

CASA DE LA RAZA

ABSTRACT

The plan for Casa de la Raza was produced by an ad hoc committee in Berkeley's relatively small Chicano community, which also selected the school's first director and assistant director. Staff recruitment was also performed by a Chicano community group.

An authentic community product, Casa opened as a BESP site in Fall 1971 and was immediately subject to investigation by the Office for Civil Rights on charges of practicing segregation in violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Like Black House, Casa was compelled to close in June 1973 when OCR returned its verdict of guilty as charged.

Casa was a K-12 school with a bilingual curriculum that aimed to meet the special problems and needs of Chicano children, not only through bilingualism but also with a curriculum and atmosphere that were informed with Chicano culture and values. Its founders argued that the language (English) and the culture and values (Anglo) of conventional U. S. schools imposed enormous handicaps upon Chicano students reared in Spanish-speaking homes and the Chicano traditions. Casa was designed to eliminate such handicaps.

Community participation in Casa was impressive. Almost a third of the 427 Chicano students in Berkeley's public schools attended Casa. Enrollment ranged from some 130 in 1971/72 to 95 in 1972/73. The drop was explained by dissension about the "free school" atmosphere in the first year, deficient housing for the school (four wooden bungalows with poor light, no heat, and portable outside privies), and OCR pressures. In the second year, there was a new administration, a more structured format, and a sharper focus on basic skills.

Casa was governed by La Mesa Directiva, which was composed of three staff members, three students and three parents. Its regular staff was supplemented by 20-30 volunteers, including students from the University of California and local colleges, parents, and professionals from the Chicano community. It also served as a community center, especially on ceremonial occasions (e.g., Cinco de Mayo, a Chicano holiday).

For all of its two-year life span Casa was under the cloud of OCR investigation, and thus forced into a preoccupation with the struggle for the right to survive. This circumstance compounded the difficulties in designing a system of evaluation that corresponded to Casa's unique character and needs.

No hard evaluation data are available on Casa. As was true of Black House, the decisive "evaluation" of Casa was rendered by OCR, which was not concerned with specific educational outcomes at Casa. In a reply to OCR charges, Casa's staff said the school was culturally based, not intentionally segregated; that attendance was by student choice, not system coercion; that the school addressed definite educational needs of Chicano students. Casa's purpose, said the staff, was to correct ills inflicted upon Chicano children by discrimination, and it was thus unjust to call the school discriminatory. OCR rejected this defense, and also refused to accept the Alliance proposal as an alternative (see Black House description).

The fundamental issue posed by OCR's liquidation of Casa (and of Black House) was whether the legally permissible range of experimentation to overcome the acknowledged educational deficit for disadvantaged ethnic minorities in our multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society included a cultural pluralism that allowed for experimental schools based on an autonomous ethnic and cultural identity. To state the issue is already to indicate its magnitude for U. S. education.

EMERGENCE IN LOCAL PLAN

Casa de la Raza opened in Fall 1971 as a BESP site. This timing stamped it as part of the strong alternative education current in Berkeley, but its origins can be traced to the ethnic awakening in the latter half of the 1960's that introduced such words as Chicano and Raza into the vocabulary of California and the Southwest, and thrust upon the national scene such diverse personalities as Cesar Chavez and Reies Lopez Tijerina.

Pressures from Berkeley's relatively small Chicano community brought Casa into being as an alternative school that would embody Chicano culture and meet the special needs of Chicano children. The community pressures were generated by the widespread feeling that traditional U. S. education served Chicanos very poorly; that classes taught solely in English imposed an enormous handicap upon students reared in Spanish-speaking homes; that schools, whose atmosphere and curriculum were steeped in Anglo tradition and culture, alienated Chicano students with their different ethnic background. As a consequence, it was argued, the traditional schools virtually guaranteed academic underachievement by Chicano students, lowered their self-esteem and diminished their aspirations. Indeed, it was said among Chicanos that the traditional schools tended to lessen the Chicano student's command of the Spanish he had learned at home, even as they supplied him with a woefully inadequate command of English; thus, the ultimate triumph of such a system was a functional illiterate in not just one, but two languages! Casa, as a bilingual school informed with Chicano culture, was offered as the viable alternative to all that was deplored in the conventional schools.

Casa was the most innovative of all the BESP sites in three respects:

1. It was a K-12 school.
2. Its curriculum was bilingual.
3. It provided the greatest degree of community participation in school policy-making.

Nonetheless, from the outset Casa, like Black House, was shadowed by an investigation by the Office for Civil Rights on charges of practicing "segregation" in violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. As with Black House, the investigative and judgmental process extended over two years before the final verdict that shut down Casa. The history of OCR intervention is sketched in the description of Black House, as is the Alliance proposal, the most comprehensive strategy devised to save the two ethnically

oriented schools. This information will not be repeated here.

What bears repetition, however, is the destructive effect upon a school of spending a brief two-year life span under an ominous cloud. The uniquely innovative character of Casa only exacerbated that effect, as the nature of true innovation entails trial and error and free, vigorous debate about alternatives, but the exercise of such vital functions is inhibited when the innovative institution is constantly compelled to defend its right to live. A defensive posture tends to breed the excess of caution that is the blight of innovation.

Despite their common fate, Casa was significantly different from Black House in certain respects (in addition to ethnicity, grade range and curriculum), as follows:

1. Although its ethnic community was much smaller, Casa seemed to command a greater proportion of active support within it. One observer* noted, for example, that whereas Black House enrolled some 75 students out of the 1,400 Black students in Berkeley high schools, Casa enrolled some 125 students out of the 427 Chicano students in the Berkeley public schools. The comparable ratios were 1:3.4 for Casa and 1:19 for Black House; that is, Casa did about six times as well as Black House did in recruiting students from their respective ethnic constituencies.

2. Black House was governed essentially by the director and staff; Casa was governed by La Mesa Directiva, which was composed of teachers, students and parents. Moreover, the assistant director was a community representative who did not come from the educational system. Also, Casa served as a Chicano community center, especially on such ceremonial occasions as the celebration of Cinco de Mayo, a Chicano holiday.

3. A post mortem analysis of the Casa experience was performed by Chicanos (Casa de la Raza, published by the Southwest Network, Clearinghouse for Chicano Alternative Education, Hayward, California).

The case for Casa vs. the OCR was stated by the Casa staff in the terminal phase of their confrontation:

We at Casa are not an intentionally segregated school. We are a culturally based school.
Attendance at Casa is by student choice, not

*Appleton, Susan Frelich, "Alternative Schools for Minority Students: The Constitution, the Civil Rights Act, and the Berkeley Experiment," California Law Review, Vol. 61:858, May, 1973, pp. 26-86.

system coercion. Raza children have definite educational needs and Casa de la Raza is an alternative school that addresses itself to those needs. In fact, Casa attempts to correct the ills projected onto Chicano children by discrimination. We do not see how a program that tries to correct ills caused by discrimination can also be discriminatory. (Casa de la Raza, p. 9).

What Casa was about is well exemplified in the school's statement of teacher recruitment policy:

Casa seeks teachers who are not only competent in the subject matter areas, but who also are committed to Carnalismo, Raza culture, language and the values of Casa. They must understand that teaching Chicanos is not a job but a movement.*

A common ideological commitment to teaching as a movement does not, in itself, answer the question of how to teach. On this score there was great dissension within Casa from the beginning. Broadly defined, the issues between contending forces were "freedom" vs. structure, and the proper relationship between ideological abstractions and basic skill tangibles. How much emphasis should be accorded such ideological and/or anthropological concepts as Raza, Chicano and Carnalismo, and how much to development of proficiency in speaking, reading and writing in two languages? On the theoretical plane it could be agreed that there was no fatal contradiction between nurturing ethnic consciousness and imparting basic skills; that, in fact, a synthesis of the two would afford the best education for Chicano students. But this did not preclude disagreement about proportion and emphasis in the practical implementation of a theoretically conceived synthesis.

In Casa's first year, 1971/72, there was much dissension and considerable experimentation involving the issues above. At the end of the school year the director was replaced, and with the new director there was a shift to a more structured format and sharper focus on basic skills. The shift in emphasis is indicated by a comparison of an initial statement of Casa objectives (June 1971) and a revised statement drafted by the staff in Spring 1972.

*For a comment on the implications of the contradiction between Casa's teacher recruitment policy and BUSD policy, see ISA's report, A Preliminary Descriptive Analysis of the Berkeley Experimental Schools Program (1973-1974), September 1, 1974, p. 41.

The June 1971 statement included these objectives:

1. That 75 percent of the students in grades K-12 would become aware of and value their cultural heritage, traditions and values, as measured through positive attitudes reflected in the interpersonal relationships within their group and with other groups throughout the community.
2. That on a continuing basis, students would demonstrate self-actualization through the initiation and pursuit of goals and options related to their learning activities.
3. That 75-80 percent of all students would, according to the dominant language of the students, achieve one year's growth in basic language and math skills for each year of attendance.
4. That the staff would be prepared and provided bilingual training toward effective teaching of the second language through all-day involvement in the teaching-learning process in theory, language and practice. Strengths, techniques, tools, methods and materials would be developed. In addition, bilingual staff would learn through first-hand personal and academic inter-relationships with students and parents.

The above was amended by the Spring 1972 statement to include the following:

1. To train students to operate bilingually.
2. To get parents more involved in the educational experience of their children.
3. To deliver the basic skills.
4. To enable students to learn by doing.
5. To instill the concept of "carnalismo" (brotherhood) in students.
6. To train staff in bilingual techniques of teaching.

In a description of Casa (in Second 30-Month Plan), BESP said: "During the first ten months of the ESP program, Casa experimented with the idea of a free school. The curriculum was flexibly adapted to students' needs and the school day was not

structured into specific class periods. Classrooms were self-contained. Organizationally, Casa experimented with different administrative structures...."

Although progress was observed in these ten months (in students' pride and attitudes, and in a decline of absenteeism), BESP went on, "At the same time, the free school atmosphere produced a 'freedom shock' on the part of many students. An evaluation by staff, students and parents led to a re-orientation of the school. The school would continue with the same philosophy but would try a different structure. The change in educational methodology led to a revision of the school administrative structure."

The change in emphasis was, in part, a response to the demands of a sizable group of parents, who wanted more attention to basic skills, more structure, more discipline. However, the change was too late to hold many of these parents (and their children), who were repelled by the dissension and experimentation, which created an atmosphere of instability in the first year. The consequence was a significant drop in enrollment in the second year. It is not possible, of course, to gauge just how much the OCR investigation contributed to the sense of instability, although it may be reasonably assumed that it was a contributing factor.

An examination of Casa rolls for 1971/72 by an ISA observer yielded the names of 168 students. Some of these, however, attended for only a brief spell to see what Casa was like. In the lower grades, it was mostly parents who terminated such "trial period" enrollment of their children. More realistically, BUSD/BESP estimated the first year's enrollment between 132 (in the Alliance proposal) and 140 (in a sketch of Casa for the final 30-month plan). Enrollment for 1972/73 dropped to 95 (an official BUSD estimate corroborated by an ISA field observer's count). The decline approximated 39 percent.

Glaring defects in physical plant might well have contributed to the enrollment decline. For its first year, Casa was housed in four wooden bungalows behind Martin Luther King Junior High School. Lighting was poor, and there were no heating facilities (although it does get uncomfortably chilly in Berkeley during the winter). The toilet facilities were outside portable toilets. A gym and cafeteria had to be shared with King. Matters were not made better by a reported resentment among King students of their Casa neighbors. Certain other facilities (e.g., for science classes) were also lacking for what was planned as an autonomous, self-contained school.

There was some, but not much, improvement in facilities for the second year. Casa was transplanted into eight new green trailers, about a block and a half from King, in an area that

turned to mud when it rained; not until late January 1973 were asphalt pathways laid. The facilities were better than the year before, but parents (and students) who had to decide about enrollment in Fall 1972 were influenced by the discomforts of the first year.

A certain improvisation also attended recruitment of the initial staff. The director and assistant director were selected by an ad hoc group of 15-20 members of the Chicano community. This group had written the Casa proposal and included members of a short-lived Chicano Task Force and BABEL (Bay Area Bilingual Education League), along with some students from the University of California. Neither the director nor the assistant was a credentialed school administrator. They were selected primarily on the basis of their experience in the Chicano community, in Chicano education, and in dealing with BUSD on issues of concern to Chicanos. The instructional staff was recruited through an informal community grapevine and the employment of each member was subject to approval by an ad hoc community group.

The regular staff consisted of eight teachers (four full-time and four part-time, which added up to six full-time certificated positions) plus four classified employees: a clerical worker and three part-time teacher aides. There were also consultants and 20-30 volunteers, including students from the University of California and nearby colleges who helped with individualized instruction, as well as professionals and semi-professionals (some of them parents of Casa students) from the Chicano community, and a few interested parents who accompanied students on field trips, assisted in the classroom, provided transportation, participated in work crews to make the school more habitable, or monitored playground activities.

Since Casa spanned grades from K to 12, it was thought necessary to have a coordinator for the elementary grades and another for the secondary grades. These two coordinators were chosen by the director, subject to ratification by the staff.

The governing board of Casa, La Mesa Directiva, consisted of three staff members, three students, and three parents. The board dealt with overall policy and personnel issues. The director was charged with the administrative implementation of policy. Most budget expenditure decisions were made by teachers and approved by the director. The budget was explained to parents, but they did not actively participate in the fiscal sphere (although indirectly they exerted an influence to the degree that they helped shape overall policy, which necessarily affected budgetary decisions).

From the above it can be seen that there was an extraordinary amount of community input into the initial shaping of Casa and its

subsequent operation. Much emphasis was also placed on an intra-school sense of community, which was articulated in the term La Familia, conveying an image of the school as an extended family. In keeping with this concept there was much peer teaching, and espousal of the principle that all in Casa were both teachers and students. In accordance with the latter principle, which envisioned fluidity rather than rigidity in the division of labor, the director's duties were not exclusively administrative; he also had to teach.

The trend to a more structured format in Casa's second year did not diminish community input. In one respect, it was even strengthened. Responding to the expressed desire of parents, a parent was appointed assistant director to serve as liaison between the school and parents.

In keeping with Casa's objectives, the curriculum included the following:

Primary level

- o Raza Studies, focusing on individual projects to portray history and social institutions from a Chicano perspective, to develop an affirmative ethnic awareness, and to maintain and reinforce a positive image of self and Chicano cultural tradition.
- o Language Arts, teaching bilingual communications skills through use of Spanish and English materials, written and spoken.
- o Mathematics, emphasizing the practical uses of mathematics through individualized, bilingual instruction.
- o Health and Science, using student experiments and projects to guide them in discovering practical applications of scientific and health practices in the Raza community.
- o Art, emphasizing the development of cultural awareness and exposure to Raza art through such forms as teatro, murales, Ballet Folklorico, Conjunto Musical and puppet shows.

Secondary level

- o Bilingual Communications Skills, emphasizing oral and written expression through creative writing, and reading English, Spanish, Raza and Multicultural literature.

- o Mathematics, emphasizing the development of mathematical logic and practical uses of mathematics.
- o Social Science, emphasizing the perspective and contribution of La Raza as a way to develop skills for relevant social action and to further self-consciousness as a member of a pluralistic society.
- o Science, emphasizing the use of individual instruction and student projects to teach students how to apply scientific principles in their daily lives (science included biology, psychology, nutrition, first aid and ecology).
- o Special Interest Courses, including karate, yoga, guitar, boxing, film-making, sailing, photography and Ballet Folklorico.

Field trips and physical education were included in the curriculum at both the primary and secondary levels.

As noted previously, during the first school year Casa operated in a "free school" atmosphere. The shift to more structure in the second year was exemplified in such changes as: (1) at the primary level learning centers supplanted self-contained classrooms, and (2) at the secondary level all core skills courses (language arts and math) were scheduled in the morning.

In examining the operation of Casa as an educational institution, three factors should be kept in mind:

1. Much time and nervous energy were consumed in the confrontation with OCR.
2. Housing problems also diverted time and energy from educational pursuits. Aside from staff (and student) time spent to make the quarters reasonably livable, time also was spent in searching for a new site.
3. Casa was engaged in search and experimentation, but this process was truncated by the OCR axe, before some potential outcomes materialized.

The last point merits elaboration. For example, as noted previously, Casa's enrollment declined significantly between year 1 and year 2, probably because of instability, created by internal dissension and exacerbated by external pressures and defective housing. In year 2, there were greater stability

and somewhat better quarters. If the causes of the enrollment decline were, in fact, what they appeared to be, then the better situation in year 2 with respect to these causes was the basis for a reasonable anticipation that some or even all of the enrollment losses might be recouped in year 3. But Casa did not live to see year 3 and there is no way of knowing whether its conscientious effort to meet certain consumer demands would have evoked a positive consumer response.

Another example. Experience with bilingual education in the American public school system was relatively limited, especially on a comprehensive K-12 scale, and even more especially, within a framework that attached equal worth to the two languages. Casa's staff searched diligently for what it could profitably acquire, in methodology and materials, from the experience of others with bilingual curriculum. In Spring 1973, for instance, La Mesa Directiva approved a staff request to dispatch several staff members for first-hand observation of bilingual programs in other areas. Among the locales to be visited were Crystal City, Texas (where the entire school district converted to a bilingual, bi-cultural curriculum); Denver, Colorado (where Tlatelolco operated as an alternative Chicano school from grade 1 through the university level); and Seattle, Washington (where there had been more modest work in bilingual and bi-cultural education). These observation journeys were scheduled for late May and early June. In early June Casa's liquidation was announced and the results of those missions were rendered moot.

Casa hired a consultant to work with primary grade teachers on the development of the Raza Studies curriculum for grades K-7. The developmental work was to continue until June 1973. This was the month when Casa was formally finished.

It would be presumptuous to anticipate the outcome of an experiment that is abruptly terminated before midpoint in its allotted time. It is not presumptuous, in this instance, to assert that a bona fide experiment was in progress, that it was being conducted with serious dedication, that its final results seemed promising - even if incalculable.

ARTICULATION

For Casa, as a self-contained K-12 school, articulation was essentially an internal problem. As can be seen in the previous brief sketch of the curriculum at the primary and secondary levels, certain fundamental themes--bilingualism, Chicano consciousness and Chicano culture--were present from entrance into kindergarten to graduation from the 12th grade, but simultaneously there was a progression in subject matter from lower, elementary levels to higher, more sophisticated levels. The design, at any rate, provided for an impressive form of articulation. Unfortunately, two years, especially when these were formative years, do not afford enough time to evaluate how well the articulation design worked out in practice.

Systematic articulation was also a central concern in the structural distinction and coordination of the primary and secondary levels. The first year's plan for separate coordinators of the primary and secondary grades gave way in the second year to a system in which the two staffs met both separately and together. The director was made responsible for coordinating teaching. The trend, it seemed, was toward greater integration of the entire school, even as a distinction was made between the two levels, but there was not enough time to gauge how all this affected articulation.

FUNDING

As with Black House, so with Casa: five-year forward funding could hardly have provided the intended assurance of continuity while the OCR sword dangled overhead.

Unlike the Black House staff, however, Casa's felt strongly, bitterly and vocally that it was being shortchanged in the allocation of funds. At first blush the charge might seem surprising, as Casa received funds from three sources: BESP, BUSD and the Ford Foundation. But Casa personnel insisted that despite this multiple funding, its total per-pupil allocation was smaller than the average for the entire Berkeley district. This grievance was especially irritating in Casa's first year.

In an interview with ISA, Casa's budget director supplied the following computation of income for the first year:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| BESP | \$ 30,000 |
| Special BESP supplement given all off-site schools | 10,000 |
| Ford Foundation grant | 30,000 |
| BUSD | <u>80,000</u> |
| Total | \$150,000 |

The \$10,000 BESP supplement was a special allocation for that year only; it was not repeated the next year. The Ford grant of \$30,000 was

to be trimmed to \$21,000 in the subsequent year. The \$80,000 from BUSD was a rough estimate (covering salaries, supplies, services), and was, in fact, somewhat larger than the figure in the district's own tentative budget for FY 1973.

Estimating Casa's enrollment as approximately 150, the budget director concluded that total funding of \$150,000 from all sources amounted to approximately \$1,000 per student. The district-wide average for regular schools, he pointed out, was \$1,455 per student for grades K-6 and \$1,900 per student for grades 7-12. Even if one accepted the bottom figure of 132 for Casa's 1971/72 student enrollment, the total fund allocation would be \$1,136 per student, still considerably below the district-wide average, especially because about half of Casa's students were in the 7-12 grade bracket. To make matters worse, the BESP allocation was supposed to provide \$200 per student over and above the district's "normal" contribution per student, and yet, according to Casa's reckoning, it was receiving less, rather than more, per student than the common schools did.

To be sure, the budgetary comparison was not as clean-cut as presented by Casa's budget director. In computing its per-student expenditure, the district included the costs of its central administrative superstructure and its support services. Casa's budget director took into account only the funds directly available to Casa, and made no allowance for the district's administrative and service superstructure. The Casa budget director made two comments on that problem: (1) district support services were of little value to Casa; (2) district administrative costs were grossly inflated, resulting in a distortion of fiscal priorities, so that money that could be productive at the site level was eaten up by non-productive bureaucratic excesses.

Patently, the Casa-district discrepancy involved complex issues of educational cost accounting--and of educational values. Without attempting to resolve these issues, it is still possible to offer two relevant observations:

1. From the vantage point of Casa, its uniquely innovative character did render traditional district cost accounting largely irrelevant. Indeed, it does seem reasonable that a cost-benefit computation of district administration and services would be different for Casa than for the common schools, to which district operations had been geared. Latent in all this was a deep feeling in the Casa staff that the support it received from the district was a good deal less than enthusiastic.

2. The Casa staff's belief that it was being shortchanged was, in itself, a most significant factor. The edge of bitterness implicit in that belief was sharpened by several corollary factors:

- a. The poor housing provided for Casa.
- b. The chafing OCR pressures, which heightened sensitivity to any perceived slight or discriminatory treatment.
- c. The tangible reality that comprehensive bilingualism and other unique features of the Casa program did necessitate out-of-ordinary expenditures (e.g., for the creation and acquisition of special materials, for site study visits to other bilingual and bi-cultural programs).

Actual expenditures of BESP funds indicated that the Casa budget director's estimate of \$30,000 was excessive. That is, BESP may have set aside that sum for Casa, but less was spent. In its two BESP years Casa's expenditure of BESP funds was as follows:

| | |
|---------|----------|
| 1971/72 | \$25,963 |
| 1972/73 | 24,533 |

EVALUATION

No hard evaluative data are available for Casa. The problem of designing a system of evaluation that corresponded to the school's distinct character and needs was compounded by the hostile OCR pressure that placed the school in a defensive position, which is not conducive to objective evaluation.

Internal evaluation by staff, students and parents did go on, and did serve as the foundation for the changes in emphasis and structure in Casa's second year. However, such evaluation produced no presentation of findings or evaluative measures.

Level I produced nothing. By the time the present Level II contract was signed, Casa was on its way out, and the Level II work done under the previous contract (by DEEPS) had not reached the point of producing evaluative data about Casa.

As with Black House, what remains then are ISA field observations and several BESP judgments. Since the most important of the latter bracketed Black House and Casa, they were cited in the description of Black House and need not be repeated here. It may be appropriate, however, to repeat the caution that these judgments were rendered in the context of defending the two schools against OCR charges, and may therefore not be free of self-serving bias.

Notes of ISA field observers generally record good morale, a high degree of enthusiasm, and a spirit of La Familia at Casa. The notes also record the absence of evaluative data to measure educational outcomes.

However, as was said in the Black House description, the conventional measurements of educational performance and achievement had little to do with the decisive "evaluation" that was rendered by the Office for Civil Rights. What was evaluated by OCR was the right of such schools to exist. And the criterion for the ultimate judgment was an interpretation of legislation that had been enacted seven years before Casa was born; whether Casa did or did not overcome the universally acknowledged educational deficit that the conventional school system delivers to Chicano students was not relevant for OCR.

The gist of what was said about Black House vis à vis OCR is also applicable to Casa. However, two additional points need to be made:

1. The problem of ethnic distinction and awareness for Chicano students is rendered more complex by the issue of bilingualism, which also supplies an additional rationale for experimentation with special schools that cope with this issue. Language, in the instance of Casa, played a very special and specific role in defining the target population, and in determining the free choice of students to attend or not to attend such a bilingual school.

2. The Chicano community in Berkeley is much smaller than the Black, and consequently exerts much less political influence in the city at large and in its school system. There is a difference in kind between the impacts of the two communities on the overall school system, its curriculum and personnel policies. The loss of such an enclave as Casa, it would appear, had more serious consequences for the Chicano community than the loss of Black House had for the Black. In the light of the political realities, the prospects of school-system responsiveness to the special needs of Chicano students may be rated as even poorer than the prospects of responsiveness to Black needs. Awareness of such considerations might have been reflected in the proportionately greater community participation in Casa.

We reiterate that the experiment essayed with Casa was justified. Effective delivery of education to Chicano students is among the more acute, unsolved problems of the American school system. The experiment addressed this problem (and by extension the larger problem posed by the condition and status of the Chicano people in American life). Its findings might have produced insights that would have contributed to a solution of the problem. OCR's action precludes knowledge of what might have been. What remains is what is, and in the sphere of education for Chicanos, it is not good.