I looked around the room. There was order. Everything was spelled out for them. The lessons for the day. The homework lesson and when it was due. Goal statements. His room set the tone of his organizational structure. He left no excuse for failure, and it was clear what he expected. The
philosophical underpinnings of his teaching was reflection. For instance, Mr. Lehman had
posted on his board these classroom rules:

You have the power to:

1) Be Positive when Given Direction
2) Are you strong Enough to do What's Right?
3) Look at WHY we have certain rules.
4) Help Out your friends with their Behaviors.
5) Use class rules as a Tool to Self Control

All of these goals are process oriented. Lehman’s primary goal is educational success, but it is
not the only goal. There were no explanations of the rules, but rather how you process the
rules, and make the environment a learning environment for everyone. His philosophy
emphasizes student efficacy in process. Clearly, they had the power to, and they did. Often,
they would self-police themselves.

In all, Mr. Lehman provided order, content and context in his classroom practices. He
emphasized culture, difference, and relates everything back to what has been done before. He
would always ask the students “Remember when we did this or what about when we did this,
how does it relate to this?” Moreover, when I did my lesson on African American history,
Lehman was able to connect it to previous lessons on geography and history. Furthermore,
Lehman’s understanding of the implicit curriculum in schools allowed him to challenge
interpretations found in textbooks. Again, his practice of challenging the status quo or
inherent meaning in a lesson through discussion, allowed his students to do the same. For
example, their lesson on Ohio history represented a Eurocentric orientation of Native American
history. Mr. Lehman and his students addressed this view and if there were other views which
could be accessed. Consequently, they sought other resources which provided another view of
the subject matter and extended the conversation on Native American history within the context of American history. Additionally, Lehman's students dissect the local newspaper, and address specific articles in the newspaper that pertain to their classroom learning and their world outside of the classroom. Thus, Lehman's additions to the curriculum served to include another perspective rather than the one in the book. Lehman "makes choices with the curriculum" (Lehman, 1996). Consequently, Lehman is clear on what the goals are in his class, and how everyone will perform, successfully, they don't have a choice.

Lehman's organization of the class leaves no reason for failure. For instance, students were given immediate feedback and praise. Furthermore, they were given daily grades rather than just semester grades because "they work every day" (Lehman, 1996). The class structure provided clues on homework, weekly assignment, the daily assignment is on the board, and so on and so forth. Thus, Lehman just reminds them that "this is our class, and no one is going to interfere with all of our learning." Moreover, he doesn't miss a beat when someone challenges this purpose. For example, when a student gets off task, Lehman reminds them quickly it is inappropriate, and moves on with the lesson or he dismisses it if it is not an attempt to obstruct or he has the class remind the person of appropriate behavior or have the person state why they are off task. But, when it does, he is more than willing to reinforce the rules by standing quietly with his arms folded which indicates something is wrong in the classroom that requires everybody's attention. However, this rarely happens, and when a student does not follow the rules such as regarding homework, Lehman reminds them of their responsibility. In fact, he insists that is part of his responsibility to demand their homework from them. Moreover, his students respect and, I believe, admire him because he builds a relationship based on "these are our values in this class" and provides them with ownership of the mission of the class which is successful learning through a mixture of student and teacher
directed activities. In turn, these activities in addition to daily grading build the belief in the students that they can be successful.

His students have taken to self-patrolling each other. They will tell each other when they are off tasks. More importantly, Lehman because he has built success into the class, they are willing to take on more responsibility and chances in their own growth processes. It is clear what is expected. Moreover, he strives to educate the whole person. Consequently, he utilizes different instructional techniques from discussion, group activities, individual activities to class directed, student or teacher directed learning. He does not just lecture. Moreover, he has high expectations of his students and himself. On one day when I was there, he had a student teaching the class. He stood in the back of the room with his arms folded slowly pacing. He came over and said to me, "Look how much they can do. They don't really need me." He was so happy. He had provided an opportunity for growth.

The Interview: A Conversation

When we began our interview, it was an extension of all of our former conversations. We had formed a relationship by then, so it was more like a conversation. I asked him. How do you get the kids to "buy into it?" Lehman looked at me and said

"Often times, teachers will say "they don't want to learn." And I will say, Well, can you show them its important? Can they feel that its important? and can you do it in a way that is none threatening?"

So, this was how he tapped into his student's potential by being non-threatening in his demeanor and attitude. His easy-going personality had served him well. So, when his children were misbehaving, he would look at them and say, "Oh, we are not being successful right now." It is his cue to them to straighten up and fly right. But, there was more.

Lehman's goal is to see his students grow and mature and see if for themselves. He described how he did this at the end of the year.
I pass out discipline referrals at the end of the year. I think it is healthy. I say “Remember when I sent you out for this.” We laugh, and say, yeah, but that was way back then and growth has come. It is amazing the things they say I think are important. It is always amazing what they really learn. I want them to monitor themselves and give to each other, we are in this all together. meaning society, as well as the classroom.

Mr. Lehman argues that it takes time to learn to communicate effectively. The framework for him, however, is order. He professes;

My job is probably between 50% and 80% management, and the rest is content. And I think being successful in this environment you have to be very positive and a great reflective person with problem solving skills.

Over time with experience you learn how to react better or quickly so it is a matter of do you really care about the children you work with them. And another thing that is important, and this sounds old-fashioned, we are the people with the skills, the adults hopefully. And teachers say students they don’t know how to behave. Well, have you explained what that is? Have you shown them what that is? Have you talked about what that is, and some people say its the children fault that they are not successful, they don’t want to learn. Well, why is that? What can you do to alter that? Have you explained how important this is, and not just the problem solving aspect, but we are the ones with the skills we need to show them, and the skills are not just academic.

Like the other teachers in this sample, Mr. Lehman contends teachers need to know more than academics.

As our conversation turned toward teacher training, I asked him what he thinks teachers need to know beyond academics, particularly in urban settings.

Often times, teachers will say, “I’m not a social worker. I’m not this or that, but if you care about your children, yes you are. You’re everything to them. You are a teacher, mentor, counselor, listener, and a reflective person. If you don’t think you are, children are going to get these needs meet in other places. Who’s going to meet their needs?

We don’t want to label them [urban or suburban] different. There is more diversity in urban settings. But, if we continue to deny that they’re not different, what are we going to be doing? I don’t like labeling, but I do wish we had more skilled caring people in this environment. But, it’s easy to get burned out. It’s hard work.

He continues;

You know kids know when you are fake and when you are for real. These kids know. All I have to say is “Do you want me to discuss it?” If it is something
that they have heard before, they'll say, "No, no, no." Because they know I mean it. They know I'm serious. They know it's the for-real thing.

Lehman believes teachers must be honest and consistent in their behavior and classroom practices other wise they will probably not last in urban schools.

Lehman is teaching his students to realize "I can be a really together person. The past is the past. It has made me what I am, and I can improve. Now, only if everyone else felt that way." He accomplishes this by educating the whole child. He states:

Education is a wonderful medium for providing one with experiences, career choices, and learning about the world. But, the bottom line is once the people are out of school, they don't have teachers except for themselves. If you want to have a quality life, it is a great place to start. In order to have a quality life and feel good about it, it would benefit you if you could feel good about it and reach your goals. Everyone can really achieve that, to some level or degree. Education is a part of our lives, but it's a life long learning about understanding your world and understanding yourself. That is how you have a happy successful life.

Furthermore,

I really do want to see these kids get out. Get their education, and move on. And I don't care what student it is, this is our society. These are our people and our resources.

He teaches them when they do not conform to classroom protocol, "We're all going to screw up and make mistakes. You have to look at failures and learn from it. We are going to have negatives, but are we going to see the positive in it?" Mr. Lehman is positive in his approach to his students. Everything he does is positive. When he is angry, he folds his arms over his chest, and waits for them to respond. He turns the incident or behavior that impeded learning into an opportunity for discussion, dialogue or a story. The children respond, and perform.

Lehman's key lies in his ability to discuss and correct. He would often say, "WE are not being successful" to students who were off task. Yet, he was able to communicate this in a way that built on the learning process rather than impeded it further. Lehman articulated his position on communication and building relationships. He professes:
You build rapport, and I hate their behavior. But, that is not the issue. The person is still there. Being able to communicate how you feel and what is going on is important. Communication is key. In fact, it is a learning process. You learn how to say things because you don't know the student, but if they know you are sincere, that usually will work its way out.

Consequently, when students break the rules. They all regroup. Lehman maintains:

What are our priorities. And I say we because they have to buy into this system too or I'd have a disastrous class everyday where learning gets interrupted.

I spend a lot of time discussing. Laying the groundwork for what is going to happen. Frankly, I am not afraid of confrontation because I think I am right. I will say, "I think this is incorrect and here's why". So, in sixth grade when they do things that are not acceptable protocol in the room, I correct them. Then, I will continue to do so if they don't get it. Eventually, I will say "Do you think I am picking with you?" You can challenge them when you have the sense of being right. When their school work is not in, or on whatever. I am going to, and I will say force him to recall his sense of right or wrong and consequences positive and negative. There is your choice. In a sense, I am very willing to do that. I mean explain the sense of why we're doing it, the purpose behind it, and what it is so important.

He continues,

I will ask them, well, why are you doing this? You are embarrassing yourself and me. Everyone in here is learning, in the same situation, and is treated the same way. Knowing your right and knowing how to approach that in a communicative sense is important. You are trained these steps for discipline. Ignore it. I did some of that for a while, I still do. But, when I see the person's motive are to interrupt or whatever, I am going to address it. We're going to address it. You have to. But, discussing it sets the groundwork for later. You can give them more privileges when they build on it. So, then they want to be part of it. I must protect the rights of the students who are here to learn in a positive way.

It isn't easy, nor does it happen over night. Yet, the adults have to build the skills or have the skills because "children lack so many skills for survival in the 6th grade. I think it takes very special people to help them develop mechanisms for success." So, they learn at the beginning of the year what is expected by Lehman. Throughout the year, he reinforces it time and time again. Yet, he learns from his students. He cites this example:

Everyone knows what is expected of them when they come in. They must come in and write down what their homework is. However, I noticed that they began to wait until the end of class to copy down what they needed to do, instead of at the beginning. I did not say anything because it worked. They altered the process, and I learned from it.
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He concludes our conversation by adding, "teaching is a people profession. It is a labor intensive, people oriented field." and he argues,

For children, the light has to go on. If you fail and let them do nothing, that is not teaching either. You force them to see that they are capable and they are going to be monitored for a while. They will eventually take on the responsibility, and a light go on. But, you have to do something to show them they have an investment and they are capable of doing it. Many kids in sixth grade don't feel that way. It is hard work. They are going to test the system. But, it pays off in the long run. But, be prepared to do what you said. I want them to be able to self-monitor themselves. That is the goal. And every experience brings them closer to that. Eventually they say, "Hey, I can do this." and they do.

Moreover, Lehman recognized that my observations of the similarity in practices between himself and Mrs. Welch described next were true. He stated,

We have the same goals, and we both are committed to them [the children]. I am committed to them and it is my responsibility like I am committed to my own children. Still, you cannot do this well without understanding your own processes in the process.

He continues,

If you don't have your head together, then you will probably have difficulty with your students. Judgement is how do you instill your values in your children. You will NOT do that. I believe more deeply about my sense of right and wrong and my expectations of the children.

Thus, Lehman's teaching philosophy revolves around process. He believes in positive outlook that provides positive reinforcement and the ability to turn negatives into positives. Teachers must build on any positives that children demonstrate. He makes them feel good and competent. He makes them ready for the world.

**I Believe in The Old School: Mrs. Welch**

Unlike the other teachers in the school, I had originally met Mrs. Welch prior to my research on the school. In fact, that was how I learned the school still existed. It was four years ago. We met at the Future Scientist and Mathematicians Saturday Enrichment School, of which my son was a part, and I was a member of the advisory board. She reminded me of the
straightforward, 'I don't take no mess real southern Black woman. She is tall, medium build and striking in looks. I respected her. Over the next five months, I grew not only to admire her, but wish she had been my science teacher. She commands attention. She is a person you would want to get to know. She possesses such authority and power. Mrs. Welch exudes excellence. She demands it of her students. Yet, she has a heart of gold. I believed she had her own way of doing things which got things done well. And she did.

Mrs. Welch dresses professionally, and wears her white lab coat most of the time. She takes her job seriously. She commanded respect. Yet she had the ability to hug you with endearments such as "What can I do for you darlin'?" (Welch, 1996)? It always made me feel good and at home with her because it was familiar. At the same time, I also felt that I must be on my toes as well. I needed to make her proud of me. She was like family. She grew up in the segregated South in South Carolina. She went to an all Black rural school. She attended Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina where she earned a B. S. degree in biology, chemistry and mathematics. Prior to moving to Columbus, she had taught one year at Schofield school which was all Black. Mrs. Welch's teaching practices were a result of her environment.

Observations

Mrs. Welch was always teaching to the whole child no matter where she was. She is a strict disciplinarian. "Her room is so quiet," as one teacher said, "that you could hear a pin drop." (Helms, 1996).

Mrs. Welch greets her students at the door. She is clear, precise, and crisp in her presentations. She begins with "What I want you to know." or "I am ready to begin teaching" which cues students to have pencil in hand and be prepared. While she gives the scientific explanation, she also gives "common sense" names and understandings of the biological or
scientific terms so that the children can connect it with something that they know. At the same time, however, she would challenge them to look it up for themselves.

On a Monday, Mrs. Welch sets the week’s agenda and assignments. On the bulletin board as you enter the door, it reads “Believing in yourself is the first step to success” and “Take time to do your best. I may be the only chance you get.” She continued the lesson. I found it hard not to take notes as I did in Lehman’s class. She makes you want to learn.

Welch declared to the kids, “While the book has this information, I think there is more information you need to know so you will be intelligent, not smart, but, intelligent.” Mrs. Welch had informed me in other conversations that she did what was in the best interest of the children. “I’ve always taught the way I am supposed to teach. . . . I have not followed the system” (Welch, 1996). Consequently, she altered the explicit curriculum when she felt it did not adequately prepare the students for high school or beyond. Moreover, Mrs. Welch connected the information to practical examples. For example, when she spoke of the thyroid and problems associated with it, she related it back to Barbara Bush who had hypothyroidism.

Mrs. Welch checked for clarity, comments and questions when finishing a section of material. She stressed that learning is their responsibility. She stressed excellence. Twelve of her students competed in the Science Fair at the district level. Out of the twelve, four went on to compete at the state science fair and earned excellent ratings at the state competition (Champion Middle School Newsletter, v1, n5, 1996 Welch, 1996). From the entire Columbus district, the only Black children to compete at the state level came from Champion. Eight of her students received scores rating from superior to excellent at the district level. These students were prepared through drills before the competition where they presented their work before her and the class. Moreover, Welch often imparts excellence in the implicit curriculum in her class. She informs them they can make the choice of the phone call to their friends or
to study for the test. Her ultimate goal is to prepare them for high school when she says,
“You are getting ready for high school.” Welch prepares them for high school and lessons for
living; she also prepares them to think.

Welch’s questioning techniques are superb and build critical thinking skills. She
contends, “For science, you have to be able to think” (Welch, 1996). When she asks a
question, she will wait for the answer. She says “Beg your pardon?” to cue students to try it
again. If the student does not quite get it, she will ask another student what they think or if
they can help the student out. Thus, Welch sits at her desk, or walks around the room
lecturing, questioning and discussing the information with the students. She never used notes.
Welch stressed “you need to know” this or that not just for school, but so that “you can carry
on an intelligent conversation with someone” (Welch, 1996). Yet, she was also interactive
with the students, checked for clarity of the information, and related new information to past
knowledge. She makes “it interesting and delivers the lesson” so they can understand it
scientifically and in everyday language. However, she does not “spoon feed them everything”
because “discovery is part of science” (Welch, 1996). Moreover, Mrs. Welch discussed
science lessons, but also choices in life such as church attendance more than just on Easter
Sunday. She does it all, and she does it all well. Welch does not coddle and accepts no
excuses. She would often state, “Stop giving excuses and go home and study” (Welch, 1996).
She demands work from her students. She stated, “Nobody is going to give you anything.
You will earn it.” Moreover, she chides them, but she also jokes with them when it is
appropriate, but never at the expense of instruction. Welch demands of them that they “Don’t
let nobody determine your destiny but you.” She informed the students before a lesson, “You
think you have been working hard? You ain’t seen nothing yet. You think this is almost
over? We teach harder." Ultimately, her implicit curriculum is you can work to succeed, and you can do it. And they do.

The Interview: A Conversation

Mrs. Welch works as hard as she does because she believes teaching is her mission.

My personal feeling, I think teachers are called like preachers are called. If you are called to be a teacher, it's an innate thing. I think teachers are born not made. You have to be called.

After one year of teaching, Mrs. Welch had tried to pursue another career when she moved to Columbus. Mrs. Welch, like Mr. Lehman, eventually came back to teaching. She recalls "I felt I needed the people contact. So, I went back to teaching." She does it well. Welch has been personally responsible in her 28 years at the school for students competing in the Science Fair which was started by Mr. Wade. This year, twelve of her students competed and four placed in the state science fair. She explains,

I feel about a child learning something. My thrill is just as great as when Michael Jordan puts that basketball in that goal in a game. When I have a child to come around in a period of time, there is no greater joy.

Since 1969, she has been at Champion. She remembered when she was hired at the school.

She explained;

I was called in 1969-70. Mr. Ed Willis hired me. The staff was predominately Black. I think only one white person came in that year I was hired. The staff has changed, they believe in playing with the kids to motivate them. I don't believe in that.

Mrs. Welch, is from the old school, and she gets results from her students. When she was practicing with them for the Honor Society induction, she reminded them "Remember you can't do anything without academics." She always stresses academics.

She talks more about the previous teachers. "They were motivators. They were better teachers. They told you what you were going to do and you did it." Bill Atkinson was her buddy teacher. So, was A. D. V. Crosby, but
all of the teachers were mentors to us when I came to Champion. The year I came in, nine teachers came in. That was the biggest turnover they had had since Champion had been opened. It was stated by Ed Willis. Bernie Martin was the only white teacher to come in.

We did not have no friction. It was dictated by how it is run by the head. You investigate and get rid of it, if it is there.

In essence, the buddy system of interning teachers still continues. Mrs. Welch and Mrs. Helms who came in at the same time, mentor Mrs. Gossett who is new to the school, but not to teaching. Moreover, there is a cadre of teachers such as Mr. Baranec and Mrs. Molli-Clark who did their student teaching in the school and are now teaching there. Lastly, the principal, Mr. Hayes, Mrs. Helms, and Mrs. Brooks, the librarian, were actual students of Champion themselves. There is a circularity about Champion. It appears to breed success. But, people who have been successful, return to the school as teachers, and leaders. This is part of Champion's legacy as well as the Champion Hall of Fame which has recognized many successful students who attended Champion. Champion has been successful because the teachers were dedicated. So, is Mrs. Welch, and she does it just the way they did, discipline.

Mrs. Welch argues,

You have to have discipline, dedication, hard work and determination to succeed. These things determine the degree of education you get. Without the first, nothing can occur. Dedication allows you to do hard work. Discipline allows you to complete the goal. But, that comes from hard work.

She continues and indicates why she thinks this was possible for the school. She concludes:

Willis was one of the kindest. He was one of the best. He was a very personable person who believed in children learning. He put the child first and he believed no discipline no education. There can be no education without discipline.

Since she began her tenure at Champion, she has taught 8th grade math, 9th grade math, algebra, 8th grade science and 9th grade science. She provides further analysis of why it worked. She stated:

It went well because of our principal. WE did not have the problems with the kids or with teachers. It all followed down from the head. WE were concerned about
desegregation. We didn't make the law. We just have to abide by it. Community support was there and died down four or five years after deseg. When discipline fell in the school, everything fell. Both of them fell, that was it. But, I do know without help we cannot stop spinning our wheels. Where do we go from here? We are getting further and further in the hole.

Mrs. Welch is concerned about what will the school do next year when the student population doubles. Regardless of the lack of discipline in some classrooms, it is not nor will it be in Mrs. Welch's room.

Even though the school has changed, Mrs. Welch believes that only the reinstatement of practices that existed when she came can alter the overall school success. However, she has her own view about teachers and teacher training. She contends, "Teachers have to be born. No, I don't mean they don't need an education. But, it is the inner part, the personal part that is important. It's an innate thing." I asked her, then what can help them. She replied "They can't. It's an innate thing." Mrs. Welch had taught her students about the cerebrum. She stated to them, "It makes us unique from other animals. It allows us to think." While I agree and understand Mrs. Welch's philosophy, I think people who are learning to be teachers rather than born educators can learn a lot from her.

Mrs. Welch is a tall, striking figure of a woman. She would never be described as Ms. Moffitt as an old school mammy who wore black dresses. Mrs. Welch is from the South and from the old school which believed that African American teachers, particularly women, should dress well and model what they want their students to be. She is a no nonsense kind of woman. She has taught science and math at Champion for the past 28 years. A great many of her students have gone on to be successful doctors, scientist, and professional people in their own right.

Mr. Welch was perceived by her students as stern and hard. She was revered and respected by her colleagues. She is the Black Matriarch of the school. As noted by her
cohort, Mr. Kraham:

She is one of the best teachers I know. She is wonderful. It bothers me that she is not used more for student teachers when she has all the experience, knowledge and knows what she is doing. They [Whites] are intimidated by an articulate strong Black woman. They place these student teachers with people who have not been teaching long. Yet, she is here. It is such a waste. It just makes me mad because they could learn a lot from her (Kraham, 1996).

Mr. Kraham is White. Yet, he recognizes that because Welch is who she is Black and female, that she intimidates White people who are not used to dealing with competent and assertive Black women. Mrs. Welch has the respect of her colleagues.

In all, Mrs. Welch is a good teacher because she has the knowledge, the delivery, places demands on her students, she gives life lessons, she builds relationships with them, and discipline is her foundation. She is an exemplary teacher. Moreover, so is her colleague, Mrs. Helms.

But Some of Us Are Called: Mrs. Helms

But unto every one of us is a given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. . . And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers. Ephesians, 4; 7-11.

I met Mrs. Helms when I went to the school to see Mr. Hayes. It was parent teacher conference day, and her cohorts and she were sitting and waiting for parents to come in to discuss the students' progress. She reminded me of Mrs. Palmer. Mrs. Palmer was my 4th grade teacher. She was a pretty caramel colored Black woman who always dressed well, and was helpful. She would teach from her desk most times unless she had something to write on the board. I had been transferred to her room after I had taken a test in the 3rd grade and had tested very well. I hated to leave Mrs. Reasoner's room because she was good to me. Little did I know I was going to be promoted to the 4th grade when I took that test. But, the experience I had has shaped my life. Mrs. Palmer was my first Black teacher. She was my first mentor and exemplar of what it meant to be a successful Black educator. So, when I
looked at Mrs. Helms I believed I would learn a lot from her. She was always dressed like a teacher or at least the Black teachers that I knew growing up. She was soft-spoken which made you have to really listen. But, what she said was always profound and wrapped in a culture that I knew well.

Mrs. Helms was the first teacher to talk about God. Again, she knew that “religion was what saved our people.” I knew this too. Consequently, she really reminded me of women in my church at home I admired and respected.

**Observations**

I had learned from Mrs. Brooks that Mrs. Helms had attended Champion. I learned from her that she had lived in Poindexter Village which was the first public housing complex built in Columbus in the 1940s. It replaced the Blackberry Patch area and surrounds Champion (Wright, 1996; Bishop, 1990). Consequently, she knew the school well. Mrs. Helms had Mr. Butler’s old room, who had been the Basketball coach and teacher at the school since the late ’30s. It was quite large and roomy. She displayed her students’ work. When I observed her with her students the first day, she introduced me, and then went on to the lesson. I read along with the students. They were reading “Flowers for Anguion” by Daniel Keyes.

Mrs. Helms interacted with the students well. She stated, “If you can’t be anything else with students, you can be kind” (Helms, 1996). She was kind and she loved teaching. She never had a harsh word to say and her demeanor was warm and comforting, but demanding. While she contended students’ efforts had decreased over the years, she provided them with support systems from which to attain the lesson. For example, instead of just giving them the spelling and vocabulary words on a sheet and allowing them to gather the correct spelling and definition for the words, she allowed different students to write the words.
and their meaning on the board and the rest of the class wrote the information down during class time to ensure they would have the correct information. Moreover, this practice built rapport between her and the students, and allowed the students to practice teaching methods as well. Hence, Mrs. Helms was providing them with the knowledge that they could effectively model what teachers actually do in practice as a part of teaching. Consequently, she was building success in their practices, and at the same time, implicitly demonstrating that they too could be teachers. Furthermore, Mrs. Helms understood the Black experience experience. She had lived it and achieved despite her families lack of economic resources. In essence, she was a perfect model for them to identify with. This helped sustain her relationships with the students.

During the lesson, Mrs. Helms asked questions of them, asked someone else if they agreed with what the former person had said, and shared her opinions of the story, and what she would do in the characters place. The discussion which ensued related to their choices in life and the choices the main character had. Some students agreed with the main character and would have had the operation to "be smart." On the other hand, others did not agree with the concept and one in particular felt "if God would have wanted the character to be smart, he would have been." They really enjoyed the story, and were engaged in the learning process. Mrs. Helms had provided cues for comprehending the particulars of the story. She would say, "Pay attention to this section," or "Why do you think he wanted to be smart?" When students responded correctly, she provided positive reinforcement by stating "very good." I found it hard to believe afterwards that it was the same group of students I had observed a week ago in another class where they were totally out of control. I could not believe it. But, they were in control in her class. Moreover, they were engaged in learning.
Mrs. Helms was respectful to the students and received respect. She explained to me during a conversation that "she had never had any problems with disrespect from the students. It always came to me." Mrs. Helms interacted with the students in a light tone. She, too, was from the old school, and demanded excellence from them. However, she contends "there must be discipline." Before the lesson had started, she gave them their assignment. During the reading, she also checked for clarity and comprehension. She also connected the material to their experiences by asking them "what would you do?" Moreover, she was willing to self-disclose her own opinion and how she viewed the experience. Consequently, students provided examples from their own experiences. One time, the dialogue even led to a discussion of choices and Bart Simpson. In their discussions, Mrs. Helms positively reinforced their progress. She was playful, even joked with the students, but stern. Helms noted "A lot of what you do is counseling" (Helms, 1996). She reminded one student who was about to test the waters, "You are about to have a lunch detention," and she moved on with the lesson. It was a calm classroom. Mrs. Helms knew what she was doing. Moreover, she loved doing it. That day, she taught, and the students learned.

The Interview: A Conversation

As a student, Mrs. Helms came to Champion reluctantly. She wanted to attend the desegregated Franklin. Yet, she found out the school was fine, and the students were motivated. "During my time, when you walked out the door you represented your family and your race. We enjoyed school." Moreover, they had good teachers. She described one of the teachers; "Mrs. Bessie Beacham had a sense of expertise. She was crisp, authoritative and business like." After leaving Champion, she went on to East High and later to OSU on a scholarship. She earned a dual major of English, history and government. Mrs. Helms student taught at Barrett Junior High School. Her first teaching job was at Buckeye Middle school.
She recalled, “It was all White. Deseg. had not started yet. The only Blacks were the
custodian and the lunch staff.” Thus, Mrs. Helms was part of the cadre of Black teachers who
had begun to desegregate the schools before student desegregation. Mrs. Helms married after
her first year of teaching. After marrying, she “got pregnant” and after having her son,
returned to teaching. When she returned to school, she requested “inner-city.”

After I had my son, they wanted me to go to an all white school. I could have
gone anywhere. I wanted to teach inner city. I said, “I would really like Champion.”
As it turned out, there was an opening at Champion. It was only through God’s
intervention that it was there.

She describes her phone interview with Mr. Willis as a funny story because principals hired
their teachers at that time. She recalled;

When I called him, he was not as friendly or personable as I had heard he
was. I was surprised by his tone. He was kind of guarded. I wondered what was
going on. He said “I am not sure who I wanted for the position.” He eventually said,
“Well, you can come down to interview for the job.” He asked if I knew where
Champion was. I told him I had went to Champion. He laughed. He thought I was
White because I had taught at Buckeye, and he wanted Black teachers for the school.

Mrs. Helms was subsequently interviewed and hired by Willis. She has been at Champion
ever since.

When she got to Champion, Mrs. Marie Stribling was her buddy teacher. She recalled
“She gave me insights and clues on how to do the very best you can. We owed it to our race.
She was a master craftsman.” She continues, “I felt we owed it to our race, too. We knew
how to instill in our kids what they needed for excellence.” Mrs. Helms still instills in her
kids “excellence.” Mrs. Helms confirmed that she “could have went anywhere. But, I felt the
white kids were going to get good teachers. I wanted to teach Black kids.” Hence, teacher
expectations are not the only factor. Cultural norms also determine what is acceptable and
what is practiced. Still, Mrs. Helms seeks excellence from her students.
Mrs. Helms is committed to her students, and she is a good teacher. She indicated in earlier conversations that:

Over the years, you gain wisdom. I could have confronted her, [the student] and lost instruction time. As long as she was not interrupting the class instruction, I let her be angry and moved on.

She continues,

You have to love children to teach, especially today. A lot of what you do is counseling the kids. Behavior gets in the way of them being liked. For teachers, social and people skills are important. You teach more than just the subject.

Thus, Mrs. Helms, like Lehman, Welch and others believed in educating the whole child. In essence, they believed teachers imparted more to their students than just the content of the lesson, but life lessons for life long learning. In earlier conversations, Mr. Helms indicated to me that she never had any problems with respect from her students. She still does not.

While respect is an important component of her classroom structure, Mrs. Helms informed me that with experience, you know when to challenge things, and when to let it go. Moreover, she believes “you can’t teach or learn from an undisciplined environment. I am from the old school. Students are quiet when I talk.” And indeed they were. Like many of her cohorts, she contends, “Teaching is a calling. I believe teachers are called. It is an innate thing. You are dealing with the most precious commodity, our children.” She refers to the Bible and how people are called. She continues,

College academics and professional background are the science of teaching. The ability to deal with the students, that is the art. The job is more than teaching subject matter. I look at the whole child. I believe that they can achieve anything if they have the means to do it.

Overall, Mrs. Helms contends that the key to successful teaching is discipline. All of these exemplary teachers believe in discipline and order, yet they all knew how to deliver the material to “catch the attention of the student.” They were not boring at all. Again, Mrs. Helms’s philosophical point of view was similar to the other exemplary teachers. Moreover,
Helms, like Welch and others, believed that the school had changed. It had changed because of desegregation.

Mrs. Helms contends that desegregation altered the school. However, she also argues that change in family and in church also affected the school as well. She stated,

I can't see where this [desegregation] helped. Overall, it was an artificial desegregation. Only deseg for six or seven hours. The only benefit has been the races get to mingle.

Mrs. Helms and others have questioned the efficacy of desegregation in Columbus schools. As Mrs. Welch stated, "We were doing just fine." And they continue to do well with their students despite changes in the overall organization and order of the school. Mrs. Helms, however, contends that something needs to change in the school.

I don't know how we are going to change, but I know we have to. Parents have to be actively involved. My parents came here anytime. There is no religious aspect in these kids' life. How you treat people. They don't go to church. The foundation of our race has been the church.

Over its history, area ministers had always been involved with Champion. Even today, there is some linkage to the church. Consequently, preachers, teacher and principals were leaders in the community. Mrs. Helms's feels that this focus needs to be re instituted in the school.

As a former student of the school, Mrs. Helms is a part of the past and the present. As an exemplary teacher she testifies of the strength of the teachers who taught her as well as those who initiated her in other teaching experience at Champion based on cultural values. Mrs. Helms' was definitely called. Moreover, she represents the core values of the Black community: religion and education. Still, she maintains that "you have to create an environment for learning. A key way to change that is discipline." She created such an environment in her class. She led by example just as she was called to do so.
A Realistic Facilitator: Mrs. Nelson

When I first met Mrs. Nelson, she was curious about what I was doing. She asked questions, and we talked about what has happened at the school. She is a pretty woman with blonde hair and blue eyes. She is not much taller than her students. But she dresses like the teacher, and really looks like a friendly person, and looked like someone's mother. Like you could talk to her. I found out later she was a mother, and had taught at the school where she graduated from before moving to Columbus and having a child. She felt that was one of the key experiences that helped her in her teaching: the fact that she had life experiences. She grew up outside of Detroit, Michigan, and graduated from Michigan State University at a time when junior high and middle school practice were emphasized in the curriculum. She remembered that they were introduced to the field much sooner than people are now. She became a teacher because she came of age when “women became teachers or nurses.” Mrs. Nelson was the first White female teacher to seek me out. I made plans with her for the interview and observations. She seemed glad to help.

Observations

Mrs. Nelson's class is well organized. Again, assignments were displayed. Rules were posted. She allows five minutes at most for order to develop. She signals to the class by holding up her hand, when she is ready to begin the lesson and calls for order. On this particular day, they were receiving tests back. After receiving their test and asking questions, they were instructed what page to turn to in their book. What ensued was some of the best out loud reading that I have heard from 6th graders. They enjoyed reading, and it was obvious. I wondered how she had done that because most kids don't like to read, especially out loud at this age level. As she conducted, she wove the lesson through a particular order of student seats, there was silence when people were reading. She checked for comprehension
and asked questions. They asked questions. They talked about the activities of the main character. How they would do similar, but different things than the character. Mrs. Nelson shared her memory of Easter egg hunts, and asked the class if they had ever been to an Easter egg hunt. They did not want to stop reading the book, and asked “can we do just a little more?” It was a good lesson. But, it was time to move on to another activity which built upon the lesson. Mrs. Nelson commented, “that was wonderful reading today. You guys are really getting fluent” (Nelson, 1996). Nelson moved on to the next part of the lesson which built on the activity of the characters of the story. They were going to color Easter eggs like the characters in the story whom were the President’s children. They had the first Easter Egg Hunt on the White House lawn, except the children’s eggs in the class were paper. They put away their books, and orderly acquired their materials and began to color their eggs. She was in control, but they did the work. She was an exemplary teacher who had provided order in which learning could take place, supported the learning through positive reinforcement and kind correction of reading errors, provided opportunities for success for students through explicit classroom behaviors such as reading out loud, and lastly, she shared with the students her experiences which was the basis for their learning relationship. I would return to her class on other visits. Each time, learning was going on, and the students were engaged. Each time she combined a series of activities for her student which were varied in content and context. She was the facilitator of their learning.

The Interview: A Conversation

Nelson begins by stating the obvious. “I like middle school because of the content emphasis. I think you can have the perfect synthesis between content and child centered curriculum. The curricular concerns are different at high school.” Mrs. Nelson enjoys the content, but she also enjoys relating with the students. “You still get to play a little.”
During our conversation, we had talked about the curriculum since she had had the opportunity to actually create a curriculum. Mrs. Nelson included folktales and such in her curriculum with the students. She is a language teacher, and has been at Champion for seven years. She recalled

I had chosen to come to Champion. I was honored to come there because it was an alternative school at the time. Being a blonde-haired, blue-eyed White woman from the suburbs was something that I had to overcome: the fact that I was so different from the children.

Well, Mrs. Nelson overcame it. However, she contends, "I think every year I work on it."

Mrs. Nelson works on her own perceptions and wins the students over to believing she is concerned about them and that I can teach them the right things, that I wasn't just some goody-two shoes, nor was I there just for the money. Or because someone made me come here.

She is honest with her students and discloses some of herself to them. She states, "It has served me well, and has helped build the trust factor." Her students do trust her, and more importantly, they learn from her.

As a language teacher, she understood that there are differences in language. She referred to the difference as "the economics of language." While she contended that these children may talk different, "they needed to know how to talk this way because it was the economics of language. Whether they liked it or not. They needed to learn it." Thus, she saw her task as a facilitator in the process of helping them to learn another language without denigrating what they came to school with.

While Mrs. Nelson has only been at Champion for seven years, she has been teaching for almost twenty-years. Experience and organization are the cornerstones of her educational practice. She reflects

I was glad that I stopped teaching and went back after my son was in school. That experience of parenting helped in the classroom. It helped me to be understanding of what goes on with kids.
Moreover, she contends it is important how you build a relationship with them. "You can't be phony because, boy, they know right away. I have an affection for them. A love for them."

Mrs. Nelson does like her other cohorts. Her affection for her students is explicated in her classroom practices. She is excited about being there. Moreover, she is excited about learning, and their learning in particular. Her praises of them demonstrate her joy. Moreover, Nelson’s smile actually lightens up her face.

Nelson believes if a teacher has good classroom management in the beginning, then "after the honeymoon is over, things settle down, and you can allow them more." Yet, she contends "you have to be clear on academics and the places we need to go. You can have fun, but must be firm." Moreover, in middle school "the social component is important. You have to be able to see the relevance of their daily lives, and meet the skill needs of our children."

She loves teaching, but there are other reasons why she continues to teach.

Mrs. Nelson, because of her era, became a teacher. Nonetheless, she has remained with teaching "because teaching is easy to stay with it as a career because it allowed me to have a family, time schedule and being a parent. The pay is getting better." While these concerns sound typical, the most critical element for Nelson, however, was "it is part of my mission. In my church we are trained to give of ourselves. It is a very important part of our church's mission. You are supposed to bloom where you are planted." Mrs. Nelson blooms at Champion.

Mrs Nelson had teaching experience before coming to Champion. The kids in those schools were predominately Black, and in one school she had a lot of Appalachian children. However, Nelson attests

We appreciate those things, but were going to have to live in a real world of money English. If you chose to succeed and you want to succeed, then we need to learn this. Whether the children accept it or not. You are going to be looked at by
the rest of the world. So, it is important because I see that as freeing rather than limiting for our kids.

Mrs. Nelson's philosophy reminded me of my own parents. They demanded that we learn proper grammar and English because after all we did go outside of our house. Moreover, we represented them. Thus, Mrs. Nelson's assertion relates to a sense of efficacy in the power that education can have on the effects of these children's lives. In essence, she makes them acquire reading and language skills in order for them to gain freedom. She does this through the learning relationship in which she is the central facilitator.

She states:

I teach my kids how to adapt to a changing society. We do need to be realistic. They can't do anything they want. They have been sold a bill of goods. There is a huge world out there and in between. We must be realistic.

Mrs. Nelson discussed how people are giving kids dreams to reach without supplying them with the foundations upon which to get there.

We have a social responsibility to point out their limits. But, at the same time supply them with the skills so that they will want to be life long learners. Teach them to be learning, adaptable, flexible and communicative into the twenty-first century. I am hoping that we are giving them an understanding of their gifts, abilities and limitations.

She continues,

Having been a student. I think every child needs the opportunity to earn an F and an A. The joy of earning an A. I remember my first quarter at Michigan State, when I got my first paper back, it was a D. Support your answer written all over it in red ink. And that was a wake up call to me. I don't want to hurt their little self-esteem, but maybe sometimes... They need to be petted, but they need that little reality check too. And not feel too bad about it, because we learn from our mistakes. The F will challenge them, and kids need to be continually challenged, and of course kids are reluctant. They cannot always stay in a comfort zone.

While our conversation began to turn in another direction, we talked about the history of Champion.
Mrs. Nelson was aware of some of Champion's history. But, she had missed the beginning date by twenty years. Nelson knew desegregation had altered the school, and that the school had originally been gerrymandered into existence. It was clear that she understood the politics of urban schools. She stated,

I did not realize that Champion was built as a "Black school." I knew of the strong Black community support and expectation. I didn't really think it was traditionally an Afro-American school.

She feels, however, that in the setting that she was a "Blond haired, blue-eyed female has to constantly prove myself." As we discuss her feelings further, she notes "you get no respect when you condescend to children. In fact, I think that is the most virulent form of racism. Because there is a difference, the trust has to be built each year with a new class." Mrs. Nelson struggles with this a little, but it does not impede her relationships with the students.

Our conversations about Champion's history helped her

...to understand some of what has happened. Some of the negativism, and some of the hurdles that I had to overcome to prove myself to the children. I have to re-establish and reprove it every year. I fell a kind of racism against me.

Still, Mrs. Nelson is committed to going to Champion. She feels that "I have more ownership with the program now that the leadership has changed. I feel appreciated and valued" She gives her students this same kind of ownership in their work. She notes "it is rough in the beginning of the year until we figure it out. There is a certain week when they figure it out. WE say the honeymoon is over. And then you can go from there." Still, Nelson contends that the school has changed particularly over the past three years. She believes it is related to desegregation.

Mrs. Nelson argues

I thought the point of deseg was to attract. Maybe more affluent students to Champion. It didn't work. Well, it worked for a while, but it didn't last. Even though our busing area was up North, people found out which block had to take the bus ride
down to Champion. Most of the complaints came from African American families who had worked and moved North to leave the inner-city.

Regardless of the effects of desegregation, Mrs. Nelson still is committed to her students at Champion. Moreover, she is committed to her formalist classroom because it works for her children and her. Lastly, she is committed to continuing to be “content oriented, but child centered” in her teaching for success.

A Forgotten Legacy: Mr. Murray

Mr. Murray is the music, drama and vocal teacher. He has an average size build, and has a dark complexion. He has somewhat of a beer belly. He has a warm and raspy voice, and he likes to laugh and feels like that is okay at times, but not all the time. He reminded me of Brother Williams at my church. He was jovial, but always taking care of the church business. When I met Murray, he was walking down the hall. He wore sweaters. I shook his hand and introduced myself. He was the first Black man I had seen in the school besides Mr. Hayes. Mr. Omens, the physical education teacher, and the janitors were the only Black men in the building. I said to him “I need to talk with you about your work here at Champion.” He replied, “I don’t know if you want to talk to me. I will give you the whole story. It maybe something you don’t want to hear.” I assured Mr. Murray that I wanted the whole story.

Mr. Murray, like Mrs. Weich, was from the South. He attended an all Black school with all Black teachers who demanded the best from him. Moreover, his parents demanded it as well. When he graduated from high school, he received an award for never missing a day of school during his twelve years of high school. “We didn’t have a choice. If you weren’t sick. You went to school. My parents, teachers, church, the community stressed education.” From high school, Mr. Murray went to Kittel then Livingston College where he attained his degree. He later earned a Masters from Wright State. Mr. Murray, who is an exemplary
musician and singer wanted to sing. But, he realized there were a lot of people who sang well. So, he decided to teach. Her often mentioned that he thanked God for that decision.

We had several conversations over the time I was in the school. He knew a great deal about the history of the school. He believes “Champion is a good school, but it has been great.” He believed discipline and respect were important. He was able to silence those kids when no one else could. They did not try him because they knew what he stood for and that he was consistent. Consequently, Mr. Murray always corrected students in the hall, the lunchroom, or wherever they were when they were not acting disciplined. But, he would talk to them, and eventually they would admit their wrong doing, and he would ask them to “do better because you know better.” Mr. Murray believed you had to help them “master their faults as a sense of growth.” He, too, was from the old school. He had taught at Champion for nineteen years and had taught for 21 years total. He had been hired by Mr. Foreman who was the first White administrator of Champion. Mr. Murray noted “He stressed academics. He wanted these kids to learn. He said he would do anything to promote learning for the students.” Mr. Murray, however, was the continuation of a legacy. He, too, represented the “Stalwart Men of Champion.”

Observations

Mr. Murray was on task. He did not allow his students to get out of order. He instructed them of their task, gave them time to do it, checked it, and gave them immediate feedback. In other words, he himself was on task. No matter where he was, you could expect there to be order. When students did not cooperate, they lost privileges. He did not play. He was serious about what they were learning. Moreover, Murray enjoyed music. He knew he could sing, but it was his responsibility to teach them to sing. He had mostly girls in his class. But as he said, “they can be a handful too.” Yet, he praised them when they did well,
and he corrected them when they did not. It was as simple as that. He was from the old school. They did work.

Since I had never been in music, I did not know what music teachers did. I learned that they taught about music, instruments, music history and theory. Mr. Murray stressed the academic or knowledge component of music as well as the singing part of it. It was hard work, and he wanted them to do it well, and know about the different instruments in an orchestra, or the different kinds of wind instruments, or guitars. However, Murray taught them more than just music. He taught them how it connected in the real world.

While Mr. Murray was mostly serious, he also allowed play. It is a part of his personality. During one class, when the students finished their assignments, he allowed them to watch a movie. After the movie, they would talk about the music. He would ask questions. But, they would also talk about the life lessons in the movie. In essence, the music was the focus of the lesson, but he also taught them life lessons through the usage of the movies.

Overall, Mr. Murray represents the continuation of the legacy in that he is a positive Black male who demands students behave. He is a keeper of cultural norms. He talks to his students the same way their parents would particularly if they have maintained traditional Black child rearing practices.

The Interview: A Conversation

Mr. Murray’s mother attended college for one year. His father completed high school. Yet, all of his siblings except one who went to a technical school, went to college. One sister graduated from Temple University. He remembers his school experiences as “just like family. If you were wrong, you were dealt with.” Murray explained his first impressions of the schools in the North:

I had never heard of suspensions or expulsions in my life ‘til I started teaching up North. In the South, they’d deal with the problem, beat your behind, and send you
back to class. No questions asked. We lived in a community and you were taught to respect all of the adults in the community, especially teachers because it was hard to get an education.

Mr. Murray was most perplexed by the cultural differences in the North and the South. Yet, he became a part of Champion. But, he did not change his outlook on what role children play in the classroom. Moreover, he was committed to teach, and recalls “I came here expecting to teach.”

Mr. Murray has a straightforward philosophy of teaching. He explained how he developed learning relationships with children.

I learned to listen to kids and you know I learned that you just don’t jump right on them. And I believe in also respecting kids, then kids will respect you. I don’t come dressed like them, and I don’t try to make them friends or those kinds of things. Those things will come together if they find that you are a good teacher.

Mr. Murray believes a lot of teaching is common knowledge. Yet, teachers have to spend time reflecting about their practices. Moreover, they have to set examples for the children. He declared,

You don’t do and he won’t do. You do what I say do. You know that’s my philosophy. When I sit down and play I sing just as hard as they do. I expect you [them] to sing too. So, I asked them to do no more than what I would do. That’s another one. That’s some of my main philosophies, don’t ask your kids to do more than you will do.

Besides setting examples for the children through his own modeling, Murray believes in character development in children. “When you have a kid to apologize, to admit to their faults, that’s a sense of growth.” Mr. Murray does not allow his children to disrespect himself or others. He continued,

They cannot disrespect me or themselves. I do not want them to lie to me about anything. If they’re wrong tell me the truth. Even though you’re young be a man. If you’re gonna’ be a woman, be a woman. Stand up and take responsibility for your own actions and don’t lie. That’s another one of my main points.
Murray’s philosophies are entrenched primarily in the culture in which he was reared. He makes sure children get their dose of “mother wit’ or life lessons from their mistakes. Murray’s theories of action are related to the cultural context in which he lived and still believes in the values of that community. Consequently, “teaching is just common knowledge. You know, I watched a lot and I observed a lot. These are the things I teach.” Moreover, he alters the curriculum to meet the students because “some of the things in the book are for the kids in the book.” Yet, Mr. Murray’s life and his experiences before coming to Champion are what he bases his practice on. He comments

Southern teachers DO NOT PLAY. They were hard and it was hard getting an education. Yet, I learned from them to be firm and fair, and you can teach what is expected. If you can teach in the South, you can teach anywhere.

Well, Mr. Murray does not play either. But, he loves kids.

Mr. Murray loves teaching. In fact, he notes “I love kids you know. I originally wanted to be a performer. But, I think my calling was to be a teacher” Mr. Murray, like Mrs. Helms and Mrs. Welch, believe teaching is a calling and not just a job. He continued, “I love to teach. I love kids and I love the intellectual subjects too. But, my calling was I think to teach. I thank God I became a teacher rather than a performer” Mr. Murray who was a honor student as well, could teach any subject. In fact, people often ask him why he is not in academics. Nonetheless, he loves what he is doing, but feels that you have to “really work with the kids.”

Murray concludes that academics is not all there is to teaching. He states,

If you got knowledge and no delivery, change professions. If you have the knowledge, that’s fine and good. That’s why you got your degree. You’re certified. But, that don’t mean you know how to deliver it to these kids.

He continues his point, “I would deal with the kids socially, ‘cause they already have the basic knowledge that’s academics. You have to be able to deal with these kids socially.” Mr.
Murray’s assessment is based on his understanding that “all kids can learn.” Moreover,

There are no dummies. There are no underachievers. Also, you have to find out where a child is, and you carry them on from there. Most kids are bored to death with these teachers which is why they act out. You have to make it interesting. You have to have delivery.

Murray, like Welch, believes you have to make it interesting. “You have to catch their attention.” Furthermore, Murray’s philosophy is similar to Mrs. Molli-Clark’s, the special education teacher, described shortly, who also contends that you reach the child where they are and move forward from there.

Murray has no problems with the kids. “Basically, they do what I say do. But, they respect me, you know. And most of them are going to do what I want. I wouldn’t do anything or say anything to them to hurt them” Ultimately, Murray’s goal is “I’m trying to make sure that these kids know they are valued. Education that doesn’t work is a crime. But, honey, you gotta give these kids these basics. That’s our problem we have lost the basics” Again, Murray’s basics are related to respect, self-respect, kindness, discipline and common sense. In essence, Murray’s philosophy is based on the way in which he was raised. Consequently, he views God as important to these kids as well. Overall, Murray educates the whole child for when they are not in school, and beyond it. He states emphatically,

And I’ll tell you, like I told them. Like I told them in the beginning. If you give me some kids to work with, I’ll give you something. Teachers must be consistent and accept kids where they are and work to make them grow.

Mr. Murray plans to keep giving. He stated “I plan to teach as long as I can. Until, I am 70.”

Not Quite My Father’s Shoes: Mrs. Molli-Clark

Mrs. Molli-Clark was raised in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio. She is White and has a medium build with brown hair. She reminds one of Nancy Drew in temperament. Yet, Molli-Clark is very kind, compassionate and nice, especially to her students. Unlike the majority of the teachers presented, her father was an urban school teacher. She recalled;
My father was mean. He carried a paddle. When I started teaching, he sent me a paddle. I used to think he was mean, and to some degree I still do. But, I understand why he did what he did.

Mrs. Molli-Clark is a special education teacher like her father. She graduated from Cuyahoga Falls High School and received her B. A. from Ohio State with K-12 certification. Since that time she has attained her M. A. as well. She has taught at Champion for eleven years. It was her first teaching position. In fact, she did her student teaching in the school with Mrs. Polomik who still teaches at Champion. They have team taught together.

Molli-Clark recalls her first year. She indicated she cried almost every day. But, she didn’t give up. She believed she “could make a difference.” Moreover, she had Polomik who continued to serve as her role model and in reality her “buddy teacher.”

Observations

Above her board, she has “Kids are special people.” Special is how she treats her students, and not because they are in special education, but because they are special to her. She provides a lot of positive reinforcement when they are on task. Moreover, she does a lot of hands on work with them. Finally, she treats them with genuine affection through hugs and the such. Molli-Clark wants to help them have as much opportunity as possible despite their physical or emotional limitations. Thus, she provides opportunities such as visiting the nursing home, and volunteer activities at the American Red Cross to teach them that they have something to give: their time, love and support.

During her class, she questions students, praises students for correct answers and behavior, gives clear directions and checks for clarity, and corrects when necessary. She dismisses concerns which are not critical with a flick of “We’ll talk about that later” and moves on with the lesson. It is obvious she enjoys what she does. Thus, her students are
engaged and learning is occurring in the classroom. Her students work cooperatively with each other. She directs the lessons, and they do them.

On this particular day when I attended her class, students were preparing gifts to take over to the nearby home for the elderly. They were excited. They worked hard on their baskets, or their bunnies, or whatever they were making for the occasion. Before this activity, however, Molli-Clark taught them some more life skills. As a special education teacher, she has to teach the whole child. Molli-Clark prepares them for life long learning and living because for them their options are limited. Yet, she strives to push them as far as she can.

In her classroom, the curriculum is different. It is more of an activity or do curriculum to develop skills and is very demonstrative in nature. For instance, on one occasion they read clothes labels and discussed how the clothes they sorted would be cleaned. The curriculum is explicit and under law must be carried out. She attested to the fact that “the curriculum is different in special ed. You get them ready to get along in society. They gain vocational skills, career and employment skills.” Molli-Clark was preparing them well to get along in society.

The Interview: A Conversation

Molli-Clark admits “I enjoy what I do” Moreover, “I recognized that middle school was where I belonged. The kids are needy, but I can do needy.” She believes “inner city is like a tough line. What my father was doing worked for him even though I didn’t agree with it. I believe only certain people can work in inner city. It’s like a calling.” Well, Mrs. Molli-Clark was definitely called. However, her parents made conscious choices which allowed her to be comfortable in the setting. She recalled, “I didn’t have Black friends because of where I lived. Dad, because he worked in inner-city Cleveland schools, had Black friends. So, I had acquaintances. It was a conscious effort on my parents’ part.” Consequently, Molli-Clark
knew what the inner-city was on two levels: from experiencing her father's classroom and her parents' conscious choice to have Black friends.

Molli-Clark is an exemplary special education teacher, but what she does should be done in every classroom. She delivers the lesson in an interesting manner. Molli-Clark engaged students in their own learning, and required that they understand "what their choices are." She concentrated on what was possible, and attempted to push them beyond it. Molli-Clark corrected by calling their names with swiftness, yet, she also provided continual praise of their positive actions. Moreover, she set behavior and academic standards, limits and demanded their cooperation. She got it. As in Mr. Lehman's class, her students policed themselves. One student reminded another student, "You know Ms. Molli don't like that." I asked her about the students' behavior during the interview. She stated "Oh, they know there are certain things not allowed in the classroom. There is street talk, and classroom talk. It must have been something that was for outside the classroom." Well, her students all worked well together. They were cooperative. I asked her to explain how she accomplished it. She professed "I do a lot of eye contact. I am firm and consistent in my treatment of them. They have responsibilities. They help each other to meet those responsibilities. WE are family. We work as a family. We take a family picture at the start of the year." This activity sets the tone for how Molli-Clark and her students view their classroom experiences and how students in the class relate to each other within the class as family.

Molli-Clark also knew a little about the school's history. "I knew it was an all Black school. All Black teachers and the students were wonderful at basketball. The teachers were dedicated" However, she admits she doesn't know much more, but would like to know more. As we closed out the interview, I asked her what her teaching philosophy was. She commented,
I believe that any child can learn and they learn at different levels. As a teacher, my purpose is to find out where they are, and go from there. I teach self-esteem, self-respect, and I teach them kindness to people and kindness to each other. We will get along better. Even though they are limited, they still have the capacity to learn. They are only retarded because their environment retards them. Yet, these kids are street smart and their knowledge base in that area is outstanding. The experiences they don’t have limits them. I push them into new experiences. They learn.

In essence, she too teaches the whole child more than just academics.

Molli-Clark does push them. Before I entered her room, I thought special education classes were slow. But, she keeps them moving at a fast pace. They get through the lesson. She had talked about how she adds Black history to her lesson plans because “the kids didn’t know. I knew more than they did.” Yet, she does not blame the children for their predicament. She understands that “their development is delayed by their environment.” She provides for them new opportunities. In essence, Molli-Clark developed the learning relationship with the children in order to teach them experiences beyond the world which often circumscribes them. She is an exemplary teacher. After 11 years in the school, she is only getting better.

**Only the Strong Will Survive: The Present Teaching Staff**

Dr. Martin Haberman writes about what it takes for a teacher to stay in an urban setting. He argues that the culture of poverty is the most striking detriment to effective teaching in urban schools. Teachers who ascribe to it as an excuse usually do not stay in urban schools, and if they do they often are mediocre (Haberman, 1994). On the bulletin board, a notice said Haberman was coming to do a workshop in the school district. I thought while Haberman’s analysis of effective teaching is exceptional, people in this building could have their own workshop on urban education.
What They Taught Me or What I Learned From Them

My experience at Champion has profoundly altered my perceptions of teachers in urban schools. A good deal of the literature only pertains to what is bad, wrong, or needs reforming in urban schools. Very little pertains to what is good. These teachers' lives, their practices speak to the idea and reality of there is "good" in urban schools. Moreover, good has existed in the history of this historically northern de facto segregated urban Black school.

One of the first things I learned was teaching in urban schools is not difficult. Yet, it requires dedication, discipline, determination, consistency and hard work. Because of the differences between the teachers and students, i.e., race, gender, and class, education within this context is to say the least complicated. However, as these six lives attest, it can be done and it can be done well. This researcher contends that these teachers' practices are not much different than those exhibited by exemplary teachers in other contexts. However, the basis of their exemplary work regardless of context is their mission to educate children regardless of race, class or gender. As Lehman, Welch and others indicated, if you care about the education of all children, then you will be successful in an urban setting. Yet, there were several ascriptive qualities of these teachers which made them exemplary.

First, they are committed to the education of the children in this school. Moreover, all of them believe it is their mission. As the interviews indicated, either a significant event propelled them into teaching, they considered it their mission, or they were "called" to teach. In sum, it is their life work and probably will remain their life work.

Second, these teachers stress discipline. They believe without it, there can be no learning. It is not an overriding concern in their instructional practice, it is the foundation upon which it rests. Consequently, they are not every day, day in day out speaking about discipline. It was established in the beginning of the school year. They as well as their
students only maintain it. Hence, they were able to focus on what their task at hand was: teaching and learning.

Third, these teachers were more than just curricularly competent. They enhanced the given knowledge base provided by text and so forth to enhance the students' learning. Moreover, they concentrated on not just providing the curriculum to the students, but providing them with an implicit curriculum which emphasized excellence, opportunity, hard work, and common sense "motherwit" life lessons. These seeds of thought or as some have called it "emancipatory pedagogy" provided students with a sense of efficacy and power beyond the mere mastering of the explicit curriculum. These teachers provided their students particularly through their instructional practices an exchanges with backbone from which to build any opportunity in their life. The choice is theirs'. Over and over again, these teachers emphasized choice, determination, hard work, dedication and discipline. Moreover, they themselves modeled it. Consequently, their theories of action revolved around practices curricular or otherwise which enhanced the children's opportunity for success academically as well as in life.

Fourth, these teachers were masters at critically evaluating the social, political, economic, cultural and historical realities of the students they taught. Their phenomenological approach to understanding the world in which these children and they live supplied the impetus for change in their instruction and practices. Hence, their reflective practice was key in creating an environment which fostered learning rather than blamed the child. They built learning relationships with the children and taught them as if they were teaching their own children. Thus, their ability to "be real" with these children fostered and enhanced the learning relationship between the students and themselves.
Fifth, these teachers love teaching. While some contend that there is nothing you can do to prepare teachers to teach in an urban setting, they all would contend that a teacher must love innately what she/he is doing. Otherwise, that teacher will not have the desire nor strength to teach to the child where she/he is and move the child beyond it. For them, there is no greater joy or thrill than to see a child learn.

Six, these teachers had vision. Moreover, they shared the same vision. These six exemplars believe in the efficacy of education to alter the social, political, economic, historical and structural barriers existent in urban centers. In essence, they believe academics and the development of character can and do provide these children with more life chances and choices. Consequently, they actualize their vision thereby giving the students the belief in their own power to transform and transcend the barriers that bind them.

Seven, they knew to some degree the school’s historic mission. While some understood Champion’s history more than others, the important factor was Champion’s history served as a basis for understanding what was possible in the context. In other words, there were no excuses for failure. Nor did they allow their students excuses for failure. In fact, they demanded excellence.

In sum, these seven ascriptive qualities represent the reasoning behind why these teachers do what they do. Their passion, commitment, and vive de la vive rested on their belief in their own ability to make a difference in the lives of children. Hence, they did.

What I Taught Them

The majority of what I taught them was about each others’ practices. Each teacher, particularly those who were isolated by being at ends of halls, where happy to know that they were similar to their colleagues. However, some of them already knew that. Nonetheless,
teachers rarely have the opportunity to visit other teachers' rooms. Moreover, they have even less time to share what has worked for them in successfully building learning relationships with their students. Champion had a history of assigning "buddy" teachers to new teachers which facilitated their socialization to the mission and practices of the school. Furthermore, these teachers served as sounding boards for beginning teachers or even teachers who were not new to teaching, but were new to Champion. This practice provided the continuity of vision of excellence demanded by incoming teachers.

Secondarily, I was able to provide them with an understanding of the history of the school beyond what they already knew and understood. This was significant for most of them in understanding the totality of what Champion had actually created over its lifetime. Even the "old guard" who has been there for some time did not have a complete historical analysis of Champion's history. Moreover, my presence and interest in what they had created provided an impetus for instilling the legacy in the students, and reinforcing the school's practices, and history in the present cultural ethos of the school. In other words, they gained more pride in their school.

Lastly, I provided for the teachers an opportunity to be reflective about their practices. Time and time again, I was thanked not just by these six, but other teachers who had the opportunity to think and reflect on what it is that they are actually trying to do, and why they do it. Consequently, teachers became more reflective and even more committed to their practice, and the reaffirmation of what Champion's legacy is and hopefully, will continue to be.
What it All Means

What it all means is that this school has a history which is still present in the school. The Hall of Champion attests to this tradition of keeping the history of the school. Moreover, it is the best indicator that Champion had exemplary teachers who produced exemplary students who were successful in their academic and life endeavors beyond the doors of Champion.

It means that Champion’s legacy of exemplary teachers continues. While some teachers are not exemplary, a cadre of dedicated teachers empowers the majority Black student occupation. Moreover, they build and maintain learning relationships and environment in which learning does and will continue to take place. No, Champion is no longer in its heyday, but as Murray notes “it is still a good school.”

In essence, Champion’s teacher and student composition was determined by powers existent outside of the school walls. However, there was a short period when the faculty was desegregating that its content remained predominately Black because of the work of Mr. Willis. Furthermore, Champion’s teachers have historically been highly qualified. One thing that has changed significantly, however, is teachers’ connection to the Black community. Teachers no longer live in close proximity to Champion. While some of them are active in their church and the communities in which they live such as Helms, Welch and Nelson, the majority are no longer connected to the everyday life of the Black community. Furthermore, because the school was organizationally changed from a neighborhood school to an regional alternative middle school, the students nor their parents no longer live in the community surrounding the school. Yet, this is about to change.
Conclusion

In conclusion, Champion no longer has an all Black teaching force. Yet, that teaching force and particularly Mitchell as the principal were responsible for establishing an exemplary de facto northern urban segregated school. Dr. Johnetta Cole, current President of Spelman University remembers those historically Black institutions. She writes:

Ironically, today in many public schools attended by African American youngsters, we find neither the strengths of the “colored school,” nor the advantages of a fully integrated public school system. In those “colored schools,” more often than not there were African American teachers who believed in our children and their capacity to learn. With the so-called integrated schools, because of neighborhood segregation we often find African American students with White teachers, and many of our children are quickly and summarily labeled uneducable and left to fully underdevelop. (Cole, Conversations, 1993, 165).

Champion had some of those Black teachers who believed in the ability of Black children to learn. The good news today, however, is that there are still vestiges of that belief existent in this historically Black school. Yet, it has taken almost sixty years to alter the BOE’s early policy on Black teacher and Black student placement at the school. And while the BOE’s policies have been altered by law, the effects of their policy has not been fully explicated.

The story, however, is still unfolding, and so is Champion’s history.
Chapter 7

Champion's Organization and Curriculum

In 1896, a Supreme court decision was made that would forever alter the civil and human rights of African Americans. Plessy v Ferguson (1896) initially established Jim Crow laws in railroad transportation. However, the "separate but equal" doctrine eventually spread to all areas of American life. Education was one such parameter. Consequently, the turn of the century was a time of change in the lives of all Americans regardless of race, creed or gender. By law, a demographic component of American citizens had been regulated to second-class citizenship. Therefore, reform meant not just for the good of people, but for the maintenance of White Anglo-Protestant ideals on race relations.

In Columbus, the Plessy decision eventually led to informal policies of segregation in social relations, housing, and schools (Himes, 1942; Wade, 1992; Wright, 1996). As noted in earlier chapters, Champion came into existence during the heart of the Progressive Era. Consequently, its organization and curriculum were framed by the new group of middle-class reformers such as William Oxley Thompson who controlled the majority of the BOE policies and practices.

This chapter chronicles the evolutions of Champion's organization and curriculum from 1910 to the present. During its eighty-six year history, Champion's organizational structure and its curriculum has been altered five distinct times. In its early period, Champion was an elementary school from 1910 to 1922. In 1922 and through 1937, Champion was organizational changed into an intermediate school. During its third structural shift, Champion
became a junior high. It remained a junior high from 1937 to 1977. In 1977, the BOE reorganized Champion into a middle school because of impending desegregation. For the past nine years, Champion has been a Regional Alternative Middle School (RAMS). However, seeds of change are planted.

Champion's organizational design and curricular changes were predicated upon changes in the overall city of Columbus and changes in the Black community in particular. The BOE policies and practices, however, remain the significant factor in the institutionalization of Champion's curriculum and structure. This chapter elucidates Champion's history as an organizational structure and school. Moreover, it chronicles the five successive periods of change in Champion's school history. In all, Champion's design and curriculum has changed since its inception during the Progressive Era. This chapter chronicles these changes.

The Progressive Era: School Structure, Schooling and the Curriculum

From 1870 to 1920, American society changed drastically. “Reform and progress were watchwords of the day in the early twentieth century, and they were synonymous with the Progressive Era” (Bernard Powers, 1992, 1). Urbanization, industrialization, immigration, and migration forever altered the landscape of America (Hofstadder, 1955; Wiebe, 1967; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). These changes fundamentally determined the constitution of urban centers (Judd & Swansstrom, 1994; Rothstein, 1993). Urban centers became the home of immigrants, particularly Southeastern European immigrants, who were different from their White Anglo-Saxon Protestant neighbors in terms of ethnicity, class, and in the case of African-American migrants from the South, race. These groups, however, became the working-class that dominated the political, social, and cultural constitution of the city (Judd & Kantor, 1992). It was these groups that altered and endangered what it meant to be American. Ultimately, it
was these groups that reformers deemed needed reform (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Hofstadder, 1955; Judd & Kantor, 1992. Consequently, progressive reformers sought to control society, and Americanize immigrants through schooling. Therefore, schools became centers of social engineering where people not only learned to speak English, but where they learned to be American (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1994; Perlmann, 1988).

Ethnic differences as well as class issues combined in urban centers. New immigrants learned that they were the workers, and not part of the emerging middle-class (Rothstein, 1993; Judd & Kantor, 1992; Judd & Swanson, 1994). In order to quench class conflict, progressive reformers, particularly administrative progressives, viewed education as the key to creating a orderly, efficient, and harmonious society (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Klieberd, 1986). The reformers believed that the school curriculum would serve as the vehicle to create an ordered society. During the Progressive Era, three significant reports altered the content of the school curriculum: The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary Education (1893) The Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education (1895), and the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education otherwise known as The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918) (Kliebard, 1988; Ravitch, 1995; Spring, 1994).

Progressive Ideology and the School Curriculum

In 1893, the Committee of Ten developed a secondary education curriculum that advocated a curriculum that prepared students for "duties for life" (Ravitch, 1995, 39). However, it was not well accepted, and received a lot of criticism because it argued for "a liberal education for all" (Kliebard, 1988, 16). In 1895, the Committee of Fifteen presented a revised curriculum for elementary schools. Both committees favored a humanist or liberal education curriculum. Both of these reports, however, were not well adopted because of the
social changes mentioned earlier, and because the advocates of the reports were no longer at the forefront of educational policy.

During the last decade of the era, four competing groups had emerged and fought for control over educational curriculum policy. Herbert Kliebard in *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958* (1986) writes that "with the recognition of social change came a radically altered vision of the role of schooling" (Kliebard, 1986, 1). Schooling was no longer viewed as an end, but as a means to establish a new social order. Education represented a panacea that could cure the social ills of the changing society. Consequently, four different groups vied for control of the school curriculum, however, one group eventually won (Kliebard, 1986).

The four groups seeking to control school curricula were: the humanists, who advocated education curricula based on classical education, the developmentalists who sought to establish curricula that would be centered around the development of the child, the social efficiency group who favored science as a means for creating modern and efficient curricula, and lastly, the social meliorist who sought social progress through education (Kliebard, 1988). However, the social efficiency group or administrative progressives won (Kliebard, 1988; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). "Social utility became the supreme criterion against which the value of school studies was measured" (Kliebard, 1988, 90). Consequently, the administrative progressives viewed schooling as social engineering, and created the standards for school curricula based on their ideological frame of reference (Tyack & Hansot, 1988; Kliebard, 1988; Spring, 1994).

**Progressive Ideology and Administrative Progressives**

Administrative progressives contended that the educational curricula and public education was "an instrument of progress" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, 8). The leaders of this
movement such as Ellwood P. Cubberly, Edward Thorndike, G. Stanley Hall, and others represented the new educational trust (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). The administrative progressives that constituted this educational trust were acutely aware of how changes in the economy had transformed American society. They were worried about the potential for class conflict and eager to use schooling to preserve—but improve—the existing social order” (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, 109).

Thus, the gospel of efficiency which was a strange blend of religion and science served as the ideological foundation for their social construction practices. As developers of educational psychology and educational administration, science and scientific management provided them with the rationale from which to create their “stable social order in which education was a major form of human engineering” (Tyack & Hansot, 107). Because they believed that society was just, they developed educational curricula that replicated the inequities in society.

Consequently, the administrative progressives argued that all children should be given through public education a fair chance to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for success in a specialized credential oriented society. Hierarchy and inequality in the economy were justified by the twin notions of equality of opportunity and meritocracy (Tyack & Hansot, 111).

A differentiated curriculum, however, was the result because administrative progressives sought to replicate society, and not challenge it (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Yet, consensus was built into the curriculum through the implementation of the Cardinal Principles.

Overall, the social efficiency or progressive administrative ideology had three major implications for the educational system.

First, the argument suggested that school curricula should be organized to meet the future social needs of the students. Second, it was believed that school activities should be designed to teach cooperation as preparation for future social activities. Third, social efficiency arguments prepared differentiated curricula based on the future social destination of the student (Spring, 217).

Therefore, constructed conceptions of race, class and gender were institutionalized into the curriculum. Moreover, gender and race ideology were embedded into the foundation of the
present day American school system. However, school structure was the instrument upon which curriculum was instituted.

The Progressive Era and School Structure

As society changed, and the educational systems changed with it, the establishment of new educational institutions such as the junior high school, and the high school as well as compulsory school laws provided the structure from which to socially construct an ordered society based on consensus values. As noted earlier, there were three major reports during the Progressive Era. The Cardinal Principles, however, had a significant affect on the high school (Tyack, 1982; Spring, 1994). The Cardinal Principles, "identified the main objectives of education" (Ravitch, 1995, 410. The seven principles were "Health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure and ethical character" (Ravitch, 1995, 4). Hence, their purpose was to help "shape the high school to meet the needs of the modern corporate state" (Spring, 22). Thus, education exemplified "their faith in the power of schooling to correct structural inequities by improving individuals, to reform the society not by direct means but by teaching youth" (Tyack & Hansot, 111). Thus, the development of the comprehensive high school, the junior high school and the changes in elementary school curricula served as the basis for democratic training through the differentiated curriculum (Spring, 1994).

In the Progressive Era, the high school and the junior high school were firmly established educational institutions. These institutions became the vehicle from which progressive reformers, or administrative progressives implemented new curricula designed to socially construct an ordered society. Therefore, home economics and vocational education represented an essential element within the differentiated junior high, and high school
curriculums. Yet, class and racial differences represented in the curriculum as well effected
different classes, and races differently (Kliebard, 1987; Spring, 1994; Wright, 1982).

**Race Ideology in the Progressive Era**

Embedded within progressive ideology was the notion that people of color, certain
ethnic groups, and particularly Black people were mentally inferior to whites (Spring, 1994;
Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Perlmann, 1988). Consequently, schooling for many groups as well as
specific immigrants consisted of a differentiated curriculum and/or segregated educational
facilities that geared their schooling toward their perspective labor position in society (Tyack
& Hansot, Tyack, 1969; 1982; Spring, 1994; Perlmann, 1988; Anderson, 1988). Thus,
schooling based on race took on two distinct forms: segregated or differential access to
educational facilities and differential access to classical curriculum. In other words,
progressive ideology maintained that these groups were either excluded or tracked through
differential curriculum in schools. Yet, there were regional differences, particularly in the case
of African Americans. Moreover, in urban centers the reforms established by the
administrative progressives "assumed that Negroes belonged on the lowest tracks of the
vocational curricula" (Tyack, 1969). Hence, in urban centers administrative progressives
sought to establish a utilitarian curriculum that through the Cardinal Principles compelled the
migrant and immigrant "to adapt to American ways" (Tyack & Hansot, 177) as well as
institute an industrial curriculum for Blacks that constituted the "great army of incapables"
(Kliebard, 49) Yet, industrial or manual education was not the same as vocational or trade
education (Anderson, 1988). Consequently, African Americans received an inequitable as well
as inferior education as compared to their immigrant counterparts (Kliebard, 1986; Perlmann,
1988; Spring, 1994; Anderson, 1987).
The urban schools, however, provided not only a differentiated curriculum by blending "together the moral and ethical demands of the past with the secular requirements of an emerging industrialism" (Rothstein, 12), but perpetuated the racial, class and gender ideologies. High schools, junior high schools and elementary schools were segregated along racial and class lines (Rothstein, 1993). Moreover, tracking was instituted through the high school in order to stratify on the basis of class and race. Consequently, Blacks in urban centers were "offered industrial and craft training" (Rothstein, 12) rather than vocational education or trade training.

Race Ideology: An Alternative View

Even though the administrative progressives had won the battle over the control of the curriculum, the alternative view did not go away. John Dewey rejected the administrative progressives' ideology. Dewey "rejected the rigid lockstep practices that typified public schools in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" (Ravitch, 1983, 47). Instead, Dewey advocated a curriculum in the school that "might become a fundamental lever of social progress by virtue of its capacity to improve a quality of life for individuals and for the community" (Ravitch, 47). Dewey conceived that the purpose of the curriculum was to provide "experiences and activities that were carefully selected as starting points from which the teacher would direct them [children] to higher levels of cultural, social, and intellectual meaning" (Ravitch, 47) rather than fit children to some order determined by society. Yet, Dewey was not alone. W. E. B. DuBois provided also rejected socially constructed educational curricula, particularly those that rested on race ideology.

Since the institutionalization of slavery, Africans strove to secure educational enlightenment. The movement for educational acquisition for Blacks predates the abolishment of slavery (Woodson, 1919). Since that time, the movement to gain educational enlightenment
for Blacks has had peaks and valleys. During the Progressive Era of reform, Blacks’
philosophical underpinnings on educational reform reached another plateau. Yet, two
dominate views advocated different educational opportunities for Blacks. Booker T.
Washington represented one view while W. E. B. DuBois held the other. Washington’s view
was that of the administrative progressives. Washington favored industrial education for
Blacks (Washington, 1901). Unlike Booker T. Washington who held an accommodationist view
on the education of Blacks, W. E. B. DuBois held a different progressive ideology of
education for Blacks that favored the classical curriculum. While DuBois understood
Washington’s view, his main argument was that it should not be the only view. DuBois’s
ideology contained the inclusion of both perspectives: vocational not industrial and classical,
neither to the exclusion of the other.

W. E. B. DuBois represented a point on the continuum of advocacy for equal and
quality education for Blacks (Stewart, 1831; Walker, 1830; Watkins, 1993; Cooper, 1892).
Nonetheless, DuBois’s position was different from the view of administrative progressives who
sought to prescribe Blacks to an inferior role in society through industrial education
(Anderson, 1987). DuBois’s treatise The Souls of Black Folk (1903) includes the tenants of
his educational philosophy. In the text, DuBois counters the prevailing opinion of industrial
education of Blacks advocated by Booker T. Washington and others. He argues against
Washington’s “singleness of vision” (DuBois, 1903) that advocated industrial education for
Blacks. Instead, DuBois promoted the establishment of the Talented Tenth who would receive
a classical education as opposed to an industrial education. Ultimately, DuBois argued for
equal opportunity for Blacks rather than a prescribed education that would relegate Black men
and women to forever be hewers and drawers of water (DuBois, 1903). DuBois understood
that industrial education “accepts the alleged inferiority of the Negro race” (DuBois, 140). He
rejected the notion of African American inferiority that was prevalent during the Progressive Era. Moreover, DuBois argued against the position that administrative progressives held concerning the "higher education of Negro youth" (DuBois, 140). DuBois maintained that Black children should have the same educational opportunities as their White counterparts. He believed all children regardless of race, or class should be "educated according to ability" (DuBois, 140). However, DuBois championed the advantages of the classical curriculum (DuBois, 1903).

While DuBois has been criticized for his "Talented Tenth" proposal, it is important to note that what DuBois argued against was not an industrial education per se, but the relegation of all Black youth to an industrial education regardless of ability. In the best of both worlds, DuBois wanted African American youth to have equal access to both avenues of educational attainment (DuBois, 1903).

When Champion was built in 1909, elementary, junior high and high school institutions were all part of the organizational structure of schooling in Columbus. Consequently, their organization and curriculum served as the basis for social engineering. The building of Champion, however, constituted a shift in BOE policy toward the education of African American children. It represented an acceptance of the administrative progressives' prevailing ideology on segregated schooling. Hence, Champion's design and organization would forever be linked to the BOE's intention to construct an ordered society in the city. Thus, Champion's organizational and curricular context continued to evolve to maintain social order within Columbus.
Organizational Change and Structure: The Champion Avenue School

From the time of its inception, Champion served an all Black elementary student population. It contained first through sixth grade. Hence, in the beginning, it was an elementary school. Yet, its organization represented the institutionalization of segregated educational facilities for Blacks in the city. Moreover, it represented that administrative progressives controlled Black education in Columbus.

Even though Columbus was the first city to have a junior high school, when Indianola Junior High was built in 1909, Champion's organizational structure and hence its curriculum would not be altered into a junior high until eleven years later. (BOE Minutes, No. 20). At that time, it continued to represent differential access to education for African Americans in Columbus. Over Champion's lifetime, the school has gone through successive organizational changes related to the factors explicated in this dissertation particularly politics, demographics, social practices and customs. Each successive change in Champion's structure has been fostered by external changes in the constituency of Columbus. Consequently, Champion has evolved from an elementary school to an intermediate school, to a junior high, to a middle school and lastly, to an alternative middle school. While the organizational structure of the school evolved, its purpose, however, the education of Black students, remained constant.

In the Beginning: 1910-1922

When the BOE initiated the building of Champion, it was originally called Hawthorne Avenue School because the school resides on Hawthorne and Champion Avenues. However, the BOE eventually decided to call the school Champion Avenue Elementary School. When it opened after the failed protest of the Black community in 1910 under Baker's leadership, its organizational structure and curriculum included 1-6 grades and its curriculum included domestic science and manual training. This curriculum implies that Champion's curriculum
consisted of both a classical and industrial education. Thus, the BOE designed its curriculum based on the current educational ideology which believed industrial education best suited the needs of Black students (Spring, 1994). Yet, other changes occurred at Champion which signified it was intended to incorporate the values of the dominate educational philosophy of the era.

After Champion opened, several things changed. For instance, an Evening School was started in its first year for the education of African American adults. In 1912, its first organizational change took place when a kindergarten was added. In addition to the kindergarten, Half-Play Schools were added (BOE Minutes, No. 18, 1912, 182-183). The Half-Play School was designed to develop motor activity, constructive work, free play and instructional games with music among other activities were included in its curriculum. It, too, corresponded to the prevailing purpose of schools. Champion was beginning to serve more than educational objectives. It began to be used by the community for activities ranging from social gatherings by surrounding churches such as the Hawthorne Avenue church to other community and educational activities by such organizations as the School Extension Society and St. Paul's Neighborhood House. By 1920, the school had become a major part of the developing Black community.

During this period, industrial education grew in Columbus and continued to influence the educational practices in Columbus. In 1915, the President of the BOE reported

The work in the industrial departments of the school system has shown a steady growth. Manual Training and Home Economics centers have been gradually increased and today furnish the opportunity for splendid work (Annual Report, 1914-1915, 24).

Champion had had the first Domestic Science and Manual Training Department. While industrial education had increased in the schools, vocational education was not always open to Black students. Vocational and Industrial education are not the same (Anderson, 1987; Spring,
At the Trade School, it was reported that “eight colored boys who wish to study auto-
machines, but the men in the shops object to their presence, so it has been impossible for us
to place them” (BOE Minutes, No. 20, 1918, 95). Consequently, organizations of the city
provided the materials for their subsequent training. Moreover, millinery and manual training
classes were provided in the YMCA for Champion students at night (BOE Minutes, No. 19).
Thus, the manual and industrial training provided to Black students was limited and not the
same as vocational education which is skill/trade oriented. By 1920, Champion was about to
encounter its first major organizational change.

In September of 1920, the Superintendent Francis recommended Champion’s
organizational structure and curriculum be altered to represent an intermediate school. While
the BOE agreed to this motion, the school was not actually changed to an intermediate School
until 1921. The Black community protested, circulated petitions, and held mass meetings
concerning the changes in the school. However, the changes were implemented. When its
design was altered, it included K-8 instruction. Moreover, Mitchell’s position as principal
allowed this change to occur because he was qualified to head such a structure.

In 1922, the BOE added ninth grade to the institution. A local paper read, “Champion
adds junior high level by adding ninth grade. Objections raised in Black community” (Call
and Post, 1976). Blacks protested the alteration of the school structure because they believed
that the next step would be a Black high school. In essence, they were protesting the further
segregation of Black children. No Black high school materialized. However, the BOE still
maintained its administrative progressive stance as indicated in its reply to the Black
community. The Superintendent stated;

The pupils at the Champion Avenue School have a splendid spirit and the
quality of their work is improving year to year. The courses of study used in this
school, in both elementary and junior high departments, are the same courses followed
in other grade and junior high schools in Columbus. The work of pupils transferred
from Champion Avenue to other buildings compares favorably with that of pupils transferred from other schools.

The general condition of the Champion Avenue School are now very satisfactory. The building itself as on of the best in Columbus. It is provided with electricity. The rooms are large, light and well ventilated. The Manual Training and Home Economic rooms are exceptionally good. The playgrounds are unusually ample and well equipped.

The School Superintendents and Supervisor have been cooperating in every way with the teachers and parents of the Champion Avenue School in a sincere effort to carry out the recommendations of Superintendent Francis, approved by the BOE, providing the same educational opportunities for the pupils of the Champion Avenue district that are provided for the elementary and junior high school pupils in the other districts of Columbus. (BOE Minutes, No. 21, 1922, 56).

Thus, the BOE was instituting differential curriculums and segregated educational facilities. No other school in Columbus consisted of both an elementary and junior high. However, the BOE asserted that the alteration of Champion's organization best served the needs of the students. Consequently, the Black community continued to utilize Champion as a part of the community. However, the next period would bring increased segregation of Black students which eventually would make the next stage of Champion's history possible.

**Champion Intermediate: 1922 to 1937**

From 1922 to 1937, Champion remained an intermediate school which educated students from kindergarten to Eighth grade. As Mr. Lucien Wright indicated "few had an elementary and junior high school" (Wright, 1996). The Black community protested the changes in Champion because they felt it would further segregate Black students. Nonetheless, Champion opened as an intermediate school in 1922.

During this phase of Champion's history, more teachers and courses were added such as French. It continued to be a major part of the community. Moreover, the industrial program was a major part of the curriculum. Champion even had a shoe repair shop which provided "shoes for indigent pupils at a reduced cost" (BOE Minutes, No. 21, 1924, 912). Furthermore, vocational training was provided for some of Champion's students. As the
school continued to grow, it needed repairs. The majority of Mitchell's communication during the period to the BOE concerned repairs on the buildings floors, grounds and walls. The Black community, however, paid a portion of these expenses (BOE Minutes, No. 21, 1922, 88; No. 22, No. 23). From 1922 until 1937, Champion remained an Intermediate school containing K-9 grades. However, as the Black community grew, so did the constriction of their attendance at area schools. It was not the last time Champion's curriculum and structure would be modified.

**Champion Junior High School: 1937-1977**

As noted previously, in 1931 and 1932, two all Black schools were instituted in Columbus. Some of the student populations from Champion were relegated to the Mt. Vernon and Garfield Avenue School buildings which were elementary schools. However, as the Black population increased more schools were needed for their education and at different levels. Subsequently, Champion's organizational structure and curriculum would be transformed again in 1937. The BOE made Champion into a junior high exclusively in 1937. They did so, however, through covert means. Again, the newspaper recounted the change. It read:

> Although having been promised a hearing and... told form time to time that there was no thought of changing the present status of the school, which was built only for an elementary school, yet the board in closed session with the sole purpose of further segregating our children in public schools passed a resolution making the Champion Ave. school a junior high school *(Call and Post, 1976)*.

From 1937 to 1977, Champion would remain a junior high with 7th-9th grades.

This period of Champion's history remains its most stable period. Its curriculum continued to possess classical and industrial course work. Thus, students were tracked along these two lines of educational attainment. Moreover, Champion would receive students from all over the city as predicted by the Black community constituency which protested the change from intermediate to junior high school. In fact, some of Champion's students were
transported by the East Side Cab Company (BOE Minutes, No. 25). It became the predominant junior high for Blacks in the area. However, Champion's Evening School and other community services were continued as well.

The Parent Teacher Association played a significant part in the history of Champion. They promoted the school, provided support to the faculty and students, hosted Open Houses at the school and other events such as sporting events. Champion earned its first City Championships in the junior High League in 1926. The school would have bake sales, Science Fairs, and all kinds of academic competitions. Champion has hosted Walk-A-Thons, supported the Red Cross, and Isabelle Ridgeway Nursing Home as well. Thus, community service was also part of the implicit curriculum of Champion almost from the beginning with the institutionalization of the Evening School which during the 1920s became Americanization Classes and back to an Evening School. Moreover, health services were also provided through the school. A dentist and a doctor worked out of the school. These social services were also part of the school's structure and were located in the basement of the school.

From 1910 to 1977, Champion was an entrenched part of the Black community. Champion continued as a junior high until another key event, desegregation, altered the structure of the building, the staff and the curriculum. By the time Champion's organizational structure was altered in 1977, it had been renovated twice in 1937 when it was made into a junior high and in 1953 to accommodate the growing student population. It had an average student population by 1977 of 700 students.

While several cities implemented magnet schools in an attempt to keep White families in central cities, Columbus tried several tactics, one of which was the implementation of middle schools, and alternative middle schools in particular. Champion's organizational
structure would be changed to meet the demands of yet another external crisis in the city, desegregation. However, Champion was almost closed.

Desegregation and Organizational Change: 1977 to the Present

According to Bill Moss, "when desegregation came, they almost closed Champion until I protested. It was turned into a middle school" (Moss, 1996). Since 1977, Champion has been a middle school. Its organizational structure was changed from a junior high with 7-9 grades to a middle school, incorporating 6-8 in their design structure. Some of Champion's present teachers indicated that changes associated with desegregation were difficult. Yet, Champion maintained its vision, but it also gained new books, supplies, and a diverse student faculty population because of desegregation. In the yearbooks for those years, as a middle school Champion had a fairly mixed population of students. Hence, it was still successful in gaining fiscal resources and maintaining student and teacher cohesiveness and progress despite organizational changes. When Champion was changed to a regional alternative middle school, however, curricular changes would eventually affect the student and faculty population.

Champion became a Regional Alternative Middle School (RAM) in 1987. According to Mr. Baranco, the Art teacher who student taught at Champion in 1991, "as an RAM, Champion has a designated school attendance zone as well as a lottery." The alternative middle school's purpose was also to attract Whites to attend these schools which were supposedly racially balanced. Consequently, Champion was renamed in 1987 the Champion Alternative Middle School of Arts and Sciences. However, Champion's shift from a middle school to an alternative middle school did alter its curricular focus for the first time in its history. Mr. Murray recounts, "A lot of classes and programs were done away with. Not all students are good at math and science or the arts." (Murray, 1996). When it was a junior high
and into its middle school phase Champion continued to offer both an industrial and classical curriculum to provide students with choices in the curriculum. Consequently, Champion’s focus on math, science, and the arts including language arts displaced its more comprehensive curriculum which included other courses which were traditionally along industrial lines where students could be successful as well. Moreover, it did attract Whites for a while as well as the small Asian and Hispanic population in the city. It still has a small contingency of White students. Furthermore, it also attracted teachers. Mrs. Nelson stated, “I wanted to come to Champion because it was an alternative school.” (Nelson, 1996). However, Champion’s constituency has reverted to a predominately Black student population. Currently, more than 90% of its student population is Black. However, its curriculum remains strongly focused on the arts and science with very little industrial focus. According to the teachers, particularly Mrs. Helms, “We have an excellent curriculum.”

Champion’s Past and Present Curriculum

Champion’s curriculum is composed of three major components: the explicit curriculum which constitutes mandates often listed in school policies, the implicit curriculum which is related to intended and unintended practices exhibited in the everyday nature of schooling, and the null curriculum which represents what is not taught in schools (McCutcheon, 1995). Yet, the most important component in curriculum regardless of type is “the quality of the curriculum’s content and goals and the activities employed to engage students in it” (Eisner, 1991, 75). The degree to which teachers at Champion engaged students in the curriculum can be addressed, both historically and currently.

Over Champion’s history, the majority of the explicit curriculum has consisted of the combination of both classical and industrial education. Apparently, Mitchell subscribed to the notion preferred by DuBois which included both aspects of the curriculum for the education of
Black children. Using Champion's Hall of Fame, interviews, newspaper articles and the such to gage how well former teachers engaged students in the curriculum, it would appear that they were successful based on the degree of success their students encountered. Moreover, the implicit curriculum of the school which emphasized excellence also was a powerful stimulator which fostered student engagement in not only the mastery of the curriculum, but fostered student transferability of the curriculum to contexts outside of the school walls. Much of Champion's implicit curriculum was grounded in excellence, but also discipline and hard work. it was also grounded in the culturally relevant and emancipatory pedagogy of its Black teachers (Delpit, 1995; Foster, 1995; Irvine, 1989). For example, Eugene Walker recounted how he felt when he left Champion. He recalled, "I felt like I could be a professor when I left Champion. I felt like I could do anything" (Walker, 1996). Mrs. Brooks concurs. She stated, "Every teacher gave you homework. They didn't care about what you had to do in your other classes. You were expected to do it all. I spent many a night completing homework" (Brooks, 1996). All of the former students interviewed, spoke to how the implicit curriculum of Champion manifested in their success outside the walls of the school (Anderson, 1992; Brooks, 1996; Hayes, 1996; Helms, 1996; Ranson, 1996; Walker, 1996; Wright, 1996). Mrs. Brooks, and others commented on the success of student's once they left Champion. Quite a few of Champion's students went on to college such as Dr. Janice Hale who wrote Unbank the Fire: Visions for the Education of African American Children (1994), and Black Children: Their Roots, Culture and Learning Styles (1986). In sum, Champion educated the new cadre of Black leadership often associated with DuBois's notion of the aforementioned "talented tenth" (Franklin, 1984; Parsons, G. 1993). Hence, Champion's implicit curriculum was culturally relevant and indicated that it was important for the students to be disciplined in order to succeed not only in life, but to succeed as African Americans in a racist society.
Whereas students were never tested on their responsibility to “uplift the race” through educational excellence, all of the internal workings of Champion demanded that they do just that. As indicated earlier, however, Champion's implicit, explicit and null curriculum changed as a result of organizational change predicated upon changes outside of the school walls. Yet, what is the curricular content of Champion now.

Whereas Champion's past implicit curriculum was discipline, service, and hard work exemplified by its principal, Mitchell, and the Black teaching staff, it is now obedience. They are two different concepts. One demands compliance without understanding while the other places the impetus on the person's ability to garner their energies to complete a task. Yet, my six teachers demonstrated very little of this implicit curriculum centered around obedience. They fostered an integrated curriculum in which both teachers and students framed the activity along a continuum which was never static. However, some of these teachers such as Welch and Nelson were more teacher-driven in their classrooms. On the other hand, Lehman and Helms often provided students with opportunities to frame, alter, transform and transfer the curriculum content. In essence, however, all of these teachers implicit curriculum reminded students that they were the most important mediator of choice regardless of the lesson.

At present, Champion's explicit curriculum includes the subjects of health, mathematics, science, social studies, reading, language arts, and unified arts which includes music, art and physical education. Computers are utilized in the school, but they are outdated. However, this year, the school is scheduled to receive new computers. Mr. Taft has played a central role in establishing the updated computer systems in the school. The faculty viewed computer access for their students as the most significant curricular change for the upcoming year. However, the null curriculum represents such courses as home economics, metal and wood shop which are more associated with junior high school programs. Champion's students
no longer have the opportunity to learn metal shop or other industrial courses. Consequently, students in the school who are not academically gifted may be impeded. However, other resources have been supplied to the school. Champion is one of 18 middle schools. However, unlike the other alternative middle schools its student population is regional and locational. Consequently, students can attend Champion from all over the city. However, it is still an urban school. One significant curricular innovation which has supplemented the school's curricular and fiscal resources has been its adoption by Secretary of State, Robert Taft.

Secretary of State, Robert Taft adopted the school in 1991. However, Taft and his wife have been involved in the school for some time (Taft, 1996). One year Taft gave his raise to the school to be used for academic support materials. Taft’s presence at the school has also altered the curriculum. Students are able to engage in such activities as mock elections, job shadowing, voter registration and computer literacy. All of which move them beyond the school house doors. On several occasions, Taft and his office provide tutoring, a book program, and other activities to the school. Additionally, they host a “Teacher Appreciation Day.” Taft’s involvement in the school has added to its curricular base as well as its financial base, particularly the purchase of computers for the school. Overall, this component of the curriculum benefits the students and teachers and is similar of other school partnerships in other cities. Another organizational structure of the curriculum is connected to the 6/7 grade cohort.

William Glasser’s “house philosophy” has been implemented as the organizational structure of the 6/7 grade cohorts. This philosophy permits students to remain with the same teacher for two years. In essence, students stay with the same teachers beginning in six grade and through the 7th grade. This cohort system is supposed to enhance student-teacher relations by allowing student and teachers to really get to know and understand each other
thereby enhancing the learning relationship and school success for middle school students.

While some teachers such as Lehman and others enjoy this organizational innovation, others such as Nelson do not. She contends "children need a fresh start and the opportunity to have new experiences. This organization prevents that from occurring" (Nelson, 1996). Regardless of internal organizational structures, the present curriculum of Champion is predicated upon specific curricula related to the arts and sciences. Yet, it is about to experience another transformation.

Organizational Change and Community Participation

Champion's curriculum has been historically mediated by the external and internal structure of the school. So, has its organizational structure. Even though Champion has experienced several organizational changes, prior to desegregation, it remained a major part of its surrounding Black community. All data gathered such as school yearbooks, school papers, newspaper articles, and school pictures identified Champion as a vital part of the Black community that was supported not only by parents, but the community as well. Mrs. Brooks recalled how the community supported the school. She noted that "there was not difference between school and home" (Brooks, 1996). She contends further that "a lot of times, not only parents came to see how you were doing [at the school], but neighbors, relatives, and other community people were interested in your education, too (Brooks, 1996). In my interview with Mr. Willis and others, they pointed out how supportive the parents were of the teachers. He noted how parents would instruct teachers to discipline children if "they acted out (Willis, E., 1995). Moreover, Willis recounted how when he became a teacher at Champion that not only he, but other teachers were invited to dinner at student's homes (Willis, E., 1995). While Champion has always been surrounded by an economically poor Black community, parents were willing to share whatever they had with teachers. This practice demonstrates the
reverence and admiration the Black community had for teachers. Moreover, at that time, Champion's teachers lived primarily within the confines of the Black community because (Butler, C., 1992; Saunders, 1992; Ward, 1993; Willis, E., 1995). Moreover, Black teachers also attended the same churches as their students, shopped in the same part of town, and even lived on the same streets as their students. However, the connections that Black teachers had with the Black community would change.

While desegregation was the biggest factor which altered Champion's relationship with the Black community, other factors related to the changing urban context did as well. For example, housing discrimination laws permitted Black who had the economic resources to move outside of the traditionally Black housing area. Black teachers were among this cadre of middle-class Blacks who could afford better housing now that discriminatory housing policies could be circumvented by law. Moreover, Champion's traditional Black teachers were replaced by White teachers who did not live in the Black community, nor were adequately prepared to maintain linkages between themselves and the Black community. In all, the changing context of urban America also changed Champion's relationships with its community, and its historic Black teachers.

Conclusion

One of the issues facing Champion when it began its 1995-1996 school year was whether or not it would remain open. It did. However, after the 1995-1996 school year, Champion will no longer be a regional alternative middle school with its curriculum focused around arts and sciences. It will return to a neighborhood school. Moreover, it will be "just a middle school" (Hayes, 1996). It will receive nine more teachers and six more special education units. Consequently, Champion's organizational structure and curriculum will be altered again.
Since its inception, Champion has evolved from an elementary school to an intermediate school, from an intermediate school to a junior high school, from a junior high school to a middle school, and from a middle school to an alternative middle school. Recently, it has begun its shift back towards a neighborhood school. It appears to have almost come full circle. With each of these changes which were caused by the population growth of the Black community, BOE policies, and desegregation, the curriculum was changed as well. However, the curriculum over much of Champion's history has consisted of two components: classical and industrial education. It has only been recently that Champion has lost this focus. This change in curricular focus was primarily due to the change in the student population.

Still, Champion is about to evolve again. Champion's impending transformation, however, will probably alter the school's organization and curriculum again. During the 1996-1997 school year, it is projected that Champion will have an enrollment of over 500 students, more than twice its present enrollment. New teachers and more leaning disabled units will be supplied to the school. Champion will no longer be an alternative middle school. While its present curriculum, organizational structure are exemplary, whether or not both will remain that way is unknown.
CHAPTER 8

ANALYSIS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation addressed the life-history of a historically Black northern de facto segregated urban school. It chronicled the changing urban context in which the school evolved, the leadership of the school, the life histories and practices of the teachers, and changes in the organizational structure of the school and the curriculum. This study was a historical analysis of a single-case study; and it addressed as holistically as possible the emergent themes in the life of the Champion Avenue School. Essentially, this research was transformed from a study of the first de facto segregated school, to a qualitative analysis of a "good" northern urban de facto segregated school. Moreover, this study revealed and explicated those qualities that are associated with a "good" school, especially the contributions of the Black principals, teachers and community within the changing political, social and economic landscape of urban communities.

Research Questions

Two primary research questions were addressed in this dissertation: First, what were the past learning relationships existent in a medium-sized Midwestern urban school, and how were they developed, enhanced and maintained within a changing social, political and economic environment? Second, what were the current teachers' understanding of the historical learning relationships in the school, and how did those relationships foster community and parental support? These questions were used to help guide the direction of this research. Moreover, the research questions employed in this study were also used to:
explicate the historical factors that produced this exemplary school, and ascertain if any of the
relevant historical factors that contributed to the development of Champion were existent in the
present school practices. Therefore, this researcher attempted to ascertain whether or not the
school's history contains ascriptive characteristics from which educators could gain some
valuable insights as to how to better prepare teachers for the urban environment (Siddle
Walker, 1993; Stoddart, 1993; Weiner, 1993). One key factor that helped to address the
research questions was the methodology.

Methodological Insights

The multidisciplinary approach combined with a multivariant methodology and theory
provided this researcher with insight into the cultural, geographical, political, social and
historical context in which Champion was and continues to be embedded. Moreover, the
methodology supplied this researcher with a knowledge base and valuable insight from which
to examine the past and present ethos of Champion, particularly as it pertains to leadership,
teachers, organizational change, curriculum and community participation. Thus, critical theory,
phenomenology, and historiography as well as urban, class, race, and gender theory converged
to provide the crux of the methodological, theoretical and analytical framework of this study.
Hence, these philosophical underpinnings formed a multi-method and analytical framework
often existent in urban single-case studies (Coulby, 1992; Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991).
The methodology revealed several interesting interconnections between and across disciplinary
boundaries that effect urban education and schooling (Hill & Jones, 1995).

The a priori and emergent themes were dependent, independent, and interdependent
within the external and internal context of Champion (Anhalt, Digaetano, Ragas, & Henig,
1995). The resultant ascriptive qualities addressed were: the urban context and related factors,
school leadership, teachers's histories and theories of action, Champion's organization and curriculum, and parental and community participation. Organizational change, community participation and curriculum were emergent themes. The methodology employed lent itself to the explication of these themes.

A qualitative single-case study with historical underpinnings was chosen as the primary method to answer the research questions. Stake contends,

The real business of case study is particularization, not generalization. We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others, but what it is, what it does. There is emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself (Stake, 1995, 8).

Thus, it was this researcher's intent to examine the uniqueness of this particular school from a holistic approach as much as possible given the limitations of qualitative research. The methodology selected by this researcher accomplished this task. Moreover, a single-case study bounded by space and location, a unique feature of this school, along with the context in which it was embedded, northern and urban, allowed this researcher to utilize past and present sources relevant to illuminating the uniqueness of this particular school. In essence, a case study approach furnished the methodological framework, and it enabled the researcher to gather as much “thick description” as possible. This methodology, however, does have other attributes such as theory generation.

Snow and Anderson maintain,

The quintessential characteristic of case studies is that they strive toward a relatively holistic understanding of cultural systems of action. By cultural system of action, we refer to sets of interrelated activities and routines engaged in by one or more networks of actors within a social context that is bounded in time and space (Snow & Anderson, 1991, 152).

Although the case study approach has its flaws, this approach was still appropriate for this study because it afforded the researcher with an understanding of Champion bounded within
the historical and contextual framework of a northern urban city. While the primary purpose of the case study was to explicate the uniqueness of the particular case, the case study approach can lead to the reconfiguration of generalizations (Stake, 1995). Theoretical generalizations can be garnered from case studies (Orum, Feagin, & Sjoberg, 1991; Snow & Anderson, 1991; Yin, 1990). “New interpretations and concepts or reexamining earlier concepts and interpretations,” (Orum, Feagin, & Sjoberg, 1991, 13) in different ways can be accomplished through case study research. Hence, Snow and Anderson contend that a case study can develop new theory or extend existing theory (Snow & Anderson, 1991). The particulars of this case lent itself to the generation of theory. Thus, a central factor in the subsequent theory generation was the particulars of the case which were bounded by place, space, and time.

**Toward a Theory of Urban Education**

Orum, Feagin and Sjoberg argue the utilization of a case study permits a researcher to capture and experience everyday circumstances of people and “offer a researcher empirical and theoretical gains in understanding larger social complexes of actors, actions, and motives” (Orum, Feagin & Sjoberg, 1991, 8). Although the development of new theory or the extension of current theory was not the initial intent of this researcher, the methodology chosen, however, lent itself to theory generation.

The primary salient factor throughout this case, was the history, social actions, and complexities related to the urban setting of this school. An urban case study seeks to understand the qualities inherent in the case as it pertains to the city. Because an urban case study addresses the interconnections between institutions in the city, and changes in all of these factors over time, a theory of urban education based on an examination of such a school
should address all of these parameters. Thus, to grasp an understanding of the urban school, urban educators must not only understand the context of the school, but the local history and organizations which directly impact on the efficacy of the school. While Jean Anyon provides important insight toward understanding the factors which impede inner-city school reform, she also offers useful theory toward that aim. This author's goal is to extend Anyon's view even further based on the findings of this research.

In "Inner-City School Reform: Toward useful Theory," Anyon provides an alternative theoretical framework to the previously utilized theory related to sociological/educational assumptions that guide school reforms aimed at inner-city schools. Anyon contends that in order for reform to be successful, one should address "the city itself, and even beyond, is, perhaps, required" (Anyon, 1995, 65). Therefore, this researcher contends that a theory of urban education must rest on the historical understanding of the urban context, and the particular context in which the teacher candidates will engage. One must remember, that although most teacher candidates are required to take courses in education history, the particulars of these courses need to be modified and integrated with the local history of that particular urban education setting. Thus, one cannot expect students to understand the complexities of urban education if that student does not understand the urban context nationally, and the locally.

Urban education is embedded in the social historical context of urban areas (Anyon, 1995; Liston & Zeichner, 1990; Kantor & Benzel, 1990). This research reveals that urban education is comprised of urban history and involves the utilization of geography, sociology and politics. Thus, urban education theory is constructed upon the disciplines of sociology, history, politics and geography as the foundation for understanding the field of urban education. Urban education is related to all of these fields of study. Education alone cannot
stand as the basis for providing philosophical underpinnings to teacher candidates. As indicated in this research, people are in conflict in urban centers over space. Champion was created by the politics of racial polarization, and by the conflict over the efficient use of space. Moreover, the subsequent dual-system of education which emerged in the political, social and economic context of Columbus was developed based on housing patterns, demographic change, political influence and economics.

Urban education occurs in a bounded system (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). The system itself provides the basis of urban education theory. For instance, the education of Blacks in Columbus was circumscribed by the geography, politics, and social parameters of the city. Education did not occur outside of that context, but within that circumstance. Consequently, a theory of urban education rests on the theoretical understanding garnered from these interlocking factors existent in urban areas. Moreover, historical change or continuity provides the theory with a basis of why reforms have not been successful because they have either worked to alter either internal or external structures, but not both. Anyon argues,

Implicit in all of these activities is a belief that educational institutions can be changed independently of other institutions—that schools can be fundamentally altered without making structural changes elsewhere in the social system, such as political and economic institutions. This perspective assumes a micro/macro distinction, in which a setting is artificially isolated from the larger structural dependencies that contribute significantly to its history, form, and functioning. It seems to me that this conception operates when educators attempt to reform inner city schools without attending to the surrounding macrostructural political, cultural, and economic forces that have created and marginalized a class of extremely poor people whose children attend the schools (Anyon, 1995, 65-66).

This case analyzed the complexities inherent in one such school, Champion Avenue School. This researcher contends that the uniqueness about Champion was that it was a de facto segregated northern urban school. The case study approach allowed this researcher to examine as holistically as possible how urban education for Black children was affected by the micro/macro structures of the school and the city, and how these two factors were not
inherently separate, but continually interconnected over this school's lifetime. Thus, urban education theory must address these aspects related to urban education, and how these demarcations influence the education of urban students, the efficacy of urban teachers, and the role of urban history, geography, sociology, and politics especially related to school board policies in the development of quality schooling in urban centers for urban youth.

Nagel defines theory as "any more or less systematic analysis of a set of related concerns" (Kliebard, 1982, 11). However, McAdams contends that "the utility of any theory ultimately depends less on the elegance and logical structure of that model than on how well it predicts or describes concrete empirical phenomena" (McAdams, 1982, 60). Consequently, the urban education theory generated from this research incorporates both of these aspects in its framework. Moreover, conflict theory particularly as viewed as a political process provided the theoretical framework for this inquiry because the questions asked in this inquiry were fundamentally concerned with issues of power and understanding (ways of knowing). Moreover, historical ethnography informs this inquiry because it allowed this researcher not only to understand the world of the participants, but understand the historical power relationships present in the urban contest, competing cultures and ideology (Coulby, 1992; Grace, 1978; Thomas, 1993). The political process model of conflict theory provided the conceptual framework from which this research defined educational access as a political phenomenon and process (Coulby, 1992; McAdams, 1982). Furthermore, this researcher contends that critical theories such as political process theories permitted the researcher to explicate the complexities and conflicts persistent in urban school systems historically. Moreover, urban/social theory explicates power relationships and the inherent conflicts over space in urban settings (Castells, 1992; Coulby, 1992; Finkelstein, 1992). While most studies on urban education have not combined theoretical and historical analysis, this study did. Thus,
the methodology framework addressed the research questions, and generated the
dకnentioned urban theory of education which rests upon the premise that urban education
theory consists of understanding the complexities of both inside and outside the school walls.
The historically constructed demarcation between the two inhibits effective urban education.
This assertion was garnered from the research findings.

Research Findings

Summatively, the case study provided this researcher with access to the micro social
order of human interactions, the shifting nature of historical process, and the salient features of
complex organizational structures existent in urban schools and the cities in which they exist
(Orum, Feagin, & Sjoberg, 52). This was accomplished through the examination of an array
of historical documents, through the conduction of interviews, and through participant
observation of the present school structure, teachers and students.

First, and foremost, all qualitative and quantitative measures supported the community
nomination of this school as a "good" school. Interviews, documents, yearbooks, pictures and
school newspapers. Moreover, other resources explicated the strength and richness of the
learning relationships which existed and continue to exist (although altered) in this school.

Even though community nomination and previous research led to the explication of the
particulars of Champion, after the conclusion of this research this author argues that Champion
was an exemplary all-Black school because of its leadership, teachers, parental support, and
community participation. Today, it continues to be a "good" school because of two of those
historical factors. This is an important finding of this research. Historically, scholars have not
associated the word "good" with urban schools (Rothstein, 1993). Moreover, it is even less
associated with northern urban de facto segregated African American schools. Often, social
scientists have focused on what is “wrong rather than search for what is right, to describe pathology rather than health” (Lawrence Lightfoot, 1983, 10). However, researchers have identified “good” characteristics associated with effective all-Black schools while at the same time foreshadowing the context that did not equitably provide these schools with financial and other resources such as supplies and equipment (Edmonds, 1979; Foster 1990; Hawkins, 1987; Jones, 1981; Lawrence Lightfoot, 1983; Siddle Walker, 1994; Sizemore, 1982). Few of these studies, however, focused on such schools found in the North (Edmonds, 1979; Sizemore, 1982; Sowell, 1976). These studies explicate the existence of these exemplary schools. Thus, Champion Avenue School represents the existence of such a phenomenon in a northern urban center historically characterized by five distinctive “good” qualities existent in all-Black exemplary schools:

1) A strong and committed leader or principal (Siddle Walker, 1993; Moody & Moody, 1988; Sowell, 1976).

2) A climate of high expectations in which no children are permitted to fall below minimal levels in an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid or oppressive (Moody & Moody, 1988).

3) Strong, competent and highly educated teachers who emphasize the teaching of basic skills in a well-prepared classroom where students spend most of their time on clearly defined tasks (Walker, 1993; Moody & Moody, 1988; Sowell, 1976).

4) Community support and participation (Siddle Walker, 1993; Irvine & Irvine, 1984).

5) The existence of a “positive sociocultural system in which uniquely stylized characteristics exist that are reflective of the student population developed independently of White control (Siddle Walker, 1993; Foster, 1992; Kind, 1992; Irvine & Irvine, 1984).

While these and other characteristics may exist in "good" schools, these were the descriptive characteristics existent during Champion's history which identified the school as a "good" school. While Champion has experienced change over time consistently throughout its history, the majority of these qualities have existed within the school as indicated through the
community nomination of this particular school. Moreover, this researcher agrees with Lightfoot in that good is not meant to be "something close to perfection" (Lawrence Lightfoot, 1983, 309). Since its inception, Champion has been beset by imperfections which were explicated throughout this research. However, according to Lawrence Lightfoot, a researcher's willingness to admit to imperfections and to "search for their origins and solutions is one of the important ingredients of goodness in schools" (Lightfoot, 1983, 309). Finally, Champion's imperfections were and continue to be the direct result of macro structures that impede the micro structures of learning relationships in urban schools. Hence, an examination of such a school could only generate theory to explicate similar schools by examining within as well as outside of the schools doors to explicate how such schools created a "good" school within the urban context (Suttles, 1986; Wirt, 1995). Thus, the goodness of this school is the fact that it existed amidst imperfection as indicated by its community nomination.

Second, this school was once a "great school," and it currently remains a "good" school (Murray, 1996). It remains a good school because of the proliferation of exemplary teachers who have maintained and continued the legacy of Champion. These teachers were able to proliferate the legacy of Champion because they knew of its history and because they themselves were committed to the education of the whole student. Of the six teachers chosen for this single-case case study, all of them knew something about the history of this school. However, some knew more than others primarily because of their tenure in the school, and others because they had been actual students in the school. Thus, part of the historical practices of the school still continue today such as the teacher practice of standing by the door and the socialization of new teachers to the school practices and purpose. In other words, the "buddy teacher" system still reigns at Champion. Consequently, prospective urban school teachers need real mentors who effectively demonstrate high expectations; who have strong
identities; who maintain various teaching methods; who possess an understanding of the social/political/historical experiences of the children they teach, and their respective communities; who advocate for quality education for children; and who can provide teachers with process rather than products for improving their teaching (Gay, 1995; Guyton & Hidalgo, 1995; Hope King & Bey, 1995; Stoddart, 1993).

Third, African American teachers have contributed and continue to play a significant role in the maintenance and survival of this "good" school. Champion probably has one of the highest Black teacher ratios in the city. Seven teachers on its teaching staff of twenty-four are African American. Moreover, the African American teachers were primarily the keepers of the cultural history of the school. For instance, Mr. Murray provided the author with an entire history of the school leadership and data on the organizational changes in the school. Champion's African American teachers were committed to providing a quality education to the students because of the cultural belief in the efficacy of education. Hence, they viewed it as their mission. Black teachers at Champion were more than just role models, and mentors. They were a valuable and respected part of the leadership in the Black community (Foster, Franklin, 1990; Irvine, 1989; Siddle Walker, 1993). Champion's former Black teachers were highly qualified. Moreover, they understood the political/social/historical context of African Americans and their role in providing their students with resources from which to transcend the perils of racism. They believed and maintained the core values of the Black community: one of which was education. In essence, Black teachers such as Willis through Welch understood implicitly and imply explicitly to their students that education is the key to success for African Americans.

Fourth, leadership in this school continues to be a factor which mediates the internal and external efficacy of the institution. From Ms. Baker to the present Mr. Hayes, the school
principal's ability to access the powers that he has played a vital role in securing needed resources for the institution. Moreover, the internal leadership and the vision of the principal has determined whether the school succeeded in their mission: the education of African American children. Mitchell had a mission, and while there are different views held on his leadership outside of the school, it was clear that within the school walls he was "the bear" (Willis, E., 1995). The most mediating factor for principals has been the amount of "power" given to them to establish policies and practices in the school outside of central administration and union policies. Whereas Mitchell could decide who would be hired at Champion based on their qualifications, he was also able to dictate the vision of the school, and insist that the teachers uphold that vision. Over Champion's history, the principal's power within the school walls has dissipated due to historical and policy factors. Hayes no longer can hire who he believes will work for the best interest of the children, he has teachers sent to him whom he must "bring on board" to his vision of the school (Hayes, 1996). While Mitchell could maintain his vision without question and demand excellence from his teachers, Hayes vision is based more on the shared consensus of his teachers and himself. Consequently, the leadership in urban schools, particularly in light of the lack of power of the principal, is critical to the success of the school and the students.

Fifth, the external forces which create policy such as the BOE within this urban context have provided the structural, organizational and curricular parameters of this school over its lifetime. Champion has experienced five organizational changes which altered the organizational structure and curriculum of the school. It has been an elementary, intermediate, junior high, and middle school. All of these changes were caused by the ever changing political, demographic, economic and social context of this urban city and the overall cities relationship to the Black community. Whereas Champion had a strong tie to its surrounding
Black community, it no longer does. The greatest detriment to the parental and community support at Champion has been desegregation. As an regional alternative middle school, Champion has a city-wide parental and community support base. Yet, changes in family economics, job placement and the such hampers the ability of parents who no longer live within a stones throw to support the school as they did in the past. Moreover, curricular changes caused by organizational changes has instituted a null curriculum. In the past, Champion students had access to classical and vocational curriculum. This has changed and for students who are not academically gifted, it leaves them with few options for success. Regardless of these changes, the historical purpose of the school has remained consistent: the education of African American children. Despite organizational and curricular changes to desegregate the school, Champion maintains a predominately African American student population. However, desegregation was successful in altering the teacher composition of the school.

Contributions to the Literature

First, this research added to our understanding of Black education in northern urban centers. This case study illuminated the effectiveness of de facto segregated education in the North. Moreover, it furnished an understanding of the historical and present day role and contributions of Black teachers and administrators in the urban North (Butchart, 1988). As Franklin, Irvine and others contend, Black teachers and principals were significant in the Black community not just as role models, but as leaders who maintained the cultural ethos of the Black community (Franklin, 1990; Irvine, 1989; Siddle Walker, 1993). While a great deal of literature points to the need for more minority teachers, it also points to the fact that most likely Blacks and other minorities are not seeking teaching as a career choice. Consequently, historical and present day illuminations of the efficacy of Black teachers should be utilized in
teacher education course work (Ward Randolph, 1996). Champion did indeed represent three stories in this case: a story of educational excellence, a story of African American education history, and a story of Black urban education. In essence, it adds to the literature on African American education history, African American teachers's educational philosophy and history, and African American northern urban education history. However, its legacy holds other insights.

Second, this research explicated how urban education consists of what occurs outside of the school walls, and what occurs inside the school walls. It is critically important to understand both of these arenas in urban education, particularly as it relates to the education of racial and class minorities (Anyon, 1995; Suttle; 1986; Wirt, 1995). As Anyon argues, this often held dichotomy in education impedes long-range reform (Anyon, 1995). This author contends it also impedes quality learning in urban schools. Schools are socially embedded institutions. Urban education consists of both internal and external factors in the urban context such as conflict over the utilization of space, politics, economic factors, social dynamics. Moreover, these factors do not remain outside of the school doors, but effect the efficacy of learning in the school, and relationships between the school and its community. However, a transcender of both parameters are teachers and their understanding of the context of schooling and their students realities.

Third, Irvine and others argue that the major factor impacting upon student success in addition to family, community and other sources, is the teacher (Haberman, 1995; Holmes, 1995; Irvine, 1989; King, I. E., 1990; Stoddart, 1993). This research indicated that the principals and teachers shared a vision and maintained vested interest in the education of Black children at Champion. Moreover, Champion's former teachers vision was not "colored". They were well aware of the factors outside of the school walls which circumvented the lives of the
children they were educating. Hence, while the context is critical, so is a teachers's understanding of the context, their ability to transcend the context, and develop effective learning relationships with their students, their parents and their community. Former teachers at Champion and the six teachers observed in this study demonstrated that effective teaching and learning can occur and has occurred in Champion despite external and internal factors which could have impeded learning. Thus, one can generalize that effective learning can occur in other settings with similar qualitative characteristics. Consequently, the literature on teacher pedagogy, the implicit curriculum and learning relationships were enhanced. Teachers are products of their own experiences, and as these teachers demonstrated, their own personal theories of action were exemplified in the implicit curriculum of the classroom. When Champion was an all-Black school, the implicit curriculum was “you had to be ten times better than whites” (Willis, E. 1995). Even though race was not an explicitly expressed factor for Mitchell, his vision insisted on educational excellence that was equal if not better than that received by Whites. Mitchell and his teachers believed education was the panacea to cure racial ills for Black students. When Champion became a desegregated school with a desegregated teaching force, Willis contends that teachers could not demand educational excellence in a mixed setting based on African American cultural norms. Prior to desegregation, their vested interest, determination, and beliefs were never hidden, but part of the implicit curriculum expressed explicitly in their classroom practices. Moreover, their understanding of themselves, their reflections on their teaching, their school's history and present political reality, their mentoring experiences, and lastly, their understanding of the curriculum as a mutable entity allowed them to foster positive learning relationships with their students. These same qualities, however, were demonstrated by the all-Black staff and the six teachers in this study. Thus, future urban teachers must be able to understand their own
personal theories of action, the context and politics of the setting in which they will teach, and the importance and practicality of fostering good relationships between student's parents and their community. Lastly, future urban teachers should be provided with role models and mentors which possess these characteristics (Gay, 1995; Guyton & Hildago, 1995; Hope King & Bey, 1995).

Fourth, organizational change and community participation more so than the explicit curriculum were emergent themes in this research. However, community relationships and school organization are critical factors in Champion's history. While Columbus's Black community has been historically divided over segregated schooling in Columbus, they were not divided over their commitment to Champion and its teachers once the school doors opened. Although Champion has changed organizationally several times, from the beginning, the community embraced the school and supported the teachers because they believed they had their children's best interest in mind. As Mr. Willis, Mr. Wight, Mrs. Willis, Mrs. Brooks and others contended the school and the community values were the same. Both wanted the students to succeed. The greatest detriment to Champion's success was desegregation. While this analysis requires further study, this author is willing to contend Champion's organizational changes during desegregation severed its relationship with its historic community—the Black community. As a regional alternative middle school, Champion's community is located all over the city. This phenomenon accounts for the lack of parental support and community participation at Champion which was once the center of its surrounding Black community. While Champion has faltered as a result of the lack of parental and community support, whether or not it will be able to recapture this part of its history, remains uncertain. However, as a neighborhood school particularly servicing the Black community, it has already been
relegated as a school that can do without sufficient resources such as modern computers (Hayes, 1996).

Thus, this single-case study added to the literature in urban education, African American education history, pedagogy and curriculum as they relate to African American teachers and schools, and lastly, teacher education. Still, what policy can be explicated from this research.

**Policy Implications**

Should urban schools hire teachers who have not been prepared for urban schools? Or should they institute mechanisms which provide incoming urban teachers with practical and theoretical understandings of what it means to be an urban educator? Will teacher unions allow changes to occur in urban schools which demand excellence from their teachers? Regardless of the questions and answers, policy can only be effective if it can be implemented. What is practical and who has the power in the urban context to implement policy changes?

As indicated in this research, the school board determines the majority of policy in urban schools. However, their policies are implemented at the school level and at the bureaucratic level associated with unions, state boards of education, and certification standards. On that note, this author contends the most effective avenue for policy implementation is in colleges of education. The success of urban schools will depend on either identifying teachers who are prepared to teach in culturally, ethnically, racially, and class diverse settings or to either grow them. While state boards of education can mandate certification standards, colleges of education implement those standards. Hence, while state boards of education are state-wide organizational structures, school boards are not. School boards can require teachers to retool themselves. Whether they will or not, however, as this study indicates, is a political
issue, particularly in urban areas. In essence, colleges of education provide teacher candidates and current teachers with the core curriculum for teaching. Hence, colleges of education curriculum is the focus for this policy initiative.

**Urban Teacher Education Curriculum**

At the present time, teacher educators’s research indicate that the majority of teachers at present, and in the future will be White females (Stoddart, 1993; Ward Randolph, 1996). Quality “teaching is contextual, situated, and developmental” (Stoddart, 1995, 104). Moreover, it is a process, and not a product (Gay, 1995). Nonetheless, White female teachers need an understanding of the context, the situation and have access to the resources from which to develop effective teaching, particularly in urban schools. Linkages between teachers and urban colleges of education are necessary for continual and formative education experiences.

Yet, what should a urban education curriculum look like?

This researcher contends an urban education curriculum would possess these components. They are:

1). Urban history which explicates the conflict inherent in the historical development of urban areas or cities

2). Urban sociology which explicates an understanding of demographic groups and competition over space related to territory and geography.

3). Urban theory which explicates the conflicts over resources and space in urban areas.

4). Urban geography which explicates how space is used in urban areas.

5). Urban politics which explicates how politics in urban areas effects the quality of life for different constituency and service delivery in urban centers.

6). Group history of the predominant groups encompassed in urban centers should be studied beyond fast-food multicultural education.

All teachers prepared to teach in urban schools should have a thorough understanding of these courses in addition to traditional education curricula. For the most part, the emphasis in
teacher education is on methods. While methods are important, so is an understanding of the contextual space in which pedagogy is practiced. Weiner's, and Ward Randolph's research even though they elucidate different aspects of teacher preparation both point to the need for a new model for urban teacher preparation (Ward Randolph, 1996; Weiner, 1993). Moreover, this researcher agrees with Haberman in that this knowledge base is not intended to teach to poverty, but to provide perspective urban teachers with an understanding of the situated context of urban education in order to transcend that context rather than teach to it.

In addition to new courses, new experiences should also be provided to teacher candidates and current teachers (Stoddart, 1993; Weiner, 1993). Prospective urban teachers should be provided with opportunities to observe the complexities of urban education which include urban classrooms, school board meetings, faculty and administrator meetings, community activities, and the such. Moreover, they need exposure to effective mentors and models, either historic ones or present day exemplary teachers who have been successful in educating African American and other minorities (Foster, 1991b; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ward Randolph, 1996). Teacher candidates should be exposed to urban schools long before they are actually accepted into an urban education curriculum tract. While some may argue that it would be unfair to develop separate tracts, we cannot continue to permit people to teach in urban centers who do not believe in the efficacy of their own work. Hence, by identifying students who are committed from the beginning to teach in urban schools, and providing them with the theoretical and practical understanding process related to urban education, those students are more likely to become successful teachers or better teachers to urban students. If this is our goal, then we will have to institute policy which permits only students who are committed to urban education to engage in quality learning experiences which will enhance their ability to teach effectively in urban schools. Additionally, we must provide them with
life-long learning resources which will enhance their success once in urban schools. Consequently, we will thereby ensure better teachers for urban schools, and eventually greater success for urban students. Lastly, we must require that teachers who are already certified retool themselves in order to teach in a urban school.

The Future of Champion

Based on its history, Champion will continue to educate primarily African American students. However, it will never again have an all-Black faculty. Still, whether or not Champion will survive the recent restructuring in Columbus in the fall will depend on several key factors:

1). The ability of Mr. Hayes to articulate and build consensus on the vision and mission of Champion.

2). The continued commitment of teachers and staff to provide a quality education to the majority African American student population.

3). The reemergence of parents and the community as a vital part of Champion’s role in the community as the center of the African American core value of education.

At present, it appears that the nine teacher vacancies will probably be filled by inexperienced teachers. Moreover, as a community school which services the Black community, Champion will most likely not receive adequate resources if its history is any indicator. Consequently, Champion will once again depend on the resources which made it into an exemplary all-Black school even though it will no longer be such a school: its principal, its teachers and its Black community.

Conclusion

Since the publication of Robert Woock’s Education and the Urban Crisis (1970), and Joseph Kretovics and Edward Nussel’s Transforming Urban Education (1994), it is apparent
that there are historical issues related to urban education, and hence, urban schools. These issues have ranged from community aspects of urban education to the politics of urban education. Regardless of the causes of change or the problems in urban schools, it is clear that urban schools are not effectively serving their constituency (Irvine, 1989; Sirotnik, 1991; Fine, 1994; Holmes, 1986). This research attempted to explicate a case of a community nominated school which did educate its African American constituency effectively.

In 1910, the Champion Avenue School was officially opened. History was made for two primary reasons. First, it was the reinstitution of segregated educational practices in a city and a state which legally forbade the establishment of such an institution. Second, Champion eventually would develop into an exemplary all-Black educational institution. While Champion came into being and existed in an urban northern de facto segregated setting, that context did not impede the facilitation of an exemplary all African American educational facility. In fact, some say it enhanced it. Champion’s history explicates the richness and strength of what a shared vision and purpose can create in a less than perfect context.

Moreover, while principals are significant in establishing vision, practices and policies within the confines of a school, if teachers do not summarily share and wholeheartedly believe in the vision of the school, the children will not receive an quality education. What has made Champion significant and continues to make it significant was its relationship to the Black community and Black teachers relationship to that community and the shared vision of education by both parties as a resource from which to overcome racism. Moreover, African American teachers contributions and commitments to the “education of the race” cannot be overlooked. Nor can the historically grounded respect and leadership given to their work be dismissed as insignificant. In order for urban schools and urban teachers to be “good,” they must understand the history, lives, culture, goals and dreams of its constituency. It will simply
not be enough to have sympathy, but teachers particularly White teachers who have not historically been part of that history, culture or vision, must have empathy (Darder, 1993). Moreover, they should be prepared to intellectually and critically understand the world which has circumscribed the lives of African American children and other people of color within urban areas. Thus, their goal must be to overcome and transcend problems associated with urban schooling rather than teach to them.

Few scholars have defined segregated educational settings as excellent, particularly as it relates to the education of African American children (Clark, 1965; Rist, 1970). In fact, the politically driven dismantling of de jure and de facto segregated educational settings was a must to ensure access to equitable educational resources for African American children. To everyone segregated schools represented inequality at its worst. However, few scholars have examined the actual schooling practices in these institutions beyond their fiscal structures. Even though the physical and economical resources were less than adequate, some researchers contend the learning that occurred in those schools may not have been less than adequate, but ranged from poor to excellent (Anderson, 1988; Foster, 1990; Irvine, 1989; Irvine & Irvine, 1984; Siddle Walker, 1993; Sowell, 1976). Champion exemplifies one such school that was exemplary. Although this researcher is not advocating for a return to segregated schools, Champion's distinct legacy clearly indicates that effective learning can occur in such settings. Moreover, Champion's ascriptive characteristics can provide us with practical constructs for developing effective and quality urban education for urban students, particularly African American students.

In conclusion, Champion was an exemplary northern Black de facto segregated school which did and continues to provide quality learning for its predominately African American student population. Consequently, this research celebrated that tradition of academic
excellence grounded in the core values of this particular northern urban de facto segregated African American community. Regardless of the context or the ascriptive characteristics of the school, the school community, teachers and principal must have a shared vision which demands the children in the school regardless of race, class or gender receive and equitable and quality education. Champion provides us with one such particular case. Moreover, we can learn from the particularities of this specific case. Whether or not it provides insight into similar cases is not the purpose. Yet, this author's historical analysis of Champion enhances our knowledge and understanding of the actual learning and teaching practices which existed in this particular northern urban de facto segregated school. However, more qualitative research needs to be conducted to address similar and additional aspects of Black educational life in the urban North.
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APPENDIX A

MAP OF SCHOOLS
APPENDIX B

SURVEY AND QUESTIONS

Questions

1. Tell me your story?
   Family       Church
   Community    School

2. What were your school experiences like?
   What kind of school did you attend?
   Kind of student: Honors/Above Average/Average/Below Average
   Academic and Extracurricular Activities
   Was it important to your family, community, church?

3. Community Service or Group Memberships
   Kinds of? Why? Any related to this particular school?
   Greek letter organization?

4. Work experiences
   As teenager    As Adult

5. What and who do you teach now?

6. How do you perceive your role as an educator to be?

7. How would you describe or characterize your work?

8. Why did you become an educator?

9. How do you relate to children?

10. How do your students, their parents, and the community relate to you?

11. What do you know about this school’s history?

12. Why are you in this particular school? What has your experience been like? How have you changed? Was it what you expected? Have you ever visited a child’s home?
***Survey***

Name______________________________________________________________

Position____________________  Grade Level________  How Long__________

Subject(s) Taught____________________________________________________

Education:
- High School
- Undergraduate
- Graduate

Role Model(s) or Mentors:
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________

Professional Organizations or Unions:
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________

Prior Position(s):
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________

School Committees or Projects:
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________
- _______________________________________________________________

Circle All That Apply:
- Married/Single/Divorced
- Children
- Yes or No
- Age (Optional) _____
- PTA Member
- Yes or No

Comments:
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APPENDIX C

LETTERS

January 16, 1996

240 E. Keiso Rd.
Columbus, OH 43202

Ms. Lucretia Williams
Columbus Public Schools
270 E. State Rd.
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Ms. Williams,

I received a message from your administrative assistant, Ms. Helen Maynard, that indicated that I needed to specify the number of teachers that I needed to interview during my research project. Because this is a historical study, I need to interview from six to fifteen of the twenty-nine teachers from the representative groups as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen or more</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven to six</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five and below</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think that the number of interviews will provide this researcher with a good representative sample of the teacher population in the school based on experience. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call. I can be reached or a message can be left at 262-3726 (h). Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Adah Ward Randolph, M.A., M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University

cc: Joan Harding
February 23, 1996

Mr. William Hays
Principal
Champion Alternative Middle School
1270 Hawthorne Avenue
Columbus, OH 43203

Dear Mr. Hays;

This letter follow up our telephone conversation of February 16, 1996. The Research Review Committee recently approved my research proposal for my dissertation entitled "A Historical Analysis of an Urban School, 1909-1995: Implications for Present Practices, A Single-Case Case Study." At this time, I am meeting with you to seek participants for this study.

As noted in earlier communication, this study will examine the historical as well as present day schooling practices of a good urban school. A major part of the study is the educational practices and philosophies of the administrators and teachers of the school. I have attached a letter sent to Ms. Williams that outlines my proposed participants as well as the time schedule and administrator/teacher requirements approved by the Research Review Committee.

This research is primarily concerned with the impact an urban school’s history may or may not have on the present day administrative, teaching and learning relationships in an urban school. It examines the role of change as it relates historically to the school, teachers, curriculum, school organization, student efficacy and community involvement in the school. In essence, it is a social, cultural and educational history of an historic urban school.

Because this is a historical study, real names will be used unless the participants deem otherwise. I would like to assure you that the contents of any conversations that I might have with you will be held in strictest confidence. Any references or information ascertained during our interviews and utilized in the dissertation or subsequent scholarly work will require your written permission for usage.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Adah L. Ward Randolph, M.A., M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University
February 23, 1996

Mrs. Mackoline Brooks
Librarian
Champion Alternative Middle School
1270 Hawthorne Avenue
Columbus, OH 43203

Dear Mrs. Brooks,

This letter follows up our personal conversation of February 23, 1996. Our conversation centered around my dissertation entitled "A Historical Analysis of an Urban School, 1909-1995: Implications for Present Practices, A Single-Case Case Study." This study examines the historical as well as present day schooling practices of a good urban school. A major part of the study is the educational practices and philosophies of the administrators and teachers of the school.

This research is primarily concerned with the impact an urban school’s history may or may not have on the present day administrative, teaching and learning relationships in an urban school. It examines the role of change as it relates historically to the school, teachers, curriculum, school organization, student efficacy and community involvement in the school. In essence, it is a social, cultural and educational history of an historic urban school.

Because this is a historical study, real names will be used unless the participants deem otherwise. I would like to assure you that the contents of any conversations that I have with you will be held in strictest confidence. Any references or information ascertained during our interviews and utilized in the dissertation or subsequent scholarly work will require your written permission for usage.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Adah L. Ward Randolph, M.A., M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University
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PICTURES

Mr. J. Arnett Mitchell (Center) and Champion Avenue Teachers
1938
Champion Avenue Teachers: 1992-1993