The Cleveland Schools Incorporate their Ethnic Students: Early Multicultural Pathways

Murry Nelson

Introduction

The difficulties associated with school placement for immigrant and culturally diverse children are not a recent phenomena. During the period 1910 to 1920 two factors combined to produce a veritable explosion in the school population. One was the increased number of students staying in school to elementary graduation and, in many cases, secondary school graduation. This phenomenon was promoted by schools somewhat out of self interest, but much more so, out of the altruistic belief that more schooling would benefit students and, ultimately, produce a better society. American business joined in this support of longer school attendance since better educated citizen meant easier to train, better prepared workers. Economically, then, this was a great boon for American businesses. It also reinforced the popular practice of efficiency in industry and supported the commensurate linkage in education.[1]

The third factor supporting the enormous growth in school population was the recognition by a number of recently arrived immigrant groups of the direct and swift advantages to those citizens with more schooling.

All of these factors are seen, to a large degree today in cities like Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Antonio, and New York. Examining the experience of one city's approach to the influx of new students in the early part of this century may provide suggestions and insights for today's educators, planners, business people and government bureaucrats. Cleveland, Ohio in the years 1910 to 1920 was an ideal example of how a city recognized its needs and sought innovative, community based solutions to meeting those needs.

Cleveland: The City

In 1910 Cleveland was the fifth largest city in the United States with a population of just under 561 thousand behind only New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and St. Louis in size. Its growth had been phenomenal from 261 thousand in 1890 to 381 thousand in 1900, increases of 46% for each of the two census periods. Like most American cities of the time, the growth had been largely due to immigrants, and Cleveland had one of the largest populations of foreign born or children of foreign born populations of the eleven American cities reporting populations between 400 and 750 thousand in 1915's "mini" census. Cleveland's population of 35% foreign born whites was exceeded only by Boston's 36% and Cleveland's 40% native whites of foreign parents was exceeded only by Milwaukee's 21%.[2] Thus, Cleveland was one of the most foreign of American cities and approximately 1/3 of the population was of school age. In the Cleveland survey, Leonard S. Ayres (1917) claimed that

> Cleveland has a larger population of foreign inhabitants who are unable to speak English than has any other large city and that nearly one third of all the men of voting age are aliens possessing no political rights in this country and owing no allegiance to the government of the United States. Nearly half the school children come from homes in which some foreign language is regularly spoken. (21-22)

As will be discussed further these sociopolitical realities combined with economics to shape the direction and recommendations of the Cleveland School Survey.

In order to place the school in a financial setting within the city, the survey staff compared Cleveland's wealth and tax rate against the same ten cities of approximate population. They determined that Cleveland was one of the wealthiest (figured in terms of wealth/inhabitant), ranking eighth of the eleven but one of the most frugal (figured in terms of taxes/ $100,000 of wealth), ranking fifth. Finally the eleven cities were ranked by amount spent in tax dollars on various services--libraries, sanitation, education, general government, recreation, police, fire and highways. Only in libraries, where Cleveland ranked third, was Cleveland among the top five in any of these. In education Cleveland ranked eighth. Obviously, this data would later be used to buttress proposals for increased funding for the Cleveland Schools.

School Survey

The notion of the school survey is analogous to the function now served by accrediting agencies, except that the survey team had no power, thus no leverage to see their recommendations implemented. Commensurately they had no particular standards that had to be met within each school system.

School systems usually hired a survey director who assembled a team of a size appropriate to carry out the tasks desired. This may seem almost a tautology, but team sizes could be as small as one person (for a general view of the school or schools in question) or as large as the Cleveland team which consisted of nineteen authors, three permanent "special" staff members and eight staff assistants.

The time for a survey might vary also from a few months (to provide a "snapshot" of the school system) to a few years to see the system in full scale operation over more than one work cycle.

Funding for a survey was provided by either the school system itself, private foundation funds or a mixture of the two. In the case of the Cleveland School Survey, it "was conducted under the auspices of the survey committee of the Cleveland Foundation, which supplied the necessary funds" (Ayres, 1917, 19).

The Cleveland Foundation was a community trust "established in 1914 by Mr. Frederick H. Goff through the agency of the Cleveland Trust Company and for the purpose of forwarding social progress and human welfare in that city" (Ayres, 31). The foundation funding was generated from various sectors of the Cleveland community and because of their diverse, yet focused concern with Cleveland, "The foundation decided to enter upon a systematic policy of investigation of the conditions, problems and needs of the municipal community," (Ayres, 32) with the education survey being the first of these investigations. Field work took place over a fifteen month period from April 1915 to June 1916.

The newspapers in Cleveland gave the survey's onset large coverage and conveyed a sense of excitement. A page one article in the Cleveland Press discussed the significance of education, its relationship to industry and the objectives of the school survey ("Ayres to Begin...," 1915).

Thus, the "interested parties" in this survey were the community leaders of Cleveland rather than some political, educational, or governmental agency. Nevertheless those with economic and political power were unlikely to want to see their power greatly diminished. They sought school improvement to indirectly sustain their positions, though they also wished to genuinely seek municipal reform. Indeed, this was an era of municipal reform for reasons of altruism, social justice, to a degree, as well as to strengthen the economic base of the cities. The school could provide all of that.

The schools of Cleveland were typical of many urban sites at the time. Political corruption was often evident and scandal was not uncommon. The actions of Superintendent Frederick and the School Board were a source of tension among many groups in the city, including the Cleveland teachers, and the Women's Civic Association (cf. "Frederick is hit...," "Seek Successor...", "New Vote...," "Take up Abolishing...").

Most surveys were published in a large volume which was presented to a school board or similar agency and the team might then either discuss it with the agency or be finished with their tasks. The Cleveland Survey was issued in 25 small volumes (26, if the summary volume is included), then submitted to the Board of Education, the superintendent of schools and "such interested school officials as the board or the superintendent might designate," (Ayres 1917, 34). Thus, a volume on buildings was submitted to the architect and building director, the one on financing the schools to the treasurer of the school board and the chief financial officer of the school district, etc.

After a series of conferences, revised copies were printed as monographs of 60 to 300 pages. then, an interesting action occurred. Each monograph, as it came from the printer, was given to the public and to the newspapers at a public luncheon in one of the leading hotels. (Ayres 1917, 35). At the luncheon (which cost $.60) each monograph author summarized her or his findings and answered questions. Monographs were sold there at 25 cents, less than the cost of publication.

Though invitations were sent out to attend the luncheon, they were open to anyone. They were held weekly for more than a year in a hotel dinning room, that accommodated about 300 people. Audiences filled the hall comfortably though occasionally strained it. Audiences seemed to change as the topic changed. "A discussion of school finance filled the hall with business men; one on medical inspection attracted a large number of doctors; while one on school room methods brought out the teachers and principals." (Ayres 1917 36).

The newspapers covered these meetings regularly, increasing their coverage as the meetings grew in popularity and occasionally stories on the survey appeared on the front page. All this served to bring the process "to the people." Though all Cleveland groups were probably not able to voice their views, this was a first, real effort at popular responses to school problems, to real school-community partnerships early enough in a process to allow for input with impact. Whether such input actually led to significant, or even modest change is not discernible. Nevertheless the model of allowing citizen input may be reflected in the findings and the recommendations.

The Team

The 19 member survey team that Leonard Ayres assembled was one of the most extensive and distinguished to ever conduct a survey. And many were conducted in the period 1910 to 1930. Every large school system and many smaller ones seemed to be the subject of a survey. School directors saw a "successful" outside evaluation as a badge of excellence. Many foundations and municipal leaders saw this as one avenue toward overall Urban improvement- a team like Ayres assembled would add credibility to the aspirations of excellence held by Cleveland's city fathers.

Leonard Porter Ayres, the director of the survey was born in 1879 and after graduating from Boston University took his first teaching job in Puerto Rico in 1902. He was a regional superintendent in Caguas in 1903 and San Juan in 1904 before being named superintendent of schools for all of Puerto Rico in 1906. He later returned to Boston for graduate school receiving his Ph.D in 1910.

Ayres worked for another Cleveland foundation beginning in 1908 and following receipt of his doctorate. At the time of the survey he was director of the Division of Education and director of the Division of Statistics of the Sage Foundation. In 1920 Ayres left education to become vice president and chief economist of the Cleveland Trust Company in charge of statistics.

Frederick H. Goff, founder of the Cleveland Foundation, was president of the Cleveland Trust Company as well as an officer of three different midwestern railroad companies and a former senior partner in a number of Cleveland law firms. Was there any connection between Goff's position as founder of the foundation and president of the bank and Ayres' selection as head of the survey and subsequent employment by the bank? Clearly Ayres was eminently well qualified to lead the team. He was one of the most respected statisticians in education and had done no fewer than three major surveys in schools by 1916. His subsequent employment may have just been a fortuitous turn of events, but the findings of the survey must have been consistent with Goff's views and expectations or Ayres' hiring would have been less likely.

The remainder of the survey team had expertise and sometimes, prior Cleveland connections. George Johnson, for instance, had been a teacher in Cleveland from 1901 to 1903 after being superintendent of schools from 1895 to 1901 in Andover Massachusetts and before becoming superintendent of recreation for the city of Pittsburgh. Johnson, then assistant professor of education at Harvard, authored the volume, *Education Through Recreation*.

Edna Bryner, author of *The Garment Trades, Dressmaking and Millinery*, was on Ayres' staff at the Russell Sage Foundation as were no fewer than three other members of the survey team. They were Earle Clark, author of *Financing The Public Schools*, R. R. Lutz, author of *The Metal Trades: Wage Earning and Education*, and Clarence Perry author of *Educational Extension*.

The team also had an impressive number of educational leaders. Walter Jessup, the president of the University of Iowa was one. At the time that Jessup joined the survey he was dean of education at Iowa, having previously served in the same position at Indiana University. Jessup also ended his career as a foundation employee. In 1934, he was named president of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching and in 1941 he became president of the Carnegie Corporation, a position he held until his death in 1944.

One other dean, William S. Gray, of the University of Chicago, was a member of the permanent staff of the survey, though at the time of his appointment to the survey he was an assistant professor of education at the University of Chicago. He later was co-author of the Scott-Foresman reading series and was sometimes known as the father of 'Dick and Jane' Books.

Four of Gray's colleagues at Chicago were also associated with the survey. Charles Judd, a survey team member who authored the *Measuring The Work of The Public Schools* volume, was director of the School of Education at Chicago. The two other staff members Joseph Gonnelly and George Counts were graduate students at Chicago. Counts was appointed Professor of Education, at the State College of Delaware in 1916, returned to Chicago in 1926 as a professor before going to Teachers College, Columbia in 1927 where he remained as professor until 1956.

One last survey team member of note was, also a Chicago faculty member J. Franklin Bobbitt, who had directed school surveys of South Bend, San Antonio, Denver and, later, Los Angeles. He also served on the Illinois State survey and the Grand Rapids (MI) survey.

The team, then, was dominated by midwesterners, mostly with Cleveland or Chicago affiliations. The Clevelanders were mainly from Ayres' own staff and, at least eight of the 19 had been or were currently employed by educational foundations. Should one impute malice or evil from this? Hardly, but it should be born in mind that such foundations were formed largely to help the unfortunate and in the long run, to keep an orderly society. If that meant retaining or reinforcing a tiered society and helping the less fortunate to succeed "in their place," so be it.

General Findings and Conclusions

Of the ten major findings by the survey team, three addressed "professionalizing" school leadership in the interest of efficiency and effectiveness. The other findings essentially said that Cleveland schools were well run, inadequately financially supported, well staffed and with good facilities.

The question still remained, however: How to maintain excellence amidst the massive influx of immigrant children into the school system. At least three volumes addressed this issue directly or indirectly. *The School and The Immigrant*, (Herbert Miller); *What The Schools Teach and Might Teach*, (Franklin Bobbitt); *Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children*, (Daniel Mitchell). Jessup's *The Teaching Staff* failed to acknowledge pupil differences in teacher training or practice.

Bobbitt's volume, unfortunately was limited to the codification of subject areas such as Social Studies, Mathematics, Foreign Language, English, Manual Arts, Science, all of which was more finely honed in subsequent works by Bobbitt, *The Curriculum* (1918) and *How to Make a Curriculum* (1924). In all of these works Bobbitt saw individual differences existent, but merely suggested less work, attenuated work or slower place for less able

students. Most immigrants were seen as less able. This is not to say that Bobbitt's volume did not arouse controversy. On November 29, the *Cleveland Press* blared that the schools were behind the times with students not fitted for work. This conclusion was based on Bobbitt's survey volume which had just been released ("Cleveland Schools...").

The two volumes, then, that directly address the multicultural concerns that are recognized today were the volumes on the immigrant and on exceptional children, though Ayres incorporated some of the discussion in the summary volume. Ayres, drawing from Mitchell emphasizes a major point in the placement of exceptional children who are divided into two groups referred to as "socially incompetent." The former are those who

> are of normal mentality and who will spend their lives in association with normal people. The deaf, the crippled, the foreign and the children of the open-air classes. Since these children are socially competent and are to spend their lives in competition with the rest of us they should be educated in special classes in regular schools and have at least part of their work in the regular classes with the normal children.
>
> (Ayres 1917, 65)

Today we would see this as "pull out" program reflecting the least restrictive environment of an individual education plan (IEP).

On the other hand, the socially incompetent such as the "feebleminded and the epileptic" will need to be cared for forever in society, most likely in institutions. Thus, "(t)he duty of the school system is to prepare these children for self-support in institutional life, and the most reasonable way of doing this in large cities is to aggregate then in special classes." (Ayres 1917, 65).

Tests to identify "social incompetence" were not without controversy, themselves. The Binet test was criticized by Ayres for its inaccuracy. The test was given to the School Board and six of the seven members failed the version for 12 year olds. Within a week the Ohio State Board of Education weighed in with its own criticism of the test ("Who's loony now?...").

Regarding immigrant children Ayres felt that "it would be a comparatively simple matter and a very desirable procedure to modify the instruction given in each school so as to meet most adequately the needs of the pupils of the different foreign nationalities." (Ayres 1917, 66). Ayres notes that it is administratively impractical to separate pupils of the different foreign nationalities. The reason given is the same reason that such plans are impractical today in cities like Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, i.e., the children come from a great number of non-English speaking homes (often out numbering the English speakers in any one classroom), but there is no educational basis on which they can be taken together. (Ayres, 66). It is noted that children belong to more than 50 different nationalities and speak a great variety of languages and dialects. So too with aforementioned cities today. In Hollywood High School in Los Angeles, for example, there are 85 languages spoken. The parallels to Cleveland are obvious.

One recommendation that was made addressed a concern still existent today majority teachers and minority students. The survey report stated, "it is essential that the teachers should know something of the history and characteristics of the different national groups represented by the pupils."(Ayres, 291). Other concerns will be discussed more fully later in this paper.

Examining Exceptional Children

Cleveland's schools sought to meet the state of Ohio decree that each student shall be educated. It was recognized that the curriculum should not be arranged just for the limited group of exceptional children nor for the majority and to ignore certain exceptional students. In an early recognition of the view today of schooling exceptional children, it is noted that "(t)he aim and purpose of compulsory education will be defeated unless the principle is followed of giving to each child the most suitable instruction." (Mitchell, 18).

The Cleveland school personnel recognized the following "types" of exceptional children--incorrigible boys, deaf students, "backward" children, "defectives", "Steamer" classes, epileptics, crippled children, retarded children, blind students, open air (anemic/tubercular) classes. It was noted that the brighter and the slowest pupils need to advance as rapidly as they can and "a curriculum should be devised which meets the needs of these children in the same way that the curricula for the other children will fit their needs." (Mitchell, 19).

Earlier it was mentioned that exceptional children were seen as either socially competent or socially incompetent. The criterion for determining that is "social fitness." Can a child be educated for self-support and an independent existence in the community? If so, he is socially competent." (Mitchell, 21).

Socially Competent

These socially competent include the blind where they are in normal classes with special tutors. Mitchell recommends similar treatment for other socially competent but exceptional children.

The same treatment is advocated for deaf students, who were being taught in special schools. Mitchell does not advocate immediate and total immersion but a gradual immersion starting with "physical exercises, manual work

and similar activities," (Mitchell, 30), with other instruction in special classes in the regular school building. As children become adroit at lip reading, their time will be more increasingly with "normal children". There is no mention of signing which is not surprising since it was heavily suppressed at this time both in the U.S. and Europe.[3]

Mitchell notes that opposition for this plan will likely arise from those who see it as inviting chaos and lack of control into the classroom. Thus, the key to temper that is an improvement in the training and understanding of the teaching staff of the deaf. In a comment appropriate for any era, Mitchell notes that "It is poor policy to spend large sums of money on the erection and maintenance of a plant and handicap the work by failing to provide adequately trained teachers." (Mitchell, 31). All teachers of the deaf should be trained in lip reading and articulation and special financial compensation should be provided to recruit and retrain such teachers.

As with deaf children, it was advocated that crippled children be removed from a separate building and taught in regular school buildings in special classes or integrated as much as possible into the regular classes.

"Steamer" classes were the 1915 Cleveland version of bilingual education concerns. The term refers to the pupils who largely came directly to Cleveland schools from the steamer which brought them to the country. The "steamer" class was intended to give non-English speaking children the opportunity to learn the language before they were placed in a class of 40 other children who were not similarly handicapped. The classes were viewed as transitional, and ideally, they would make themselves obsolete over time. Unfortunately the "steamer" class was often used as a "dumping ground" for children whose difficulty was not just with language. These students often impeded the progress of brighter pupils. Mitchell averred that the work of the "steamer" classes "should not be handicapped by the presence of feebleminded children" (Mitchell, 41).

Students with speech defects were largely ill served, if served at all, in the Cleveland schools. The survey team recommended much more attention to these children with differentiated treatment based on the needs and nature of the individual child. Specially trained teachers with experience in articulation, pedagogy and psychology were called for. State and local funding were necessary to procure such professionals.

All so called retarded students should be re-examined where there was any doubt of mental ability. Then special classes (called restoration classes) "should provide opportunity for the retarded to advance and for the doubtful one to prove their ability. The teachers of these classes must be among the very best in the school system and because of this should receive extra compensation" (Mitchell, 48).

Social Incompetents

As noted earlier, the social incompetents are "those who will never be able to associate on terms of equality with so-called normal people" (Mitchell, 52). It is here that the most serious objections to how youngsters are to be dealt with educationally might be raised. The first group, epileptics, were seen as handicapping others and themselves when in regular classrooms. Thus, it was advocated that they belonged in separate classes. Today, with better and earlier diagnosis, advanced medical care and appropriate training, these students are now seen as no longer in need of special classes and only minimal special care in schools.

The other group of social incompetents, the feebleminded, are given the greatest attention (in pages) in this survey volume discussion. Though these gradations of ability are discussed, no "refined" distinctions like trainable mentally retarded (TMR), severely and educable mentally retarded (EMR), emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, etc. are used or alluded to. The only real distinction made is this. "No one who can manage his own affairs so that he will not need supervision can ever be called feebleminded."

Separate classes for such youngsters were provided throughout Cleveland, but, "(f)or many of the children the expenditure is out of all proportion to the results obtained" (Mitchell, 72). Diagnosis relied initially on Binet-Simon tests of intelligence and then augmented that with assessments of home and environmental conditions made by well trained psychologists. The result was a type of educational triage, designated "A, B and C; or high, middle and low" (Mitchell, 97). The first group is composed mainly of "high grade imbeciles, trainable "to carry on under supervision an occupation in which they would be practically self-supporting" (Mitchell, 98). The second group, "middle grade imbeciles," may be trained in manual occupations, but the actual process of reading and writing are impossible (Mitchell, 99). Their "accomplishments" are compared to the tricks of a pet dog trained to do few stunts or with the ability of people to "wag our ears." Amusing, but meaningless.

The third group referred to as low grade imbeciles, idio-imbeciles or idiots, are more often not even sent to school. Those that do reach school can "be trained to keep themselves clean and neat, but most of the time should be spent in playground activities" (Mitchell, 100).

It is suggested that classes for the feebleminded be organized along these lines. Then, each child would be taught "as far as possible to care for himself and to be as happy as possible. No time will be wasted trying to teach him things which can never be an advantage to him"

(Mitchell, 101)

It is here that cultural bias educational efficiency and paternalism seem to intersect. These children are to be separated, labeled and helped in their limited lives. The educational expert can, and should, triumph over any disagreement, especially those of the parent. Certainly, many diagnoses will be on target, but for those others, they are doomed to an existence with in many cases, no reading, writing or arithmetic.

> The tendency in all educational work is to see that the children have the best opportunity to make progress. The stage is reached where the fetich (sic) of parental responsibility is no longer occasion for serious concern. The entire energy of the schools is to be bent toward fitting the child for the position he will occupy. With this aim, if it is necessary to work against the wishes of the parent who is unable to realize the plight of the child, progress may be made, with the assurance that in a very short time the wisdom of the policy will be demonstrated. The parent will no longer object to a plan which is obviously best for the child. (Mitchell, 104)

Mitchell advocates not paying teachers more for the instruction of the feebleminded. His reasoning is, basically, that it is an unprofitable investment. It is argued that these teachers are researchers and experts in the training of the children. He disagrees on both counts. He sees the lowest group as only needing a "nurse-mother" who need never have been trained for the work of regular grades. The teachers for the middle group should know manual work and "need not be familiar with the methods of instruction for children in academic subjects" (Mitchell). The teacher for the highest group needs to know how to teach reading and writing with the primary instruction in industrial and domestic work. Thus, such teachers should be no more costly than regular teachers.

Finally, classes for the feebleminded should be in special schools with larger classes and less expense for instruction. These children should continue to be segregated when they are older, housed in an institution provided by the state, the city or both, in cooperation.

The Schooling of Immigrants

As noted previously, the changing city and school population of Cleveland gave rise to concern for the commonweal of Cleveland and led, in large part, to the establishment of the Cleveland Education Survey. Cleveland's changing population demographics were discussed earlier as was one specific solution, the "steamer" classes. Other issues and suggested solutions need further scrutiny.

Adolphus Miller, the survey team member who authored the volume, *The School and the Immigrant*, was a professor of sociology at Oberlin College, about 30 miles from Cleveland. He had conducted previous research on nationalism, immigration and race problems and it was there that his interests lay. Thus, more than one third of the volume dealt with both the characteristics of national groups and each group's efforts to preserve their own language. Many groups had private language schools which students attended after public schools on weekends in summer schools. Groups who utilized such practices included Bohemians, Croatians, Jews (with both Hebrew and Yiddish) Norwegians, Poles, Russians, Ukrainians (or Ruthenians) and Slovaks. Germans were unique in being the only one of these foreign groups whose language was taught in public elementary schools.

Miller's discussion of these national groups notes that, "a teacher should know something of the social life to be found within these various groups, both in order that she may understand her pupils better and that she may be able to use these social forces to the advantage of the school and the community" (Miller, 56-57). He goes on to suggest teachers know some of history of the region from whence her students or their parents came as well as a few words of their language, and some knowledge of the geography of the child's native land. Miller provides some anecdotes to support his contentions, then concludes that, "these illustrations show the common indifference of teachers who take it for granted that all they need is a knowledge of the subject they teach" (Miller, 58). He then goes on to discuss characteristics and background of each of the most populous foreign groups in Cleveland.

But there is still the question of how to educate these foreign children. He sees two major divisions in that task: dealing with non-English speaking children and dealing with children "who come from homes where English is not spoken, but who have themselves acquired some facility in the use of language and some familiarity with American customs and standards" (Miller, 72).

In dealing with non-English speakers Miller sees the aforementioned "steamer" class as an excellent solution, a transitional placement that can ease the child into a full English speaking classroom. Unfortunately only the larger schools or those with the larger immigrant populations have such classes and many students are then not served by them. In such cases the immigrant child inevitably suffers. Not being able to keep up with companions in regular classes, he is sent to a special class and, without a steamer class, this is usually the backward class.

> This is not because the backward class is the right place for him, but rather because it furnishes an easy means of disposing of a pupil who, through no fault of his own, is an unsatisfactory member of a regular grade, holds back the other pupils, and makes the

> teacher's work more difficult and less effective.
>
> (Miller, 74)

These problems were already discussed a bit in the examination on exceptional children. One of the biggest reasons that the problems persist, according to Miller, is that the problem of teaching foreign children to speak English has never been regarded by the public schools as one of their serious problems (Miller, 75).

There are still nagging problems which Miller exposes through school/language data. Of the 98 elementary schools, only 26 exist where there is a group of one nationality out- numbering the children from English-speaking homes. "In only 11 schools are there homogeneous foreign groups so numerous as to constitute more than half of the children enrolled" (Miller, 82).

In a single classroom there may be pupils of a dozen different nationalities. This is, of course, an enduring American school problem. When I taught in Chicago my classroom contained Native American, Slavic, Puerto Rican, Guatemalan, Mexican, Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Haitian students in addition to my "typical" African and Anglo Americans. Today the groups may change but the situation remains the same. Miller's assertion also remains constant. "The one educational certainty is that the most important single education asset that the schools could give all the children, whether they come from English-speaking or non-English-speaking homes, would be a mastery of speaking, reading, and writing the English language" (Miller, 84).

Miller concludes his volume with a chapter on "The adult immigrant and the school" in which he and his team found uneven teaching, poor supervision, no plan for improving teachers in service and no effort being made to find out "which of the many methods used produces the best results" (Miller, 94). The drop-out and non-attendance rate was scandalously high--often more than 75%. The survey staff saw reorganization of the evening elementary work as essential and the key to this was efficient leadership. Though today's schools have largely dropped this "service," these kind of lessons and suggestions should be borne in mind before consideration of such an adult teaching plan is seriously proposed.

The Effects of The Cleveland Educational Survey on The Schools

The direct effects of the survey on the Cleveland schools are not readily apparent. There are no citations to nor even mentions of the survey and its recommendations in the Cleveland School Reports for the years 1917 through 1920. Some changes in foreign language curriculum were noted but these were more likely the result of World War I than the Survey. Changes included "the complete elimination of instruction in German" in lower grades and an "equal opportunity offered for the taking of French, Spanish and German in all high schools." (Spaulding, 18).

Most of the data in the reports are unaccompanied by narrative, but some data seem to reflect survey recommendations. The 1920 report contains a Table (XXV) that traces movements and developments in the schools of Cleveland in the last decade. Using those data it would seem that the Epileptic School was eliminated after 1916 and the number of foreign classes dropped by 50% from 1910 to 1920. Since immigration did not drop that much, it might seem that more immigrant students were being "mainstreamed" into regular classes as the Survey had recommended (Eighty-fourth annual report.... n.p.).

The lack of acknowledgment does not necessarily mean the Survey recommendations went unutilized. Clearly the political nature of the School Board-Superintendent made both sides eager for direct credit for school changes. Superintendent Frederick left in 1916 and was replaced by F.E. Spaulding. Thus, the Survey was a "victim" of such in fighting.

Surveys continued to be done and grew in stature as well as field of study. Sears (1925) waxed eloquent

> Beginning first with the city school survey, in 1911, the idea has since been extended to the state, county, university, and normal school, as well as to finance, buildings, course of study, administrative organization, and other special phases of school work. The results of the survey movement, coupled with the new test and measurement movement which came in only a little later, have so deeply influenced administrative practices and instruction school administration as to promise an early rewriting of our texts in terms of these new administrative procedures.

Included in Sears' book was a list of no fewer than 50 city and state surveys conducted over ten year period. Few districts replicated their surveys and many established their own research departments which gathered the more sophisticated data that surveys had done. These data were then included in annual school reports. Thus, the success of the surveys seemed to hasten their ultimate demise. That, and the crushing economic times of the Great Depression led to the absence of any evidence of new surveys of any consequence being initiated after 1930.

Applying Cleveland's Experience

At least four areas deserve mention, areas that still can inform educational practice today. The first is funding. It has become increasingly apparent that there is great dissatisfaction with the financing of schools exclusively through property taxes. Many courts have found it an

archaic system that relegates schools in poorer economic areas to inherently poorer educational results. The decision in California in 1974 (5?) was the first of state legal holdings that forced individual states to devise new methods of financing their schools.

Even with new financing systems in place, however, it is clear that many districts need additional assistance to overcome years of neglect and under funding. The large proportion of these schools are located in large urban cores. Recent and isolated successes have been seen with the infusion of particular corporate funds in "Adopt-a-School Program. In inner cities, however, the results are uneven and, as noted, isolated. Perhaps it is time to reconsider Cleveland's efforts in the early part of the century. The creation of singular foundations in cities that are expressly comprised as a community trust for the purposes of "forwarding social progress and human welfare" in the particular city. (Ayres). The money would come from corporations and prominent citizens and the foundation, thus formed would utilize corporate and individual citizens in administering such a body. The Cleveland Foundation relied heavily on banking officials and members of their boards of directors. The foundation counsel, James R. Garfield, the son of the late president, was also a respected politician and bureaucrat having served as a State Senator, chair of the Civil Service Commission and Secretary of the Interior.

There is no question that interlocking directorates were prominent in this foundation formation and financial success. Rather than being a detriment, this situation was exploited and utilized as an asset to achieve successes.

A second area of use is the curriculum where planners were cognizant of the ethnic diversity, the many languages spoken by students and the needs of exceptional students, anticipating laws and procedures sixty years in the future. Cleveland's school program provided a variety of programs whose goal was to offer the best education possible for the students of Cleveland, in whatever language. As swiftly as possible for understanding and success, such students were gradually shifted into the regular school curriculum.

So too with the exceptional children who were placed in the least restrictive environment (in today's rubric) and who gained a greater opportunity to learn as well as to be socially accepted. Clearly, however, students with lower intellectual abilities were too easily categorized, labeled and cast adrift educationally to a large degree. Nevertheless both these successes and failures would inform curricular practice struggling today with analogous situations caused by an enormous influx of new immigrants.

A corollary to Cleveland's curriculum is found today in the *Lau v. Nichols* decision and the impact of that decision. The Lau "remedies" generally required elementary schools to provide special English-as-second-language instruction as well as academic subject matter instruction through the student's strongest language until the student achieved proficiency in English sufficient to learn effectively in a Monolingual English classroom (Lyon, 72). This is almost precisely what Cleveland and some other cities were doing in the early part of the 20th century, yet little awareness of this existed nor does that exist today. Joseph Perlmann observed that "It is striking how little historical research has been stimulated by the contemporary debates about bilingual education" (Perlmann, 28). One can only speculate on the amount of time and money spent while rediscovering and seeking to implement bilingual teaching ideas and mandates refined in Cleveland before World War I.

A third area of note for current practice was a need to link curricular change with meaningful teacher training. Such training in the area of ethnic groups went beyond techniques to knowledge of such groups as well as sympathy for the culture of the blind, the deaf, the retarded. The need for in service and more appropriate preservice training was emphasized in Cleveland. Such emphasis is unevenly applied today, despite the obvious parallels and need for such training. Finally, the overall status of a school system addressing an enormous influx of immigrants of various cultures and languages has obvious similarities to America in the 1990's and the foreseeable future. Most responses to the rising school population of non-English speakers have been narrow and isolated in scope. A systematic policy has neither been promulgated nor implemented on a federal nor a state wide level. Such an approach is vital and reaches beyond merely school based policy. That was recognized in Cleveland in 1915. Being cognizant of such would aid today's school and community planners. Being ignorant continues to cost students, society and schools and to limit chances for successes.

Notes

[1] Callahan's classic work still remains the best, one volume discussion of this.

[2] The percentage of "coloreds" or "negroes" in Cleveland was between one and two percent, significantly less than the 11% reported in the 1910 census nation wide.

[3] Lane notes that there were 26 American institutions for the education of the deaf in 1867 and ASL was the language in all 26; by 1907 there were 139 schools for the deaf and ASL was allowed in none. (Lane, 1980)

References

Ayres to begin survey of city's schools Thursday. (April 13, 1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.

Ayres, L. P. (1917). *The Cleveland School Survey, (Summary Volume).* Cleveland, Ohio, The Survey Committee of The Cleveland Foundation.

Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and The Cult of Efficiency*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Cleveland Schools Behind Times, Pupils Not Fitted for Wife Work. (November 29, 1915). Cleveland Press, page 1.

Eighty third Annual Report of the Report of the Board of Education of the City School District of Cleveland for the School which ended August 31, 1919. (1919). Division of Publications, Cleveland Board of Education, Cleveland, OH.

Eighty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City School District of Cleveland for the School Year which Ended August 31, 1920. (1920). Division of Publications, Cleveland Board of Education.

Frederick is hit by women in resolution. (April 28, 1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.

Jessup, W. A. (1916). *The Teaching Staff.* Cleveland, Ohio, The Survey Committee of The Cleveland Foundation.

Lane, H. (1980). "A Chronology of The Oppression of Sign Language in France and The United States" in H. Lane and F. Grosjean, Eds. *Recent Perspectives on American Sign Language.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lyons, J. (March 1990). "The Past and Future Directions of Federal Bilingual Education Policy" *Annuals of American Political and Social Science*, 508 66-80.

Miller, H. A. (1916). *The School and The Immigrant.* Cleveland, Ohio, The Survey Committee of The Cleveland Foundation.

Mitchell, D. (1916). *Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children.* Cleveland, Ohio, The Survey Committee of The Cleveland Foundation.

New vote on Frederick to be asked. (May 25, 1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.

Perlmann, J. (March 1990). "Historical Legacies: 1840-1920" in *Annuals of American Political and Social Science.* 508, pp. 27-37.

Sears, J. (1925). *The School Survey.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Seek Successor to Superintendent Frederick. (May 12, 1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.

Spaulding, F. E. (1917-18). *Eighty second annual report of the Superintendent of Schools, F. E. Spaulding.* Board of Education, Cleveland, OH.

Take up Abolishing City's School Board. (June 28, 1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.

U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1910 and 1920 Census

Who's loony now? Members of School Board fail to pass the Binet test. (1915). *Cleveland Press*, page 1.