

" The Koocher Papers "

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MY COLLEAGUES ON THE CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

FROM: GLENN S. KOOCHEK, MEMBER

DATE: NOVEMBER 12, 1980

RE: SUPERINTENDENCY

On July 3, 1980 I wrote a letter of substantial length to Mayor Duehay outlining some serious concerns which I had over the status of the Cambridge Public Schools and, in particular, over the Superintendency of William C. Lannon. As most of you know, the Superintendent's contract will expire on August 15, 1981. It has never been my interest to participate in a termination which would smack of political machinations. Rather, my interest is in bringing before the School Committee and the public my reasons for reservations about renewing Lannon's contract.

This is no pleasant task. As some of you know, I was one of the four Committee Members who first brought Lannon to Cambridge in 1975. However, the public may not be aware of the agreement reached in August, 1975 in the living room of Committeeman Charles Pierce, an agreement to which I was a party, whereby, I would give my affirmative vote to a joint motion of Members Gesell, Pierce, and Wolf to appoint Lannon if they would support my motion to grant four year contracts to Assistant Superintendents Woodward and Brown. (With the election upcoming, I was concerned about stability for these untenured administrators. Assistant Superintendent Saterial, who was serving as Acting Superintendent was tenured at the time and needed no such protection.)

I held a pivotal vote on the Committee at that time and I can speak with authority as to what were or were not conditions and facts at the time. Following the resignation of Superintendent Alflorance Cheatham, we initiated a public interview process to review the list of some 25 semi-finalists out of a field of 120. We then narrowed the field to six. A clear choice was Mr. John Lawson, then Superintendent of Schools in Shaker Heights, Ohio. Had there not been illness in his family forcing him to withdraw, he would have been Superintendent. However, he took himself out of the running as did a finalist from Worcester. Two Boston finalists were not in the running with more than one or two members and they were ruled out. Another individual serving as a school administrator in the Virgin Islands, the only black applicant, had minimal support even among the more progressive interviewers. Only Lannon and Joseph Saterial remained as viable finalists.

This set the stage for a classic "Cambridge Vs. the Outsider" confrontation which had so bitterly divided the city a few years earlier during the firing of Superintendent Frank Frisoli. The scars were far from healed.

At the time, the School Committee was completing the first of the major tasks that the reform elements had set out to do - a complete cleaning up of the personnel functions handled at that time by the Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Rose O'Rourke. My public statements about that position "running the patronage mill" are public record and I will stand by them. In fact, Ms. O'Rourke was in eager pursuit of the new Director of Personnel Position.

The job of proposing a nominee for this position fell upon Acting Superintendent

Joseph Saterial. I met with him to review the school department situation in general. We discussed the prospect that the School Committee might reject his nominations now or in the future, as it might reject the nominations of any superintendent. He explained that, in that case, he would follow his original recommendation with the second choice. For me, that was not only the wrong answer - it cost him the superintendency. For it would then become obvious to any School Committee that all it needed to do was continue to reject people until the person the Committee wanted was nominated. For me, any situation which would allow four politically motivated members to wait out good people for a politically preferred person was not satisfactory.

I should make it clear that I believed then, as I do now, that Mr. Saterial is an individual of the highest integrity. Our philosophical difference in this instance was based on his interest in being a pragmatist with a future Committee. Mine was to insure that a future Superintendent would be isolated from political pressure, conscious or subconscious.

Thus, we were able to secure a three year contract for our new Superintendent and four year contracts for the Assistant Superintendents, guaranteeing a freedom from political pressures at that time. Although Lannon never impressed me before he came (he tended to ramble, he was too low key, and he had never worked with racial minorities), something I told him in a telephone conversation prior to the meeting at Mr. Pierce's house, I fought hard, much harder than any of my colleagues, to have his contract extended and his salary increased from \$38,000 to \$44,000 soon after he arrived.

However, over the past two years, I have witnessed serious changes resulting in the areas of reservation which I will outline. They include:

- Continuous attempts to preempt and usurp the legitimate and exclusive policy prerogatives of the School Committee.
- Tolerance of the appointment of mediocre administrators and his subsequent support for them, in such critical areas as personnel, secondary school administration, and planning programs which have resulted in inexcusable cases of arbitrary administrative actions, rudenesses to students and parents, and a loss of morale among faculty.
- Placement into sensitive positions of the School Department of individuals whose positioning seems to have been based on the willingness to carry out Mr. Lannon's tasks without regard to the personal, human needs of parents, children, and faculty.
- A callous attitude toward the law and collective bargaining contracts as they apply to the school department and its employees.
- Favoritism displayed to certain members of the School Committee in the form of the sharing of information and political personnel patronage.
- A lack of understanding or respect for budgeting and fiscal procedures and responsibility.

It is over the issue of the Reorganization of the high schools with which I first began to challenge the integrity of Superintendent Lannon.

PROBLEMS WITH THE "REORGANIZATION"

Prior to submitting his comprehensive high school and curricular reorganization package to the School Committee, Mr. Lannon met with members individually to identify any areas of concern, reservation, and interest. He also asked if we were interested in "protecting anyone", but he offered no guarantees or commitments that his recommendations would respect those concerns over individuals.

I expressed two concerns which he respected and another which, although he agreed to, he blatantly ignored. He kept his promise to keep the new "Housemaster" position out

of the curriculum sphere, a problem that Edward Sarasin, then a Housemaster, had exacerbated by insisting that he, as housemaster, would run an autonomous house free of all influence of the existing, traditional Department Heads. Second, he agreed to accommodate the needs of an administrator who was retiring within one year of the date of introduction of the reorganization by giving that person meaningful responsibilities and a place of respect.

However, it was made clear to him, and he fully agreed in light of the very sensitive and controversial nature of the many future appointments, that before members put themselves "on the line" with his reorganization, that the School Committee had better "see the whole, complete plan" - and "that four members agree to support the plan as presented" before Larmon would formally introduce the package. Although he agreed, and clearly understood the reason for that prior approval, he never even attempted to honor his word.

Members did not see the Reorganization Recommendation until it was released to everyone else, and only Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Berman, and Mr. Holway had agreed to support it when it was introduced. I had opposed a prior year's weaker plan and had clearly indicated to Larmon that I would not support any plan until I had a chance to analyze a full, complete draft. Thus, Larmon had maneuvered me into a political corner - however clever for him to have gotten away with - a corner I resented, placed by a man who had promised not to do it. He did tell me, in a desperate effort to explain that he was honoring his commitment, that "Mr. Fantini seems to like it, and Mayor Danahy has no problems with it," implying broad Committee support. It is my clear opinion that he merely used comments out of context, if those comments were ever made at all, to imply that Fantini and Danahy would support his plan. Neither person ever took a public position that was anything but inalterably opposed to Reorganization.

Thus, much as I am ashamed to admit it now, it was as much a need to protect Larmon's ability to function as an administrator within the school system, as it was a perceived need to reorganize the school system that swayed my vote. Had I known that Larmon would submit nominees without sustaining votes, that Mr. Holway had indicated that he would never support a complete reorganization of the Physical Education Department, (a crucial component of reorganization), or that some of the new administrative recommendations would be persons distinguished by their mediocrity, I would never have supported Reorganization.

It is important to note, for the record, that, in our preliminary discussions on draft schemes for reorganization, Larmon suggested individuals who might appropriately fill the newly developed jobs. Edward Sarasin was identified as a strong possibility for Headmaster, Henry Lukas for the Policy and Students Assistant Headmastership, and Diane Tabor for the Curricular position. There is now no doubt in my mind that the new positions were created with these individuals in mind.

Now, with the plan implemented, we can look back on individuals whose recommendations came at a time when it was, in fact, too late for Committee Members to interview them - as in the case of the Assistant Headmaster for Fundamental and the most recently appointed Housemaster. Further, I can say that, with the exception of Ms. Chayet (Social Studies), Dr. Tabor, and Dr. Brown (Physical Education/Health/Athletics), the new group of administrators are at best, nearly as competent as their predecessors. Headmaster Sarasin, while more effective in some respects, has had serious problems in others.

Mr. Leslie Oliver's position was eliminated illegally with the request of the Superintendent to transfer him despite a clear accidental omission by the School Committee. One might question why the cutting of Oliver's position from the budget document results in the transfer of this person to a teacher's position, while Mr. Alan Cherish's po-

sition, also eliminated in the budget, is restored with the endorsement of the Superintendent who issued a memorandum in support of Cherish's appointment implying that the money remained in the budget when it had clearly been cut. However, it is easy to understand this when one considers what Mr. Lannon explained during the budget hearings last year - Cherish was a member of the Vellucci family.

A very serious violation of trust occurred in negotiating the salaries of the newly established reorganization positions under "impact" bargaining following implementation. Lannon was eager to upgrade the new positions. Almost all the negotiating was done with the School Committee being given little or no information. A long impasse developed. Finally, the Committee agreed to make a final proposal increasing certain steps and ratio scales. This was in fall, 1979. However, before the final offer could be endorsed, the municipal election rendered the Committee as "lame ducks".

As you may all recall, the initial ballot count was ominous for me personally to the point where I, and almost all veteran observers of "PR" counts, believed that I would not be re-elected. Accordingly, I phoned the Superintendent and told him that it was clear to me that I would lose my seat in favor of Mrs. Attles and that my support of the newly upgraded salary package was no longer valid. I said quite clearly that, I (would) let (him) know if this situation changed, but until then, (you) are not to make any proposals in my name to the union."

Although I was reelected, Lannon never consulted me before offering the package to the union. I spoke with him on this, and he assured me that he had the four votes without my commitment. I was quite surprised since my Independent colleagues were refusing to vote for any components of the Reorganization. Lannon indicated that Mr. Maynard had agreed to support the new wage package for reorganized people. I did not believe it and told Lannon so. In a telephone poll, conducted informally to ascertain committee support for the package, Lannon had clearly implied to members that I had supported the package without telling them that I had withdrawn my support. Thus, the members were given "filtered" information, as misleading as Lannon's earlier statements about Danahy and Fantini's support for reorganization. My suspicions were confirmed when, at the meeting when a vote was scheduled on the confirmation of the salary offer, Maynard was not present and Lannon was desperately looking for a fourth vote.

The use of the "telephone poll" has proven one of Lannon's most effective techniques for accomplishing what he wants to do, particularly in his efforts to install Muriel Heilberger as the acting project director for Project SPAN.

USUPRING AND MANIPULATING THE POLICY PREROGATIVES OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

It is often possible to manipulate events so that decisions make themselves. When this is done consciously to interfere with the right of the School Committee to become fully informed and to take an action, I resent it bitterly.

Most recently, the example of transfers came to light. In one grievance, Lannon asked the Committee to sustain his ruling that a move within a building was a "transfer" under the collective bargaining agreement. Later in the year, in the case which resulted in the Committee apologizing to a teacher for the action, Lannon tried to reverse himself without telling the School Committee. The case involved Ms. Gurry-Axtman who was ordered to move involuntarily to another school. Personnel Director Theall, with Lannon's support, insisted that the move was needed so that a minority person could be appointed to the Fitzgerald School. As the record shows, no minority individual was ever considered. Ms. Axtman objected when her position, one of four 4th grades, was transferred while another position, held by a substitute teacher, was left vacant at the same school. This, more than any other incident reflects the insensitivity of Lannon and his Macciavellian staff.

In this case, the problem was made worse when a teacher in grade 8 was transferred to grade 7 without any consideration of the transfer policy - an action defended by the Superintendent and Personnel Director as "not a transfer".

In another matter, without formal recommendation to the Committee, Larmon has redefined the positions held by Mr. Woodward and Mr. Sateriale. It has become clear to me that Larmon seeks to maneuver them into positions of expendability, eventually to eliminate them. The decision to redefine the positions came in the form of a notification after the fact. Such a change may be appropriate, but **THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS BELONGS WITH THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE!!!!**

It has become increasingly frustrating to see the extent to which Larmon is given a free hand by certain members of the School Committee which refused even to consider the above action for review. Larmon's free hand to allow individuals to step on people (as were done conspicuously with Mr. Burns and Mrs. Boyle at the High School and with parents innumerable during racial imbalance processes) have destroyed morale among the faculty.

During the tense negotiations for the latest collective bargaining agreement with the teachers, one fact became obvious - obvious to the point where it was painfully clear: the faculty, in general, young and old, competent and incompetent, conservative and progressive, do not trust William Larmon AT ALL. The man is disliked intensely by a broad spectrum of the faculty. Racial imbalance meetings have brought out similar feelings among parents.

If it did not become obvious to all concerned that Larmon is attempting to use the processes of racially balancing the Cambridge Public Schools voluntarily to enhance his own standing with his professional colleagues at the expense of the long term good of the City of Cambridge and its public schools, then the School Committee is **BLIND!!!!!!**

RACIAL IMBALANCE

When all the theses are written describing how Cambridge addressed the issue of the racial imbalance of its public schools, there should be dark chapters for Larmon and his first SPAN Director, Jerry Kohn. Both oversaw a period of maneuvering, half-truths, lies, and misinformation - and both were parties to it all.

To substantiate the positions I hold, it is important to review briefly the story of how SPAN began and developed.

About three years ago, Project Span was started with a state grant, dealing mostly with racial sensitivities as an issue. Larmon recommended Jerry Kohn as its director. Kohn, who had been working out of Larmon's Office during his attendance at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, had lost the respect of many faculty at the high school for having served as "Larmon's eyes and ears" while Reorganization was being developed. Because of this role, confirmed to me by Larmon, Kohn had earned the reputation of a "snake". What none of us knew then was that the state Department of Education, which funded Span, was concerned that its function was not true to the spirit of the grant - a grant made to support the efforts to racially balance the public schools of Cambridge. I was also to learn later that Mr. Charles Glenn, Equal Opportunity Administrator at the State Department of Education had threatened to cut off funding if Kohn was not replaced. He was clearly not trusted by the state department.

Following the renewal of Project SPAN, the School Committee was asked by Lannon and Kohn to go into executive session to review concerns about the racial imbalance of some of our public schools. In that meeting we were informed that the focus of SPAN would be changing to deal with this problem. It seemed that the language of the grant application had been changed, and, although the Committee had been informed of this through the formality of having a copy of the renewal sent to members, no effort was made to remind the Committee to look for the fine print changes in the scope of this important program.

During this executive session Kohn told us a number of things including:

- "There are literally millions of dollars that the 'Feds' will pour into Cambridge if we act."
- "Nobody at the Cambridge Housing Authority will talk with us on this."
- "David Vickery will not work with us if we deal with this issue in public rather than in executive session. He doesn't want the public involved."
- "Charlie Glenn and his staff won't put anything in writing as far as specifics is concerned."

At that meeting, before the entire Committee and Lannon's staff I made the following statement so as to leave no possible ambiguity. "Look Jerry, and you too Mr. Lannon, I want to know everything you're doing in this area before, during, and after you do it. This is too sensitive an area not to be closely observed and followed. We've got to do it properly." I remember distinctly that the rest of the Committee supported my demand to be kept informed. Lannon and Kohn, in my opinion, never had the slightest intention of even attempting to meet the spirit, or the letter, of this demand.

IN FACT, AS IT TURNS OUT, EACH OF THE FOUR POINTS LISTED ABOVE WERE NOTHING LESS THAN LIES TOLD BY MR. KOHN, AS WE HAVE ALL LEARNED BY NOW.

The first step was to develop a Phase I plan to attempt to correct the imbalance which Kohn had so clearly decided was of such scope as to indict the previous actions of earlier school committees. In doing so, Kohn and his half-time assistant Muriel Heilberger (whom he excitedly described as "a member of the community, who lives right here in Cambridge, and who speaks Spanish." We were all to learn later that she was one of his colleagues from the Harvard Graduate School of Education) met individually with members of the committee to get their input into the "temporary" Phase I plan in the clear hope that it would be workable, stable, and possibly permanent.

Despite my offer to save time and to be interviewed with one or more colleagues, Kohn and Heilberger insisted on separate meetings. It became clear that the strategy was to keep members from exchanging ideas before them and to facilitate the manipulation of ideas to suit their own conveniences. I told my interviewer, Heilberger, that there was no way that the schools could be racially balanced voluntarily, as they hoped to do, but that redistricting, transporting, and other involuntary steps would be required. I warned her that "we can't fool these people. The community better get the truth and get ready to move." That was the last I was to see or hear from her until the evening prior to the deadline for submission of a Phase I plan to the State Department of Education.

At the conclusion of a School Committee meeting, at about 11:00 p.m., Kohn hurriedly passed around a final draft Phase I plan as Lannon insisted that he had to have it adopted and approved at that meeting for "submission tomorrow." Needless to say, I was livid, for all of my suggestions were ignored. I was to learn later that Mr. Fantini had also made recommendations similar to mine warning of involuntary mandated steps. I argued that if important suggestions of a Committee Member were to be ignored, at minimum, the member was owed the courtesy of being informed, rather than an eleventh hour forcing of hands. There is no doubt in my mind that Lannon and Kohn knew exactly

what they were doing.

I confronted Kohn who, to my utter shock, supported me totally, blaming Larnon who, according to Kohn had had the draft plans for some time and had not shared them with the School Committee. Larnon, on the other hand, indicated that there was a shortage of time and suggested that Kohn had been late in his data gathering. Later, in his office, Kohn and Heilberger were full of apologies. He and Larnon were busy pointing fingers at each other (in private only, of course), and they were probably laughing at us all when we weren't looking.

Again, SPAN was reminded of my demand to be kept informed "before, during, and after" whatever they were doing. Within two weeks of the opening of school, Heilberger called my office to say that, it was obvious, that Phase 1's call for voluntary transfers was not going to work. I was distressed because, in the clear minds of the average public citizen, everything was, and would be fine with Phase 1. No one ever went out of his way to warn that deep inside Phase 1 was a warning that Phase 2 would be far broader and tougher in scope. The public was clearly deceived into believing that Phase 1 was all that would ever be necessary. There had never been the slightest hint of doubt that Phase 1 would not work perfectly.

An essential anecdote is presented here. In October, 1979, Kohn called my office to tell me that a federal planning grant had been received. It required, according to him, that 25% of his and Heilberger's salary be covered by the federal dollars. Since I was eager to see as much money as possible go directly into classroom assistance, and knowing that Kohn and Heilberger were drawing large salaries (25% would have been close to \$10,000), I was curious. I asked where in the regulations, or written instructions, we were required to allocate a portion of their salaries with federal grants, since I knew that SPAN was a state funded grant. Kohn asked me why I had to know that. After some hesitation, he indicated that he was told to do it. Upon my insistence, he told me that the person so directing him was based at Brandeis University. I asked him if the Feds had opened a branch at Brandeis, and asked for the gentleman's number. Kohn then explained that, "well, ah, er, he works with the federal government."

Then I recalled that the federal fiscal year (October 1 - September 30) was different from the state fiscal year ending three months before the federal year. I confronted Kohn with this evidence. It was only then that he admitted that his real purpose was to cover 100% of their salaries for the $\frac{1}{4}$ year following the end of the state fiscal year to the end of the federal fiscal year. (The state year ended on June 30, 1980. By allocating 25% of his annual salary to the federal grant, he could collect full salary for the period of July 1 - September 30, 1980 with Washington dollars and thus, insure three months of highly paid employment while he looked for a job elsewhere. By the way, he used his "highly successful experience" in Cambridge to gain employment in a suburban Connecticut school system.)

Mrs. Wolf also expressed resentment when the real reason for the allocation when I confronted Larnon and Kohn in public. Apparently, She and Mrs. Bernan had bought Kohn's original story without objection.

In addition, other matters reflect unfavorably on Larnon and SPAN:

- The failure of Larnon to recommend a plan based on the pairing of schools as the Committee had instructed because Larnon feared subversion of it by elementary administration and faculty.
- The failure to involve the active community in the final drawing of the Phase 2 plan despite dozens of preliminary meetings.
- Larnon's retro-active recommendation to install Muriel Heilberger as Kohn's replacement following an unsuccessful attempt to do so by telephone poll - a clear "back-door" ascension to office.

OTHER AREAS OF CONCERN

Recently, members learned that an Amicus Curiae brief had been filed in court (drafted at our expense by our attorney) on behalf of a case brought by the Massachusetts Teachers Association dealing with early retirement benefits counting towards pensions. The School Committee never authorized the production of this brief, however noble or well written it may have been. In addition, I noted that the employer's briefs in support of grievances filed on our behalf, and the arbitrators rulings (especially when the School Committee is not the winner) were not being forwarded to us. I was embarrassed to learn of rulings from the President of the teachers union. In addition, the briefs, which explain the Committee's policies, have never been submitted to the Committee for approval, a dangerous fact of life for it gives the Superintendent the right to espouse policy, file it with the arbitrator, and let the Committee know about it after the fact.

I add here my bitter resentment to the personal lobbying efforts of Lannon to defeat, or render weak, my recent motion to keep the approval and notification of consulting services before the Committee for action. It is no secret that education and social planners have eager eyes on our public school system, and that, consultants, however noble they may be, should be known to the Committee as to their full purpose, before we hire them. We may well determine that certain planning is going on, certain topics are being discussed, and thus, be better informed.

Many objections have been raised by members as to the information provided to the School Committee. Those of us who cannot spend our days in school buildings have not been kept abreast of such events as racial incidents at the high school, problems with the implementation of the racial imbalance plan, personnel issues, preliminary updates on collective bargaining, and problems with departmental administrators. I found it interesting to note that Lannon recently admitted to the Committee that there were problems with Mr. Sarasin, a person regarded as infallible by Lannon in public up to that time. Serious problems resulting in loss of morale among the faculty were not reviewed with the School Committee.

During the intense collective bargaining negotiations, the out and out distrust, and dislike for Lannon was obvious from almost all factions within the school department. The man has lost the trust of the faculty from school to school.

The personnel department, which has Lannon's unwavering and total support, has made serious errors in implementing the policy of the school department. More and more, it has been necessary to reverse the Superintendent on matters of grievances because of errors by Lannon and the Personnel Director.

Last year, during City Council hearings on our \$919,000 deficit, Lannon was embarrassingly ill prepared to give clear, concise answers to the Council, showing to me, a lack of understanding of important fiscal and budgetary issues. The fact that some accounts were overspent, especially in the high school, reflect Lannon's first loyalty to his newly appointed pet administrators, at the expense of the overall credibility of the entire public school system.

The lack of morale in the bilingual department can be traced, in large part, to the free, unchecked hand given to Director Fernandez and Coordinator Cynthia Oldham, about whom not a single remark less than negative has been made to me by many faculty. It is easily explained because both are willing to respond to Lannon's commands regardless of who is harmed among the faculty. It is interesting to note that during the 1980 budget hearings, positions were cut from the Bilingual Department at Fernandez's recommendation with the understanding that he not be required to defend them publicly - thus giving him the best of possible worlds (Lannon's favor, and not being exposed

to his constituency.

SUMMARY

Lannon cannot be totally blamed for trying to get away with what he does. He has had, up to this time, the willing support and defense of some members of the School Committee. I have noted, with regret, that Mrs. Wolf and Mrs. Berman have never been inclined to ever question the Superintendent's actions. I regretted even further, that up to this point, the Mayor has also been reluctant to do so.

I had hoped that the input of even the more enlightened members of the teachers union might have at minimum convinced my colleagues that Lannon's administrative integrity needed to be held to public scrutiny.

His carelessness with the truth has become chronic, as I have tried to point out at meeting after meeting.

His support of administrative staff (at the expense of the School Committee's right to have full information in many matters) is tearing at the morale of many fine staff members who are suffering when administrators are allowed to govern without regard to equitable treatment. The recent opening-of-school corridor assignments without the slightest regard to the personal concerns of high school teachers remains one of the most serious administrative errors, made worse by the refusal to acknowledge the problem.

Manipulative attempts to transfer certain Submasters, checked finally by the School Committee remain symptomatic of the larger problem.

"Administrative Patronage" continues to show its face as Lannon makes room for special favorites. Only a reduction of actual jobs seems to have stopped some of the blatant political patronage which created problems in the past, including some very unfortunate assignments in the health and safety area.

As Lannon's contract expires on August 15, 1981, and as the deadline to notify him of our intent to renew his contract approaches in January, the Committee must have serious deliberations over how to proceed. It is my firm opinion, that, if Lannon is permitted to remain as our Superintendent, he must recognize that he has made serious mistakes in his treatment of the School Committee. He must make a firm, if not written commitment, to honor the policy prerogatives of the Committee, to deal truthfully and honestly with the seven most active volunteers in service to education in Cambridge, and to respect the needs of our community in which we will reside long after William Lannon is long gone.

I welcome the opportunity to hold a public discussion as to the fitness of Mr. Lannon to hold the public trust and the support of the School Committee in home that, through a show of public feeling, Mr. Lannon may decide that, if he is to remain, he must be more honest and open and less careless with the future of our city.

" The Koocher Papers "

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MY COLLEAGUES ON THE CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

FROM: GLENN S. KOOCHEER, MEMBER

DATE: NOVEMBER 12, 1980

RE: SUPERINTENDENCY

On July 3, 1980 I wrote a letter of substantial length to Mayor Duehay outlining some serious concerns which I had over the status of the Cambridge Public Schools and, in particular, over the Superintendency of William C. Lannon. As most of you know, the Superintendent's contract will expire on August 15, 1981. It has never been my interest to participate in a termination which would smack of political machinations. Rather, my interest is in bringing before the School Committee and the public my reasons for reservations about renewing Lannon's contract.

This is no pleasant task. As some of you know, I was one of the four Committee Members who first brought Lannon to Cambridge in 1975. However, the public may not be aware of the agreement reached in August, 1975 in the living room of Committeeman Charles Pierce, an agreement to which I was a party, whereby, I would give my affirmative vote to a joint motion of Members Gesell, Pierce, and Wolf to appoint Lannon if they would support my motion to grant four year contracts to Assistant Superintendents Woodward and Brown. (With the election upcoming, I was concerned about stability for these untenured administrators. Assistant Superintendent Saterial, who was serving as Acting Superintendent was tenured at the time and needed no such protection.)

I held a pivotal vote on the Committee at that time and I can speak with authority as to what were or were not conditions and facts at the time. Following the resignation of Superintendent Alflorance Cheatham, we initiated a public interview process to review the list of some 25 semi-finalists out of a field of 120. We then narrowed the field to six. A clear choice was Mr. John Lawson, then Superintendent of Schools in Shaker Heights, Ohio. Had there not been illness in his family forcing him to withdraw, he would have been Superintendent. However, he took himself out of the running as did a finalist from Worcester. Two Boston finalists were not in the running with more than one or two members and they were ruled out. Another individual serving as a school administrator in the Virgin Islands, the only black applicant, had minimal support even among the more progressive interviewers. Only Lannon and Joseph Saterial remained as viable finalists.

This set the stage for a classic "Cambridge Vs. the Outsider" confrontation which had so bitterly divided the city a few years earlier during the firing of Superintendent Frank Frisoli. The scars were far from healed.

At the time, the School Committee was completing the first of the major tasks that the reform elements had set out to do - a complete cleaning up of the personnel functions handled at that time by the Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Rose O'Rourke. My public statements about that position "running the patronage mill" are public record and I will stand by them. In fact, Ms. O'Rourke was in eager pursuit of the new Director of Personnel Position.

The job of proposing a nominee for this position fell upon Acting Superintendent

Joseph Saterial. I met with him to review the school department situation in general. We discussed the prospect that the School Committee might reject his nominations now or in the future, as it might reject the nominations of any superintendent. He explained that, in that case, he would follow his original recommendation with the second choice. For me, that was not only the wrong answer - it cost him the superintendency. For it would then become obvious to any School Committee that all it needed to do was continue to reject people until the person the Committee wanted was nominated. For me, any situation which would allow four politically motivated members to wait out good people for a politically preferred person was not satisfactory.

I should make it clear that I believed then, as I do now, that Mr. Saterial is an individual of the highest integrity. Our philosophical difference in this instance was based on his interest in being a pragmatist with a future Committee. Mine was to insure that a future Superintendent would be isolated from political pressure, conscious or subconscious.

Thus, we were able to secure a three year contract for our new Superintendent and four year contracts for the Assistant Superintendents, guaranteeing a freedom from political pressures at that time. Although Lannon never impressed me before he came (he tended to ramble, he was too low key, and he had never worked with racial minorities), something I told him in a telephone conversation prior to the meeting at Mr. Pierce's house, I fought hard, much harder than any of my colleagues, to have his contract extended and his salary increased from \$38,000 to \$44,000 soon after he arrived.

However, over the past two years, I have witnessed serious changes resulting in the areas of reservation which I will outline. They include:

- Continuous attempts to preempt and usurp the legitimate and exclusive policy prerogatives of the School Committee.
- Tolerance of the appointment of mediocre administrators and his subsequent support for them, in such critical areas as personnel, secondary school administration, and planning programs which have resulted in inexcusable cases of arbitrary administrative actions, rudenesses to students and parents, and a loss of morale among faculty.
- Placement into sensitive positions of the School Department of individuals whose positioning seems to have been based on the willingness to carry out Mr. Lannon's tasks without regard to the personal, human needs of parents, children, and faculty.
- A callous attitude toward the law and collective bargaining contracts as they apply to the school department and its employees.
- Favoritism displayed to certain members of the School Committee in the form of the sharing of information and political personnel patronage.
- A lack of understanding or respect for budgeting and fiscal procedures and responsibility.

It is over the issue of the Reorganization of the high schools with which I first began to challenge the integrity of Superintendent Lannon.

PROBLEMS WITH THE "REORGANIZATION"

Prior to submitting his comprehensive high school and curricular reorganization package to the School Committee, Mr. Lannon met with members individually to identify any areas of concern, reservation, and interest. He also asked if we were interested in "protecting anyone", but he offered no guarantees or commitments that his recommendations would respect those concerns over individuals.

I expressed two concerns which he respected and another which, although he agreed to, he blatantly ignored. He kept his promise to keep the new "Housemaster" position out.

of the curriculum sphere, a problem that Edward Sarasin, then a Housemaster, had exacerbated by insisting that he, as housemaster, would run an autonomous house free of all influence of the existing, traditional Department Heads. Second, he agreed to accommodate the needs of an administrator who was retiring within one year of the date of introduction of the reorganization by giving that person meaningful responsibilities and a place of respect.

However, it was made clear to him, and he fully agreed in light of the very sensitive and controversial nature of the many future appointments, that before members put themselves "on the line" with his reorganization, that the School Committee had better "see the whole, complete plan" - and "that four members agree to support the plan as presented" before Larmon would formally introduce the package. Although he agreed, and clearly understood the reason for that prior approval, he never even attempted to honor his word.

Members did not see the Reorganization Recommendation until it was released to everyone else, and only Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Berman, and Mr. Holway had agreed to support it when it was introduced. I had opposed a prior year's weaker plan and had clearly indicated to Larmon that I would not support any plan until I had a chance to analyze a full, complete draft. Thus, Larmon had maneuvered me into a political corner - however clever for him to have gotten away with - a corner I resented, placed by a man who had promised not to do it. He did tell me, in a desperate effort to explain that he was honoring his commitment, that "Mr. Fantini seems to like it, and Mayor Danehy has no problems with it," implying broad Committee support. It is my clear opinion that he merely used comments out of context, if those comments were ever made at all, to imply that Fantini and Danehy would support his plan. Neither person ever took a public position that was anything but inalterably opposed to Reorganization.

Thus, much as I am ashamed to admit it now, it was as much a need to protect Larmon's ability to function as an administrator within the school system, as it was a perceived need to reorganize the school system that swayed my vote. Had I known that Larmon would submit nominees without sustaining votes, that Mr. Holway had indicated that he would never support a complete reorganization of the Physical Education Department, (a crucial component of reorganization), or that some of the new administrative recommendations would be persons distinguished by their mediocrity, I would never have supported Reorganization.

It is important to note, for the record, that, in our preliminary discussions on draft schemes for reorganization, Larmon suggested individuals who might appropriately fill the newly developed jobs. Edward Sarasin was identified as a strong possibility for Headmaster, Henry Lukas for the Policy and Students Assistant Headmastership, and Diane Tabor for the Curricular position. There is now no doubt in my mind that the new positions were created with these individuals in mind.

Now, with the plan implemented, we can look back on individuals whose recommendations came at a time when it was, in fact, too late for Committee Members to interview them - as in the case of the Assistant Headmaster for Fundamental and the most recently appointed Housemaster. Further, I can say that, with the exception of Ms. Chayet (Social Studies), Dr. Tabor, and Dr. Brown (Physical Education/Health/Athletics), the new group of administrators are at best, nearly as competent as their predecessors. Headmaster Sarasin, while more effective in some respects, has had serious problems in others.

Mr. Leslie Oliver's position was eliminated illegally with the request of the Superintendent to transfer him despite a clear accidental omission by the School Committee. One might question why the cutting of Oliver's position from the budget document results in the transfer of this person to a teacher's position, while Mr. Alan Cherish's po-

sition, also eliminated in the budget, is restored with the endorsement of the Superintendent who issued a memorandum in support of Cherish's appointment implying that the money remained in the budget when it had clearly been cut. However, it is easy to understand this when one considers what Mr. Lannon explained during the budget hearings last year - Cherish was a member of the Vellucci family.

A very serious violation of trust occurred in negotiating the salaries of the newly established reorganization positions under "impact" bargaining following implementation. Lannon was eager to upgrade the new positions. Almost all the negotiating was done with the School Committee being given little or no information. A long impasse developed. Finally, the Committee agreed to make a final proposal increasing certain steps and ratio scales. This was in fall, 1979. However, before the final offer could be endorsed, the municipal election rendered the Committee as "lame ducks".

As you may all recall, the initial ballot count was ominous for me personally to the point where I, and almost all veteran observers of "PR" counts, believed that I would not be re-elected. Accordingly, I phoned the Superintendent and told him that it was clear to me that I would lose my seat in favor of Mrs. Attles and that my support of the newly upgraded salary package was no longer valid. I said quite clearly that, I (would) let (him) know if this situation changed, but until then, (you) are not to make any proposals in my name to the union."

Although I was reelected, Lannon never consulted me before offering the package to the union. I spoke with him on this, and he assured me that he had the four votes without my commitment. I was quite surprised since my Independent colleagues were refusing to vote for any components of the Reorganization. Lannon indicated that Mr. Maynard had agreed to support the new wage package for reorganized people. I did not believe it and told Lannon so. In a telephone poll, conducted informally to ascertain committee support for the package, Lannon had clearly implied to members that I had supported the package without telling them that I had withdrawn my support. Thus, the members were given "filtered" information, as misleading as Lannon's earlier statements about Danehy and Fantini's support for reorganization. My suspicions were confirmed when, at the meeting when a vote was scheduled on the confirmation of the salary offer, Maynard was not present and Lannon was desperately looking for a fourth vote.

The use of the "telephone poll" has proven one of Lannon's most effective techniques for accomplishing what he wants to do, particularly in his efforts to install Muriel Heilberger as the acting project director for Project SPAN.

USUPRING AND MANIPULATING THE POLICY PREROGATIVES OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

It is often possible to manipulate events so that decisions make themselves. When this is done consciously to interfere with the right of the School Committee to become fully informed and to take an action, I resent it bitterly.

Most recently, the example of transfers came to light. In one grievance, Lannon asked the Committee to sustain his ruling that a move within a building was a "transfer" under the collective bargaining agreement. Later in the year, in the case which resulted in the Committee apologizing to a teacher for the action, Lannon tried to reverse himself without telling the School Committee. The case involved Ms. Gurry-Axtman who was ordered to move involuntarily to another school. Personnel Director Theall, with Lannon's support, insisted that the move was needed so that a minority person could be appointed to the Fitzgerald School. As the record shows, no minority individual was ever considered. Ms. Axtman objected when her position, one of four 4th grades, was transferred while another position, held by a substitute teacher, was left vacant at the same school. This, more than any other incident reflects the insensitivity of Lannon and his Macciavellian staff.

In this case, the problem was made worse when a teacher in grade 8 was transferred to grade 7 without any consideration of the transfer policy - an action defended by the Superintendent and Personnel Director as "not a transfer".

In another matter, without formal recommendation to the Committee, Lannon has redefined the positions held by Mr. Woodward and Mr. Sateriale. It has become clear to me that Lannon seeks to maneuver them into positions of expendability, eventually to eliminate them. The decision to redefine the positions came in the form of a notification after the fact. Such a change may be appropriate, but **THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS BELONGS WITH THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE!!!**

It has become increasingly frustrating to see the extent to which Lannon is given a free hand by certain members of the School Committee which refused even to consider the above action for review. Lannon's free hand to allow individuals to step on people (as were done conspicuously with Mr. Burns and Mrs. Boyle at the High School and with parents innumerable during racial imbalance processes) have destroyed morale among the faculty.

During the tense negotiations for the latest collective bargaining agreement with the teachers, one fact became obvious - obvious to the point where it was painfully clear: the faculty, in general, young and old, competent and incompetent, conservative and progressive, do not trust William Lannon AT ALL. The man is disliked intensely by a broad spectrum of the faculty. Racial imbalance meetings have brought out similar feelings among parents.

If it did not become obvious to all concerned that Lannon is attempting to use the processes of racially balancing the Cambridge Public Schools voluntarily to enhance his own standing with his professional colleagues at the expense of the long term good of the City of Cambridge and its public schools, then the School Committee is **BLIND!!!!**

RACIAL IMBALANCE

When all the theses are written describing how Cambridge addressed the issue of the racial imbalance of its public schools, there should be dark chapters for Lannon and his first SPAN Director, Jerry Kohn. Both oversaw a period of maneuvering, half-truths, lies, and misinformation - and both were parties to it all.

To substantiate the positions I hold, it is important to review briefly the story of how SPAN began and developed.

About three years ago, Project Span was started with a state grant, dealing mostly with racial sensitivities as an issue. Lannon recommended Jerry Kohn as its director. Kohn, who had been working out of Lannon's Office during his attendance at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, had lost the respect of many faculty at the high school for having served as "Lannon's eyes and ears" while Reorganization was being developed. Because of this role, confirmed to me by Lannon, Kohn had earned the reputation of a "snake". What none of us knew then was that the state Department of Education, which funded Span, was concerned that its function was not true to the spirit of the grant - a grant made to support the efforts to racially balance the public schools of Cambridge. I was also to learn later that Mr. Charles Glenn, Equal Opportunity Administrator at the State Department of Education had threatened to cut off funding if Kohn was not replaced. He was clearly not trusted by the state department.

Following the renewal of Project SPAN, the School Committee was asked by Lannon and Kohn to go into executive session to review concerns about the racial imbalance of some of our public schools. In that meeting we were informed that the focus of SPAN would be changing to deal with this problem. It seemed that the language of the grant application had been changed, and, although the Committee had been informed of this through the formality of having a copy of the renewal sent to members, no effort was made to remind the Committee to look for the fine print changes in the scope of this important program.

During this executive session Kohn told us a number of things including:

- "There are literally millions of dollars that the 'Feds' will pour into Cambridge if we act."
- "Nobody at the Cambridge Housing Authority will talk with us on this."
- "David Vickery will not work with us if we deal with this issue in public rather than in executive session. He doesn't want the public involved."
- "Charlie Glenn and his staff won't put anything in writing as far as specifics is concerned."

At that meeting, before the entire Committee and Lannon's staff I made the following statement so as to leave no possible ambiguity. "Look Jerry, and you too Mr. Lannon, I want to know everything you're doing in this area before, during, and after you do it. This is too sensitive an area not to be closely observed and followed. We've got to do it properly." I remember distinctly that the rest of the Committee supported my demand to be kept informed. Lannon and Kohn, in my opinion, never had the slightest intention of even attempting to meet the spirit, or the letter, of this demand.

IN FACT, AS IT TURNS OUT, EACH OF THE FOUR POINTS LISTED ABOVE WERE NOTHING LESS THAN LIES TOLD BY MR. KOHN, AS WE HAVE ALL LEARNED BY NOW.

The first step was to develop a Phase 1 plan to attempt to correct the imbalance which Kohn had so clearly decided was of such scope as to indict the previous actions of earlier school committees. In doing so, Kohn and his half-time assistant Muriel Heilberger (whom he excitedly described as "a member of the community, who lives right here in Cambridge, and who speaks Spanish." We were all to learn later that she was one of his colleagues from the Harvard Graduate School of Education) met individually with members of the committee to get their input into the "temporary" Phase 1 plan in the clear hope that it would be workable, stable, and possibly permanent.

Despite my offer to save time and to be interviewed with one or more colleagues, Kohn and Heilberger insisted on separate meetings. It became clear that the strategy was to keep members from exchanging ideas before them and to facilitate the manipulation of ideas to suit their own conveniences. I told my interviewer, Heilberger, that there was no way that the schools could be racially balanced voluntarily, as they hoped to do, but that redistricting, transporting, and other involuntary steps would be required. I warned her that "we can't fool these people. The community better get the truth and get ready to move." That was the last I was to see or hear from her until the evening prior to the deadline for submission of a Phase 1 plan to the State Department of Education.

At the conclusion of a School Committee meeting, at about 11:00 p.m., Kohn hurriedly passed around a final draft Phase 1 plan as Lannon insisted that he had to have it adopted and approved at that meeting for "submission tomorrow." Needless to say, I was livid, for all of my suggestions were ignored. I was to learn later that Mr. Fantini had also made recommendations similar to mine warning of involuntary mandated steps. I argued that if important suggestions of a Committee Member were to be ignored, at minimum, the member was owed the courtesy of being informed, rather than an eleventh hour forcing of hands. There is no doubt in my mind that Lannon and Kohn knew exactly

what they were doing.

I confronted Kohn who, to my utter shock, supported me totally, blaming Larnon who, according to Kohn had had the draft plans for some time and had not shared them with the School Committee. Larnon, on the other hand, indicated that there was a shortage of time and suggested that Kohn had been late in his data gathering. Later, in his office, Kohn and Heilberger were full of apologies. He and Larnon were busy pointing fingers at each other (in private only, of course), and they were probably laughing at us all when we weren't looking.

Again, SPAN was reminded of my demand to be kept informed "before, during, and after" whatever they were doing. Within two weeks of the opening of school, Heilberger called my office to say that, it was obvious, that Phase 1's call for voluntary transfers was not going to work. I was distressed because, in the clear minds of the average public citizen, everything was, and would be fine with Phase 1. No one ever went out of his way to warn that deep inside Phase 1 was a warning that Phase 2 would be far broader and tougher in scope. The public was clearly deceived into believing that Phase 1 was all that would ever be necessary. There had never been the slightest hint of doubt that Phase 1 would not work perfectly.

An essential anecdote is presented here. In October, 1979, Kohn called my office to tell me that a federal planning grant had been received. It required, according to him, that 25% of his and Heilberger's salary be covered by the federal dollars. Since I was eager to see as much money as possible go directly into classroom assistance, and knowing that Kohn and Heilberger were drawing large salaries (25% would have been close to \$10,000), I was curious. I asked where in the regulations, or written instructions, we were required to allocate a portion of their salaries with federal grants, since I knew that SPAN was a state funded grant. Kohn asked me why I had to know that. After some hesitation, he indicated that he was told to do it. Upon my insistence, he told me that the person so directing him was based at Brandeis University. I asked him if the Feds had opened a branch at Brandeis, and asked for the gentleman's number. Kohn then explained that, "well, ah, er, he works with the federal government."

Then I recalled that the federal fiscal year (October 1 - September 30) was different from the state fiscal year ending three months before the federal year. I confronted Kohn with this evidence. It was only then that he admitted that his real purpose was to cover 100% of their salaries for the $\frac{1}{4}$ year following the end of the state fiscal year to the end of the federal fiscal year. (The state year ended on June 30, 1980. By allocating 25% of his annual salary to the federal grant, he could collect full salary for the period of July 1 - September 30, 1980 with Washington dollars and thus, insure three months of highly paid employment while he looked for a job elsewhere. By the way, he used his "highly successful experience" in Cambridge to gain employment in a suburban Connecticut school system.)

Mrs. Wolf also expressed resentment when the real reason for the allocation when I confronted Larnon and Kohn in public. Apparently, She and Mrs. Berman had bought Kohn's original story without objection.

In addition, other matters reflect unfavorably on Larnon and SPAN:

- The failure of Larnon to recommend a plan based on the pairing of schools as the Committee had instructed because Larnon feared subversion of it by elementary administration and faculty.
- The failure to involve the active community in the final drawing of the Phase 2 plan despite dozens of preliminary meetings.
- Larnon's retro-active recommendation to install Muriel Heilberger as Kohn's replacement following an unsuccessful attempt to do so by telephone poll - a clear "back-door" ascension to office.

OTHER AREAS OF CONCERN

Recently, members learned that an Amicus Curiae brief had been filed in court (drafted at our expense by our attorney) on behalf of a case brought by the Massachusetts Teachers Association dealing with early retirement benefits counting towards pensions. The School Committee never authorized the production of this brief, however noble or well written it may have been. In addition, I noted that the employer's briefs in support of grievances filed on our behalf, and the arbitrators rulings (especially when the School Committee is not the winner) were not being forwarded to us. I was embarrassed to learn of rulings from the President of the teachers union. In addition, the briefs, which explain the Committee's policies, have never been submitted to the Committee for approval, a dangerous fact of life for it gives the Superintendent the right to espouse policy, file it with the arbitrator, and let the Committee know about it after the fact.

I add here my bitter resentment to the personal lobbying efforts of Lannon to defeat, or render weak, my recent motion to keep the approval and notification of consulting services before the Committee for action. It is no secret that education and social planners have eager eyes on our public school system, and that, consultants, however noble they may be, should be known to the Committee as to their full purpose, before we hire them. We may well determine that certain planning is going on, certain topics are being discussed, and thus, be better informed.

Many objections have been raised by members as to the information provided to the School Committee. Those of us who cannot spend our days in school buildings have not been kept abreast of such events as racial incidents at the high school, problems with the implementation of the racial imbalance plan, personnel issues, preliminary updates on collective bargaining, and problems with departmental administrators. I found it interesting to note that Lannon recently admitted to the Committee that there were problems with Mr. Sarasin, a person regarded as infallible by Lannon in public up to that time. Serious problems resulting in loss of morale among the faculty were not reviewed with the School Committee.

During the intense collective bargaining negotiations, the out and out distrust, and dislike for Lannon was obvious from almost all factions within the school department. The man has lost the trust of the faculty from school to school.

The personnel department, which has Lannon's unwavering and total support, has made serious errors in implementing the policy of the school department. More and more, it has been necessary to reverse the Superintendent on matters of grievances because of errors by Lannon and the Personnel Director.

Last year, during City Council hearings on our \$919,000 deficit, Lannon was embarrassingly ill prepared to give clear, concise answers to the Council, showing to me, a lack of understanding of important fiscal and budgetary issues. The fact that some accounts were overspent, especially in the high school, reflect Lannon's first loyalty to his newly appointed pet administrators, at the expense of the overall credibility of the entire public school system.

The lack of morale in the bilingual department can be traced, in large part, to the free, unchecked hand given to Director Fernandez and Coordinator Cynthia Oldham, about whom not a single remark less than negative has been made to me by many faculty. It is easily explained because both are willing to respond to Lannon's commands regardless of who is harmed among the faculty. It is interesting to note that during the 1980 budget hearings, positions were cut from the Bilingual Department at Fernandez's recommendation with the understanding that he not be required to defend them publicly - thus giving him the best of possible worlds (Lannon's favor, and not being exposed

to his constituency.

SUMMARY

Lannon cannot be totally blamed for trying to get away with what he does. He has had, up to this time, the willing support and defense of some members of the School Committee. I have noted, with regret, that Mrs. Wolf and Mrs. Berman have never been inclined to ever question the Superintendent's actions. I regretted even further, that up to this point, the Mayor has also been reluctant to do so.

I had hoped that the input of even the more enlightened members of the teachers union might have at minimum convinced my colleagues that Lannon's administrative integrity needed to be held to public scrutiny.

His carelessness with the truth has become chronic, as I have tried to point out at meeting after meeting.

His support of administrative staff (at the expense of the School Committee's right to have full information in many matters) is tearing at the morale of many fine staff members who are suffering when administrators are allowed to govern without regard to equitable treatment. The recent opening-of-school corridor assignments without the slightest regard to the personal concerns of high school teachers remains one of the most serious administrative errors, made worse by the refusal to acknowledge the problem.

Manipulative attempts to transfer certain Submasters, checked finally by the School Committee remain symptomatic of the larger problem.

"Administrative Patronage" continues to show its face as Lannon makes room for special favorites. Only a reduction of actual jobs seems to have stopped some of the blatant political patronage which created problems in the past, including some very unfortunate assignments in the health and safety area.

As Lannon's contract expires on August 15, 1981, and as the deadline to notify him of our intent to renew his contract approaches in January, the Committee must have serious deliberations over how to proceed. It is my firm opinion, that, if Lannon is permitted to remain as our Superintendent, he must recognize that he has made serious mistakes in his treatment of the School Committee. He must make a firm, if not written commitment, to honor the policy prerogatives of the Committee, to deal truthfully and honestly with the seven most active volunteers in service to education in Cambridge, and to respect the needs of our community in which we will reside long after William Lannon is long gone.

I welcome the opportunity to hold a public discussion as to the fitness of Mr. Lannon to hold the public trust and the support of the School Committee in home that, through a show of public feeling, Mr. Lannon may decide that, if he is to remain, he must be more honest and open and less careless with the future of our city.

" The Koocher Papers "

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MY COLLEAGUES ON THE CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

FROM: GLENN S. KOOCHEK, MEMBER

DATE: NOVEMBER 12, 1980

RE: SUPERINTENDENCY

On July 3, 1980 I wrote a letter of substantial length to Mayor Duehay outlining some serious concerns which I had over the status of the Cambridge Public Schools and, in particular, over the Superintendency of William C. Lannon. As most of you know, the Superintendent's contract will expire on August 15, 1981. It has never been my interest to participate in a termination which would smack of political machinations. Rather, my interest is in bringing before the School Committee and the public my reasons for reservations about renewing Lannon's contract.

This is no pleasant task. As some of you know, I was one of the four Committee Members who first brought Lannon to Cambridge in 1975. However, the public may not be aware of the agreement reached in August, 1975 in the living room of Committeeman Charles Pierce, an agreement to which I was a party, whereby, I would give my affirmative vote to a joint motion of Members Gesell, Pierce, and Wolf to appoint Lannon if they would support my motion to grant four year contracts to Assistant Superintendents Woodward and Brown. (With the election upcoming, I was concerned about stability for these untenured administrators. Assistant Superintendent Saterial, who was serving as Acting Superintendent was tenured at the time and needed no such protection.)

I held a pivotal vote on the Committee at that time and I can speak with authority as to what were or were not conditions and facts at the time. Following the resignation of Superintendent Alflorance Cheatham, we initiated a public interview process to review the list of some 25 semi-finalists out of a field of 120. We then narrowed the field to six. A clear choice was Mr. John Lawson, then Superintendent of Schools in Shaker Heights, Ohio. Had there not been illness in his family forcing him to withdraw, he would have been Superintendent. However, he took himself out of the running as did a finalist from Worcester. Two Boston finalists were not in the running with more than one or two members and they were ruled out. Another individual serving as a school administrator in the Virgin Islands, the only black applicant, had minimal support even among the more progressive interviewers. Only Lannon and Joseph Saterial remained as viable finalists.

This set the stage for a classic "Cambridge Vs. the Outsider" confrontation which had so bitterly divided the city a few years earlier during the firing of Superintendent Frank Frisoli. The scars were far from healed.

At the time, the School Committee was completing the first of the major tasks that the reform elements had set out to do - a complete cleaning up of the personnel functions handled at that time by the Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Rose O'Rourke. My public statements about that position "running the patronage mill" are public record and I will stand by them. In fact, Ms. O'Rourke was in eager pursuit of the new Director of Personnel Position.

The job of proposing a nominee for this position fell upon Acting Superintendent

Joseph Saterial. I met with him to review the school department situation in general. We discussed the prospect that the School Committee might reject his nominations now or in the future, as it might reject the nominations of any superintendent. He explained that, in that case, he would follow his original recommendation with the second choice. For me, that was not only the wrong answer - it cost him the superintendency. For it would then become obvious to any School Committee that all it needed to do was continue to reject people until the person the Committee wanted was nominated. For me, any situation which would allow four politically motivated members to wait out good people for a politically preferred person was not satisfactory.

I should make it clear that I believed then, as I do now, that Mr. Saterial is an individual of the highest integrity. Our philosophical difference in this instance was based on his interest in being a pragmatist with a future Committee. Mine was to insure that a future Superintendent would be isolated from political pressure, conscious or subconscious.

Thus, we were able to secure a three year contract for our new Superintendent and four year contracts for the Assistant Superintendents, guaranteeing a freedom from political pressures at that time. Although Lannon never impressed me before he came (he tended to ramble, he was too low key, and he had never worked with racial minorities), something I told him in a telephone conversation prior to the meeting at Mr. Pierce's house, I fought hard, much harder than any of my colleagues, to have his contract extended and his salary increased from \$38,000 to \$44,000 soon after he arrived.

However, over the past two years, I have witnessed serious changes resulting in the areas of reservation which I will outline. They include:

- Continuous attempts to preempt and usurp the legitimate and exclusive policy prerogatives of the School Committee.
- Tolerance of the appointment of mediocre administrators and his subsequent support for them, in such critical areas as personnel, secondary school administration, and planning programs which have resulted in inexcusable cases of arbitrary administrative actions, rudenesses to students and parents, and a loss of morale among faculty.
- Placement into sensitive positions of the School Department of individuals whose positioning seems to have been based on the willingness to carry out Mr. Lannon's tasks without regard to the personal, human needs of parents, children, and faculty.
- A callous attitude toward the law and collective bargaining contracts as they apply to the school department and its employees.
- Favoritism displayed to certain members of the School Committee in the form of the sharing of information and political personnel patronage.
- A lack of understanding or respect for budgeting and fiscal procedures and responsibility.

It is over the issue of the Reorganization of the high schools with which I first began to challenge the integrity of Superintendent Lannon.

PROBLEMS WITH THE "REORGANIZATION"

Prior to submitting his comprehensive high school and curricular reorganization package to the School Committee, Mr. Lannon met with members individually to identify any areas of concern, reservation, and interest. He also asked if we were interested in "protecting anyone", but he offered no guarantees or commitments that his recommendations would respect those concerns over individuals.

I expressed two concerns which he respected and another which, although he agreed to, he blatantly ignored. He kept his promise to keep the new "Housemaster" position out

of the curriculum sphere, a problem that Edward Sarasin, then a Housemaster, had exacerbated by insisting that he, as housemaster, would run an autonomous house free of all influence of the existing, traditional Department Heads. Second, he agreed to accommodate the needs of an administrator who was retiring within one year of the date of introduction of the reorganization by giving that person meaningful responsibilities and a place of respect.

However, it was made clear to him, and he fully agreed in light of the very sensitive and controversial nature of the many future appointments, that before members put themselves "on the line" with his reorganization, that the School Committee had better "see the whole, complete plan" - and "that four members agree to support the plan as presented" before Larmon would formally introduce the package. Although he agreed, and clearly understood the reason for that prior approval, he never even attempted to honor his word.

Members did not see the Reorganization Recommendation until it was released to everyone else, and only Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Berman, and Mr. Holway had agreed to support it when it was introduced. I had opposed a prior year's weaker plan and had clearly indicated to Larmon that I would not support any plan until I had a chance to analyze a full, complete draft. Thus, Larmon had maneuvered me into a political corner - however clever for him to have gotten away with - a corner I resented, placed by a man who had promised not to do it. He did tell me, in a desperate effort to explain that he was honoring his commitment, that "Mr. Fantini seems to like it, and Mayor Danahy has no problems with it," implying broad Committee support. It is my clear opinion that he merely used comments out of context, if those comments were ever made at all, to imply that Fantini and Danahy would support his plan. Neither person ever took a public position that was anything but inalterably opposed to Reorganization.

Thus, much as I am ashamed to admit it now, it was as much a need to protect Larmon's ability to function as an administrator within the school system, as it was a perceived need to reorganize the school system that swayed my vote. Had I known that Larmon would submit nominees without sustaining votes, that Mr. Holway had indicated that he would never support a complete reorganization of the Physical Education Department, (a crucial component of reorganization), or that some of the new administrative recommendations would be persons distinguished by their mediocrity, I would never have supported Reorganization.

It is important to note, for the record, that, in our preliminary discussions on draft schemes for reorganization, Larmon suggested individuals who might appropriately fill the newly developed jobs. Edward Sarasin was identified as a strong possibility for Headmaster, Henry Lukas for the Policy and Students Assistant Headmastership, and Diane Tabor for the Curricular position. There is now no doubt in my mind that the new positions were created with these individuals in mind.

Now, with the plan implemented, we can look back on individuals whose recommendations came at a time when it was, in fact, too late for Committee Members to interview them - as in the case of the Assistant Headmaster for Fundamental and the most recently appointed Housemaster. Further, I can say that, with the exception of Ms. Chayet (Social Studies), Dr. Tabor, and Dr. Brown (Physical Education/Health/Athletics), the new group of administrators are at best, nearly as competent as their predecessors. Headmaster Sarasin, while more effective in some respects, has had serious problems in others.

Mr. Leslie Oliver's position was eliminated illegally with the request of the Superintendent to transfer him despite a clear accidental omission by the School Committee. One might question why the cutting of Oliver's position from the budget document results in the transfer of this person to a teacher's position, while Mr. Alan Cherish's po-

sition, also eliminated in the budget, is restored with the endorsement of the Superintendent who issued a memorandum in support of Cherish's appointment implying that the money remained in the budget when it had clearly been cut. However, it is easy to understand this when one considers what Mr. Lannon explained during the budget hearings last year - Cherish was a member of the Vellucci family.

A very serious violation of trust occurred in negotiating the salaries of the newly established reorganization positions under "impact" bargaining following implementation. Lannon was eager to upgrade the new positions. Almost all the negotiating was done with the School Committee being given little or no information. A long impasse developed. Finally, the Committee agreed to make a final proposal increasing certain steps and ratio scales. This was in fall, 1979. However, before the final offer could be endorsed, the municipal election rendered the Committee as "lame ducks".

As you may all recall, the initial ballot count was ominous for me personally to the point where I, and almost all veteran observers of "PR" counts, believed that I would not be re-elected. Accordingly, I phoned the Superintendent and told him that it was clear to me that I would lose my seat in favor of Mrs. Attles and that my support of the newly upgraded salary package was no longer valid. I said quite clearly that, I (would) let (him) know if this situation changed, but until then, (you) are not to make any proposals in my name to the union."

Although I was reelected, Lannon never consulted me before offering the package to the union. I spoke with him on this, and he assured me that he had the four votes without my commitment. I was quite surprised since my Independent colleagues were refusing to vote for any components of the Reorganization. Lannon indicated that Mr. Maynard had agreed to support the new wage package for reorganized people. I did not believe it and told Lannon so. In a telephone poll, conducted informally to ascertain committee support for the package, Lannon had clearly implied to members that I had supported the package without telling them that I had withdrawn my support. Thus, the members were given "filtered" information, as misleading as Lannon's earlier statements about Danahy and Fantini's support for reorganization. My suspicions were confirmed when, at the meeting when a vote was scheduled on the confirmation of the salary offer, Maynard was not present and Lannon was desperately looking for a fourth vote.

The use of the "telephone poll" has proven one of Lannon's most effective techniques for accomplishing what he wants to do, particularly in his efforts to install Muriel Heilberger as the acting project director for Project SPAN.

USUPRING AND MANIPULATING THE POLICY PREROGATIVES OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

It is often possible to manipulate events so that decisions make themselves. When this is done consciously to interfere with the right of the School Committee to become fully informed and to take an action, I resent it bitterly.

Most recently, the example of transfers came to light. In one grievance, Lannon asked the Committee to sustain his ruling that a move within a building was a "transfer" under the collective bargaining agreement. Later in the year, in the case which resulted in the Committee apologizing to a teacher for the action, Lannon tried to reverse himself without telling the School Committee. The case involved Ms. Gurry-Axtman who was ordered to move involuntarily to another school. Personnel Director Theall, with Lannon's support, insisted that the move was needed so that a minority person could be appointed to the Fitzgerald School. As the record shows, no minority individual was ever considered. Ms. Axtman objected when her position, one of four 4th grades, was transferred while another position, held by a substitute teacher, was left vacant at the same school. This, more than any other incident reflects the insensitivity of Lannon and his Macciavellian staff.

In this case, the problem was made worse when a teacher in grade 8 was transferred to grade 7 without any consideration of the transfer policy - an action defended by the Superintendent and Personnel Director as "not a transfer".

In another matter, without formal recommendation to the Committee, Lannon has redefined the positions held by Mr. Woodward and Mr. Sateriale. It has become clear to me that Lannon seeks to maneuver them into positions of expendability, eventually to eliminate them. The decision to redefine the positions came in the form of a notification after the fact. Such a change may be appropriate, but **THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS BELONGS WITH THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE!!!!**

It has become increasingly frustrating to see the extent to which Lannon is given a free hand by certain members of the School Committee which refused even to consider the above action for review. Lannon's free hand to allow individuals to step on people (as were done conspicuously with Mr. Burns and Mrs. Boyle at the High School and with parents innumerable during racial imbalance processes) have destroyed morale among the faculty.

During the tense negotiations for the latest collective bargaining agreement with the teachers, one fact became obvious - obvious to the point where it was painfully clear: the faculty, in general, young and old, competent and incompetent, conservative and progressive, do not trust William Lannon AT ALL. The man is disliked intensely by a broad spectrum of the faculty. Racial imbalance meetings have brought out similar feelings among parents.

If it did not become obvious to all concerned that Lannon is attempting to use the processes of racially balancing the Cambridge Public Schools voluntarily to enhance his own standing with his professional colleagues at the expense of the long term good of the City of Cambridge and its public schools, then the School Committee is **BLIND!!!!**

RACIAL IMBALANCE

When all the theses are written describing how Cambridge addressed the issue of the racial imbalance of its public schools, there should be dark chapters for Lannon and his first SPAN Director, Jerry Kohn. Both oversaw a period of maneuvering, half-truths, lies, and misinformation - and both were parties to it all.

To substantiate the positions I hold, it is important to review briefly the story of how SPAN began and developed.

About three years ago, Project Span was started with a state grant, dealing mostly with racial sensitivities as an issue. Lannon recommended Jerry Kohn as its director. Kohn, who had been working out of Lannon's Office during his attendance at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, had lost the respect of many faculty at the high school for having served as "Lannon's eyes and ears" while Reorganization was being developed. Because of this role, confirmed to me by Lannon, Kohn had earned the reputation of a "snake". What none of us knew then was that the state Department of Education, which funded Span, was concerned that its function was not true to the spirit of the grant - a grant made to support the efforts to racially balance the public schools of Cambridge. I was also to learn later that Mr. Charles Glenn, Equal Opportunity Administrator at the State Department of Education had threatened to cut off funding if Kohn was not replaced. He was clearly not trusted by the state department.

Following the renewal of Project SPAN, the School Committee was asked by Lannon and Kohn to go into executive session to review concerns about the racial imbalance of some of our public schools. In that meeting we were informed that the focus of SPAN would be changing to deal with this problem. It seemed that the language of the grant application had been changed, and, although the Committee had been informed of this through the formality of having a copy of the renewal sent to members, no effort was made to remind the Committee to look for the fine print changes in the scope of this important program.

During this executive session Kohn told us a number of things including:

- "There are literally millions of dollars that the 'Feds' will pour into Cambridge if we act."
- "Nobody at the Cambridge Housing Authority will talk with us on this."
- "David Vickery will not work with us if we deal with this issue in public rather than in executive session. He doesn't want the public involved."
- "Charlie Glenn and his staff won't put anything in writing as far as specifics is concerned."

At that meeting, before the entire Committee and Lannon's staff I made the following statement so as to leave no possible ambiguity. "Look Jerry, and you too Mr. Lannon, I want to know everything you're doing in this area before, during, and after you do it. This is too sensitive an area not to be closely observed and followed. We've got to do it properly." I remember distinctly that the rest of the Committee supported my demand to be kept informed. Lannon and Kohn, in my opinion, never had the slightest intention of even attempting to meet the spirit, or the letter, of this demand.

IN FACT, AS IT TURNS OUT, EACH OF THE FOUR POINTS LISTED ABOVE WERE NOTHING LESS THAN LIES TOLD BY MR. KOHN, AS WE HAVE ALL LEARNED BY NOW.

The first step was to develop a Phase 1 plan to attempt to correct the imbalance which Kohn had so clearly decided was of such scope as to indict the previous actions of earlier school committees. In doing so, Kohn and his half-time assistant Muriel Heilberger (whom he excitedly described as "a member of the community, who lives right here in Cambridge, and who speaks Spanish." We were all to learn later that she was one of his colleagues from the Harvard Graduate School of Education) met individually with members of the committee to get their input into the "temporary" Phase 1 plan in the clear hope that it would be workable, stable, and possibly permanent.

Despite my offer to save time and to be interviewed with one or more colleagues, Kohn and Heilberger insisted on separate meetings. It became clear that the strategy was to keep members from exchanging ideas before them and to facilitate the manipulation of ideas to suit their own conveniences. I told my interviewer, Heilberger, that there was no way that the schools could be racially balanced voluntarily, as they hoped to do, but that redistricting, transporting, and other involuntary steps would be required. I warned her that "we can't fool these people. The community better get the truth and get ready to move." That was the last I was to see or hear from her until the evening prior to the deadline for submission of a Phase 1 plan to the State Department of Education.

At the conclusion of a School Committee meeting, at about 11:00 p.m., Kohn hurriedly passed around a final draft Phase 1 plan as Lannon insisted that he had to have it adopted and approved at that meeting for "submission tomorrow." Needless to say, I was livid, for all of my suggestions were ignored. I was to learn later that Mr. Fantini had also made recommendations similar to mine warning of involuntary mandated steps. I argued that if important suggestions of a Committee Member were to be ignored, at minimum, the member was owed the courtesy of being informed, rather than an eleventh hour forcing of hands. There is no doubt in my mind that Lannon and Kohn knew exactly

what they were doing.

I confronted Kohn who, to my utter shock, supported me totally, blaming Larnon who, according to Kohn had had the draft plans for some time and had not shared them with the School Committee. Larnon, on the other hand, indicated that there was a shortage of time and suggested that Kohn had been late in his data gathering. Later, in his office, Kohn and Heilberger were full of apologies. He and Larnon were busy pointing fingers at each other (in private only, of course), and they were probably laughing at us all when we weren't looking.

Again, SPAN was reminded of my demand to be kept informed "before, during, and after" whatever they were doing. Within two weeks of the opening of school, Heilberger called my office to say that, it was obvious, that Phase 1's call for voluntary transfers was not going to work. I was distressed because, in the clear minds of the average public citizen, everything was, and would be fine with Phase 1. No one ever went out of his way to warn that deep inside Phase 1 was a warning that Phase 2 would be far broader and tougher in scope. The public was clearly deceived into believing that Phase 1 was all that would ever be necessary. There had never been the slightest hint of doubt that Phase 1 would not work perfectly.

An essential anecdote is presented here. In October, 1979, Kohn called my office to tell me that a federal planning grant had been received. It required, according to him, that 25% of his and Heilberger's salary be covered by the federal dollars. Since I was eager to see as much money as possible go directly into classroom assistance, and knowing that Kohn and Heilberger were drawing large salaries (25% would have been close to \$10,000), I was curious. I asked where in the regulations, or written instructions, we were required to allocate a portion of their salaries with federal grants, since I knew that SPAN was a state funded grant. Kohn asked me why I had to know that. After some hesitation, he indicated that he was told to do it. Upon my insistence, he told me that the person so directing him was based at Brandeis University. I asked him if the Feds had opened a branch at Brandeis, and asked for the gentleman's number. Kohn then explained that, "well, ah, er, he works with the federal government."

Then I recalled that the federal fiscal year (October 1 - September 30) was different from the state fiscal year ending three months before the federal year. I confronted Kohn with this evidence. It was only then that he admitted that his real purpose was to cover 100% of their salaries for the $\frac{1}{2}$ year following the end of the state fiscal year to the end of the federal fiscal year. (The state year ended on June 30, 1980. By allocating 25% of his annual salary to the federal grant, he could collect full salary for the period of July 1 - September 30, 1980 with Washington dollars and thus, insure three months of highly paid employment while he looked for a job elsewhere. By the way, he used his "highly successful experience" in Cambridge to gain employment in a suburban Connecticut school system.)

Mrs. Wolf also expressed resentment when the real reason for the allocation when I confronted Larnon and Kohn in public. Apparently, She and Mrs. Berman had bought Kohn's original story without objection.

In addition, other matters reflect unfavorably on Larnon and SPAN:

- The failure of Larnon to recommend a plan based on the pairing of schools as the Committee had instructed because Larnon feared subversion of it by elementary administration and faculty.
- The failure to involve the active community in the final drawing of the Phase 2 plan despite dozens of preliminary meetings.
- Larnon's retro-active recommendation to install Muriel Heilberger as Kohn's replacement following an unsuccessful attempt to do so by telephone poll - a clear "back-door" ascension to office.

OTHER AREAS OF CONCERN

Recently, members learned that an Amicus Curiae brief had been filed in court (drafted at our expense by our attorney) on behalf of a case brought by the Massachusetts Teachers Association dealing with early retirement benefits counting towards pensions. The School Committee never authorized the production of this brief, however noble or well written it may have been. In addition, I noted that the employer's briefs in support of grievances filed on our behalf, and the arbitrators rulings (especially when the School Committee is not the winner) were not being forwarded to us. I was embarrassed to learn of rulings from the President of the teachers union. In addition, the briefs, which explain the Committee's policies, have never been submitted to the Committee for approval, a dangerous fact of life for it gives the Superintendent the right to espouse policy, file it with the arbitrator, and let the Committee know about it after the fact.

I add here my bitter resentment to the personal lobbying efforts of Lannon to defeat, or render weak, my recent motion to keep the approval and notification of consulting services before the Committee for action. It is no secret that education and social planners have eager eyes on our public school system, and that, consultants, however noble they may be, should be known to the Committee as to their full purpose, before we hire them. We may well determine that certain planning is going on, certain topics are being discussed, and thus, be better informed.

Many objections have been raised by members as to the information provided to the School Committee. Those of us who cannot spend our days in school buildings have not been kept abreast of such events as racial incidents at the high school, problems with the implementation of the racial imbalance plan, personnel issues, preliminary updates on collective bargaining, and problems with departmental administrators. I found it interesting to note that Lannon recently admitted to the Committee that there were problems with Mr. Sarasin, a person regarded as infallible by Lannon in public up to that time. Serious problems resulting in loss of morale among the faculty were not reviewed with the School Committee.

During the intense collective bargaining negotiations, the out and out distrust, and dislike for Lannon was obvious from almost all factions within the school department. The man has lost the trust of the faculty from school to school.

The personnel department, which has Lannon's unwavering and total support, has made serious errors in implementing the policy of the school department. More and more, it has been necessary to reverse the Superintendent on matters of grievances because of errors by Lannon and the Personnel Director.

Last year, during City Council hearings on our \$919,000 deficit, Lannon was embarrassingly ill prepared to give clear, concise answers to the Council, showing to me, a lack of understanding of important fiscal and budgetary issues. The fact that some accounts were overspent, especially in the high school, reflect Lannon's first loyalty to his newly appointed pet administrators, at the expense of the overall credibility of the entire public school system.

The lack of morale in the bilingual department can be traced, in large part, to the free, unchecked hand given to Director Fernandez and Coordinator Cynthia Oldham, about whom not a single remark less than negative has been made to me by many faculty. It is easily explained because both are willing to respond to Lannon's commands regardless of who is harmed among the faculty. It is interesting to note that during the 1980 budget hearings, positions were cut from the Bilingual Department at Fernandez's recommendation with the understanding that he not be required to defend them publicly - thus giving him the best of possible worlds (Lannon's favor, and not being exposed

to his constituency.

SUMMARY

Lannon cannot be totally blamed for trying to get away with what he does. He has had, up to this time, the willing support and defense of some members of the School Committee. I have noted, with regret, that Mrs. Wolf and Mrs. Berman have never been inclined to ever question the Superintendent's actions. I regretted even further, that up to this point, the Mayor has also been reluctant to do so.

I had hoped that the input of even the more enlightened members of the teachers union might have at minimum convinced my colleagues that Lannon's administrative integrity needed to be held to public scrutiny.

His carelessness with the truth has become chronic, as I have tried to point out at meeting after meeting.

His support of administrative staff (at the expense of the School Committee's right to have full information in many matters) is tearing at the morale of many fine staff members who are suffering when administrators are allowed to govern without regard to equitable treatment. The recent opening-of-school corridor assignments without the slightest regard to the personal concerns of high school teachers remains one of the most serious administrative errors, made worse by the refusal to acknowledge the problem.

Manipulative attempts to transfer certain Submasters, checked finally by the School Committee remain symptomatic of the larger problem.

"Administrative Patronage" continues to show its face as Lannon makes room for special favorites. Only a reduction of actual jobs seems to have stopped some of the blatant political patronage which created problems in the past, including some very unfortunate assignments in the health and safety area.

As Lannon's contract expires on August 15, 1981, and as the deadline to notify him of our intent to renew his contract approaches in January, the Committee must have serious deliberations over how to proceed. It is my firm opinion, that, if Lannon is permitted to remain as our Superintendent, he must recognize that he has made serious mistakes in his treatment of the School Committee. He must make a firm, if not written commitment, to honor the policy prerogatives of the Committee, to deal truthfully and honestly with the seven most active volunteers in service to education in Cambridge, and to respect the needs of our community in which we will reside long after William Lannon is long gone.

I welcome the opportunity to hold a public discussion as to the fitness of Mr. Lannon to hold the public trust and the support of the School Committee in home that, through a show of public feeling, Mr. Lannon may decide that, if he is to remain, he must be more honest and open and less careless with the future of our city.

"The Koocher Papers"

MEMORANDUM

TO: MY COLLEAGUES ON THE CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

FROM: GLENN S. KOOCHEK, MEMBER

DATE: NOVEMBER 12, 1980

RE: SUPERINTENDENCY

On July 3, 1980 I wrote a letter of substantial length to Mayor Duehay outlining some serious concerns which I had over the status of the Cambridge Public Schools and, in particular, over the Superintendency of William C. Lannon. As most of you know, the Superintendent's contract will expire on August 15, 1981. It has never been my interest to participate in a termination which would smack of political machinations. Rather, my interest is in bringing before the School Committee and the public my reasons for reservations about renewing Lannon's contract.

This is no pleasant task. As some of you know, I was one of the four Committee Members who first brought Lannon to Cambridge in 1975. However, the public may not be aware of the agreement reached in August, 1975 in the living room of Committeeman Charles Pierce, an agreement to which I was a party, whereby, I would give my affirmative vote to a joint motion of Members Gesell, Pierce, and Wolf to appoint Lannon if they would support my motion to grant four year contracts to Assistant Superintendents Woodward and Brown. (With the election upcoming, I was concerned about stability for these untenured administrators. Assistant Superintendent Saterial, who was serving as Acting Superintendent was tenured at the time and needed no such protection.)

I held a pivotal vote on the Committee at that time and I can speak with authority as to what were or were not conditions and facts at the time. Following the resignation of Superintendent Alflorencia Cheatham, we initiated a public interview process to review the list of some 25 semi-finalists out of a field of 120. We then narrowed the field to six. A clear choice was Mr. John Lawson, then Superintendent of Schools in Shaker Heights, Ohio. Had there not been illness in his family forcing him to withdraw, he would have been Superintendent. However, he took himself out of the running as did a finalist from Worcester. Two Boston finalists were not in the running with more than one or two members and they were ruled out. Another individual serving as a school administrator in the Virgin Islands, the only black applicant, had minimal support even among the more progressive interviewers. Only Lannon and Joseph Saterial remained as viable finalists.

This set the stage for a classic "Cambridge Vs. the Outsider" confrontation which had so bitterly divided the city a few years earlier during the firing of Superintendent Frank Frisoli. The scars were far from healed.

At the time, the School Committee was completing the first of the major tasks that the reform elements had set out to do - a complete cleaning up of the personnel functions handled at that time by the Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, Rose O'Rourke. My public statements about that position "running the patronage mill" are public record and I will stand by them. In fact, Ms. O'Rourke was in eager pursuit of the new Director of Personnel Position.

The job of proposing a nominee for this position fell upon Acting Superintendent

Joseph Saterial. I met with him to review the school department situation in general. We discussed the prospect that the School Committee might reject his nominations now or in the future, as it might reject the nominations of any superintendent. He explained that, in that case, he would follow his original recommendation with the second choice. For me, that was not only the wrong answer - it cost him the superintendency. For it would then become obvious to any School Committee that all it needed to do was continue to reject people until the person the Committee wanted was nominated. For me, any situation which would allow four politically motivated members to wait out good people for a politically preferred person was not satisfactory.

I should make it clear that I believed then, as I do now, that Mr. Saterial is an individual of the highest integrity. Our philosophical difference in this instance was based on his interest in being a pragmatist with a future Committee. Mine was to insure that a future Superintendent would be isolated from political pressure, conscious or subconscious.

Thus, we were able to secure a three year contract for our new Superintendent and four year contracts for the Assistant Superintendents, guaranteeing a freedom from political pressures at that time. Although Lannon never impressed me before he came (he tended to ramble, he was too low key, and he had never worked with racial minorities), something I told him in a telephone conversation prior to the meeting at Mr. Pierce's house, I fought hard, much harder than any of my colleagues, to have his contract extended and his salary increased from \$38,000 to \$44,000 soon after he arrived.

However, over the past two years, I have witnessed serious changes resulting in the areas of reservation which I will outline. They include:

- Continuous attempts to preempt and usurp the legitimate and exclusive policy prerogatives of the School Committee.
- Tolerance of the appointment of mediocre administrators and his subsequent support for them, in such critical areas as personnel, secondary school administration, and planning programs which have resulted in inexcusable cases of arbitrary administrative actions, rudenesses to students and parents, and a loss of morale among faculty.
- Placement into sensitive positions of the School Department of individuals whose positioning seems to have been based on the willingness to carry out Mr. Lannon's tasks without regard to the personal, human needs of parents, children, and faculty.
- A callous attitude toward the law and collective bargaining contracts as they apply to the school department and its employees.
- Favoritism displayed to certain members of the School Committee in the form of the sharing of information and political personnel patronage.
- A lack of understanding or respect for budgeting and fiscal procedures and responsibility.

It is over the issue of the Reorganization of the high schools with which I first began to challenge the integrity of Superintendent Lannon.

PROBLEMS WITH THE "REORGANIZATION"

Prior to submitting his comprehensive high school and curricular reorganization package to the School Committee, Mr. Lannon met with members individually to identify any areas of concern, reservation, and interest. He also asked if we were interested in "protecting anyone", but he offered no guarantees or commitments that his recommendations would respect those concerns over individuals.

I expressed two concerns which he respected and another which, although he agreed to, he blatantly ignore. He kept his promise to keep the new "Housemaster" position out

Joseph Saterial. I met with him to review the school department situation in general. We discussed the prospect that the School Committee might reject his nominations now or in the future, as it might reject the nominations of any superintendent. He explained that, in that case, he would follow his original recommendation with the second choice. For me, that was not only the wrong answer - it cost him the superintendency. For it would then become obvious to any School Committee that all it needed to do was continue to reject people until the person the Committee wanted was nominated. For me, any situation which would allow four politically motivated members to wait out good people for a politically preferred person was not satisfactory.

I should make it clear that I believed then, as I do now, that Mr. Saterial is an individual of the highest integrity. Our philosophical difference in this instance was based on his interest in being a pragmatist with a future Committee. Mine was to insure that a future Superintendent would be isolated from political pressure, conscious or subconscious.

Thus, we were able to secure a three year contract for our new Superintendent and four year contracts for the Assistant Superintendents, guaranteeing a freedom from political pressures at that time. Although Lannon never impressed me before he came (he tended to ramble, he was too low key, and he had never worked with racial minorities), something I told him in a telephone conversation prior to the meeting at Mr. Pierce's house, I fought hard, much harder than any of my colleagues, to have his contract extended and his salary increased from \$38,000 to \$44,000 soon after he arrived.

However, over the past two years, I have witnessed serious changes resulting in the areas of reservation which I will outline. They include:

- Continuous attempts to preempt and usurp the legitimate and exclusive policy prerogatives of the School Committee.
- Tolerance of the appointment of mediocre administrators and his subsequent support for them, in such critical areas as personnel, secondary school administration, and planning programs which have resulted in inexcusable cases of arbitrary administrative actions, rudenesses to students and parents, and a loss of morale among faculty.
- Placement into sensitive positions of the School Department of individuals whose positioning seems to have been based on the willingness to carry out Mr. Lannon's tasks without regard to the personal, human needs of parents, children, and faculty.
- A callous attitude toward the law and collective bargaining contracts as they apply to the school department and its employees.
- Favoritism displayed to certain members of the School Committee in the form of the sharing of information and political personnel patronage.
- A lack of understanding or respect for budgeting and fiscal procedures and responsibility.

It is over the issue of the Reorganization of the high schools with which I first began to challenge the integrity of Superintendent Lannon.

PROBLEMS WITH THE "REORGANIZATION"

Prior to submitting his comprehensive high school and curricular reorganization package to the School Committee, Mr. Lannon met with members individually to identify any areas of concern, reservation, and interest. He also asked if we were interested in "protecting anyone", but he offered no guarantees or commitments that his recommendations would respect those concerns over individuals.

I expressed two concerns which he respected and another which, although he agreed to, he blatantly ignored. He kept his promise to keep the new "Housemaster" position out

of the curriculum sphere, a problem that Edward Sarasin, then a Housemaster, had exacerbated by insisting that he, as housemaster, would run an autonomous house free of all influence of the existing, traditional Department Heads. Second, he agreed to accommodate the needs of an administrator who was retiring within one year of the date of introduction of the reorganization by giving that person meaningful responsibilities and a place of respect.

However, it was made clear to him, and he fully agreed in light of the very sensitive and controversial nature of the many future appointments, that before members put themselves "on the line" with his reorganization, that the School Committee had better "see the whole, complete plan" - and "that four members agree to support the plan as presented" before Larmon would formally introduce the package. Although he agreed, and clearly understood the reason for that prior approval, he never even attempted to honor his word.

Members did not see the Reorganization Recommendation until it was released to everyone else, and only Mrs. Wolf, Mrs. Berman, and Mr. Holway had agreed to support it when it was introduced. I had opposed a prior year's weaker plan and had clearly indicated to Larmon that I would not support any plan until I had a chance to analyze a full, complete draft. Thus, Larmon had maneuvered me into a political corner - however clever for him to have gotten away with - a corner I resented, placed by a man who had promised not to do it. He did tell me, in a desperate effort to explain that he was honoring his commitment, that "Mr. Fantini seems to like it, and Mayor Danehy has no problems with it," implying broad Committee support. It is my clear opinion that he merely used comments out of context, if those comments were ever made at all, to imply that Fantini and Danehy would support his plan. Neither person ever took a public position that was anything but inalterably opposed to Reorganization.

Thus, much as I am ashamed to admit it now, it was as much a need to protect Larmon's ability to function as an administrator within the school system, as it was a perceived need to reorganize the school system that swayed my vote. Had I known that Larmon would submit nominees without sustaining votes, that Mr. Holway had indicated that he would never support a complete reorganization of the Physical Education Department, (a crucial component of reorganization), or that some of the new administrative recommendations would be persons distinguished by their mediocrity, I would never have supported Reorganization.

It is important to note, for the record, that, in our preliminary discussions on draft schemes for reorganization, Larmon suggested individuals who might appropriately fill the newly developed jobs. Edward Sarasin was identified as a strong possibility for Headmaster, Henry Lukas for the Policy and Students Assistant Headmastership, and Diane Tabor for the Curricular position. There is now no doubt in my mind that the new positions were created with these individuals in mind.

Now, with the plan implemented, we can look back on individuals whose recommendations came at a time when it was, in fact, too late for Committee Members to interview them - as in the case of the Assistant Headmaster for Fundamental and the most recently appointed Housemaster. Further, I can say that, with the exception of Ms. Chayet (Social Studies), Dr. Tabor, and Dr. Brown (Physical Education/Health/Athletics), the new group of administrators are at best, nearly as competent as their predecessors. Headmaster Sarasin, while more effective in some respects, has had serious problems in others.

Mr. Leslie Oliver's position was eliminated illegally with the request of the Superintendent to transfer him despite a clear accidental omission by the School Committee. One might question why the cutting of Oliver's position from the budget document results in the transfer of this person to a teacher's position, while Mr. Alan Cherish's po-

sition, also eliminated in the budget, is restored with the endorsement of the Superintendent who issued a memorandum in support of Cherish's appointment implying that the money remained in the budget when it had clearly been cut. However, it is easy to understand this when one considers what Mr. Lannon explained during the budget hearings last year - Cherish was a member of the Vellucci family.

A very serious violation of trust occurred in negotiating the salaries of the newly established reorganization positions under "impact" bargaining following implementation. Lannon was eager to upgrade the new positions. Almost all the negotiating was done with the School Committee being given little or no information. A long impasse developed. Finally, the Committee agreed to make a final proposal increasing certain steps and ratio scales. This was in fall, 1979. However, before the final offer could be endorsed, the municipal election rendered the Committee as "lame ducks".

As you may all recall, the initial ballot count was ominous for me personally to the point where I, and almost all veteran observers of "PR" counts, believed that I would not be re-elected. Accordingly, I phoned the Superintendent and told him that it was clear to me that I would lose my seat in favor of Mrs. Attles and that my support of the newly upgraded salary package was no longer valid. I said quite clearly that, I (would) let (him) know if this situation changed, but until then, (you) are not to make any proposals in my name to the union."

Although I was reelected, Lannon never consulted me before offering the package to the union. I spoke with him on this, and he assured me that he had the four votes without my commitment. I was quite surprised since my Independent colleagues were refusing to vote for any components of the Reorganization. Lannon indicated that Mr. Maynard had agreed to support the new wage package for reorganized people. I did not believe it and told Lannon so. In a telephone poll, conducted informally to ascertain committee support for the package, Lannon had clearly implied to members that I had supported the package without telling them that I had withdrawn my support. Thus, the members were given "filtered" information, as misleading as Lannon's earlier statements about Danehy and Fantini's support for reorganization. My suspicions were confirmed when, at the meeting when a vote was scheduled on the confirmation of the salary offer, Maynard was not present and Lannon was desperately looking for a fourth vote.

The use of the "telephone poll" has proven one of Lannon's most effective techniques for accomplishing what he wants to do, particularly in his efforts to install Muriel Heilberger as the acting project director for Project SPAN.

USUPRING AND MANIPULATING THE POLICY PREROGATIVES OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

It is often possible to manipulate events so that decisions make themselves. When this is done consciously to interfere with the right of the School Committee to become fully informed and to take an action, I resent it bitterly.

Most recently, the example of transfers came to light. In one grievance, Lannon asked the Committee to sustain his ruling that a move within a building was a "transfer" under the collective bargaining agreement. Later in the year, in the case which resulted in the Committee apologizing to a teacher for the action, Lannon tried to reverse himself without telling the School Committee. The case involved Ms. Gurry-Axtman who was ordered to move involuntarily to another school. Personnel Director Theall, with Lannon's support, insisted that the move was needed so that a minority person could be appointed to the Fitzgerald School. As the record shows, no minority individual was ever considered. Ms. Axtman objected when her position, one of four 4th grades, was transferred while another position, held by a substitute teacher, was left vacant at the same school. This, more than any other incident reflects the insensitivity of Lannon and his Macciavellian staff.

In this case, the problem was made worse when a teacher in grade 8 was transferred to grade 7 without any consideration of the transfer policy - an action defended by the Superintendent and Personnel Director as "not a transfer".

In another matter, without formal recommendation to the Committee, Lannon has redefined the positions held by Mr. Woodward and Mr. Sateriale. It has become clear to me that Lannon seeks to maneuver them into positions of expendability, eventually to eliminate them. The decision to redefine the positions came in the form of a notification after the fact. Such a change may be appropriate, but **THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS BELONGS WITH THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE!!!**

It has become increasingly frustrating to see the extent to which Lannon is given a free hand by certain members of the School Committee which refused even to consider the above action for review. Lannon's free hand to allow individuals to step on people (as were done conspicuously with Mr. Burns and Mrs. Boyle at the High School and with parents innumerable during racial imbalance processes) have destroyed morale among the faculty.

During the tense negotiations for the latest collective bargaining agreement with the teachers, one fact became obvious - obvious to the point where it was painfully clear: the faculty, in general, young and old, competent and incompetent, conservative and progressive, do not trust William Lannon AT ALL. The man is disliked intensely by a broad spectrum of the faculty. Racial imbalance meetings have brought out similar feelings among parents.

If it did not become obvious to all concerned that Lannon is attempting to use the processes of racially balancing the Cambridge Public Schools voluntarily to enhance his own standing with his professional colleagues at the expense of the long term good of the City of Cambridge and its public schools, then the School Committee is **BLIND!!!!**

RACIAL IMBALANCE

When all the theses are written describing how Cambridge addressed the issue of the racial imbalance of its public schools, there should be dark chapters for Lannon and his first SPAN Director, Jerry Kohn. Both oversaw a period of maneuvering, half-truths, lies, and misinformation - and both were parties to it all.

To substantiate the positions I hold, it is important to review briefly the story of how SPAN began and developed.

About three years ago, Project Span was started with a state grant, dealing mostly with racial sensitivities as an issue. Lannon recommended Jerry Kohn as its director. Kohn, who had been working out of Lannon's Office during his attendance at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, had lost the respect of many faculty at the high school for having served as "Lannon's eyes and ears" while Reorganization was being developed. Because of this role, confirmed to me by Lannon, Kohn had earned the reputation of a "snake". What none of us knew then was that the state Department of Education, which funded Span, was concerned that its function was not true to the spirit of the grant - a grant made to support the efforts to racially balance the public schools of Cambridge. I was also to learn later that Mr. Charles Glenn, Equal Opportunity Administrator at the State Department of Education had threatened to cut off funding if Kohn was not replaced. He was clearly not trusted by the state department.

Following the renewal of Project SPAN, the School Committee was asked by Lannon and Kohn to go into executive session to review concerns about the racial imbalance of some of our public schools. In that meeting we were informed that the focus of SPAN would be changing to deal with this problem. It seemed that the language of the grant application had been changed, and, although the Committee had been informed of this through the formality of having a copy of the renewal sent to members, no effort was made to remind the Committee to look for the fine print changes in the scope of this important program.

During this executive session Kohn told us a number of things including:

- "There are literally millions of dollars that the 'Feds' will pour into Cambridge if we act."
- "Nobody at the Cambridge Housing Authority will talk with us on this."
- "David Vickery will not work with us if we deal with this issue in public rather than in executive session. He doesn't want the public involved."
- "Charlie Glenn and his staff won't put anything in writing as far as specifics is concerned."

At that meeting, before the entire Committee and Lannon's staff I made the following statement so as to leave no possible ambiguity. "Look Jerry, and you too Mr. Lannon, I want to know everything you're doing in this area before, during, and after you do it. This is too sensitive an area not to be closely observed and followed. We've got to do it properly." I remember distinctly that the rest of the Committee supported my demand to be kept informed. Lannon and Kohn, in my opinion, never had the slightest intention of even attempting to meet the spirit, or the letter, of this demand.

IN FACT, AS IT TURNS OUT, EACH OF THE FOUR POINTS LISTED ABOVE WERE NOTHING LESS THAN LIES TOLD BY MR. KOHN, AS WE HAVE ALL LEARNED BY NOW.

The first step was to develop a Phase 1 plan to attempt to correct the imbalance which Kohn had so clearly decided was of such scope as to indict the previous actions of earlier school committees. In doing so, Kohn and his half-time assistant Muriel Heilberger (whom he excitedly described as "a member of the community, who lives right here in Cambridge, and who speaks Spanish." We were all to learn later that she was one of his colleagues from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.) met individually with members of the committee to get their input into the "temporary" Phase 1 plan in the clear hope that it would be workable, stable, and possibly permanent.

Despite my offer to save time and to be interviewed with one or more colleagues, Kohn and Heilberger insisted on separate meetings. It became clear that the strategy was to keep members from exchanging ideas before them and to facilitate the manipulation of ideas to suit their own conveniences. I told my interviewer, Heilberger, that there was no way that the schools could be racially balanced voluntarily, as they hoped to do, but that redistricting, transporting, and other involuntary steps would be required. I warned her that "we can't fool these people. The community better get the truth and get ready to move." That was the last I was to see or hear from her until the evening prior to the deadline for submission of a Phase 1 plan to the State Department of Education.

At the conclusion of a School Committee meeting, at about 11:00 p.m., Kohn hurriedly passed around a final draft Phase 1 plan as Lannon insisted that he had to have it adopted and approved at that meeting for "submission tomorrow." Needless to say, I was livid, for all of my suggestions were ignored. I was to learn later that Mr. Fantini had also made recommendations similar to mine warning of involuntary mandated steps. I argued that if important suggestions of a Committee Member were to be ignored, at minimum, the member was owed the courtesy of being informed, rather than an eleventh hour forcing of hands. There is no doubt in my mind that Lannon and Kohn knew exactly

what they were doing.

I confronted Kohn who, to my utter shock, supported me totally, blaming Larmon who, according to Kohn had had the draft plans for some time and had not shared them with the School Committee. Larmon, on the other hand, indicated that there was a shortage of time and suggested that Kohn had been late in his data gathering. Later, in his office, Kohn and Heilberger were full of apologies. He and Larmon were busy pointing fingers at each other (in private only, of course), and they were probably laughing at us all when we weren't looking.

Again, SPAN was reminded of my demand to be kept informed "before, during, and after" whatever they were doing. Within two weeks of the opening of school, Heilberger called my office to say that, it was obvious, that Phase 1's call for voluntary transfers was not going to work. I was distressed because, in the clear minds of the average public citizen, everything was, and would be fine with Phase 1. No one ever went out of his way to warn that deep inside Phase 1 was a warning that Phase 2 would be far broader and tougher in scope. The public was clearly deceived into believing that Phase 1 was all that would ever be necessary. There had never been the slightest hint of doubt that Phase 1 would not work perfectly.

An essential anecdote is presented here. In October, 1979, Kohn called my office to tell me that a federal planning grant had been received. It required, according to him, that 25% of his and Heilberger's salary be covered by the federal dollars. Since I was eager to see as much money as possible go directly into classroom assistance, and knowing that Kohn and Heilberger were drawing large salaries (25% would have been close to \$10,000), I was curious. I asked where in the regulations, or written instructions, we were required to allocate a portion of their salaries with federal grants, since I knew that SPAN was a state funded grant. Kohn asked me why I had to know that. After some hesitation, he indicated that he was told to do it. Upon my insistence, he told me that the person so directing him was based at Brandeis University. I asked him if the Feds had opened a branch at Brandeis, and asked for the gentleman's number. Kohn then explained that, "well, ah, er, he works with the federal government."

Then I recalled that the federal fiscal year (October 1 - September 30) was different from the state fiscal year ending three months before the federal year. I confronted Kohn with this evidence. It was only then that he admitted that his real purpose was to cover 100% of their salaries for the $\frac{1}{4}$ year following the end of the state fiscal year to the end of the federal fiscal year. (The state year ended on June 30, 1980. By allocating 25% of his annual salary to the federal grant, he could collect full salary for the period of July 1 - September 30, 1980 with Washington dollars and thus, insure three months of highly paid employment while he looked for a job elsewhere. By the way, he used his "highly successful experience" in Cambridge to gain employment in a suburban Connecticut school system.)

Mrs. Wolf also expressed resentment when the real reason for the allocation when I confronted Larmon and Kohn in public. Apparently, She and Mrs. Berman had bought Kohn's original story without objection.

In addition, other matters reflect unfavorably on Larmon and SPAN:

- The failure of Larmon to recommend a plan based on the pairing of schools as the Committee had instructed because Larmon feared subversion of it by elementary administration and faculty.
- The failure to involve the active community in the final drawing of the Phase 2 plan despite dozens of preliminary meetings.
- Larmon's retro-active recommendation to install Muriel Heilberger as Kohn's replacement following an unsuccessful attempt to do so by telephone poll - a clear "back-door" ascension to office.

OTHER AREAS OF CONCERN

Recently, members learned that an Amicus Curiae brief had been filed in court (drafted at our expense by our attorney) on behalf of a case brought by the Massachusetts Teachers Association dealing with early retirement benefits counting towards pensions. The School Committee never authorized the production of this brief, however noble or well written it may have been. In addition, I noted that the employer's briefs in support of grievances filed on our behalf, and the arbitrators rulings (especially when the School Committee is not the winner) were not being forwarded to us. I was embarrassed to learn of rulings from the President of the teachers union. In addition, the briefs, which explain the Committee's policies, have never been submitted to the Committee for approval, a dangerous fact of life for it gives the Superintendent the right to espouse policy, file it with the arbitrator, and let the Committee know about it after the fact.

I add here my bitter resentment to the personal lobbying efforts of Lannon to defeat, or render weak, my recent motion to keep the approval and notification of consulting services before the Committee for action. It is no secret that education and social planners have eager eyes on our public school system, and that, consultants, however noble they may be, should be known to the Committee as to their full purpose, before we hire them. We may well determine that certain planning is going on, certain topics are being discussed, and thus, be better informed.

Many objections have been raised by members as to the information provided to the School Committee. Those of us who cannot spend our days in school buildings have not been kept abreast of such events as racial incidents at the high school, problems with the implementation of the racial imbalance plan, personnel issues, preliminary updates on collective bargaining, and problems with departmental administrators. I found it interesting to note that Lannon recently admitted to the Committee that there were problems with Mr. Sarasin, a person regarded as infallible by Lannon in public up to that time. Serious problems resulting in loss of morale among the faculty were not reviewed with the School Committee.

During the intense collective bargaining negotiations, the out and out distrust, and dislike for Lannon was obvious from almost all factions within the school department. The man has lost the trust of the faculty from school to school.

The personnel department, which has Lannon's unwavering and total support, has made serious errors in implementing the policy of the school department. More and more, it has been necessary to reverse the Superintendent on matters of grievances because of errors by Lannon and the Personnel Director.

Last year, during City Council hearings on our \$919,000 deficit, Lannon was embarrassingly ill prepared to give clear, concise answers to the Council, showing to me, a lack of understanding of important fiscal and budgetary issues. The fact that some accounts were overspent, especially in the high school, reflect Lannon's first loyalty to his newly appointed pet administrators, at the expense of the overall credibility of the entire public school system.

The lack of morale in the bilingual department can be traced, in large part, to the free, unchecked hand given to Director Fernandez and Coordinator Cynthia Oldham, about whom not a single remark less than negative has been made to me by many faculty. It is easily explained because both are willing to respond to Lannon's commands regardless of who is harmed among the faculty. It is interesting to note that during the 1980 budget hearings, positions were cut from the Bilingual Department at Fernandez's recommendation with the understanding that he not be required to defend them publicly - thus giving him the best of possible worlds (Lannon's favor, and not being exposed

to his constituency.

SUMMARY

Lannon cannot be totally blamed for trying to get away with what he does. He has had, up to this time, the willing support and defense of some members of the School Committee. I have noted, with regret, that Mrs. Wolf and Mrs. Berman have never been inclined to ever question the Superintendent's actions. I regretted even further, that up to this point, the Mayor has also been reluctant to do so.

I had hoped that the input of even the more enlightened members of the teachers union might have at minimum convinced my colleagues that Lannon's administrative integrity needed to be held to public scrutiny.

His carelessness with the truth has become chronic, as I have tried to point out at meeting after meeting.

His support of administrative staff (at the expense of the School Committee's right to have full information in many matters) is tearing at the morale of many fine staff members who are suffering when administrators are allowed to govern without regard to equitable treatment. The recent opening-of-school corridor assignments without the slightest regard to the personal concerns of high school teachers remains one of the most serious administrative errors, made worse by the refusal to acknowledge the problem.

Manipulative attempts to transfer certain Submasters, checked finally by the School Committee remain symptomatic of the larger problem.

"Administrative Patronage" continues to show its face as Lannon makes room for special favorites. Only a reduction of actual jobs seems to have stopped some of the blatant political patronage which created problems in the past, including some very unfortunate assignments in the health and safety area.

As Lannon's contract expires on August 15, 1981, and as the deadline to notify him of our intent to renew his contract approaches in January, the Committee must have serious deliberations over how to proceed. It is my firm opinion, that, if Lannon is permitted to remain as our Superintendent, he must recognize that he has made serious mistakes in his treatment of the School Committee. He must make a firm, if not written commitment, to honor the policy prerogatives of the Committee, to deal truthfully and honestly with the seven most active volunteers in service to education in Cambridge, and to respect the needs of our community in which we will reside long after William Lannon is long gone.

I welcome the opportunity to hold a public discussion as to the fitness of Mr. Lannon to hold the public trust and the support of the School Committee in home that, through a show of public feeling, Mr. Lannon may decide that, if he is to remain, he must be more honest and open and less careless with the future of our city.



City of Cambridge

10.

IN CITY COUNCIL

November 24, 1980

COUNCILLOR VELLUCCI

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to direct David Vickery, Assistant City Manager for Community Development, to appear at the December 1, 1980 City Council meeting to answer charges in the Koocher Papers dated November 12, 1980, Page VI, that nobody at the Cambridge Housing Authority will talk to us on this. David Vickery will not work with us if we deal with this issue in public rather than in Executive Session. He doesn't want the public involved.

In City Council November 24, 1980.
Adopted by the affirmative vote of 7 members.
Attest:- Paul E. Healy, City Clerk.

A true copy;

ATTEST:-

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paul E. Healy".

Order # 10

F 429

C. Vellucci re: David Vickery to appear at
Dec. 1, 1980 Council meeting to answer charges
in the Koocher Papers.

In City Council,

November 24, 1980

*Copy of order & Koocher
Papers sent to David
Vickery 11/25/80 (dl)
Copies of Koocher papers
sent to all Councilors 11/25/80 (dl)
Copy of Koocher papers sent
to C. Ingr. 11/25/80 (dl)*