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Urban school systems experienced widespread failure in the 1960's in the process of meeting the needs of their students. Studies of this failure point to many things including new school clienteles which the system has been unable to adjust to, bureaucratic administrations which get bogged down in red tape and remain unresponsive, and teachers whose attitudes have been shaped according to a white middle class ethic which makes them unable to respond to the needs of students.

Recognizing the need for reform, the Washington, D. C. Public School System sought to initiate change by setting up a Model School Division (MSD). This act designed to initiate and foster change in the D. C. schools, led to the creation of the Innovation Team as a vehicle for system change. This dissertation is a documentation of the development of the Washington, D. C. Innovation Team as an agent for change and an assessment of the impact of the Team on the system.

The Team provided a pool of human resources available on call to MSD teachers in need of specific help. The primary activity of the Innovation Team was the teacher-to-teacher activity. Team members went in to classrooms, upon request, to provide on-site consultive services and to reinforce techniques presented in teacher workshops sponsored by
the Team.

The experiences of the Innovation Team pointed out the need for indigenous members or agents, as initiators of change, in an urban public school system. Members of the group, as well as the leader, were employees of the Washington, D.C. school system. The Team had a common bond of classroom experiences, ethnic identity and educational ideology. This document presents a historical assessment of the development of the Innovation Team and the role they played in the change process initiated in the Model School Division.

Revelations relevant to the replicability of this model for change is also highlighted in the presented case study. The author reviews the supportive data collected by interviewing team members. These data deal with: (1) experiences of the Innovation Team outside the Model School Division, (2) support provided by other school personnel who were sympathetic to the efforts of the Innovation Team, (3) the significance of group processes as a methodology for training teachers, and (4) the identification of transferable and non-transferable skills.

As a result of program evaluations, personal interviews and his own experience as Team Leader, the investigator concludes that the Team was an effective instrument for change. Based on this and other conclusions the following recommendations were formulated:

1. Goals and objectives should be clearly articulated and understood by the Team members. At the program's inception these goals and objectives should be short-range.
2. Alternative programs for the retreading of teachers should be offered. Change agentry skills should be coupled with cognitive and affective experiences.

3. Group dynamics approach be an integral part of the Team members' on-going experiences.

4. Similar programs should be developed with full autonomy from traditional methods for change within the school system.

5. The basic design of a replicated team model should be developed so that it will, a designated point in time, self-destruct.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION ........................................ i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ............................... ii

PREFACE ........................................ iii

Chapter

I. THE NEED FOR SYSTEM REFORM .... 1
Introduction ..................................... 1

Background for the Study
Schools as a Social Force
Reform in Washington, D.C.

Purpose of the Study .......................... 21

Importance of the Study ..................... 21

Summary ........................................ 22

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WASHINGTON INNOVATION TEAM ...
Introduction .................................... 24

The Model School Division, Washington, D.C.
The Pilot Communities Program, EDC

Team as Temporary Systems ............. 41

Why Teams Work
Teams as Vehicles for Change
Teams as a Delivery System

The Creation of the Team ............... 43

Team Functions
Leadership and Team Development
In-Group Resistance to Team Development

Stages of Growth and Development .... 64

Selecting Team Members ..................
Setting Team Goals
The First Year
Maturation

The University of Massachusetts Involvement

Conclusions

Size of Team
Dealing with Success
Key Components for the Team's Function
within a System

Charts

I. Experience and Training for Team Building
II. Defining a Functioning Team
III. Change Agency: Functions

III. COMPONENTS OF THE INNOVATION TEAM

Introduction

Staff Development

Summer Reading Institutes
Mathematics Workshop
The Contemporary Environmental Laboratory
PROBE
Georgetown
Staff Development Conference

Classroom Support

Curriculum Development

Children of Cardoza Tell It Like It Is
Autobiography of Martin Luther King
Names You Hear In Cardoza
Cardoza Raps
I Wish I Was -- Everything
The Way It Ought To Be
Cloud Nine
Classrooms In Transition
Mother, This Isn't Your Day

Summary
IV. THE CREDENTIALING PROCESS: THE GROWTH OF TEAM MEMBERS

Introduction

The Innovation Team Members

Credentials of Team Members
Human Relations as a Functional Part Of The Team
Human Relations as a Skill
Support by "Outsiders"

Outside Experiences of the Team

Use of Acquired Skills

Identifiable Skills

Transferable Skills
Personal Skills
Initial Skills

Leadership

Training of Leader
Transferability of Team Members
Product of the Process
Relinquishing the Leadership

Summary

Charts

#1 No. of Years Teaching Experience of Team

#2 Skill 1967 and 1970

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDICES

BIBLIOGRAPHY
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past three decades, large American cities have grown to be unwieldy and unmanageable. Big cities having populations in excess of 500,000 have absorbed more than one-half of the total growth of this nation between 1900 and 1970.1 During this period, the magneticism of our cities attracted 35 to 50 percent of the forty million American families who subsequently migrated to major urban settings.2 In many instances, in-migration has been comprised of citizens from the low socio-economic strata. Since World War II, in-migrating Blacks began to pose a major challenge to the cities and their institutions. By 1970 the central core of our metropolitan areas contained an estimated 34% of all Blacks in America.3 The influx of a different kind of populace to the cities has had a profound influence on urban public school systems.

---


2 Ibid., p. 6

Within the past ten years inner city schools have been increasingly populated with students for whom conventional public schools have proven inadequate. Blacks, Puerto Ricans and other minorities form the bulk of the population in urban schools while the teaching staff and administrations have remained predominantly white middle class. These students come to the schools with a different set of life experiences than those the schools expect and are prepared to accept and use as the basis on which to build a meaningful in-school experience.\(^4\) This changed school clientele has meant that in order to successfully deliver those services which schools are traditionally charged with delivering, they would need to change their expectations, curriculum, style of teaching and interacting with students. Yet, attempts to improve services have proved only minimally successful. Consequently, students continued to be alienated by the school systems which purported to serve them. Evidence of this alienation can be found throughout the literature on urban education.\(^5\) In addition, statistics from big city school systems attest to the contin-


uing deterioration in pupil achievement as determined by the numbers who meet established and comparative norms of academic competence.6

Much of this failure can be attributed to the inability of urban schools to adapt to the unique needs and interests of its changed clientele. Faced with what appeared to the massive deterioration of its schools, big city school officials began a critical re-examination of its delivery system during the sixties. This process was speeded by the growing militancy of urban school communities who began to voice their concerns about the effectiveness of the schools. Their concerns centered on the need for a different kind of teacher, more relevant curricula, greater flexibility in the organization for instruction, and a more equitable examination and grading system. As a result of specific student concerns and urban unrest in general, education reform in the sixties centered on those areas closest to the student.7

It was quite obvious that more needed to be done to involve inner city youth in the educational process and too keep them interested once they were involved. It was further evi-


dent that by excluding or dismissing students who were most seriously in need of positive educational services, the schools could not serve as meaningful inner city institutions. One of the more serious concerns with many urban school systems, including the one in Washington, D.C., was their lack of sensitivity to the effects of biases on students.

One major area of concern was in teacher perception of students. HARYOU, a massive study and documentation of educational deterioration in New York City schools spoke of this phenomenon. According to HARYOU, the image of the Black child held by many city school teachers "...has been one of the lovable child of limited intellectual capacity, unable to gear himself to competition of any appreciable degree, and of his culture as one which has made an extremely limited contribution to the total American heritage." Coleman found that a majority of teachers interviewed would rather not teach children of a different racial or ethnic background. Clark employed a group of white students to interview a sample of white teachers


in New York City. Fifty percent of the subjects stated that Negroes were inherently inferior in intelligence and, therefore could not be expected to learn. 11 Such negative perceptions held by the teacher of students whose backgrounds and values are different from his own complicates any efforts to provide an educational experience meaningful for such students. In addition to personal difficulties on the part of the teacher to accept and respect differences, there was the educational system's--and indeed society's--lack of interest in so doing. Until quite recently, society generally, and teacher education institutions specifically, have attached little status to working with poor Blacks from the inner city. 12

Thus, all too often, teachers who are either less successful in their own educational endeavor or who are least experienced, face students with deep-seated differences, problems and needs which they little understand. Where the teacher is far from his students in terms of their background and culture and is conscious of his own lack of status as awarded by society for teaching the Black inner-city child, the teacher is inclined to develop a set of defenses which distorts his perceptions of


his students. Accordingly, such cultural pluralism compounded by the great size and density of the urban school population produces a growing schism based on mutual misperception and mistrust between teachers and the urban student.13

It was not surprising that for the student, his belief that the system had failed was manifested in his lack of opportunity to achieve success within its framework. Consequently, this judgment reinforced his assumption that something outside the system held more relevance for him than anything within. It also enhanced his hostility toward the school environment. The validity of these attitudes can be documented through the indices of student achievement, dropout rates, and acts of vandalism or other forms of hostility toward the system.14 In summary, most urban school systems have failed the urban student, particularly the student of a racial or ethnic minority.15

13Samuel Bowles, "Unequal Education and the Production of the Social Division of Labor", in Schooling In a Corporate Society, ed. by Martin Carney. (New York: David McKay Co. Inc., 1972), p. 71


Schools as a Social Force

In the past, all too often education and its setting were treated as separate entities with separate problems. However, such is not the case. The operating units of the educational system—the schools—are based in neighborhood settings. And the problems, values, and needs of the residents of the neighborhood are inevitably carried by its children into the school. Moreover, the school is the most visible or tangible public social agency in the neighborhood. Since children and youth spend more time in the school than they do in any other social agency, the school—in one form or another—exerts a tremendous social force.

Schools have traditionally served as agencies of acculturation and as channels for vertical mobility. However social pressures caused by an influx of low-income minorities into the cities have produced a break in the acculturation process. A widening of the channel for vertical mobility was needed. Instead, beyond the system's problems in coping with the increased numbers, lack of facilities and lack of personnel, it has demonstrated a blindness in perception of the student of of today's inner city. By and large, the system has expected

student failure. Unwilling to deal with its own failure, the system has succeeded in creating a self-fulfilling prophecy vis-a-vis expectations of students and subsequent pupil performance.17

William Waller argues that schools are designed to serve as testing, selecting and distributing agencies for the talented and for those with desirable moral qualities and should work for the elimination of failures.18 The lie of democracy is that each person can become what his talents, skills and ambition permit. Instead, the schools have aided in the channeling and elimination process whereby students are sorted into the various rungs of the social system.

It is obvious that various socialization patterns in schools attended by students of ethnic and socially different backgrounds do not arise by accident.19 Rather, they stem from the fact that the educational objectives and expectations of both parents and teachers, and the responsiveness of students to various patterns of teaching and control, differ for students of different social classes. For example, the older democratic ideology of the common school—gave way to the


18Waller, The Sociology of Teaching, p. 72.

"progressive" insistence that education should be tailored to the needs of the child. In the interest of providing an education relevant to the later life of the students, vocational schools were developed for the children of working families and children who were classed as minorities, and tracks were created to maintain that separation between the children of working families and those of the upper class. The academic curriculum was generally preserved for those who would later have the opportunity to make use of book learning, either in college or in white-collar employment. This and other educational reforms of the progressive education movement reflected an implicit assumption of the immutability of the class structure.\(^\text{20}\)

Brubaker and Zahowik quote McLuhan's hypothesis that the medium is the message..." But certainly the notion that the medium is a message and, quite possible the dominant message, is not without validity. Applied to education, this means that instruction or what the teachers and students actually do in the classroom as they interact with each other is the major learning outcome for students. What they learn is what happens to them to a greater extent than are told".\(^\text{21}\)

---

\(^{20}\)Illich, De Schooling Society, p. 40.

as the sociology of the neighborhood has an effect on the child, how he grows and who he is, the sociology of the classroom affect the child in profound ways.

Reform in Washington, D.C.

In Washington, D.C., after 25 years and ten million dollars expended in studies focused on the public schools, the first move towards reform was made in 1964. Although these studies differed in many ways, Norman W. Nickens, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, writes:

...they seem to have one major factor in common--their recommended reforms have never been successfully implemented within the Public Schools of the District of Columbia...22

Nickens further identifies a wide variety of internal factors as the reason for "ineffectiveness of educational reform in Washington, D.C.".

The first in-roads for change in D.C. schools came in 1965 and was the result of outside driving forces, particularly the interest of the Panel on Educational Research and Development, a local branch of the President's Science Advisory Committee. From these forces came the ideas of the formation of a semi-autonomous sub-division which was to be known as the Model School Division.23


On June 17, 1964 the Washington, D.C. Board of Education authorized the establishment of a "model sub-system" in the area of northwest Washington and named the system the Cardozo Model School Division. The Board declared this move a strategy for "attacking the deficiencies of inner-city education". This division was to initiate and coordinate a wide range of programs and services aimed at eliminating educational deficiencies found in the area.

The Model School Division was delineated by its complex of urban problems. The average income was under $4,000, families without male heads were numerous, the crime rate was the highest in the city, drop-out was high, and achievement and reading scores in the schools were below city and national norms. The population was almost entirely Black.

Efforts to improve the school environment and instruction were immediately faced by the classic urban problems. The class load for teachers averaged 35 to 1 at the elementary level and somewhat higher on the secondary level. Most schools were in immediate need for repairs. Replacements for one junior high school had been on the "drawing board" for at least 50 years; one elementary building was erected in the

1890's. Teachers considered assignment to this area as a form of punishment for misdeeds or as an open rebellion to the "nicer" schools' principals. Cementing all these problems together was the enormous lack of so-called "motivated students". The question of why such problems existed brought such responses as "we're working with outdated curriculum" and "they aren't going to get it anyway".

An outside consulting team was retained to recommend the kind of structure and organization to accomplish the goal of the MSD. These consultants, three Harvard Professors, an assistant superintendent of schools from Newton, Mass., and a project coordinator of the New England School Development Council, reported to the superintendent in September, 1964:

Among the conditions this organization is created to provide are the following: involvement of all community agencies (United Planning Organization, an anti-poverty agency) rather than schools alone; sufficient autonomy to provide the freedom to experiment boldly and without fear of failure; provisions for adequate financing; a commitment to testing and demonstrations on a major scale rather than tinkering; a realistic relationship of the Cardozo system (MSD) to the District of Columbia system; and an approach to evaluation which can make the knowledge gained here of value to others.26


The Master plan provided for major and basic reform in one senior high school (Cardozo), four junior high schools, sixteen elementary schools, five pre-schools and a vocational high school, and was licensed to experiment across the board in the areas of curriculum development, re-development and utilization of teachers as well as providing a new focus on the management of the system itself. Provisions were made for rapid exploitation of new opportunities for inner city children.

The new Division's initial task was to establish an Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee, composed of a judge, outside consultants, retired school administrators, and a school board member, added additional impetus to the drive to initiate "innovation" in the public schools.

The major strength of the decision to create a Model School Division was seen at that time as being that the model used for change was built upon the theory that change can be accomplished by initiating action at the "top" and "bottom" simultaneously.

...This Lewinian model has implications for change strategies. To help the system change, the balance of forces has to be shifted in favor of the driving forces. This can be done in several ways: by increasing the sum total of the driving forces from inside, outside, or both: or by the reduction of the restraining forces.

The increase of the driving forces results in
an initial movement in the desired direction, but it frequently causes an increased countersurge of the restraining forces which may stop the change momentum. Or it may, after the pressure for change relaxes, lead to backsliding, that is the old patterns creep in. Thus the change force has three tasks to consider: (1) to initiate and maintain the push of the driving forces, (2) to reduce the restraining forces through redirection and prevent the countersurge through the involvement of the organizational members in the new order, and (3) to maintain an overall contextual perspective which will keep the change force from getting bogged down in non-essential encounters.27

It was later found that this design had many weaknesses. A notable one was that the assumption that high-ranking people from outside the organizational pyramid of the schools could force by decree active participation in the process of change. Richard Bechard states:

People support what they help to create. People affected by a change must be allowed active participation and sense of ownership in the planning and conduct of the change.28

Cernius and Sherburne support this position in saying that "Teachers like children, muster anti-bodies to repel outside directions."29 A teacher will change only if he is a


29Cernius, Vytas and Mary Lila Sherburne, "The Innovation Team, A Model for School Change". (Newton, Massachusetts; Education Development Center, 1968), p. 5.
part of the process and is, therefore, personally involved and committed to change. The failure to recognize this principle caused difficulty and delay in implementing the program.

Many teachers looked upon the Advisory Committee's blueprint for change as a pacification program. Teachers didn't believe the upper echelons of the administration really wanted the proposed change. Teachers commented sarcastically that "they'd be dead and buried before change ever came to their school".30

The teachers had good cause for skepticism. Only three temporary administrators were assigned to the task of revolutionizing the fourteen elementary schools, four junior high schools and one senior high school that comprised the Model School Division. In addition, little or no money was allotted to maintain the Division. Attitudes of principals toward the concept fluctuated between indifference and hostility. In fact, no one, from principals to supervisors to resource personnel, was officially bound to do anything for the Division since they still reported to the central office for the D.C. School System. Finally, the Model School Division, though semi-autonomous in name, was almost a non-entity, because a lack of an operating budget.31


31Norman Nickens, Educational Reform, p. 28.
Despite the identified obstacles, the Passow study commented at length on the benefits of this experience:

The MSD does not seem to be as bogged down in red-tape, forms and reports as does the rest of the school system. The task force's report impressions is that teacher morale here is higher, rapport with administrators greater, and that MSD's limited size invites closer interpersonal relationships and discussions with the administrative decision-makers...

The Model School Division is unique in many ways in the District organization. It has the beginnings of a decentralized operation with maximum responsibility at the building level. There appears to be considerable strength in this approach.  

The Advisory Committee was aware of, and seldom failed to point out, the failings of the system; therefore the Committee found it difficult to mobilize support for change. Its one concrete contribution in terms of a program came in the summer of 1965 when the executive for the Advisory Committee mobilized resources for the first meeting with teachers of the Model School Division. The Advisory Committee also planned the summer institutes which followed.  

Activating the teachers stimulated feelings and questions

---


about the executive's sincerity and motives. Her commitment as an executive was questioned because she was white. Historically, no one had ever offered assistance to these schools. Ironically enough neither of these suspicions were openly confronted then. Despite suspicions, representative bodies of teachers were assembled to plan for the summer. Simultaneous strategic assistance came from outside curriculum groups, such as the Madison Mathematics Group and Educational Service Incorporated (now Education Development Center). These groups were to represent new thinking in curriculum and teaching methodology. They advocated an opportunity for children to learn by 1) beginning with a specific problem; 2) presenting the problem through concrete materials rather than verbally; 3) providing an opportunity for each child to handle, test, and draw conclusions from his own materials; 4) making generalizations after gathering of information; 5) exploring a subject in depth; and 6) allowing for opportunities for a child to illustrate in concrete ways that he is learning, establishing connection, and achieving understanding, without being wholly dependent upon verbal description to indicate it.35


In contrast, the stable organizational equilibrium in the schools was based on traditional expectations and teaching methodology. For example, the students were instructed in large groups, and the texts were the major source of information. Instruction was usually from the general with illustrations in the specific. Evaluation was often based on the outward signs of order. Finally, the pathway for new ideas into this system was rather singular, beginning with the top levels of supervision.

The most glaring shortcoming in the plan thus far seems to hinge on the fact that the "top" knew the kind of behavior it wanted to promote with frequent references to the effect that teachers were not teaching according to the yardstick being used. Because of their limited involvement in the project, principals and supervisors had a difficult time performing the task of teacher evaluation. Most supervisors and principals were charged evaluating, with traditional guidelines and standards, a new type of classroom setting and more important, a new teacher.

By June, 1967, the complexity of the situation had increased with the MSD remained charged with the task of "providing a wide range of services for the diversified population of the area". New programs had burgeoned. Non-graded instruction and team teaching had been introduced in 99 MSD
classes. Similarly, a teacher aide program provided para-professional assistance in 66 classes. In the area of curricular improvement, 17 different reading programs were in use in 110 classes. In science, math and social studies, new approaches had been introduced during two six-week summer institutes in 1965 and 1966; by the end of the school year 1967, teachers initiated units in Elementary Science Study (ESS) in 70 classes; Senesh Social Studies in 55; and the Madison Project in Mathematics and School Mathematics Study Group in 70. 36 Typically, the programs were introduced independently of each other without regard to change in the total individual classroom or in each school as a whole and without supportive services by supervisors, principals and the materials-supply officers.

During the same period of time, Education Development Center, a major curriculum developer, had initiated the Pilot Communities Program funded by Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds of the U.S. Office of Education. 37

Another major weakness of the Model School Division was the lack of a budget for follow-up sessions and materials. Allocations were programmed for the participants to be


37 The Pilot Communities Program, p. 21.
distributed the following September. These monies were subsequently confused and buried in the bureaucratic machinery. Consequently, teachers received no support in the form of materials and follow-up sessions. This reinforced their beliefs that change could not take place because the "system" was playing the same old "promising game", leaving teachers geared up to implement programs without materials. Current research in educational administration has shown that change takes place when there is total commitment from all responsible, from the teacher down to the administrators. Periodic reinforcement is crucial to any change program initiated. Trained in new methods and materials, teachers had been calling for on the spot advice and assistance since the first summer institute in 1965. Out of this need for full-time support and in collaboration with EDC, the idea of the Innovation Team was born.


40Sherburne, Mary Lela, Teaming for Change in the Schools, (Newton, Massachusetts: Educational Development Center, 1971).
Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to present a case study of how one big city school system sought to initiate system wide reform using its teachers as the primary change agents. Pursuant to this goal, the study will document the development of the Washington, D.C. Innovation Team, and focus on four major areas:


2. Construction of a profile for each of the participants of the program.

This profile will consist of:

   a) years of teaching experience
   b) expertise entering the team
   c) current position
   d) earned degree or degrees
   e) areas of expertise (at the time the Team disbanded)

3. Identification and description of the skills identified by the members as part of their training.

4. Presentation of recommendations based on the Washington, D.C. Model for institutionalizing change.

Importance of the Study

Big city school systems across the country are faced with the increasingly militant demand to stop the failure of urban school students, to halt the deterioration of the quality
of urban schools and to improve the quality of the in-school experience for urban youngsters. In order to do this, massive, district wide reform will have to occur. Introducing reform on a wide scale is difficult and complex. This study will be of assistance to those school systems seeking to initiate system wide change particularly those using a model which cast the teacher in the role of change agent. The assessments with implications and recommendations in this study will be useful to centralized urban school systems contemplating adopting a decentralized model. Finally, to those identified as proponents of educational change using the team approach, the conclusions will have great significance in planning for targets for intervention.

Summary

Urban school systems experienced wide spread failure in the 1960's in the process of meeting the needs of their students. Studies of this failure point to the new school clientele which the system has been unable to adjust to, the problems in bureaucratic administrations which get bogged down in red-tape and remain unresponsive, and teachers where attitudes have been shaped according to a white middle class ethic which makes them unable to respond to the needs of students.
Recognizing the need for reform, the Washington, D.C. school system sought to initiate change by setting up a Model School Division. This act led to the creation of the Innovation Team as a vehicle for system change. This dissertation will be a documentation of the development of the Team as an agent for change and an assessment of the impact of the Team on the system.
CHAPTER II
The Development of the Washington Innovation Team

The first chapter presented a brief description of the national and local scene at the time of the intervention of the Model School Division and the development of the Washington Innovation Team. An assessment of the significance of that intervention in the area of educational reform was also presented. Chapter II is presented as an historical assessment of the development of the Innovation Team with a description of the role played by key agents involved, particularly Model School Division and Education Development Corporation.

The Model School Division

During the sixties, the middle Atlantic States lead the nation in the degree of concentrated "compensatory education" programs. Washington, D.C., paced with the middle Atlantic States, initiated comparable activities in the Model School Division. Dr. Norman Nickens quotes from the United Planning Organization report "the kind of reform envisioned" as being:

...(the) involvement of all community agencies (U.P.O.) rather than the schools alone; sufficient autonomy to provide the freedom to experiment boldly and without fear of failure; provisions for adequate financing; a commitment to testing and demonstrations on a major scale rather than "tinkering"; a realistic relationship of the Cardozo system to the District of Columbia school system....

Established in the area of Northwest Washington which draws its name from Cardoza High School, the Model School Division had a charter issued in 1964 to operate as a semi-autonomous sub-system. A major influence on the conception of the Model School Division came from the panel on Educational Research and Development under the auspices of a presidential science advisory committee. In its progress report, "Innovation and Experimentation in Education", the panel advanced the idea of the model sub-system as a "natural" unit for educational reform.2

A major concern was the operational definition of autonomy and how the Model School Division was related to other school departments. A second related concern was the internal effort at delineating the authority of the Division was contained in a set of guidelines issued in the fall of 1964. The guidelines defined: 1) the relationship of the "model school system" to the regular system, 2) the autonomy of the assistant superintendent; 3) personnel policies; 4) educational program policies and 5) research and evaluation plans.3 This list of guidelines was the most explicit definition of the Model School Division's authority on record at that time.


3Ibid., p. 11.
During the first year of operation (1964-65) the only organizational structure that was established consisted of an assistant superintendent, a director of programs, an assistant director and a small clerical staff. The assistant superintendent did not have line authority over the schools themselves. The span of administrative control extended over those special programs not considered a part of the regularly offered school programs. Teachers, principals and supervisors continued to be responsible to the Departments for Elementary and Secondary Education. The Model School Division had no formal control over regular budget allocations for the nineteen schools included in the Division. Much of the lack of coordination which plagued the early years of the operation of the Model School Division was the result of its funding history which was fraught with delays, lack of planning time, cutbacks and total eliminations. The Model School Division requested, but never received funds to support an internal research and evaluation capability. Resulting, deploying, and retaining qualified staff was a perpetual problem compounded by the tentative nature and timing of the receipt of funds.

---

From the time of its creation, the mission and programs of the Model School Division were subject to controversy and confusion. At points, its continued existence was seriously in doubt.

During its first three years the Model School Division sponsored twenty-six significant new programs and projects. It brought the skills and resources of outside organizations into collaboration with the school system. By 1967, it was shifting its emphasis to consolidation and coordination of programs and activities to insure maximum impact on the total school environment and the pupil. In a move to plan for improved organization and administration, the Model School Division sought to further clarify and define its role within the system. It sought a reaffirmation of the continuing support of the Board of Education and submitted two recommendations for the Board's consideration:

1. We recommend the Board go on record in support of the following administrative provisions:

a. That the Model School Division have the authority to deploy all specialized teaching personnel to insure effective coordination of departmental activities with experimental programs of the Model School Division.

b. That the Model School Division have the authority to disseminate experimental programs and curricula of demonstrated validity and applicability throughout the Model School Division even though these programs and curricula may not be represented in the standard departmental courses of study.
c. That the Model School Division have the authority for direct purchase of experimental materials through a special account administered by the Assistant Superintendent of Model School Division.

2. We recommend that the Board earmark a sum of $100,000 for Model School Division planning and program development. The earmarked sum should be over and above funds allocated to the Model School Division on the basis of present federal aid formulas. With this additional money the Model School Division will have the time and resources for careful planning. It will be able to visit other projects, hire outside consultants, free teachers and administrators for some planning work, and involve the community and parents in planning efforts. Within one year the Model School Division will return to the Board with a comprehensive, long-range plan for fulfilling the broad and far reaching mission which the Board initially conceived for it.5

The most significant immediate development was the decision to transfer operating control of the nineteen schools from the secondary and elementary school departments to the assistant superintendent, Model School Division. At the same time, it was made clear that other school departments of the system were to continue to service the Model School Division.

5Ibid., p. 9.
At the same time, it was made clear that other school departments of the system were to continue to service the Model School Division. This changeover had the following important administrative effects:

- The nineteen principals henceforth reported to the Model School Division assistant superintendent.
- There would be continued reliance on the service departments for the performance of many vital functions which were critical to the success of educational programs.
- The transfer of control greatly increased the administrative responsibility without immediate increase in staff.
- Control over the regular school budget allocations for the nineteen schools was not obtained. Funds were then supplied by the United Planning Organization. Beginning in 1966-67, funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, and Impact Aid sources were secured.

The four basic objectives of the Model School Division were listed as:

1. to improve the quality of instruction, through creative development and use of staff, curriculum, classroom organizational patterns, and auxiliary personnel.

2. to extend educational services, through determining and serving the special needs of its community.

3. to develop interaction and involvement of the community with the schools, through parent involvement in school planning, coordination of community resources with community needs, and through programs which help parents support their child's learning.
4. to improve administration, through coordination of experimental programs with on-going school activities, flexible administrative practices, and new patterns of personnel utilization and deployment.

Even so, becoming operational to the point of motivating real change in the D.C. public schools was difficult for the Model School Division. In May 1967, the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration cited three major problems hampering the operation of the Model School Division,

1. the method by which new programs are introduced without adequate time for orientation and involvement of teachers and principals
2. the lack of systematic evaluation of innovation; and
3. an administrative structure not conducive to experimentation and change.  

The report made several recommendations to the Division for change. One major recommendation, "Establish in each Model School a resident resource teacher, who will coordinate inter- and intra-school program operations and serve as a supportive resource liason for teachers and principals", later proved significant in the decision to create the Innovation Team.

---

Despite the difficulties, the experience provided a unique education for Model School Division personnel. The Passow study commented at length on the benefits of the experience:

The Model School Division does not seem to be as bogged down in red-tape, forms and reports as does the rest of the school. The task force's impression is that teacher morale here is higher, rapport with administrators greater, and the Model School Division's limited size invites closer interpersonal relationships and discussion with the administrative decision-makers. In short, the Model School Division personnel seem to know each other and to work out their problems more directly than the rest of the District. The schools apparently have an esprit de corps and cohesion among staff which are worth the attention of the rest of the system. Decentralized recruitment procedures in Model School Division recognize the principals as key recruiters for staffs for their own buildings. Though principals must still deal with the Personnel Department's licensing and certification machinery, they are more systematically involved in the ultimate selection and assignment of teachers for their own buildings.

Many teachers in Washington identify themselves and their responsibilities not in terms of an educational program but rather in relation to their grade level or subject assignment at the elementary and secondary levels; teachers and administrators display more of a team identity. Administrators have ready access to their Assistant Superintendent who meets with his entire staff periodically and knows intimately the problems confronting their schools and their community. Closer relationships emerge from open communications channels; education is more of a joint school and community concern.

The Model School Division is unique in many ways in the District organization. It has the beginnings of decentralized operation with maximum responsibility at the building level. There appears to be considerable strength in this approach.7

Given this general background, the Model School Division concentrated much of its efforts in retooling, renewing, recharging and reviving teachers. Programs were developed with a specific aim to 1) stabilize staff in disadvantaged schools, 2) to recruit and train teachers for teaching positions in the disadvantaged schools, 3) to develop a "Peace Corps" type of organization for the United States, 4) to credentialize all classroom connected activities, and 5) to update methods for teaching mathematics and science. The Summer Institutes of 1966 and 1967 provided six weeks of in-service training in the use of new curriculum materials in math, science and social studies for two hundred teachers. The major problem encountered after each institute was in providing reinforcement for teachers returning to the classroom who were experiencing difficulty in implementing the innovative ideas.

The 1967-68 plans for the Model School Division called for wider introduction of experimentation in new teaching methods and instructional materials to the classrooms of the Model School Division. In order to do this and provide the reinforcement needed at the classroom level, the creation of

---


9Ibid, p. 16.
a group of fifteen teachers who had participated in a summer institute and used the new materials with their classes was proposed. This group would be called The Innovation Team.¹⁰

**Education Development Center**

Education Development Center is one of the innovative bastilles of curriculum development. Through the years it had developed many manipulative materials for classroom use and other units for science, mathematics, and social studies. Education Development Center entered the Washington scene with the notion that the curriculum generated by its scholars and innovators would promote change in the Washington, D.C. schools. The vehicle for its participation was the Pilot Communities program. The basic operating concept of the Pilot Communities program was in using teams as a vehicle for change. The goals was for 'teams' of 'master teachers' in selected 'pilot communities' to channel new curricular and teaching methods into public schools.¹¹

In the Spring of 1967, when Pilot Communities was being planned, major federal aid to public education, embodied in


the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was less than two years old. Problems in urban education were just beginning to attract the interest of innovating institutions. The Pilot Communities program, then, was not intended to provide radical alternatives. Specifically, the scope of the Pilot Communities was only as broad as the movements of its four teams. One team worked with two middle schools in Bridgeport, Connecticut; a second operated out of a resource center in the Roxbury District of Boston, Massachusetts; a third team divided its efforts between three towns in a triangular section of the Maine Coast; and the Washington, D.C., team worked in the Model School Division of that district. The primary clients of the Teams were experienced elementary school teachers, and their primary function was to help teachers adopt new curriculum materials and methods of instruction.12

A series of operating principles were listed as being crucial and generally applicable:

1. **Preconditions for Change:** There must be widespread dissatisfaction with a given school system, if an innovation team is to intervene there successfully.

2. **Administrative Support:** Solid and visible support at each level of the school system's administration must be present, from the beginning.

---

3. **Contracting**: The process of contracting, or making and re-making agreements between the Team and its "client" never stops.

4. **Team Leader**: A Team needs a leader as a rallying point for its energies. After the crucial stages, the leader should continue in his role only by consensus among the Team.

5. **Team Members**: Certain characteristics of prospective Team members are imperative—"fit" with teachers they're intended to work with; high intelligence, poise, and self-assurance; specific expertise; tenacity, and likemindedness.

6. **Team-Building and Planning**: A Team must make a conscious effort to become a Team, and it must continue to grow. Its members must confront each other when necessary, lock horns on problems, make decisions, and keep moving.

7. **Interaction with the Client System**: Team members must walk a difficult path in their dealings with teachers. They must never take part in the system's evaluation of its teachers; on the other hand, they must not shrink from critical interaction with teachers.

8. **Relationship-Building with Individual Teachers**: Team members should go only where they are wanted. They should respond to specific needs, and build relationships with individual teachers in an atmosphere of mutual respect and learning.
9. **Quick Response to New Opportunities:** Team members' time should be loosely enough allocated to allow quick response to needs that arise on the project site.

10. **The Necessity of Trust:** Without mutual trust, any helping relationship will founder.\(^{13}\)

Teachers returning from the Summer Institutes attempted to implement the new ideas and methods they had learned. But, although the Institute planners had spelled out a follow-up strategy that involved continued consultant support through Saturday workshops, the numerous administrative problems that plagued all the Model School Division programs in the first few years of operation interfered with these plans. By the spring of 1967, the Model School Division had a cadre of almost three hundred teachers, many of whom could be master teachers. There obviously existed at this time both the need for greater coordination of the Model School Division functions and the people trained to fill the need. Recognizing this match between needs and resources, the assistant superintendent of the Model School Division, Norman Nickens, and the science consultant from Education Development Center, George Thomas and James Jones, *Innovation Team Operating Principles*, (Newton, Massachusetts: Educational Development Center, 1971), p. 21.
Mary Lela Sherburne, asked fifteen Model School Division teachers to become members of what came to be called the Innovation Team. The teachers were to be freed from specific classroom duties as they took responsibility for training other teachers in new materials and methods and helped coordinate Model School Division functions and services.

Team Functions

Reporting to the Board of Education on plans for 1967-68, the Assistant Superintendent of the Model School Division specified the functions of the proposed Innovation Team as:

1. Planning for expansion of existing programs, support for old ones in operation, and gradual introduction of new ones.

2. Maintaining liaison with teachers and principals in the schools involved in new programs, helping them to integrate the aims of the various new programs, and providing support and encouragement in their implementation.

3. Organizing and conducting in-service training programs which will give teachers intensive experience with new materials and methods, and providing follow-up for these programs in the form of workshops and consultation in response to specific needs and problems.

4. Reporting regularly their observation on specific aspects of changes in classroom environment and teaching
for purposes of evaluation.  

Reporting to the Board of Education in September, 1970, the new Assistant Superintendent of the Model School Division listed the functions of the team as being:

1. Operation of an in-service program of workshops for teachers.

2. Provision of innovative materials and equipment and instruction in their uses.

3. Provision of supportive services in the classroom, with and for the individual teacher, based upon his needs and those of this students.

4. Development of "responsive" curriculum materials, responsive to the times and children's needs.

5. Provision of outside consultant assistance and resources.

6. Development and operation of summer institutes and programs which assist teachers in the development of various reading instruction approaches, techniques, in instruction in other academic disciplines, organizational patterns and "sensitivity" awareness.

The Team had two primary functions as described by

---

14 Model School Summary, P. 19.
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Cort, et. al., in their evaluation report of the Innovation Team:

1. It would coordinate programs:

   Its primary aim will be to help teachers improve instruction in the classroom. Its members will serve linking agents—linking various programs together at the classroom level; linking outside organizations and ideas to the school; linking departments in the school system at large into the aims of the experimental unit, the Model School Division.

   As part of its coordinating function, the Team would maintain active liaison with specialists and supervisory personnel in the system:

   The members of the cooperative staff (subject matter coordinators and resource teachers, team teaching and non-graded supervisors) will be key persons. They will provide a corps of expertise available immediately to the Innovation Team.

2. The Team would provide immediate support for on-going instructional programs:

   The Team will serve as an instructional unit; arranging and conducting workshops and learning sessions for teachers; and proficing support in the classroom.

   It will be a facilitating unit; adopting as its operational goal the intent of making things possible for teachers. To do this, it will bring together resources and try to make available to the teacher whatever he or she feels will provide a solution to problems seriously hampering her effectiveness as a teacher, or her children's involvement as learners.

   It would stress an uncritical helping role:

   The classroom teacher is regarded as the decisive agent in deciding when and how she will make use
A summary of the early history of the Team by M.L. Sherburne, indicates what the Team decided its functions should be as well as what conditions must prevail if it were to be successful.

Major functions of the Team:

1. To help teachers see themselves as potential instruments for initiating change in their own behavior...

2. To help teachers improve instruction in the classroom to the level that teaching and learning are both more pleasant activities...

3. To increase the power of teachers in decision-making in the school, especially in the area of curriculum...

4. To provide a coordinating function for services, resources, and school programs which assist a teacher to look at her classroom unit as a whole...

5. To provide a channel for experts, specialists, and people from many walks of life to enter the school system... at a level which will affect teaching and learning.

Conditions Necessary for Success

1. All classroom teachers had to have some opportunity for on-the-job training...as a consequence, release time was built into the program.

2. Teachers had to have the right to choose among new programs, to exercise options, and to feel they could make choices and exercise responsibility for the instructional programs they carried out.

3. Teachers had to have access to new curriculum materials, equipment, and supplies on an immediate and responsible basis... Therefore, the team set up its own purchasing and distribution system for special and innovative materials.

4. The authority of the Team should be that derived from its own competence and ability to deliver services to teachers. It would have no direct administrative, evaluative, or supervisory role. Consequently, the Team members retained their classification as teachers and worked with a teacher only when she exercised the initiative in requesting help. 17

The Team as a Temporary System

All of these delineations of function seem to hinge on several principles concerning the concept of Team. The first is a view of Team as instruments of change and growth. The second is the notion of Teams as a delivery system for the input of new ideas and services into a school system. More basically then, a Team becomes a temporary system, created

17 Mary L. Sherburne, Teaming for Change in the Schools, (Newton, Massachusetts: Educational Development Center, 1971), p. 38.
within the context of a larger system to set up new balances of power, cultivate appropriate and constructive tension, and examine old assumptions about roles, leadership, power and authority. Temporary systems can perform a number of functions in large systems. They can provide outlets for problems the formal organization cannot handle. They can absorb, counteract, and make up for the malformation in the larger system. They can induce change by unfreezing old habits and attitudes and stimulating new ones. Temporary systems can accomplish short term tasks more effectively than formal organizations because they are less encumbered by the historical freight that weighs down the larger system. They can energize systems with new ideas, technology and skills. Finally, temporary systems can take a higher order of risk than persons who are responsible for routine and permanent task roles in the system.

Teams as temporary systems are useful ways of creating effective functioning in large organization which have dysfunctional parts because of a variety of factors.

First, teaming gives a new look; it invites members to understand and deal with authority and leadership, and to know from whence it is derived, rather than merely to accept its status. This gives vitality and power in itself.

Second, a Team can make use of collective knowledge.
The skills, knowledge, information, and interests of a number of people, if focused on similar goals, add up to more than the sum of their parts. Most tasks today, in any social or educational scene are so complex that they demand a wider range of knowledge and skill than one person can have.

Third, a Team offers an opportunity to work toward group goals, toward task accomplishment that benefits many rather than one. In many jobs, even within organizations, the individual competes solely for recognition of himself, or success of the program he directs. A Team works for a larger goal than mere individual success, and in so doing learns the inherent rewards that come from collaborative rather than purely individual action.

Finally, a Team enables the individual to have and know the support of others. Efforts to adapt to changing forces in society are trying ones, and test the mettle, spirits, and stamina of individuals. Support from others who share similar goals and experiences is personally enhancing and can be programmatically productive.18

---

Leadership and the Development of the Innovation Team

The most important and perhaps the most interesting issue always is leadership. It is also an issue least often dealt with in practice and theory. In schools there is little emphasis on training personnel to understand and practice real leadership. Often when leadership is discussed, what is held in mind is administration or the carrying out of routine implementation of policies and regulations. What was important for the Team was the ability of a person to lead, not merely to direct, not to administer, not to oversee, not to conduct surveillance.

Leadership of teams can be derived from: natural authority of a person who established real leadership; control by a majority of the group who represent a force within the group; and hierarchial or formal authority which appoints a leader and invests that leadership with status within the system.19

In other words, leadership of a group is usually derived from a combination of three factors: qualities within the person who is trying to be leader; events and givens within the system situation and social context; and qualities, needs, and attitudes of those on the team who will be led or function as subordinates.

If one outweighs the other, a leadership pattern is very distinctly set. If the qualities of a person dominate, then leadership can be charismatic, personal, strong, dominating, and authoritative.

If the events and situations cominate, then leadership may be political and exciting, but also erratic and sometimes highly misplaced. For if the leadership is determined solely by events outside the team and by the real situation, it may be irrelevant to the needs of a group or the task at hand, or it may be over-responsive to one aspect of what is happening in the outside world. On the other hand, this kind of leadership, determined entirely by events, might be on target depending upon the knowledge and the process of those who call the shots in selecting the leadership.20

If the team itself or its members determine the leadership, a more organic and significant process may emerge than from any other of the other two factors. A team which has designated to it the right to choose its own leader will face potentially great opportunities for growth—as well as great difficulty. The very process of being responsible for choosing a leader, if made the subject of study, work, and training can become the material out of which the team

---

grows and understands itself. If a team is to be systematically developed, there is a great deal to be offered in letting it assume responsibility for selection.  

There are some given and some pitfalls to be watched for however, in selecting a team leader, whatever process is used.

It is more important for a leader to recognize his own needs, proclivities and his leadership style, and for the team to understand them, than it is to seek for him to conform to any given and specified pattern.

In the context of contemporary society and the fermenting nature of education, few leaders can survive who do not arrange for and accept systematic inputs from subordinates, and who do not understand and recognize the value of this mode of operation.

Inputs from subordinates or fellow teammates can be derived by using consensus and unanimous decision making, but then also be acceptable in a more authoritarian leader who learns to hear, listen, and make decisions using information

---


gathered from others. A leader can function by defining his style and establishing limits for the group.

Leadership that uses consensus decision-making can produce an operation that utilizes the resources of a group. Consensus leadership makes accountability easier; it places responsibility directly on the group and its individuals for making and understanding decisions and for carrying them out.

Consensus leadership, and participative decision-making demands the most knowledge and skill on the part of a leader and members of a team.

The greatest pitfall to leaders and followers is trying to use only book knowledge about leadership and theoretical convictions about democratic relationships. Second hand knowledge about leadership based on vagueness and a general commitment to democracy without any real down-to-earth understanding of the back-and-forthness of leadership is disastrous. Leadership must be learned in the arena of action and must be understood in specific relationship to the behavior of others.²³

It is wrong to assume that if a leader is appointed or selected or chosen, he automatically becomes a leader. Leadership does not derive merely from the title and the derivation

²³Rice, Learning for Leadership, p. 149.
of formal authority. It must be won and practiced in order to be real.

It is wrong to assume that one kind of leadership is appropriate and good in all situations. The expectancies and experiences of the followers or subordinates may influence this. Some subordinates will expect freedom and participation. Others will demand more directive leadership. A leader will, of necessity, have to respond to not only his own internal style, but the demands of the group.

It is wrong to assume that race and sex do not affect or alter leadership. They do affect it, and a dangerous pitfall is to ignore this.24

There is a pitfall in assuming that freedom is measured by the number of decisions made by subordinates in a unit. In actuality freedom, autonomy, and participation are not necessarily gauged by the number of interactions, but more by the significance of the decisions with which the group deals.

The leadership for the Washington Project had many particularities. One way to begin is by describing the

---

behavioral characteristics of the "first leader". In addition to her being female and white, the changee, as seen by "me":

1. possessed enormous strength and stamina; 2) was intuitively capable of administering plans and strategies for the group; 3) was unshrinking in the face of "high-risk" situations; 4) had unusual charisma with males and females; 5) was unusually intelligent for someone who had had no concentrated education course. Perceptions of leadership remained unclear and many questions were never satisfactorily answered. Some of these were: 1) Who is the leader? 2) How is the leadership being seen by the Pilot Communities directorship? 3) When is the leader really a leader?

During the Washington Team's second year, although activities continued much as they had before, more attention was focused on managing priorities. The second year was also marked by a significant shift in leadership from the white, outside consultant to a black teacher as elected Team Leader. As the new leader, I attempted to re-organize the Team. My initial operating style was one in which I was a nice guy, responding to the whims and/or concerns of every individual. Foremost in my mind was the fact that I must be "successful" and must be like by my peers. I say peers because to be elected leader means only that I am responsible for the
coordination of the Team's activities, for chair meetings, and for representing the group when necessary. This was in no way a promotion, nor did the appointment elevate me.

My initial way to do what I knew I must do was to set up a pilot or steering committee to assist in the decision-making process. Prior to this, most of the decisions for the group were made by the Team on Fridays. A second task for this group of Task Force chairmen was to decide, by consensus, the agenda for Friday's meetings and, finally, to determine the order of priorities for the group. During this period, the overt concerns were again to develop group cohesion and remain at individual tasks, decided and controlled by the group. Many efforts were made by members of the Team to break from the group tasks and seek fulfillment from self-motivated projects.

The efforts of these persons, who initiated their own projects were stymied or halted by the Team. Questions such as, "Where are you going?" or "What are you doing?" were openly addressed to Team members. Later, I recognized these to really mean "How do your self-initiated tasks relate to the group tasks?" Very few, if any, Team members felt comfortable responding to these questions. Meetings in which members were confronted concerning their activities were very solemn and left me with a feeling of being completely
drained. Many times I wanted to answer or support an individual, but I was afraid that the interruption would half the discussion. Team members viewed this as a *laissez faire* attitude and would try to capitalize on this by asking me to make announcements for them. Within, I tried to display a behavior which would foster and promote interactions. I felt that interactions and confrontations were healthy and group atmosphere necessary for action-oriented programs, and provided a real experience for prospective leaders.

The Steering Committee idea seemed appropriate at that time. Tasks were given to volunteers and the committee gave the leader a direct line to the task groups. However, I did not have any way to hold individuals accountable for the tasks. If an individual neglected to do his task, the chairman had to rely on the group to take action. If no action was taken, the individual often got away with doing nothing.

Most of the time in my tenure as leader, I found myself force-fitting a participatory-democratic type of organization. At the end of my first year's reign, I pulled back to ask the group to look at what I was doing, where they were individually, and where they saw the Team going. The feedback was to be used to help them decide where we were going. We constantly looked at each other, and the following were the
outcomes of the consideration: 1) I, as a leader, was to lenient and tolerant; 2) I assigned tasks only when I couldn't do them myself; 3) I did not push members to perform their tasks.

My expectancies were in direct response to the lack of a given direction and the frustrated feeling of inadequacy. My situation was one comparable to the principals in most schools--being responsible for a role and task defined by superiors, and performing a role and task as defined by my own aspirations. However complicated this might be, it was not the straw that broke the camel's back. The "last straw" is to be evaluated, using neither criteria. One becomes an efficient and proficient leader because he designs and defines his role, resists other and/or outside input.

Exploring leadership and authority in an ever-changing operation affords the individual many opportunities to create a role and to explore alternative roles for the individual.

My initial task was to convert the support used to elect me to the position to one of helping me do the task. Some of the reasons for my being elected was that I appeared sensitive to others, easy to manipulate, a champion of the black cause, and my actions indicated that I knew what I was doing. Each of these, however, impedes progress because the leader is channeled into behaviors. Any deviation from these behaviors brings about active and/or passive resistance.
Many people would assume there would not be the "black-white" problem with black leadership. However, it does exist but in a different form—not black-white per se, but black style versus white style. Laboring under the myth that the white participatory-democracy is the most efficient way to lead a group, led to the exploration of a new process. The participatory-democracy process does not really work. Mainly, leadership and authority rest in the arms of the power figure which is supposed to be the group and the followers. As the leader, I could use authority or relegate it to the followers in the model of leadership adopted. The key to success, however, is having the group accept this modus operandi as fact and perform without really having any control over themselves.

The "black-white" issue was never raised or confronted by members of the Pilot Communities staff; however, E.D.C. appeared to find it expedient or convenient to recruit a high percentage of whites as the experts. This practice provoked unfavorable responses from participants in workshops and black administrators. However, there are occasions when there is value in using whiteness and blackness as a strategy. Some of these are in the "Games" the leader plays: 1) Sex: masculine, feminine; 2) Big bad wolf, aggressive; 3) Outside: using position to 'speak' for clients; 4) Inside: appealing
to the sympathy of teachers; 5) Go to strong side: using your position or masculinity to get things done; 6) Do what you ask others to do in response to "you don't know what we go through"; 7) Good guy or nice fellow: husband, father, son, brother; 8) Hoarder of individual secrets.

An afterthought is that the whole structure was somewhat self-defeating because everyone was equal. When we had staff meetings everyone reported to me as leader, but in sub-team meetings there was a chairman who didn't have the authority to see that the leader received an acceptable product. Therefore, I was being forced into "playing factors"--I used the persons I was closest to and whom I had the most confidence in for doing the job. This increased the number of skills available to the Team, but I still had the problem of the less motivated individuals, and I still had no real official authority.

Group process had lead us as a group into a democratic process or one which helped the Team to maintain the status quo. There was always resistance when one tried to elevate himself beyond the level of the classroom teachers (class 15). The process gave the members the impression that "we nominated him, but just as we nominated him, we can get rid of him." We had a Team where everyone saw every other person as his equal, no more, no less. Then all of a sudden here's a guy
whose going to be the leader. I was a sanctioned leader; the Team perceive me as a leader. But at that level of operation, the leader was just a Team member with additional responsibilities.

In-Group Resistance to Team Development

The experience of implementing an Innovation Team pointed out a sort of "natural history" of resistance that a team must go through and resolve before it can truly be successful. This resistance seems to get expressed in four major forms. The director of the team needs sufficient insight to be able to turn these predicted situations into moments of personal and group growth. These resistances include: 1) challenges regarding the legitimacy of selection procedures, 2) refusing to admit the cohesiveness of the group, 3) questions about the training procedures, and 4) claims that it is futile even to test the possibility of changing the status quo.25

Challenges to the Legitimacy of Selection Procedures

Obviously, an Innovation Team must be started by some one or more persons since, if nothing else, funds to free team members

of classroom responsibilities must be obtained. Because funds can usually be obtained before there is wide-spread support for an Innovation Team, the question of "who determined this program and on the basis of what priorities" will inevitably be raised. This must happen, if only because questions of any dollar expenditures not controlled by formula allocations are political questions, and, therefore, raise questions of policy and power.26

The way a leader handles this initial confrontation is very important. One can very easily turn people off by coming on authoritatively and suppressing their right to question the program. In fact, most leaders are surprised by how easily, in the beginning, the can stop any threat of conflict. But each also learns that he is doing no more than buying a little more time. Unless there are good reasons to delay, it is best openly to describe exactly how the program was started and to allow the group or groups, if it has been decided, to separate individuals from different levels within the system for the purpose of establishing an Innovation Team is to give individuals in school systems more power over their roles in

that system, one might as well begin by behaviorally demon-
strating that those involved in the program can question any-
thing, even the program itself.

Given some tolerable level of acceptance of the idea
of an Innovation Team, a second challenge will arise as part
of the need to agree on the criteria by which team members
will be selected. In Washington, the initial choices were
biased and personalistic. It is particularly important that
the criteria do not merely replicate the formal procedures
usually used for promotion within the system.

In addition to the selection criteria, two other questions
must be answered. These are first, how long the teams will
serve and second, what expectations need to be made explicit
regarding the jobs within the system that members are to
assume upon leaving the Team. The experience in Washington
indicated that unless such matters are agreed upon in advance,
team members will not want to return to the classroom.27

2. Resistances through the efforts of the group not to
be a group.

There is no question but that teachers do not have a
strong sense of collegial feeling toward one another in the
same sense that other professionals are, at least reputed to
have. This has been explained by many scholars in terms of

27Gordy, A Model for Change, p. 25.
the relatively isolated work situation or the closed classroom in which teachers work. Certainly, schools tend to provide few formal or informal supports to encourage teachers to develop collegial relations with one another. Teachers' lounges, when they exist, are notoriously shabby quarters set up for little more than a smoke, a quick cup of coffee, and respite from mental tension. Even teachers from the same school who spend a whole summer at a training institute rarely conceive of working together to implement some of the new ideas to which they have been exposed without outside guidance to that effect.

Given this, it should come as no surprise that the Innovation Team members will resist conceiving of themselves as a group. To begin with, often they were not a group. On the contrary, they were a number of separate individuals who were brought together by virtue of some outside interventions and suddenly charged with the task of operating as a group without having the opportunity to evolve a set of commonly shared norms. The needed time for this to occur, although the appropriate use of sensitivity training, the length of time can be shortened considerably.

Second, once the members conceive of themselves as a legitimately constituted group, they will have to assume responsibility and risk of failure just as anyone initiating
the idea of a team must have risked failure to get to this point. People, however, generally avoid such commitments until they at least know the probabilities of success. The point in this case is that instead of seeking further clarity about the risks, the members will probably take the easier route of denying that they are a group at all.

3. **Resistances through questioning the relevance of the training procedures.**

The experiences with the Washington Innovation Team showed that sensitivity-trained sessions, conducted along the lines developed by the National Training Laboratory, is powerful enough to mold a group, as well as contributing to an individuals' understanding and interpretation of their own feelings and interactions.

Such training, useful for everybody, may be even more crucial for black urban teachers, many of whom have been "conditioned" all their lives to accept the authority structure as a given or at best to resist it only through indirect and oblique methods. Obviously, the Civil Rights Movement, Black Power themes and other developments of the last decade are changing the black man's self-concept. Nevertheless, if everybody needs to learn more about himself, to participate in the decision-making processes that touch his life, and to take risks, this seems to be particularly true of individuals from minority group origins who choose teaching for a career.
The team members will initially have little, if any, stake in the effort to mold them into a cohesive group. In fact as was suggested earlier, if the group never emerges, their personal risk will be lower, and, therefore, if they have any stake at all, it should be to resist these efforts to create a group. Thus, it is to be expected that the members will seek to undermine the effort to build cohesiveness by questioning the appropriateness of sensitivity as a training methods.

Inevitably some members will argue that the T-group approach is all right for dealing with personal hang-ups, but that it has little to do with new curriculum, the open-classroom or whatever the team has been formed to implement. Some will say that sensitivity training is just "a bunch of games" and that they should be getting on with the substantive training. Others will argue that the "games" simply tear people apart by focusing on the worst side of an individual. Others may claim that dealing with these negative aspects of people is inappropriate in a public organization like a school system. Obviously, these "classic" resistances can easily be turned around by the experienced sensitivity trainer and used to further development of the group. They must be mentioned, however, because in the early stages these attacks are often so strong and persuasive that even the forewarned
initiator of an Innovation Team will find himself suppressing his own doubts about the program that is underway.

4. The futility of testing the status quo.

In the process of becoming a group, the members of the Team will come to make many decisions and take numerous interpersonal risks. In my experience, every single participant comes to feel their experience was invaluable and that they have grown tremendously. Most alledged that they have changed tremendously, and that they now deal with their family, friends and colleagues in entirely different, but more satisfactory ways. Whether this is true or not, when the team members turn to the problem of exploring the authority structure of a school and trying to change some small aspect of it, they are almost certain to fall back on their old ways of behaving and to try to avoid putting themselves in such a high-risk position. The next task of the leader, therefore, is to continue to build up the self-images of the members of the group to a point where they will feel good enough about themselves as individuals and as a group to want to go out and take risks, even public ones.

The efforts to avoid failure outside the Team will take the form of an insistance that "the system won't let us do that!" Now it is true that there are enormous constraints to prevent anyone in a school system, even the superintendent,
from changing any aspect of the organization. This is true of most organizations, but it is particularly true of organizations like school systems in which there are no mechanisms such as the sweep of profit or cost/benefit analysis to guide policy making. On the other hand, the very absence of such quantifiable guides to decision-making also means that an advocate of something has only inertia, not effective arguments, to overcome. This leaves the school in a very vulnerable position and one that is open to being pushed if there are individuals willing to work together to do so.

How does a leader get the Team to try something, to attack and let the system respond rather than continue to play the acquiescing role most school personnel assume? One of the best ways to motivate the group to start something is to focus narrowly on the substantive program for which it has direct responsibility. And within this range, it is best if the Team starts with something that has a pretty low risk of failure so that they will reassure themselves, along with others, that they can succeed.

In Washington, for example, the Team began with a series of workshops in which other classroom teachers were introduced to the new curriculum materials and encouraged to request assistance from any or all of the Team members in acquiring and using them. This project had virtually no risk of failure
since by chance alone it was almost certain that a few teachers would be interested and the Team had already purchased or had rapid access to a sufficient supply of materials to be able to "reward" such interest immediately with actual delivery of the new items.

Several tensions will arise if a Team seeks to begin with a project that the leader feels is over-ambitious, and this is very likely to be the case if the members are now operating as a cohesive change-oriented group. Despite all the training to the contrary, these tensions, just as with all the previously described resistances, can be quashed by the leader's relatively greater position of power. By now it should also be clear that it is absolutely necessary to deal openly with them. Moreover, the team, if functioning as a cohesive group will now want to succeed and will be much more willing to listen to reasonable arguments than they would have been at an earlier period.

It is important that the Team become aware of the extent to which they are now trying to proseltize "their program" to the teachers rather than implement a process whereby the with whom the team is working come to want themselves to participate and shape the decisions affecting them.
Selecting Team Members

In its original form, the Innovation Team consisted of fifteen members, twelve women and three men. With the exception of one woman, all were teachers in the Model School Division. All were teachers committed to change. The philosophy they espoused was one of considering children and teachers as valuable resources who can mutually grow together in an active, inquiring, and supportive manner. This philosophy negated a more traditional way of seeing the teacher as the possessor of knowledge that he passes on to children in whatever format he wishes. Team members were selected on the basis of two specified and written criteria. 1) That the potential Team member would have had special training in an extensive Summer Institute conducted by specialists in use of new mathematics, science and social curricula; and 2) that the potential Team member would have made successful use in his or her classroom of the trial materials and new curricula introduced in the Institute.

There were also hidden criteria which were not specified and articulated. Since the teachers were selected from those teaching in the target system and since the target system was predominantly black, the Team members were black. It seems important, in retrospect, that the overt criteria of selection
was stated as competency in subject matter. However, the
most important criteria may have been those unspecified and
inherent in the natural potential of the team which was closely
associated with its client group of the same racial background,
with knowledge familiar of the system and world in which it
would operate.

In the course of our growth and development as a Team,
and in the process of attempting to involve some criteria
for the selection of additional Team members, we isolated some
factors which we considered essential in Team member selection.
We determined that Team members must (1) demonstrate willing-
ness and commitment to join in a group in which growth and
continual development is the norm, 2) agree beforehand to be
part of organizational development and personal growth labora-
tories and experiences, 3) understand that a temporary group,
IE., a team and a system may not have the job security, nor
the guarantee of step-by-step progression upward, nor the
control by rule and regulation found in traditional positions
in the system.

In addition, Team members should have a particular skill
related to the initial task. This special knowledge could
be in teaching, in a specific curriculum subject matter, in
organization, drama, art, curriculum development, or other
skills related to the job to be done. The skills sought should
be practical and directly related to competency in the real world and should be measured by practical success not academic degree-holding success. The expansion of skill in methods and practice can be done through Team teaching.

The Team member should "know" to a practical degree the world that is their target. If it is the child, they should know children. If it is the community, they should know and have a feeling for the community. They should be interested in current tensions, relevant considerations. This means they should know something about the nature of the target system, how it functions, and they should be constructively critical and skeptical about it. Team membership should also represent, the social composition—race, sex, age, experience, geography, or status, of the target group.

The Team member should hold values and opinions which he is not afraid to own up to. He should have some expectancies for himself which he demonstrates, and he should have expectancies and standards for his system and his society. Partisanship or a sense of values, we think, is more crucial than the much discussed goal of objectivity. The reality is that caring, striving, committed individuals are seldom if ever impartial or completely objective. Being objective from our viewpoint is something which must be worked at by all committed people, and it is never an end in itself.
A potentially valuable Team member who can develop a commitment to the task of a Team must first be capable of commitment. So look for it in the beginning.

A Team member should be a risk-taker, that is willing to go out on a limb and to enter a slightly different kind of an organization which does not have all the certainties guaranteed by appointed position, line authority, and ritualized roles.

Setting Team Goals

After coming together as a Team, our first year of operation was designed to build group cohesion. To accomplish this, a trainer was engaged to run sensitivity sessions every Friday. This trainer had been involved in the Summer Institute from which Team members were selected. Utilizing this trainer added to the continuity of the summer program designed to carve out a role for the Team. Principals, teachers, supervisors, and personnel from EDC were brought together to help design the Team's role and some of its functions. We found this process to be particularly valuable for determining goals for the Team would be of little use if done routinely, or merely to meet the criteria of stating goals. Rather, having numerous interactions over a period of time among people both inside and outside the system in which the Team would be functioning, facilitators are being
able to achieve these goals once they were articulated. We learned from the process that to be successful, a Team must not only be involved and committed to its goals and objectives but to the implementation and continued testing and examination of its strategies for attaining these goals and objectives. We also learned the importance of recognizing early in the development of the Team the first stated goals may be inadequate or wrong and that as the program develops and feedback is gathered, these goals can be changed.

Our initial decision was that the Innovation Team would:
1) help teachers improve instruction, 2) link various programs together, 3) arrange and conduct workshops, 4) provide support in the classroom.

The First Year

With this direction, the Team set out to actively respond to these tasks. The first couple of weeks of the school year were spent in introducing Team members to the principals and assistant principals of the schools where they would work and in organizing the Team into four sub-teams of three members each. Each sub-team serviced three elementary schools by: 1) conversing with teachers about their needs, 2) ordering materials for teachers, 3) doing classroom demonstrations for new and tenured teachers, 4) substituted for teachers attending workshops or ill, 5) putting up bulletin boards,
assisting in writing lesson plans, 7) assisting in physical examinations of children, 8) conducting and organizing workshops, 9) providing moral support for teachers.

The simplest statement to make about that first year is that it was an eventful one. The Cernius and Sherburne report catches some of the flavor of the first months and is worth quoting at length:

The first year was characterized by ebullient spirit and immediate successes. Team members found friends and supporters among the teaching staff and the supervisors and administrators, especially those who had been part of the summer conference. In general, the Team met positive and well-disposed attitudes, or at the worst, questioning and wait-and-see ones.

There was an immediate need for the Team's services with seventy new, mostly inexperienced teachers, entering the Model Schools. These new teachers were the victims of their lack of familiarity with the style of the children whom they were to teach in the inner city. First week classes were often chaotic. Where and how did one begin?

The friendly, experienced hand of a Team member was more than welcome. They would teach a lesson and give the new teacher a chance to rest and observe. They would reorganize the room, and be off, only to be back in a while with some new piece of equipment or educational game which could occupy overactive students and grant the new teacher precious learning time to grab hold.

Even more astonishing, they would finish and would ask, "Now what would you like in the way of new materials, or workshops to help you do a better job?" And in a few days they would be back with a list of offerings and the suggestion that the teacher make the choice. Old and new teachers alike welcomed the materials and workshops the Team offered. Initial gains were easily made in this atmosphere. Feedback, both from Team to teachers and from teachers to Team, was reinforcing.
The Team set up procedures for ordering and distributing supplies. They were responsible for their own purchasing. A contractual agreement with EDC provided ready access to funds and rapid purchasing to meet daily and changing needs of teachers.

Until the end of October, the Team was immersed in formulating its new role. All relationships were new and exciting. The easiest tasks came first. The consultant Dr. Cernius, reminded the Team in one of its weekly sessions in October, this is the honeymoon.28

The Team moved rapidly through the "honeymoon" stage. They were excited and eager to begin, but unprepared for setbacks, frustrations, or failures. Many flaws were uncovered in the model. To release teachers from classes to attend a workshop was not a problem, but to replace her with a substitute became a problem. The primary reason for this problem was the fact that there were not enough substitutes on the school system's rolls. We solved this by recruiting from the district's teachers college and other schools of higher education. Once recruited, it was necessary to conduct workshops for these college juniors and seniors. Our foremost thought was to provide in-service training because we felt that the program had to make every effort to assure the teachers their absence would not cause the classroom instructional activities to be halted. Because the MSD classes were engaged

28Cernius and Sherburne, The Innovation Team, p. 97.
in many new instructional activities, it was necessary to instruct and/or acquaint the substitutes with the materials, techniques, and work philosophy of the MSD.

A second problem faced by the Team that first year had to do with the leadership of the Team. The elected Team leader was a white, outside-the-system "expert". There was constant testing of her both as an individual and as an authority. As the Team dealt with the problems of this leadership, sought to establish good interpersonal and working relationships, and clarified to its own satisfaction the Team leader's rule and commitment, the atmosphere of distrust and hostility lessened.

Clearly the most significant event for the Team that year was the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King which became the focus of the demonstration of discontent by the D.C. black population. One of the most important decisions of that year was made by the assistant superintendent for the MSD. He was of the opinion the MSD schools should not and would not carry on "business as usual" but would capitalize on the activities in evidence in the Division. Teachers were instructed to devote their time to urge the students to express their attitudes, experiences, and feelings about themselves, about blacks, whites, teachers and schools. "Do not fail them (the students) by lecturing when they need to talk", was the com-
mand of the assistant superintendent. It brought many responses from teachers, students, and Team members. It brought the Team closer together. We felt the need, the hurt and the bewilderment of the children and we were wounded too. But from the experience a curriculum from and for the children was produced that had the beauty of absolute honesty. Children of Cardozo Tell It Like It Is remains one of the best examples of what can happen when teachers take time to listen to students.29

I think the most important learnings from the events for teachers were: 1) in times of crisis, children learn best; 2) schools and teachers took advantage of this event by providing the opportunity for students to utilize their writing skills for "something", not just for writing sake; 3) called attention to the fact the curriculum should be generated from "inside" and "outside" the schools; 4) the student's feelings are valid contributions to the educational process; 5) the decision validated and legitimized some of the teachers' activities.

Success came in many forms that first year. The most rewarding one was the acceptance of the Team by their peers.

The indicators which we identified were: 1) the number of

29 Sherburne, Teaming for Change, p. 53.
responses from teachers on evaluation forms, reading survey forms and applications for the summer program; 2) the number of requests for services by teachers, principals and supervisors; 3) the response to the request for children's writings.

Maturation

The 1970-71 school year posed the greatest challenge to the Team's educational values. The school system adopted a plan for encouraging academic achievement in a way that went counter to the Team's mode of operations. The Team's central belief that change should be generated and planned by those who have to carry it out was not supported by the Board of Education when it adopted the Clark proposal for a system-wide reading plan. Similarly, the Team's belief that there should be differential solutions to instructional problems was not upheld by the unitary proposal on reading. How the Team could continue to function in a helping and innovative role, and yet pursue the stated goals of the system became a crucial issue.

The Team met the problem creatively, using the resiliency of its members to respond in planning and problem diagnosis.

---

It refused to politicize its informal power but used its human and physical resources to help principals and teachers, to the best of their ability, to respond to the system-wide reading plan. The Team conducted workshops for principals, trained teachers for reading, and assisted the superintendent in a planning and organization effort.

The issues of maturity in one sense are the most difficult of all. In school systems and human nature there is a temptation to create something and perpetuate it if it works at all. Perpetuation moves into concretization and formalization, the very attributes which the Team was created to change or to replace. Once success has been attained, a task accomplished, and members of a team trained, what lies ahead?

We do not advocate under any circumstances the maintenance and perpetuation of a team in its original form for more than three years, nor for less than two. Team work and team relationships developed in family groups or work units or in ongoing projects, or course, may continue. But they will have to be constantly worked at and continually redeveloped as new personnel move in and out.

In terms of a new team or a unique team, formed especially to do a job, there are viable alternatives about end and change, none of which need rule out the other. The members of the
Washington Team went in many directions. Chapter IV discusses some of those directions.

The Involvement of the University of Massachusetts

In keeping with the aim to bring about educational change through teacher training, the Innovation Team members developed a great many of their skills to a highly sophisticated level. Part of their training was in conjunction with the University of Massachusetts School of Education. The U. Mass School of Education expressed major concern for the design of urban-oriented graduate programs for the development of teacher trainers. In collaboration with the MSD, it developed a design for a teacher trainer program which would test its ability to match concern with activity and product delivery. The result was a uniquely designed Master's Degree program for the Washington Innovation Team members offered on-site in D.C. The aim was to concentrate efforts of the two agencies involved toward bringing about significant institutional change within the public schools of Washington, D.C. The program duration was for eighteen months and participants finished with a Master's Degree in Education.31

Spring Semester 1970

During the Spring Semester of 1970, the students involved in this Master's Degree program were registered for six hours of graduate credit at the University of Massachusetts School of Education: a three credit course titled: *Educational Leadership and the Inner City* and in addition, all of the students were enrolled for three credit hours of independent study.

The major program objectives for *Educational Leadership and the Inner City* were as follows:

1. To develop the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to function in a leadership role as in-service trainers of teachers within an urban setting.

2. To develop familiarity with and skill in the utilization of a wide variety of instructional techniques useful within a wide variety of instructional techniques useful within in-service education programs (e.g., small group discussion, role playing, independent study, systematic classroom observation skills, etc.).

3. To develop an understanding of the principles of individual and group behavior necessary for the design and implementation of effective in-service education programs.

4. To develop: 1) awareness of the urban school district as a complex social system with numerous organizational roles
and administrative levels and 2) the skills and ability to function effectively within that complex social system in coordinating efforts for the various components of several complex in-service education workshops.

5. To develop sufficient content knowledge about the areas of reading mathematics, contemporary, environmental laboratory, instructional television and orientation activities for new teachers necessary to design comprehensive in-service education workshops in all of these areas.

6. To demonstrate the achievement of various program objectives by designating actual in-service education workshops plans in conjunction with the Washington, D.C. School System in the areas of: reading, mathematics, social studies, environmental studies, instructional television, and new teacher orientation.

The major program objectives for the three credit hours of independent study offered in this program during the Spring Semester of 1970 were as follows:

1. To design and initiate the establishment of an Urban Staff Development Laboratory involving the Innovation Team, the Washington, D.C. Public Schools, Federal City College, the District of Columbia Teacher's College and the University of Massachusetts;

2. To obtain the resources necessary to test and evaluate
the concept of an Urban Staff Development Laboratory beginning in the Fall of 1970.

3. To expose members of the Innovation Team to the wide variety resources available through the University of Massachusetts School of Education;

4. To cooperatively select appropriate program elements and graduate courses to be utilized in the remainder of the Innovation Team Master's Degree program from among available resources at the University of Massachusetts.

As in integral part of their job responsibility within the Washington, D.C. Public Schools, the Innovation Team devoted one day per week for activities leading to their own professional growth. With the school system's agreement, the Innovation Team members set aside and utilized their staff development time every Friday for program activities related to their Master's Degree program. In addition, seminar and class sessions were conducted in the evening and on Saturdays when necessary. Classes and seminars met for an average number of hours per week equal to the number of course credit hours received during any given semester (e.g. six hours during the spring semester 1970; and nine hours during the fall semester, 1970). Extended individual and small group work related to the courses occurred both as an integral part of as well as outside of the normal work assignments of the Innova-
tion Team members within the Washington, D.C. School System.

Since one of the major responsibilities of the Innovation Team within the School System had been to provide staff development opportunities and assistance to teachers and administrators within the Cardoza District, it was relatively effective to utilize those normal job responsibilities as an action laboratory for testing and evaluating concepts and skills obtained within their courses and seminars. As a result, the students and professors within the Program were unusually successful in closing the traditional gulf between those learning experiences which are available with graduate degree programs and the effective application of those new ideas, skills and techniques within the realities of an urban school system.

Specific examples of program activities that took place during the Spring Semester (1970) were:

1. **Seminar meetings.** A series of weekly seminar meetings were held, usually on Friday. Resource personnel for these seminars consisted of University of Massachusetts faculty members, and personnel from a variety of affiliated agencies (Washington, D.C. schools, local universities, other school systems, federal agencies, and private industry). These seminars were supervised by the U. Mass Program Director, Dr. Arthur Eve.
2. **Retreats.** Several extended retreats were held both during the week and on weekends for the various task groups within the program. In these retreats, the participants were able to concentrate their attention and energies upon specific program objectives (e.g., the design of summer workshop components). Selected University of Massachusetts faculty members and resource consultants were utilized during these retreats.

3. **Modular Credit Week.** The Innovation Team participated during the week of Something '70 (February 23-27) at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. During the Modular Credit Week, the Innovation Team members developed and presented several modular credit sessions. In addition, Team members became involved as observers and participants in a variety of other available modular presentations.

4. **School of Education Resources.** Program participants served as resource personnel during this semester in several courses offered through the Administrative Center in Amherst. In addition, program participants were used in several other School of Education projects (e.g., in Dade County, Florida, in Boston, Massachusetts, and in Springfield, Massachusetts).

5. **In-Service Institute.** Major attention was given by program participants to the development of in-service education institutes which were then implemented within the D.C.
public school system during the Summer of 1970. These institutes were designed to provide in-service education opportunities in a broad range of content areas for District of Columbia teachers.

Fall Semester, 1970

During the Fall Semester of 1970, Innovation Team members were registered for three courses from the University of Massachusetts: Principles of Supervision; Introduction to Educational Administration; and an Educational Administration Workshop. In order to obtain sufficient time for their course involvement in nine credit hours during the Fall of 1970, two three-hour period on either Wednesday evening or Saturday morning. In addition, program participants were asked to test out and implement a variety of their course components during the remaining part of the week as an integral part of their job assignment, and these implementation activities were often supervised by personnel from the University of Massachusetts.

In addition to their regular course involvement, program participants were involved on a regular basis in the Amherst programs as guest lecturers in specific course, by participating throughout Something Else '70 Modular Credit Week (November 16-20), and by their involvement in other University of Massachusetts related programs in New York, Boston,
Massachusetts, Tallahassee, Florida, and Springfield, Massachusetts. The program participants designed, implemented and evaluated a series of follow-up activities to the summer in-service workshops. Finally, a cooperative arrangement between Dean Dwight Allen and Dr. Hugh Scott, the Superintendent of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools enabled members of the Innovation Team to assist personnel from the University of Massachusetts in the White House Conference on children from December 13 through 18 as an integral part of their Master's Degree work.

Innovation Team members developed a wide range of instructional and teacher training materials during the Program that were designed specifically for inner city children and teachers. Examples of the instructional materials include booklets, films, and multimedia materials and the accompanying teacher guides have been published jointly by the Innovation Team and the Educational Development Center, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts and are being utilized within several large urban school districts.

Spring Semester, 1971

During the Spring Semester of 1971, three three-hour courses were taught to the program participants in the Washington, D.C. area: Designing a Competency Based Teacher Education Program; School Personnel Administration and a Special Seminar in Humanistic Education.
Summary

This chapter has presented an historical assessment of the development of the Washington Innovation Team. During the course of that four year experience, we learned many lessons about the process of using Teams as vehicles for change. These lessons are not presented as a prescription guaranteed to make the same thing happen in some other place. Rather, it is hoped that the description might be helpful to school systems planning their own design for change.

The Innovation Team concept called for Master teachers to work together in teams, not as separated autonomous agents. The Team provided a pool of human resources available on call to individual team members in need of specific help. In the process of our evaluation, we isolated some components that we considered essential for the Team's function within the system. The Team should be able to work with the target group on a basis of voluntarism. The client should have the right to request services, not be forced to use them. The primary activity of the Innovation Team was teacher-to-teacher activity. Experienced classroom teachers were recruited to help less experienced teachers who wanted their help. This helping was always on invitational basis. Twam members went into classrooms only when they were asked in. Teachers attended Team workshops on a voluntary basis. The Team should
have control over resources critical to its functioning. Formally allowing the Team unusual degrees of freedom will enhance its operations. In conjunction with this, the Team should be vested with the right to judge the appropriate qualifications of its members and to experiment with new classroom material and curricula.

The Team, through its learning and training, development, and work efforts should be connected to individuals and organizations outside the school system. The members of the Team gradually saw themselves less and less as "Master Teachers", and more and more as "change agents". They began to see the critical necessity of work outside the classroom that could reinforce work with individual teachers. The Team had significant change of heart about working with principals and other supervisors. Initially, we had gone directly to classroom teachers, bypassing building principals. In our fourth year, we were heavily engaged with principals, not only in the buildings where we worked with teachers, but throughout the system.

The Team gradually began adding workshops for parents. These workshops, organized ostensibly to teacher parents how to help their children with homework, turned into fundamental math and language literacy sessions, when parents admitted their own basic educational needs. It was important, however,
for us to continue to remind ourselves that our primarily concern was with teacher support activities. We were not community organizers. We were not remedial specialists. We could not bail out a hopeless teacher. We could not resolve severly polarized school-community disputes. We were not primarily project doers. Nevertheless, our own organic development demonstrated most graphically that change in classrooms cannot be dealt with as an isolated phenomenon.

Another crucial lesson had to do with the nature of the Team itself. To begin with, the size of a group more than any other factor may determine whether it can become a Team or not. We know from communication research that there are finite limits to the number of interactions, exchanges, and bits of information that can be maintained in one's circulatory memory or active consciousness. If a Team is too large, it loses important capacities to cultivate vital interchange among every member of the group. On the other hand, if a group is too small, the power of collective experience and support is absent and the task must be limited. Interactions tend to remain individual. Diads and triads are common and may align one person against another. We recommend that in formulating a team, twelve to fifteen people make for good possibilities. Eighteen are too many. Five is not enough. A second important consideration has to do with the team
members. As mentioned before, it is important for the team to be invaluable in delineating criteria for the team membership. Without appropriate team members, a team will fail. Inappropriate members will make an already difficult task impossible. The experience of the Washington Team pointed out the need for indigenous members. Teachers who are recruited from a system are almost automatically attuned to the people in that system. They have a better chance of hearing teacher's needs accurately and helping them to new levels of performance. In selecting members who will make an Innovation Team successful, it is important to recognize that eloquent theoreticians who are scared of children are out of place. So are "natural teachers" who cannot or will not articulate their good practices and strategies. On our Team, successful members saw themselves as "consultants", not as experts. However, recognition of the useful role people with very specialized skills can perform was important.

We found that the Team leader must be able to force internal and external confrontation when necessary, and lead the Team in working through disagreements towards resolution. Perhaps of crucial importance was the selection of the Team Leader. After the first year, the Washington Team elected its own leader from within the ranks. This process of selecting a leader, in and of itself, contributed to the Team's own
cohesiveness and sense of efficacy. Finally, the common bond of classroom experience, race and ideology contributed to the high level of cohesiveness on the Team and meant that Team members could always rely on each other in times of crises.

The charts which follow summarize some of our important learnings about Team development. Chart I deals with experiences and training for Team building. Charts II and III deal with Team functions.
## Chart I

**EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING CHART FOR TEAM BUILDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Type of Training Intervention</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To be self-aware of one's individual needs and how they affect and influence team members.</td>
<td>Sensitivity training Modifications</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Away from work site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of self on others.</td>
<td>Encounter training Modifications and use of some encounter tactics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of others on self.</td>
<td>(Outside consultant as leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where am I in relationship to power in team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is calling the shots?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I live with the goals of this group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I live with the goals of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I trust myself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I liked?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of myself will I have to keep hidden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I evaluate myself and modify behavior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To be aware of the needs of a group; of how a group functions; of the processes at work in groups.</td>
<td>Organizational Development Strategies.</td>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
<td>on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are roles of members of group?</td>
<td>Utilization of learnings of Sensitivity Training, directed toward functioning in group.</td>
<td>continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the leader?</td>
<td>(Outside consultant as support to leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are his plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are decisions to be made?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Type of Training Intervention</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What actions move group forward?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task delineation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hinders group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing dysfunctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not responding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor coping strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To know, describe, and delineate strengths and needs of particular group (as team).</td>
<td>Process observation</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside consultant as observer</td>
<td>continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role play, real problems games, simulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psycho-social Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside consultant as trainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To accept goal and define objectives and related tasks.</td>
<td>Problem Diagnosis</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Force-field Analysis</td>
<td>continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside consultant as trainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workbooks and guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I understand goals of project?</td>
<td>Direction in planning and developing presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I commit myself to work with these goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is problem well diagnosed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are alternatives reasonable ones?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What tasks will have to be done to do job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What resources are under team's control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is plan and steps in plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Type of Training Intervention</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. To organize and specify details of operation and function of team.</strong></td>
<td>Utilization of all previous learnings by team and leader.</td>
<td>2-3 days</td>
<td>on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside consultant as observer and provider of feedback.</td>
<td>modification one feedback consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is task of each individual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are mechanisms for formal communication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel of memos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of time for training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will space be utilized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are procedures for budget-making and disbursement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in budget-making and accounting for program purposes.</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant as expert.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. To have particular skills in subject matter or performance areas.</strong></td>
<td>Workshops, Practicum observations</td>
<td>varies on-going</td>
<td>on site or away from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Development Procedures, intergroup action.</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
<td>away from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant as observer, trainer.</td>
<td>related to needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for inter-system cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. To relate as a team for planning and communication to other teams and groups.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I trust myself outside the group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can I act for myself or only for group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen if other group does not have my understanding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we plan and share with groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*May be largest dimension of training, but specifics depend on team goals and related skill needs.
# Chart II

## The Definition of a Functioning Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A Team:  
1. knows who sets its overall goals and what these goals are  
2. agrees to work with a sub-set of related goals  
3. works out procedures for discussing, modifying, and reshaping goals. | A Team:  
1. values group knowledge and cohesion  
2. values dispersed power  
3. values the client and his needs in the perspective of the larger goal  
4. values the human aspects involved in planning change  
5. gives all members the opportunity to exercise informal leadership | A Team:  
1. knows what knowledge of decision making are appropriate to Team operation in any given situation  
2. Acts in keeping with its understanding that consensual decision making builds group commitment and results in effective action | A Team:  
1. establishes a pod of specific skills and expertise needed to meet task goals  
2. knows how to communicate with others  
3. knows how to diagnose group problems  
4. knows how to observe groups in process with a sensitive understanding of what is happening between people  
5. knows how to plan and relate objectives and strategies to goals |
## Chart III

### Change Agentry: Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF THE TEAM IS TO DO</th>
<th>IT WILL BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Assessment - Investigation and Recommendation** | Setting up temporary relationships  
Defining problems  
Interviewing, questionig  
Collecting data  
Analyzing  
Synthesizing  
Communicating by writing and talking  
Conceptualizing  
Evaluating |
| **Implementation and Teaching** | Representing products and approaches  
Interpreting  
Explaining  
Demonstrating  
Relating to products source  
Relating to target system and group  
Training others  
Planning  
Organizing  
Overseeing logistical arrangements  
Planning and assisting with summative evaluating |
| **Development and Invention** | Using special knowledge of subject  
Defining need  
Creating new materials or organization  
Tolerating ambiguous events and relationships  
Exploring alternatives and ideas  
Utilizing human and material resources in new ways  
Utilizing formative evaluation |
### Chart III

Change Agentry: Functions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF THE TEAM IS TO DO</th>
<th>IT WILL BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maintenance of Operation | Accepting assigned roles and tasks  
Accepting definition of task  
Exhibiting specified skill for task  
Maintaining regular schedule  
Demonstrating dependability  
Organizing |
| Linkage and Integration | Concentrating on human resources  
Developing mechanisms for collaborative goal setting  
Modeling global viewpoint  
Modeling training and helping role  
Breaking down status anxiety  
Communicating and developing communication skills in others |
CHAPTER III

Components of the Innovation Team

INTRODUCTION

The Washington Innovation Team was organized initially as a vehicle for the delivery of new curricular ideas to the classroom and to provide classroom support for teachers. As the Team developed, it defined some objectives on its own and a process for arriving at these goals. This process of growth and development was outlined and discussed in Chapter II. Chapter III will describe these components developed by the Team and special projects the team, as a whole or as individual members, were engaged in. Those components will be described in the general area of Staff Development, Curriculum Development and Classroom Support.

Staff Development

Once the Team got organized in the summer of 1967, a series of meetings were initiated with the administrative staff and faculties of the fourteen elementary Model School Division schools. In these meetings, the Team introduced themselves to the school staff and described the kinds of services they could perform. These meetings were also used to clarify a variety of questions and mis-understandings
regarding the role and function of the Team. Prior to these meetings a number of crucial decisions had been made by the Team regarding how they would function.

The team decided to concentrate on a role of helping agent; to offer assistance where teachers wished it and to keep in mind that they are fellow teachers, offering assistance in the places where the classroom teacher recognizes a need. The Team also decided to devote a specific amount of time to consistently continuing its own education and development. This evolved out of recognition that if the team is to encourage innovation and the use of new and viable solutions to problems, it must stay abreast of events and be capable itself of being a genuine catalytic agent. Therefore the team set aside Fridays for work with outside consultants and Dr. V. Cernius, the adjunct team leader from Temple University, in developing and stimulating its own growth.

Finally, the team decided to function in the fourteen elementary schools, not as individuals, but as members of a sub-team. Each sub-team of three members was responsible for three buildings. This division made it possible for each team to have a wider variety of talent, skills and personalities directly available to each school than if one team member were assigned to each school. It was further decided that any team member could be called on for use in special
situations in a school where his or her particular speciality was needed.

After meeting with principals, staffs and teachers and making their general availability known along with the kinds of services available, the team began to receive more requests for assistance than they could actually respond to. Teacher needs were concerned primarily with basic classroom organization, grouping of children, maintenance of discipline, establishment of records, schedule plans, and how to get started and keep going from day to day. Some team members found themselves spending an inordinate amount of time in some classrooms because the needs were so great. The following breakdown illustrates some of the specific functions performed by the Team in the area of staff development:

In Organization

a. Assistance in grouping children

b. Assistance in all areas of the curriculum

c. Assistance in giving book checks to find reading levels

d. Assistance with weekly lesson plans

e. Helping to design and produce packages of individuals work for children which enable a teacher to let children work in groups and free her to work intensively with one group while others pursue individual work

f. Assistance in setting up records and roll books
91.

g. Arranging room physically to encourage group learning and work, and encourage constructive interactions

h. Participating in planning sessions for teaching teams

i. Assisting with bulletin boards to help provide meaningful content in relationship to what is being pursued in class

In Curriculum and teaching

a. Assistance in choosing appropriate texts after children have been grouped and given book checks

b. Assistance in working new materials into a meaningful plan for the year

c. Assisting a teacher to make a regular course of study more interesting: for example, one team member re-designed a mapping unit to provide more child participation, i.e. the class began mapping their room, school, surrounding area thus learning principles of mapping from experience

d. Teaching specific content lessons in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies where it relates to new curricula

e. Demonstrating how to use the local neighborhood resources in field trips for language development and information

f. Introduction of specific curriculum materials like Attribute Blocks, Geo-Blocks, and Cuisenaire Rods, which assist a teacher by providing for individual and small group learning situations

g. Encouraging teachers to bring outside resources into classrooms; use of city library and outside persons and ideas

h. Planning and discussing with teachers what new curriculum materials they would like to become acquainted with and introduce

i. Demonstrating use of experience charts and other
valuable but underused techniques for improving reading and language.

**On Management**

a. Advising and assisting with discipline

b. Personal assistance, listening to a teacher's problems in the classroom and giving the morale -- building support of sympathy and attempt to help.

**On Materials**

a. Redistributing materials; i.e., placing materials left behind by teachers no longer with the system in the hands of teachers who could use them or were eager to learn.

b. Providing distribution and redistribution of items to help meet classroom needs that are often overlooked.

c. Taking and filling orders of new curriculum materials and texts or equipment the teachers especially need or desire to use.

A significant part of the work for all team members was in helping teachers learn how to use the resources offered by the schools. The concentrated classroom visitation and exchange which the Innovation Team had with teachers and school staffs provided a great deal of immediate data on which to assess the current needs in the elementary classrooms of the Model School Division. Two needs were given top priority:

1. The need for improved skills in the teaching of reading and language arts received top priority. Team members made clear that they did not mean
that everyone should be teaching reading any one way. They were working for diversity. They pointed out that in few classes did teachers have all the support in materials, texts, and instructional know how which was needed. In addition, few teachers were adequately using the materials and subject matter of science, social studies, and mathematics to adequately develop reading skills.

2. A second crucial need was for more services, resources, and training in grouping of youngsters and organizing classes for group and individual learning. The team pointed out that unless adequate diagnostic services were available to the teacher, and unless he or she had know-how to handle and organize the multiple teaching functions that a classroom requires, reading instruction will suffer along with other subjects.

Based on this data, the Team proceeded to develop a comprehensive plan for a reading program in the Model Schools. A number of immediate objectives were developed by the Team for the 1967-68 school year. (Appendix) Teachers were asked how the team could best help them develop the desired reading program. From the teacher responses came plans for a series of Summer Reading Institutes which would complement on-going classroom support for teachers. The plan provided for a Reading Institute in the summer of 1968 which would focus on Kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Summer Reading Institutes

The institutes were designed to meet the needs of elementary teachers in the Model School Division. These teachers were responsible for teaching children to read; and they, as no one else, knew they were failing.
In February, the Innovation Team conducted a survey of reading practices in the district. Two things became very clear as a result of the survey. First, the teachers had not had access to new techniques and developments in the field. Practices were very traditional and not responsive to the particular needs of the children in the Cardozo area. Secondly, teachers were extremely eager for assistance. In part, the program was based upon specific requests made by the teachers, and the summarized information provided by the informal survey of practices.

The survey indicated teachers were relying heavily on basal readers as texts and only 1% had had any training other than that in use of the basal reader and "developmental reading" procedures. Many teachers, clustered especially in the upper grades, had had no training at all in teaching reading.

Practices the teachers indicated using reflected a rather strict adherence to the traditional basal reader techniques, a view of reading which regarded it as a "delimited subject of study" and a portrait of classrooms devoid of a variety of books, equipment, and things which engendered the wide-ranging and continuous use of language. The environments were not ones that valued reading for pleasure and acquisition of knowledge.
The Innovation Team, factoring in its own observations alongside what teachers reported, concluded that anything short of a very "wholistic" approach to the improvement of the teaching of reading would fail. The Team felt teachers needed not only training, books, and equipment, but, more importantly, an expanded vision about the environment in which learning might take place and the potentialities of the children they were teaching. Usually it was referred to as "teacher attitude". But the Team felt it was prepared for more precision then this and set about defining desired changes specifically.

The long range goal was set as simply improving the reading skills of children in such a way that gains were long term, not merely single year accretions in scores. But the strategies of doing so had to be such that teachers had (1) an opportunity to be acquainted with (in a detailed fashion) varying methods of teaching reading (2) the power of decision making necessary to use these programs systematically or in combination with other approaches according to varying needs of children (3) the experiences which would lead to a genuine acceptance of the child and his natural language as the beginning point of learning. In this context it was pointed out that too many teachers rejected, sometimes without realizing it, the life stages and "selfhood" of the children they were teaching.
In order to realize these goals equal time was planned to deal with affective behavior as well as cognitive learning.

It is an obvious but sometimes overlooked fact that in order to have an impact on what children learn in school, one must affect their teachers. The teachers involved in the institute had been accustomed to teaching behind closed doors with little sharing or collaboration with others, relying heavily on a single method of instruction. Direction and supervision was imposed from above. In-service workshops when opened tended to use a passive instructional style. Teachers listened and observed without doing. The institute hoped to break some of these patterns by getting participants actively involved and excited about things that seem to work with children. The program focused on getting the teachers to look at children in a new way, recognizing and respecting individual differences.

It then concentrated on providing the teachers with some familiarity with the wide variety of new techniques and materials that are available. Methods were chosen which provided different, if not conflicting, views. Teachers were introduced to techniques for and philosophies of individualizing reading. They were acquainted with new approaches in intensive development of oral language patterns and philosophy
of techniques of the linguistic approach. Emphasis was to be placed on the use of language experience approaches and how basal reader methods might incorporate some of the techniques implied in these methodologies. Some attention was given to diagnosis of an individual child's needs and the development of skills necessary for appropriate teacher response.

One of the most important elements in the model which was developed during the Institute was the creation of a spirit of equality between the staff and participants. This spirit enabled the staff to progress much more rapidly in dealing with the content of the program in the relatively short space of available time. Because the effort to introduce the teachers to a wide variety of reading materials and techniques over a five week span was an ambiguous one, the ability of the teachers to work closely with the staff and each other was crucial to the success of the Institute. For these reasons, a full week of sensitivity training was planned for all participants and staff before the summer school opened and the content portion of the Institute was initiated.

Analysis of participant reactions to the Institute by Educational Testing Service revealed that the participants: (1) were enthusiastic about their own growth and development as a result of the Institute, and (2) agreed that the content
of the workshop was relevant to their needs.

As a staff for a summer program, the effectiveness of the team was decidedly pronounced. Of particular importance was the process used to arrive at the decision to sponsor the Institute as well as the organization of the Institute. The sensitivity training with the staff and participants led to the development of a partnership style in the learning process between team members and participants. On-going follow up support for participants and development of leadership styles by team members were significant outcomes of the Institute.

The 1969 Summer Reading Institute provided an opportunity for teachers of grades four through eight to be included in developing skills in teaching reading. A three day workshop aimed at establishing inter-personal relationships prefaced the Institute. This three day session included all adult participants and two members from the Department of Research and Evaluation. The Innovation Team felt a need for some on-going evaluation of the project and had requested assistance from the Department of Research and Evaluation. In a series of meetings between members of the Department and the Team, the objectives for the Institute were discussed and the means for accomplishing these goals. These discussions laid the groundwork for the development of an instrument designed
to get the participants to react to conditions and circumstances that were part of the Institute. During the four weeks of the Institute, an intensive effort was made to provide teachers with special skills in classroom organization, teaching methodology, and the use of current materials and programs which would enable them to integrate reading and language arts into the total program.

The 1970 Summer Institute was geared to both students and teachers. Teachers were given training in the teaching of reading, methods materials and leadership. Students were provided with the opportunity to advance their reading achievement through intensive instruction during the summer. A major difference in this institute and previous institutes was that it was funded completely by the Model School Division. Prior to 1970, part of the funds had been donated by the Division with additional funding solicited by Team members from private foundations. The Taconic Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and Norman, Danner, Meyer and Public Welfare Foundations had all been previous contributors.

Mathematics Workshop

A second major staff development project by the Innovation Team during the summer of 1970 was the Mathematics Workshop. This program too had a dual purpose, to enhance the education of both students and teachers. Students were
provided with a variety of learning experiences in mathematics that were concerned with fundamental mathematical concepts such as variables, open sentences, signed numbers, and graphs. The learning experiences were designed to enliven interests and increase understanding and appreciation for mathematics. The program was designed to aid teachers in relating to students in a mathematics program using varied approaches. The teachers were provided with a training and practice ground in the instruction of mathematics. The enthusiasm of all participants in the workshop was extremely high. New materials and methods of teaching mathematics were experimented with and tried out. Teachers benefited from each other's experiences and students indicated that they found the program to be useful and enjoyable.

The Contemporary Environmental Laboratory

The Contemporary Environmental Laboratory formed a major part of the Innovation Team's Staff Development effort during the summer of 1970. This program was designed to develop techniques for the effective use of media in new and meaningful ways that affect curriculum. Emphasis was on the correlation of multi-ethnic studies and science and dealt with three areas of learning, Black history, science and Man A Course of Study. Students in the program were from the Model School Division. Participation was voluntary and
students participated in a wide variety of first hand and in some cases unusual learning experiences. Teachers were required to work closely with coordinators, directors, and consultants in planning an effective program. Teachers developed mini-units with students to be used in future classroom teaching.

PROBE

A program for the Recruitment and Orientation of Beginning Educators was initiated by the Innovation Team to provide the beginning teacher with the support, assistance, and training needed for success during the initial stages of a career in teaching. The specific objective was to provide a program of staff support and development that was intensive, continuous, and responsive to the specific individual needs and concerns of the new teacher. PROBE participants were asked to list areas of special needs and concerns they wanted covered in the workshop. The greatest need was found to be skill and techniques in the individualization of instruction. The participants indicated a desire to develop skills in handling heterogeneous grouping, skill in teaching reading and mathematics and techniques for planning enrichment activities. All participants in PROBE were beginning educators with no more than one year experience in teaching.
The Innovation Team had for two years provided services to teachers in the Model School Division with the hope of eventually expanding its operation to schools and teachers outside of MSD. The opportunity to do so formally presented itself in the form of a request from the Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, Mr. Norman Nickens, in December, 1969.

Since the Georgetown operation was a response to an administrative request, it is hard to conceive how the Team could replicate this initiation of Team work in another section of the city, based solely on a Team decision. Without the request from the Department of Instruction it seems unlikely that the Team would now be operating in the Georgetown area. It was, however, a good test of the transfer of Team operations via administrative request. In that context, the Georgetown situation offered the Team virgin territory in which to try out and to refine previously developed modes of operation.

The historical background of Team involvement in Georgetown began with a group of concerned Georgetown parents who had been meeting to discuss the feasibility of establishing a middle school--kindergarten through eighth grade--which would, in their opinion, ease the transition from elementary to junior high school as well as assure some continuity in
the quality of education they hoped to have in their community. With this in mind, these parents requested a meeting with a representative from the Department of Instruction. The meeting was arranged but the speaker did not address the question of a middle school. Therefore, the community group began to feel greatly discouraged about the possibility of getting help from the "system" in revitalizing education in three Georgetown elementary schools.

In an effort to assuage these feelings of unresponsiveness, the Department of Instruction asked that the Innovation Team begin to disseminate its services to these three schools, Hyde, Fillmore, and Jackson. In light of this request the Team leader and two Team members began mapping some beginning strategies. The basic concern at this point was how to begin servicing schools when the request to do so has come from the administration. Historically the Team has operated on a "teacher's request" basis. It was decided that an initial invitation to meet with members of the Team should be extended by the Department of Instruction to the faculties of the three schools.

Here the hope was that an introduction to the Team and an offer to provide any services it could, would elicit from the teachers requests for future services. This tactic would therefore serve the purpose of putting the Team back in its
historical, operating mode. In keeping with the Team's strategy, letters were sent from Mr. Nicken's office to the faculties of Hyde, Jackson, and Fillmore. These letters invited each faculty to an introductory meeting scheduled for either December 15th, 16th, or 17th of 1969.

Two of three meetings were observed by ESD staff. For the third, notes were provided by an Innovation Team member. Teachers had three main areas of concern that became apparent during these meetings. One was a lack of materials and supplies. The second was a desire for workshop input in subject area skills, methods, and new techniques. The third was low teacher morale stemming from both the lack of supplies and the feeling of being pressured by the community.

A post-meeting strategy session of Team members resulted in a proposal for a Georgetown Staff Development Project outlining goals and the decision to provide the equipment and materials teachers said they needed as soon as possible. The Team had found in the past that a good "foot in the door" strategy was rapid provision of materials. Therefore, before any other steps could be taken, an effort was made successfully to obtain nearly all supplies requested. Here it should be noted that materials were obtained through "special case" administrative allotment.

One of the Team's stated goals for Georgetown was
...to help make teachers aware of the kinds of intercession which can be made in order to get the things they want and need from "the system". Hopefully, in the future, with or without a "Team", you will be able to negotiate for them yourselves. That is what we are about.

Of Georgetown teachers interviewed in April and again in June, almost all felt one of the most beneficial services the Team had provided was supplying needed equipment they had been unable to get. They further felt the continuation of this procurement agent role would be helpful in the future. The implication here was that teachers would continue to need help in getting supplies quickly from the administration.

The provision of needed materials in this case was made because of administrative benevolence via the Innovation Team, a phenomenon that cannot be relied upon by all teachers who find themselves in need.

The second area of teacher interest, as expressed at the initial meeting with Team members, was in the area of subject matter skills, new methods and techniques. Here the instrument for providing these was to be the workshop.

After the Team began to service Hyde, Fillmore, and Jackson, the Team leader appointed one Team member as coordinator of Team services to those schools. It was decided that the coordinator would make known to task forces the expressed needs of teachers and that each task force was to
arrange its own involvement. From the notes kept by ESD and those provided by the Team it appears that the most responsive group to the Georgetown situation was a small corps of two or three Team members. That is to say, the coordinator and one member of the reading task force became deeply involved in the Georgetown schools. They provided input to teachers and solicited help from other task forces in the area of workshops in subject skills.

The bulk of work in the area of classroom management and organization was nearly always performed by one Team member. It should be noted that preparation support was often provided by various Team members but not in any systematic or consistent fashion. Rather, it appears that preparation support was given out of friendship with a Team member, not as a result of some operational strategy.

As a result the Georgetown operation became a special project of a few Team members rather than the total Team. That is not to imply that this detracted from the effectiveness of the effort. The concern here is that this limited Team involvement seemed to be a result of individuals, not the Team as a group, assigning priorities to other projects rather than any Team design to cover MSD, Georgetown, and special projects.

As a total Team effort the Georgetown project was
small. Six percent of total Team time was put into this operation.

**Staff Development Conference**

In the fall of 1968, the Innovation Team initiated a major effort in staff development aimed at bringing together members from the central administration, supervisors, principals and the Innovation Team. This effort culminated in the Staff Development Conference in October, 1968. The general objectives of the conference were to examine and understand role functions, work toward open, honest communication between the individuals and groups involved, improve working relationships between the groups involved, and identify ways to be helpful to the changing administration. The Conference extended through three days with peer group meetings as well as meeting in vertical groups.

Some of the major issues raised during the Conference centered around the Innovation Team’s complete freedom, the clash between the role of supervisors and the Team and the role of the assistant principals in relation to working with and helping the inexperienced teachers. The Conference served to bring attention to the vagueness and the confusion about certain role expectations and provided the vehicle for the delineation and discussion of problems caused by that confusion.
Staff development by the Team continued to take the form of making facilities and personnel available to the various support departments in the system to augment or support their staff development effort. Our strategy was two fold, to extend the total participant involvement workshop concept to the total system, and to enable team members to demonstrate to the system and departments the competency of the Team and increase the confidence of individual Team members.

Classroom Support

Classroom support is the direct corollary of staff development and, in many respects, is inseparable from it. For the Innovation Team, classroom support took on a number of dimensions. It aimed at improving instruction, improving classroom management, facilitating implementation of new or alternative curriculum approaches, increasing the amount of time available to teachers for instructional activities, and increasing the range, variety and availability of resources at the teacher's command. It was also directed toward trouble-shooting and helping the teacher solve problems related to instruction and to pupil behavior and development.

Classroom support for teachers took the form of providing supplies, assistance with implementation of instruction (including) use of materials, assistance in dealing with problems of classroom management, curriculum planning,
problems of behavior, providing models of performance or behavior, making special personnel resources available as needed, enlisting support for the development and maintenance of instructional efforts, tutoring, fixing or setting up equipment, providing curricular or instructional guidelines as appropriate, assisting with the mechanics of completing projects or instructional production (e.g. producing and distributing books of children's poems, stories, and drawings).

The supply function performed by the Team worked extremely well in the sense that a large variety of material was made available to teachers very rapidly. To the extent that this aspect of command over resources supported the teachers' instructional ability and provided educational opportunities for children, the Innovation Team made a significant and impressive contribution. To the extent that ready availability of materials and supplies increased the probability that the teacher would engage in further self-improvement and development activities, the supply function served in a significant way to maximize that potential. Team members had greater opportunities to observe instructional problems openly and directly than most other groups in the school system, including principals, because of the nature and character of the Innovation Team operations. There were innumerable instances
in which Team members have arranged to get the appropriate resources (material and human) to teachers as needed. The Innovation Team made much use of outside consultants and specialists and provided teachers with a wealth of information about what was happening in other school systems. One of the objectives of the Innovation Team was to promote an atmosphere in which teachers could and would seek information and help when they needed or wanted it.

Classroom support also may be defined as a curriculum development, and as such, received the attention of the Team. The most notable and successful instance of preparing a large scale plan and guide for teachers to use was the guideline for discussions of and writing and drawing about experiences following the April 1968 riots. The results of this effort and other endeavors in this area are discussed in the section on curriculum development.

Curriculum Development

As viewed by the Team, curriculum development involved Team members, teachers, students, and participants from the community. Team members were involved primarily in developing sources of funding or fund raising. Our view of curriculum development required teacher involvement because it brought the classroom expertise that was fresh and immediate. Students were involved because this provided an opportunity
to improve academic skills, because they could provide a wealth of creativity, and because they would be the primary users of the curriculum being developed. In addition, the Team felt that participants from the community should be involved in the developmental process. The Team felt that it was not enough to present the community a finished curriculum package to approve or disapprove. Finally, it was determined that community participants have definite tasks to perform and not be involved in a peripheral way.

Classrooms involved in curriculum development reflected a high degree of enthusiasm as evidenced by the quantity and quality of student activity. Viable partnerships were established between the Innovation Team as the changer and the classroom teacher as the changee. Capitalizing on this union, teachers conscientiously sought new ideas and assistance in the implementation of these ideas. Recognition and acceptance of the goal to "improve reading in the MSD", the Team hypothesized that by developing language skills, reading would improve. Consequently reading scores would be increased, and most importantly the attitude towards reading would improve. In addition, the self image of Black students would continuously grow more positive, as the student could visualize the worth of his contributions.

Developing curriculum appeared to be an effective secondary
strategy for assisting the "first year teacher" through the crisis of classroom discipline, providing moral support through adjustment from the learner to the facilitator of learning. It also seemed to help dispell some of the myths about Black students in an urban school.

Curriculum, as defined by the author, is the mechanism or vehicle through which we help the learner acquire such basic skills as reading, writing and arithmetic. An effective means of developing materials is by making the curriculum item responsive to the students' and teachers' need or needs, interesting to the learner, indigenous to the student, and open to the extent that students may submit what they have.

An important consideration to the team in the process of curriculum development was the appropriate time to install curriculum. For the Team, there were four items to consider; 1) after extensive work by all concerned (representation by ratio--teacher-student-parent-administrator-special and resource teacher), 2) after there is commitment by the implementors, 3) through in-service programs involving a small workable number of people at first and with the assistance of the first group expand to a larger group, 4) with a limited number of goals, if any, at the beginning, allowing other goals to evolve as the need arises.

Finally, the Team felt that the process of developing
curriculum required provisions for effective evaluation. As defined by the Team, effective evaluation would:

a) be designed to nurture feedback into the program

b) would be on-going and not something that occurred at the end of the program.

c) utilize instruments measuring what program is about. This would require developing new instruments in many instances rather than imposing instruments that were not appropriate in that they would not evaluate the goals of the program developed.

As indicated earlier, one of the most successful curriculum development efforts grew out of the riots following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King in April, 1968. Dr. Norman W. Nickens, Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Model School Division, instructed the instructional staff of the Division "not to carry on business as usual in the schools, but to allow students to talk about their experiences, what they saw and what they did" during this period. Further support of Dr. Nickens' statement surfaced in a Team conference held during this period with Dr. Robert Cole. Dr. Cole presented the idea that children learn best during crises and strongly supported Dr. Nickens' position. Based on this, the Team produced a set of guidelines for teachers to use as a vehicle for stimulating discussion of an experience which was profound to say the least, for all included. The objective was to enable children to come to
grips with their experiences, understandings and feelings in a non-moralistic context. The result was a publication, "Children of Cardoza Tell It Like It Is." As an example of a means by which schools can respond directly and constructively to events and concerns of importance in the lives of children, Tell It Like It Is, is without parallel. It is a curriculum from and for the children and has the beauty of absolute honesty. Subsequent curricula publications include:

- **Autobiography of Martin Luther King**—an autobiography of Dr. Martin Luther King written for consumption by grades three through twelve, April, 1968.

- **Names You Hear in Cardoza**—autobiographical sketches of prominent Blacks in United States History commemorated in the names of six schools in the Model School Division. Later republished and retitled Inching On Up.

- **Cardoza Raps**—A collection of High School students' anthologies, designed and produced with the assistance of the Innovation Team.

- **I Wish I Was---Everything**—Compilation and production of elementary students' poems, short stories and writings in a card format by the Team, teachers and students.

- **The Way It Ought To Be**—Teachers and Innovation Team's production of a teacher's guide to the teaching of "Black Studies and/or History.

- **Cloud Nine**—A film recording the dialogue engaged in by Black and white teachers and students immediately following the riots and upon the receipt of the booklet Tell It Like It Is.

- **Classroom In Transition**—A documentary film depicting some scenes of classrooms during the first year of curriculum intervention (1967).

- **Mother This Isn't Your Day**—The filming of the culmina-
ting activities involving elementary and secondary students in dialogue with professional writers, parents, and Team members. The students presented original stories and poems as well displayed written materials.

Another curriculum development effort was the Poloroid Project. Through a contract negotiated by the Team with the Poloroid Corporation, the Team was able to supply sixty elementary grade teachers with Poloroid Swing cameras, film, flash bulbs to explore creative uses of the cameras in developing language skills, both written and oral by means of using pictures. The project was used to encourage teachers to focus on the environment and viewpoints of children. During the year, the number of teachers in the Poloroid program was increased to approximately one hundred teachers.

Books written by students and illustrated with Poloroid pictures have been published by the Team. These are being used in Model School classrooms.

The Innovation Team received many accolades because of its curriculum products. Perhaps the most significant one was the monetary rewards to three students for rights to publish stories and pictures in the New York Times Magazine in June 1968. It was at this point that the team realized that it was part of a significant curriculum reform.

SUMMARY

The Washington Innovation Team has been discussed widely
in educational circles as a vehicle for motivating change at the system level and as a delivery system of goods and services to classroom teachers. The success of the Team in these endeavors has been noted and attempts at replication have been attempted. Chapter III has attempted to describe in summary fashion, those activities engaged in by the Team which contributed to that success. Staff development was a major function of the Team and was accomplished primarily through conferences, institutes, and in-service workshops. In keeping with it's basic operating principles, the Team made certain that workshops, institutes, and conferences centered around needs and problem areas that had been identified by teachers. Teachers were involved in the planning of all workshops, institutes and conferences centering around needs and problem areas, and participated in them on a voluntary basis. In addition, students were involved in most of the content area workshops.

The Team followed up all in-service training sessions with direct classroom support for teachers. The Team facilitated the procurement of needed classroom materials and assisted teachers in classroom organization, management and in teaching.

Staff development was complimented by curriculum development which undoubtedly contributed to the success of the
Team. Being provided with new and alternative curricular approaches was attractive to teachers when they had received some training in how to use them and knew that Team members were available to assist in implementation at their request. Student involvement may well have been the most significant part of all curriculum development efforts for there appears to be no better technique for getting teachers to make their approaches to curriculum more pupil oriented. The curriculum packages produced by the Team in conjunction with students and teachers of the Model School Division are currently in use in classrooms across the nation.
CHAPTER IV

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters presented a description of the national and local educational scene at the time of the intervention of the Innovation Team, a historical assessment of the development of the Innovation Team and a description of the role played by key agents. Chapter III presented a description of the components of the Innovation Team Program. Chapter IV will discuss the development of individual Team members as agents of change. The skills developed and the process used in the development of those skills were significant points of discussions from the interviews with Team members.

The Team

Twelve women and three men made up the original group, a group charged with 'changing the Model School Division teachers'. Of the fifteen members, fourteen were Black. Eleven was the average number of teaching years and thirty-five the average age. It should be pointed out that the statistic, average years of teaching experience, may be somewhat misleading. Of the fifteen teachers, one had thirty-five years experience and another had twenty-seven years of experience. If the experiences of these two Team members were not
used, the average teaching experience for the Innovation Team would approximate 7.3 years. (See Chart I) During the four years of existence the average experience continued to approximate eleven years.

Significantly, the thirteen members stated that their task once they became Team members was more than what they expected and that they were overwhelmed at the personal growth they experienced while members of the group. Conducting workshops for teachers, parents, students and administrators; delivering instructional materials; visiting classrooms to "demonstrate" new materials were the tasks envisioned by the Team. In addition, I personally thought a segment of my time would be devoted to updating techniques in mathematics and avail my skills to teachers who encountered difficulty in the classroom. However, I spent two summers coordinating mathematics workshops in the Philadelphia Public Schools and the Independent Schools of the Washington Metropolitan Area.
CHART I

Number of Years Teaching Experience
1967 Innovation Team

Original Team Members
Credentials of Team Members

During the first year of existence (1967-68) thirteen out of fifteen professionals on the Innovation Team were graduates from the local teacher training institution, District of Columbia Teachers College. Of the fifteen professionals only two Team members had earned their Master's degree.

As a result of their major concern for the design of urban oriented graduate programs for the development of teacher trainers, the University of Massachusetts School of Education and the Washington, D.C. Public School System initiated a Master's Degree program. During the eighteen months duration, the involved members integrated their job responsibility with their professional growth. Courses, seminars and class attendance was on Fridays, evenings and week-ends, when necessary.

Since one of the major responsibilities of the Innovation Team within the school system was to provide staff development opportunities and assistance to teachers and administrators within the Cardoza Division, it was relatively effective to utilize those normal job responsibilities as an action laboratory for testing and evaluation concepts and skills obtained within their courses and seminars from the University of Massachusetts.

Professor Eve of the University of Massachusetts reported:
As a result, the students and professors within the program have been quite successful in closing the traditional gulf between those learning experiences which are available within graduate degree programs and the effective application of those new ideas, skills and techniques within the realities of an urban school system...

**Human Relation Skills**

By the time the Innovation Team started its last year of operation (school year 1970-71), there were nineteen professionals employed as Team members. Because of the collaborative education program developed by the School of Education, University of Massachusetts and the Innovation Team, all professionals on the Team had earned at least a Master's degree by the beginning of the 1970-71 school year.

The Team experience appeared to be a three-year T-Group with all the manifestations of a Group Session. Fridays were set aside for the Team to meet as a group and deal with issues effecting the development of the Team and Team operations. During these meetings, the Team designed strategies for the ensuing weeks, the members had the opportunity to vent personal feelings, compliment, confront and resolve inter or intra conflicts with the assistance of an adjunct leader who was a T-Group trainer.

Members said of the experiences:

The most rewarding experience appears to be the Group Dynamics activities--specifically, my exposure to them, my involvement in them
and my application of these learned skills and techniques in the setting as it was then.

The ability to "get along" with others and sensitivity skills were the most important skills. I think these skills help in my interaction with others now.

I found these reactions surprising as the most feared task faced by the group appeared to be the convening of a T-Group session. Many openly verbalized dissatisfaction with the Friday meetings, as the threat of Friday meeting turning into a T-Group session always clouded the group's ability to deal with issues. The fear I thought was justifiable for many as the persistent peer pressure for behavior modification constantly confronted the non-conformant individual. Such overt behaviors as blinking the eyes when expressing a point of view were challenged as inappropriate behaviors.

Unlike many groups in which I have been a member, many challenges were issued by individuals who possessed similar behavior styles. It was only after two years that members were willing to risk such statements as:

Right...I think Human Relations was very instrumental in getting to know ourselves along with the people you were going to work(with). Human Relations helped you be open to criticism and suggestions and know when to turn your cheek... If you had feelings and frustration toward others (you learned to) be able to say it so you won't necessarily kill them or tear them to pieces. I think too, when on a job all outside things stay outside and things that go on in the group stay in the group. If you can not operate that way--get out!
Reaching the level to express this feeling was a difficult one for some Team members who were rarely active or vocal members of the group.

Although Team Members identified growth and the actual acquisition of new and innovative group skills as their most rewarding experience, some of the events and consequences of these sessions had a profound effect on the ability of individuals to move beyond the skills themselves.

Experiences were to be held confidential as in most T-Groups. However, confidentiality between the members of the group never materialized, and the wounds inflicted by members never healed. During the process of interviewing, data was gathered which indicated that although the wounds never healed, the cohesion among the members of the group was not and has not been disturbed. This cohesion became somewhat detrimental when the decision to discontinue funding became known. This cohesion interfered with the Team's exit process and the ability of Team members to self-select positions in the Public School System.

The following extract from a interview with two Team members illustrates this point:

Investigator: Okay, can you identify any skill or skills necessary for a new team, or for the person thinking of or planning a new team?

Member: Setting goals, objectives...performance One
objectives, criteria for individuals or groups. The development of a SELF-DESTRUCT MECHANISM.

Member: I can't understand why you would say that.
Member: Two
Member: After a period of time, people become dead weight.
Member: One
Member: Two
Member: If the self-destruct mechanism worked, people would be somewhere else.
Member: One
Member: Two
I think back on one of the last meetings of the Team when we were asked to answer,
1. Where are you now?
2. What have you done?
3. Where do you want to go?
4. How are you going to get there?
The group manifested behavior that they couldn't handle it. Evidence of that was joking...laughing...pairing...fight flight...
You see, I've been reading Bion (W.R. Bion). That's a perfect example of them. All the manifestations of an immature group.

Member: I saw a mature group.
Member: Two
Member: How?
Member: One
Member: Two
Mature in that they depended on each other. When the crisis came...Group spent a lot of time on personal stuff...Crisis got mature support.

Member: A mature group is goal oriented...work oriented. Whereas they began mitigating against these things.
Member: One

Member: We're still human.
Member: Two
Member: One
I am looking at how it (the group) handles conflict, etc. I know people aren't robots, but they could handle it.

(At this point, waitress drops glasses of milk off tray on Member One)

Member: I was thinking of a way to design a team that
Member: Two
would not necessitate a self-destruct mechanism—a way of finding the right 15.

Member: One

That is a 1 year, 2 year self-destruct mechanism.

Member: Two

Okay, that is a different kind of self-destruct than was used by the Team.

Member: One

There is a different self-destruct mechanism—suicide...people with goals and can't reach it. I have done it. I have carved out the population which I am going to change. Then I find I cannot do the job. For those who can't that's it...get farther. I believe in humans...fight...battle.

Member: Two

You know, I feel I would do anything for a Team member right now.

Member: One

I think the Team was the greatest process for training better teachers for classrooms...better teacher-leaders...leaders. The training was better for training teacher-leaders...a beautiful model for teacher-leaders.

The profoundness evidenced by this triad paralleled my own thoughts pertaining to the self-destruct mechanism for the change agent. The question of how the group as individuals could leave the Team, attempt infiltration into the system, and continue to be effective once the Team had disbanded was a serious one for Team members.

In retrospect, I feel that the lack of funding was a blessing in disguise, since this situation could have been the perfect opportunity for individuals to maximize their effectiveness by using their experience, skills, and knowledge to make
drastic changes within the system, since this is what the whole Team philosophy encompassed. However, determining the means for such a move was an unaccomplishable task. On one occasion, the group expended two days of intensive, but fruitless planning. I think that it's difficult enough to play one's own funeral, but even more difficult to plan the resurrection.

The disturbance of the comfortability of the individual Team member proved to be indigestible. After all, our efforts for two years were directed towards developing cohesion. At this point, we hoped the group strength would seep through to strengthen the individual. The Theory of Change has little or no provision for the infiltration of a single agent into such a massive system of antibodies.

Now I find that though I frowned on the stroking, conjoling, and the offering of compassion that went on for the three years that I was Team Leader, these activities provided the needed support for survival in a system resisting change. Exercises such as these stroking ones are everlasting, as now members continue to strengthen the bond and actively participate in the exercises earlier resisted formally and informally. Ironically, these "stroking exercises" transcend personality conflicts and wounds from previous encounters. For example, a Team member accepted the position of principal
The survival of such a group depends on the allies of the group in the larger system. Of such importance were these allies, I continuously had to favorably respond to the then Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Model School Division. This school officer supported the Team's efforts by his presence at workshops, presented the Teams proposals, searched and found funds when according to the record, there were no funds available, and openly committed himself to the change process which the Team espoused. The most important form of support the Assistant Superintendent provided was the authority to mandate the cooperation of supervisors, supervising directors of content areas, and budget and procurement personnel.

Though the group had semi-sutonomy, our clients, the teachers and principals, functioned under the edifice of the public schools. On occasions which allowed teachers to attend more than one workshop a week, many principals were unwilling or afraid to permit participation in the workshops. Resistance appeared valid or legitimate because classroom replacements for teachers were difficult to obtain in the first year. The problem was relieved when the Team secured special disposition for training and credentialing university juniors or seniors from local schools. Our support came again from the Assistant Superintendent then the Deputy Superintendent of D.C.
public schools in charge of instruction, who granted the special disposition.

Team members were always cognizant of the power and authority of the Assistant Superintendent. Current utilization of this strategy was revealed in the interviews. One member expresses:

...looking back I see many things, such as my being "allowed" to operate---operate in the sense that no one stood over me and my choice was my choice.

I had freedom to choose what to do and how to do it. Once the task was clear, in terms of objectives, I could decide on the strategies and techniques to be used for completion. I also knew of resources from EDC and other places to help me if I needed help.

I saw a great deal of support for what I did. There was Norman (Assistant Superintendent, later Deputy Superintendent) and Mary Lela (Pilot Communities Director, EDC) always there to back me up. Then there was support among us, the Team members. These people (Superintendent and Director) were also risk takers. Looking back now, I also see the Team as high risk takers, and I feel good to know that the Team was the beginning of change.

In addition, the support rendered, provided satisfaction of what is referred to by F. Herzburg as the Team's "hygiene factors". Support meant that team members had a position, with the Team, which satisfied the security need of individuals. Satisfaction of these groups or individual needs, removed the frustration which usually surfaces when these needs are unmet.
Most importantly, the group then more vigorously attempted to seek satisfaction of "motivating factors". In addition, as leader, I was then able to motivate and encourage the group to aspire for goals which included behavior modification, academic degrees and exploration of different system change models.

Realization of the goal "seeking academic degrees" occurred shortly prior to the disbanding of the Team. The process of soliciting Universities to undertake such a task, which included credentialing demonstrated competencies rather than the reservoir of knowledge, proved to be most rewarding to Team members. This effort was undertaken by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Weekly scheduled visits from university professors provided the theoretical, practical knowledge relative to the task of the Innovation Teams' operation.

Efforts to initiate such an off-campus program was prompted by my foresight and a timely suggestion to explore a possible relationship with the university by the Assistant Superintendent. The terminal point of the operation appeared to be on the horizon coupled with the search for rebuttal to the statement made by many persons in supervisory capacities, "they don't have a masters degree", made this an even more pressing objective. It was felt that the acquisition of the
degree would increase the eligibility of members for positions such as principals, supervisors and project directors which in turn would advance the change process to the middle management level. Hypothetically, intervention at the managerial level would support the classroom teacher level effort of the Team and stimulate a change effort in the personnel practices, budget and procurement, staff development and support the Team's allies in the change movement. Finally, it was my belief that the self satisfaction received by members as a result of task completion would only last four years and to perpetuate the self actualization process I would need to explore additional rewards for the members of the Team.

Outside Experiences

Prior to being selected as Innovation Team Members, the selected teachers had minimal experiences visiting other schools or school systems except at the suggestion of a supervisor for a "demonstration lesson" in one of two Laboratory Schools in the District of Columbia. Two members had provided consultative services in the content area for which he was selected. Lacking these experiences, the first task of the group became the examination of the project images through use of sensitivity training. In depth examination of behaviors revealed many overt and covert behaviors which could have rendered the member ineffective had this behavior been carried over into the Team's operation.
Examples of these learnings were stated many times in the interviews:

Many resource people here have difficulty dispensing skills because of the lack of training in self-awareness. They need to look at themselves before embarking on their task. That really helped me—looking at how I appear to others, what others think of me, or what "hang-ups" others have with me.

another member stated:

Investigator: If you were to replicate the training or the model for change, what advice or suggestions would you give? Can you identify that experience pertinent to the replication of other teams?

Member: The first summer experience, where we sat with administrators, supervisors, and resource teachers to plan what we would do.

Member: Yes, like we did the first summer. We brought together people with administrators from top to bottom, for a definition of roles. I would also say that in order to stimulate organizational growth, one should allow roles to be further defined as the job (task) emerges.

This data appears to support the notion that effective change agent styles resulted from the initial consultants' modeling an accepted or adaptable consultant style for facilitating group activities and dispensing new knowledge.

Further evidence of the replicability of the initial consultants style and technique were revealed on occasions where team members reported and shared knowledge acquired from visits to projects outside the city. Formal Team meetings on Friday
provided opportunity to report the progress of the change process in the target schools. In the meetings was highlighted strategies which were ineffective and also the effective ones. Strategies which produced favorable results with our clients were immediately presented for the edification of the group. Plans were also finalized for the inclusions of other sub-team members. The need for additional knowledge or skill was also presented by Team members. Satisfying the needs was done, after the group consensus appeared supportive of such a strategy, by one or more members deciding to pursue the skill. Acquisition of the additional skill was done by visiting the proposed consultant, wherever he was located or having the consultant visit the learning center to present the materials for a select group which included principals, resource teachers, classroom teachers, Team members and with students, seventy-five per cent of the time.

Funding such undertaking was provided in the contract budget and was a responsibility of EDC to provide for continuous input for the Team. The presented skill or material would have immediate follow-up by Team members, should the same skill or technique be requested by teachers of the MSD, the effort would be duplicated by the team.

Use of the Acquired Skills

Extensive use was made of the skills added to a members'
of an elementary school. This member was disliked because her peers envied her. Now, later, two members find it convenient to support her by joining her teaching staff, assisting her in developing proposals, conducting workshops, and offering continuous moral support.

Support

Argyris and Bennis¹, among others who study and write about modern organizations, have used the concept of "temporary system" to describe small groups of people who do specific tasks as change agents within larger organizations.

A group of competent individuals with skills matched to needs are trained and supported to accomplish a specific task and also to become self-aware and use themselves and their ideas as agents of change. They develop among themselves a group feeling. They focus on developing skills to organize groups for learning and problem solution; they create logistical systems to bypass red tape and system inhibition; and they develop ways of extending their own capabilities to others within the larger system. The focus is on personal change which will ultimately modify the larger system in which the target group functions.

repertoire of competencies. Requests originated from the Madison Mathematics Project, Webster College, St. Louis, Missouri, for members having mathematics specialities. In-service programs were conducted by these Team members in New York City, New York, Richmond, Virginia, Chicago, Illinois, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Moragora College, Tanzania, Africa and Kampala, Uganda, Africa retained the services of one of the Team's science specialists. The author of the booklet Inching On Up was involved in the design and development of the social studies unit entitled Man: A Course of Study, distributed by Education Development Center, Newton Massachusetts. In addition, courses in the teaching methods of science, mathematics, social studies were instructed by the Team members at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Change as a result of the Teams intervention was initiated in many of the areas of education in the United States and abroad.

A team member's comment:

All of them were rewarding. Rewarding in the sense that each experience helped...aided in my evolution into a change agent. Diversity! Many diverse experiences, vividly describes the impact of the experiences as a group and an individuals' commitment to the change process which demanded some behavior modifications for the changers as well as for
the changee or the teachers with a classroom assignment.

Evidence of the magnitude of the impact is revealed in the following statement by a Team member:

...long-term it has been the seeing of the growth and development of all of us over a long period of time. That the things which we started out together have had effects now and that we're still doing them. In terms of the short-term effects, the kinds of things that were rewarding at the time, I think the most rewarding one was a cross-cultural one, for me being a white person who really had no concept of black people as people, of black schools and urban problems as being made up of the human dimension. Whatever one says, no matter what your intellectual approach about black problems were at that time, unless you've really been into it and been a part of it, you are dealing with it in your mind. You are not dealing with it through experience. So, the most rewarding thing to me, on the short-term basis, was one of having an education myself of seeing a dimension of life that I just wouldn't have seen otherwise and of understanding that.

Skills

Noteworthy in the examination of the content of the interviews is the frequency with which the identification of the Group Process skills were mentioned. Only two members mentioned Group Process as their most rewarding experience. Eleven members identified Group Process as the skill which facilitates their movement professionally. Skill in group dynamics, a skill required in the training of the team, appeared as a current expertise through the individual profile. Data from the interviews also provided the list below
of amalgamated skills which can be classified as "transferable skills" and "personal skills". Transferable skills may be obtained by a Team member from consultants, another team member, and/or other resources. These skills are marketable and vital part of the working repertoire of competencies.

Bennis advances the topic in his discussion:

A practitioner who shapes and form—or getter, re-shapes and re-forms—materials of a certain sort must be something of an artist. He must have a "feel" for the materials with which he works. His knowledge of these materials must go beyond "knowledge about" them to knowledge by acquaintance with them. The latter knowledge does not come to him by detached observation and theorizing primarily or alone but by direct handling of his materials, by learning to appreciate their reluctances and readinesses, learning to guide his "handling", by the qualitative reactions of his materials to the "handling".

Group Process was used to refer to sensitivity skills, human relation skills, interpersonal skills, role definition and task delineation.

The effectiveness of the Innovation Team and future Teams would certainly hinge on the number of marketable or salable skills the group possessed. The "art", as clearly stated by Bennis, is the result when a process of apprenticeship is incorporated in the practice of the art. He cites:

This "art" dimension in practice is clearly evident in the functioning and the education of skilled artisans of various sorts. It is equally evident in the functioning and education of "help-
ing professionals", whom we seek to characterize collectively as "change agents". In seeking conceptual tools to guide the functioning of change agents, are we denying the "art" dimensions in their work or selling it short?

The skills identified by Team members which may be referred to as Transferable Skills are as follows:

- Ability to develop a plan for sharing ideas
- Ability to develop framework whereby others can define and adopt new roles
- Reservoir, knowledge in traditional classroom techniques
- Ability to demonstrate with children
- Have a balance between cognitive and affective skills
- Working knowledge of group and intergroup dynamics activities
- Ability to check all aspects of problem before acting on solutions
- Ability to be a content or curriculum specialist
- Ability to develop demonstrable definition of role to include teacher, educator, learner
- Ability to be learner oriented
- Ability to use fantasy of client in constructive way.

In addition to the "transferable skills the group identified a list of skills which are personal and collectively a part of the group. Though seemingly elementary in statue, these skills were identified as paramount in the operation of the group. Many of the listed skills were referred to in every interview with outstanding frequency.

- Ability to work on team with other teacher-trainers
- Ability to function in a situation characterized by shared leadership
- Ability to define and adopt new roles for self
- Ability to work in low-structured situations
- High tolerance for error
- Willingness to develop and try out alternative solutions to any problems
Value system which allows divergent values equal status
Unafraid of unpredictable consequences
Able to face himself
Reality oriented; willingness to admit to flexibility in reality
Acceptance of reality of role of sex in determining roles which contribute to successful team functioning
Possess non-evaluation behavior
Inability to be stamped into a mold.

Personal skills, labelled because of their personal nature, are the direct result of group interactions during and outside of "group meetings". Bennis recapitulates:

...any group of individuals me together for work shows work-group activity, that is mental functioning designed to further the task in hand. Investigation shows that these aims are by emotional drives of obscure origin.

Finally, it must be kept in mind that the personal skills must become a part of the group and more important, the skill of recognition of "groupness" must be a part of the leadership. As mentioned in the interviews, the cohesion of the group was developed. This development was directly attributed to the flexibility of the leadership and the antonomy of the team operation.

Initial Skills

Team members were asked to discuss Initial Skills, that is skills that were brought to the Innovation Team. Their discussions revealed that three major content or subject matter areas were represented in the initial group. The
skills were the direct result of the member's attendance in the 1965 and 1966 MSD Summer Institute. For comparison, these skills are listed below:

Mathematics

Primary Math (School Math Study Group) 1 member
Intermediate Math (Madison Math Materials)
1 member

Science

Elementary Science Study Materials - 7 members

Social Studies

Senesh Materials - 2 members
Man: A Course Study 1 member

In addition skills in the Team Teaching Approach were represented (1) and the Language Approach to Reading (1). In 1969-70 the Team recruited five additional members with expertise in the open classroom concept (4), Man: A Course of Study (1) and Madison Math Materials (1).

The identification of the Initial Skills serves as a point of reference for the investigator. Further study indicates that at the culmination of the Team's activities, the following skills were identified by the members as a part of the group's arsenal:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number of Members having the skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Process</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Procurement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Intermediate Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies (other than initial skill)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Process approach)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay-out and Editing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies/Black History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Wall (Cardboard Carpentry)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera (Poloroid)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Television</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Organization and Development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Classroom Concept</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Modules</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Clarification/Human Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Program and Individual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (Elementary/junior high levels)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the question, What percent of the Innovation Team related experiences are you utilizing now?, nine members indicated the use of 90% or more in their current positions. Three members indicated approximately 50%, which is the lowest figure cited by the interviewees. Of interest was the revelation that three members felt that in their current position the risk appeared too great. The members indicated that the fact they were former Innovation Team members increased the resistance on the part of their clients.

Responses to the question, Identify that experience or incident pertinent to the replication of other teams, Team members identified the following skills as relevant for future Team developers:

Documentation--members should be able to record experiences and strategies utilized for change.

Organization---to be prepared for upward mobility

Staff Development

Self Assessment activity--skill should be a part of an on-going process

Identification of task and roles--efforts should be made to initiate the training of team with a session or sessions to deal with the proposed and perceived roles of the Team members and identify with the assistance of the clients, the task.

Members be allowed sufficient time to "grow"--minimum of two years

Candidate should have classroom teaching experience prior to entering Team
Training of a Leader

Traditional training methods, vis-a-vis lectures, practicums, and searching the literature for information on the design and implementation of a Team-approach was of little value to me in my role as Team Leader. The development of additional skills, newer techniques and greater awareness about interpersonal interactions occurred primarily as a result of T-Group sessions and feedback from trainers after such sessions and/or meetings. The exchange of ideas and the analysis of intra-group interactions were of paramount value to me as I developed my role as Team Leader. Reminiscent at this point of my career is a two week session with three trainers whose expertise led to reflect one one of the basic attributes of a leader.

In this situation the Leader of the Innovation Team had to have the resiliency and pliability to withstand continuous bombardment from the team members. Team members tended to blame the Team Leader for their own individual shortcomings (personal as well as professional). In many instances, personal failures were transferred from individual team members to the Team Leader. During the formative stages of the Innovation Team most "setbacks" experienced by team members were assumed to be the "fault" of the Team Leader. In one situation a team member had some difficulty accepting responsibility for his passivity in assuming specific tasks. This position was illuminated by a remark made during the interview of a former team member, who
stated:

...the person in charge should give all members the opportunity for certain jobs...opportunity to try...if you (Team Leader) don't the member will take the back seat...

Numerous training sessions and meetings passed before this realization surfaced. Several team members had difficulty recognizing the fact that the aggressive pursuit of task assignments was desirable and encouraged. In other words, the Innovation Team operated in such a way that those members who aggressively carried out assigned tasks and showed initiative in developing new tasks received positive reinforcements more often that those members who passively pursued their assigned tasks. The team tended to view the passive pursuit of assigned tasks as minimal effort. However, those members who adopted the passive approach were not consciously penalized because they were not as aggressive as some of their more active peers. It is my observation that the more aggressive team members exhibited greater self-assurance as they assumed responsibilities above and beyond their routine day-to-day tasks. These members would assume initiatives without prior approval or acceptance from other team members or the Team Leader. Usually these initiatives were developed and tested before they were brought back to the Team as another alternative in reaching stated goals and objectives.
As Team Leader, it was incumbent upon me to encourage team members to assume various degrees of risk-taking (depending upon one's personal and professional security) in the pursuit of assigned tasks and attempts at new initiatives. This became more and more apparent as I developed and refined my functions in the leadership role. In other words, this awareness emerged as I grew into the leadership role. Such experience and insights cannot be gleaned from the text of leadership manuals. The ability of team members to assume specific risks in the assumption of new initiatives was a direct function of my growth in the role of Team Leader. The more I recognized that team members expected me to establish comfort levels for them as they assumed new tasks, the greater the percentage of team members who attempted new initiatives without prior sanction from me or other team members.

Lastly, another important insight as a leader is the ability to know when to relinquish the leadership. The Innovation Team as an autonomous group had the privilege of electing or selecting their leader on three occasions. My ascension to the leadership position came primarily because I dared to challenge my predecessor on the issue of recruiting teachers for a Summer Reading Institute. Consequently, when the team decided it was time to elect a new leader the fact that I had the strength of conviction to challenge individuals regardless of their professional status, made me attractive as a potential leader.
Unfortunately, the same attribute that made me attractive as a potential leader tended to create dependency on the part of team members after I had assumed the leadership position. Team members would raise issues among themselves and then sit back passively as I confronted administrators in the school system about such issues. Quite often I would find myself in a position of projecting the image of an individual concern rather than that of a genuine team concern. Interestingly, many team members tended to assume a very passive role when it was necessary to challenge the system on critical educational issues. As a result of this particular leadership style, team members came to expect that I would assume the risks involved in challenging the "system". This style tended to encourage team members to resist a change in leadership when it became quite obvious that it was time to change leaders.

**Transferability**

Team members frequently expressed the opinion that in order to replicate the training model of the Innovation Team it would be necessary to: (1) have a school system comparable to the one in Washington, D. C. (2) have a series of events similar to the social events that occurred between 1967 and 1971, and (3) have individuals who are willing to risk some degree of discomfort in their role as change agents. One member stated it well when she said that:

> I would make some other suggestions, too, for those who want to be involved or start a new team—don't take away the pain, pain made us. The unknown is easier on your learning. You know, I have found that personal interaction skills are null and void if others don't know what to do or are afraid to try.
All in all, individual awareness seems to be the most important factor. My predecessor in the leadership position brought forth a very significant point when she said, "the value of the Team was that we stayed together long enough...to accept some things about ourselves...about whether we were leaders or followers, about what level of competency we could arrive at on the Innovation Team, about the level of risk-taking each team member would be able to engage in as individuals, and to face up to the fact that in many cases even if they (Team) had more authority and power, individual team members wouldn't act any differently than they are presently acting...The most transferable of all the things I learned is that by letting individuals struggle together in a working group to find their own leadership potential and level of competency, one can develop skills of self-acceptance, and understanding..." In other words, replication of this Team approach depends to a large extent, the understanding of what happens to individual Team members as he goes through "specific changes" and develops a sense of understanding of what he or she is all about as a person.

Product of the Process

The training of the Innovation Team involved the acquisition of subject matter skills, organizational and managerial practices, self-awareness via group dynamics and logistical short cuts. Many
of the skills, and techniques introduced were once traditionally reserved for curriculum developers, principals, procurement officers and subject area supervisors. As a result of the efforts of the Innovation Team, these skills were presented to classroom teachers on a regular basis. Since this approach has been successful, I would consider the assignment of Team members back to traditional classroom roles a waste of talent and training. Performing in the role of effective staff developers for three years should certainly warrant serious consideration of establishing new positions for these individuals. As a result of the Innovation Team all members are prepared to assume meaningful roles as staff developers. Initially the stated goals of the MSD was to experiment with various staffing models and to examine different curriculum materials. In the opinion of this investigator, the experience in the MSD has clearly demonstrated the feasibility of the Innovation Team approach as an effective alternative to the traditional methods of staff development.

As a charge, the team sought to fulfill the role of "linking agents". Elusive as the definition of the role was, the Team matured into effective content consultants, group process leaders and program innovators. My experience on the Innovation Team leads me to conclude that the team members are the most important product of this effort. On the whole, most team members have become sophisticated in training classroom teachers and understanding the importance of system management. In summary, changes initiated by the Model School Division can be directly attributed to a large extent, to the efforts of the Innovation Team.
Summary

Chapter IV attempted to present a personal interpretation of data collected as a result of group and individual Team member interviews. This data was integrated with the author's personal knowledge to provide a more vivid picture of the process of growth for the Team during the four years of operation in the Model School Division. Developed with the desire to provide further insights to the reader the documenting process involved the acquired knowledge and skills of the author as the Team Leader of the Innovation Team.

The members of the Innovation Team shared some collective ideas about the training program in which the members were a part. Isolated in this chapter was the importance of outside experiences, the necessity of support from personnel in the managerial function, the significance of group process and identification of transferable and non-transferable skills. The need for a self-destruct mechanism surfaced as a concern for some members and the discussion revealed that there was not a mechanism developed for the exiting of the Team members.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Washington, D.C. Innovation Team was one of four projects initiated through the Pilot Communities Program of Education Development Center. Of the four, the Washington Team had the longest longevity and had the greatest impact on the system it was designed to change. This dissertation has been an attempt to document the development of the Innovation Team as a vehicle for system change. An attempt has been made to describe the major activities engaged in by the Team as it sought to initiate change and to describe the Team members as agents of change. In the course of this documentation, an attempt has been made to assess the impact the Team had upon the system, particularly in preparing teachers to be change agents. This study has led to the formation of a number of conclusions about the use of an Innovation type intervention in a major school system to produce change.

Conclusions

Underlying our entire understanding of institutional change is an implicit assumption that individuals, the human bits and pieces of any organization, form one of the key variables in bringing about organizational change. Substantial evidence collected in the personal and written interviews
support the position that the most important aspect of a change agent's life is the human or interpersonal contact. Team members considered the most important skill to be Human Relations or Interpersonal Relations. This variable, psychological in nature, is identified by Dr. A. Eve as being "quite difficult to change". Eve further identifies the support variables for change as, sense of competence and self-esteem. He states that on a basis of competence, an individual is receptive or unreceptive to change to the extent that he believes he can effectively carry out the task involved in whatever changes are suggested.¹

That this factor played a vital role in the development of the Team was evident throughout the interviews. Team members voiced strong views about feelings of threat. They indicated that fear, insecurity and anxiety arise if self-image is threatened. This generally served to hamper Team operations. The interviews also revealed that previous experiences can exert a powerful effect on an individual's ability to become involved in productive problem solving behavior. Since the extent of willingness of Team members to become involved in productive problem solving behavior directly effected the validity of the Team as a mechanism for change, the need for interpersonal and affective skill development was crucial.

Systems susceptible to change exhibit unique characteristics. These manifest themselves in the top echelon of the pyramidal structure as well as the lower base. Repeatedly, the study data revealed that the willingness to accept and promote change was referred to by the Team leader, assistant superintendent, school board and some teachers (300 in attendance at the MSD Summer Institutes). Most important to the initiation and promotion of system change was the awareness exhibited by the MSD at all levels. The critical question in organization renewal effort is that the sensing units be responsible decision-makers and gatekeepers of the organization. The "gatekeepers" were supportive of change and promoted the ideas of change by their active involvement in supportive decisions.

Responsive decisions fostered the growth of the MSD. The recognition by responsible parties of the need for a resource team encouraged and perpetuated the change momentum. The most significant of such "responsive" decisions, perhaps, was the Board of Education decision to implement the recommendations of the Harvard Study of 1967. This action was taken as a means of demonstrating support for teachers who were viewed as the real implementators of change.

---

An examination of all of the evaluations and studies completed on the Innovation Team revealed that the Team achieved an extremely high degree of success in accomplishing its goals of 1) helping teachers see themselves as potential instruments for initiating changes in their own behavior, 2) helping teachers improve instruction in the classroom to the level that teaching and learning are both more pleasant activities, 3) increasing the power of teachers in decision-making in the school, especially in the area of curriculum, 4) providing a coordinating function for services, resources, and school programs which aid the teacher in looking at her classroom as a whole unit, and 5) providing a channel for experts, specialists, and people from any walk of life to enter the school system at a level which affected teaching and learning.

This examination revealed that the Team accomplished a number of additional results in the process, particularly in the area of curriculum development. Teachers moved to the position of not only understanding that curriculum can and should be pupil-centered, but to the point of seeing students as curriculum developers. This was evidenced by the wide acceptance and use of student produced curriculum.

The evaluations reveal that much of the success of the Team is attributed by teachers to the client responsiveness
of the Team. The Team provided materials and services at the request of teachers, and teachers availed themselves of the services of the Team on a voluntary basis. Workshops developed by the Team centered on teacher identified concerns, and teachers were included in the planning process. Finally, the Team viewed its' operations as a learning process for individual members and structured activities that would facilitate continuous growth and development for its' members.

To summarize, the Innovation Team has been extremely successful and effective in five major areas: 1) as linking agents, 2) as staff development agents, 3) as supportive system agents, 4) as change facilitators, and 5) as system change agents. The Team performed an invaluable linking function for many teachers in and out of the Model School Division. There was in the D.C. Schools, a great need for such a function. Alternative schemes, such as having building representatives disseminate information about new materials, methods or techniques to the rest of the faculty had not been conspicuously successful or effective. The continued response of teachers to this Innovation Team function is sufficient demonstration of the need and the effectiveness of the response to that need by the Team. The function involved dissemination of ideas, techniques, methods, materials and in some cases, whole curricula. The main mechanisms were personal contacts, demonstrations and workshops.
As staff development agents, the Innovation Team organized and conducted a large number of workshops covering a wide variety of subject areas and skills. This training function addressed attitudes and self concepts of teachers as well as instructional skill development. In addition, some Team members provided pre-service training to prospective teachers.

As support system agents, the Team provided supplies and materials for two purposes. It enabled the Team to respond to the immediate material needs of teachers. It also enabled teachers to use immediately ideas and techniques they learned in workshops and institutes. The correlation of supplies and materials with real educational and behavioral variables, rather than with administrative ones, was a critical element in the continued acceptance and recognition of the Innovation Team by teachers. Follow-up in the classroom with teachers was also an important component of the Team's support system.

As change facilitators, the Team developed and used repeatedly the skills necessary to translate needs and tensions into constructive solutions, especially for teachers who had reached an impasse with students, supervisors, or in some cases, themselves. Certain Team members developed great skills in developing effective programs or project proposals tailored to meet the needs of particular situations or groups.

As system change agents, the impact of the Team was
noticeable but limited. As curriculum disseminators, the Team introduced new and better curricula, especially in social studies, math and science. In reading, the Team emphasized language experience as a specific approach, but its basic thrust was eclectic on the highly tenable grounds that there is no one best methods of teaching children to read. The Team contributed substantively to the development of attitudes in teachers in the Model School Division and Georgetown, that presage a readiness to change or accept change in instructional approaches. The Team encouraged and enabled many teachers to explore and try new roles and new ways of coordinating and integrating instruction.

The Team experimented with methods of disseminating information to teachers and of enlisting the cooperation of teachers in staff development activities. It contributed to the formulation of models and plans for teacher training and support throughout the Model School Division. As part of that process, the Team developed mechanisms to help change attitudes about students and approaches to teaching language art skills.

Recommendations

As a result of careful examination and research of related program evaluations, and based on the personal interviews of Team members and his own experience as Team leader, the
The investigator makes the following recommendations:

1. Goals and objectives of the intervention should be introduced at the program's inception to the members of the group. These goals should be short range goals. These goals and objectives should have behavioral implications attached and presented in an atmosphere which allows rejection without punishment. Miles supports this position when he states:

   The ability to develop evaluation and assessment models consistent with the development process determines the payoff of actions taken to change teacher education...

   Any assessment or evaluation must consider the development model which may not be in total development in the beginning but develop as a result of the process.

2. The ability to "retread" persons both in the school and in the university, to carry the developmental programs is indeed a difficult task. It is apparent that changes in teacher education are going to be carried out basically by people who are already in the colleges and schools. Those who have the interest, desire and ability to perform the new roles will have to be identified and given opportunities and assistance to make the change. As a result of the experience, being a member and the Team leader, the investigator recommends

---

that care be taken not to attempt to convert those who cannot or will not operate in the new roles. There must be alternative programs to fit the various styles of faculty, teachers and students.

3. Very often in the initiation of a change process, the change initiator holds in abeyance his personal needs. The operation principles of the Innovation Team focused on the cognitive growth of teachers. In the 1969 Cort report, Cort identifies the 1967 Summer Staff Development Conference as the sole source of information and ideas to the prospective Team members. Cort further describes the orientation workshop on remedial reading, team teaching and non-graded instruction as evidence of further preparation in the roles of "linking agents for Model School Division programs". Data from personal interviews leads the investigator to recommend that change agentry skills be coupled with cognitive and affective experiences. The Team found that after spending a great deal of time in task related activities, that it had to come back and deal with inter-personal and human relations problems. The Team discovered that before it could effectively utilize any content area skills, that members had to develop inter-

---

4Cort, et. al., Third Year Operation of the Innovation Team, p. 94.
personal skills, knowledge about the dynamics of groups, and skills in group process and organizational development.

4. A team has been defined as a "number of persons associated together in work or activity". Together signifies a group and to be effective as a group, the investigator recommends group activities as a functional part of the group's operation. Group therapy can refer to the treatment of individuals assembled for special therapeutic sessions, or it can refer to a planned endeavor to develop a group force that leads to smoothly running cooperative activity.

5. A further recommendation of the investigator is that the team approach to staff development should build in freedom from constraining and restraining of any and all established programs and departments. A programming of educational experience which affords intervals of solitude for the assimilation and integration of new knowledge increases autonomy more than programs which maintain a steady barrage of work and participation. To be successful, the Team needs complete autonomy, for as Elkin notes, "Autonomy... (is) the ability to be one's self... To be one's self, one needs complete autonomy."5

6. Finally, each Team should have a built in 'self-

destruct mechanism'. The Team was created as a temporary system within the context of the larger Division, to set up new balances of power, cultivate appropriate and constructive tensions, and examine old assumptions about roles, leadership, power and authority. The Innovation Team was a useful concept in the unfreezing of old habits and attitudes and stimulating new ones. It could take a higher order of risk than persons who were responsible for routine and permanent task roles in the system.

Further, as a temporary system, the Team was not required to get caught up in kind of self-perpetuating activities which caused the original inertia in the system. Thus, the Team should not be allowed to simply demise, but should have a planned exit which hinges on successful completion of specified goals within a specific time frame. An orderly departure should be planned well in advance of the moment of termination. A final assessment is particularly important and should consider the on-going evaluations carried on by the Team during its years of operation.
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THE INNOVATION TEAM MEMBERS
INNOVATION TEAM MEMBERS

The names listed represent the members of the Innovation Team. These do not coincide with the Roman numbers assigned to the interviews.

E. T. Beam
LaVern Ford
Mary Alexander
Jacqueline Robertson
Dorothy Christian
Maxie Wooten
Edith Baxter
Vivian Lightfoot
Marguerite Robinson
Judiene Johnson

Patricia Greer
Ralph Jenkins
Louise Boone
Flora Hill
Donald Greene
Annie Neal
Olive Covington
Joan Brown
Veola Jackson
Betty Neville

Mary Lela Sherburne, Team Leader-Project Director

Irvin D. Gordy, Team Leader-Project Director

Dr. Vytus Cernius, Adjunct Member
APPENDIX B

THE INTERVIEWS
THE INTERVIEWS WITH TEAM MEMBERS

The results of the interviews are presented below as a scenario.

INVESTIGATOR: As you know I am engaged in my doctoral studies at the University of Massachusetts. The topic for my dissertation deals with the effect of the training provided through the Innovation Team. Incorporated in this study is your assessment two years later of the total training and your use of the skills provided.

MEMBER ONE AND TWO: Okay

INVESTIGATOR: As you look back to the three years of activities, can you describe your most rewarding experience?

MEMBER ONE: I can't look at any one experience, since the total sum of experiences is what I see now. Each experience seemed to have built upon the other. However, the most rewarding experience appears to be the Group Dynamics activities—specifically, my exposure to them, my involvement in them, and my application of these learned skills and techniques in the setting as it was then.

MEMBER TWO: No, I cannot, should not, and will not isolate each experience, as each one built on the previous one.

An example would be my trip to Northeastern University (Boston) to see Dr. Mel Howard. This trip helped me to learn how to set up a trip and plan what to see—all on my own. The visit gave me skills that I
could use and did use to plan other trips and show them (teachers) how to divide their time to accomplish what they were going to see.

INVESTIGATOR: Out of that experience you cannot extract one that would stand out more than the others?

MEMBER ONE: No...looking back I see many things, such as my being "allowed" to operate--operate in the sense that no one stood over me my choice was my choice.

INVESTIGATOR: Choice of ...?

MEMBER ONE: I had freedom to choose what to do and how to do it. Once the task was clear, in terms of objectives, I could decide on the strategies and techniques to be used for completion. I also knew of resources from EDC and other places to help me if I needed help.

The semi-autonomy given the Team allowed me to make those decisions.

MEMBER TWO: My experience with the Team is not like the present one. Team members trusted your decisions and you were able to make decisions about tasks.

MEMBER ONE: I saw a great deal of support for what I did. There was Norman (Asst. Superintendent, later Deputy Superintendent) and Mary Lela (Pilot Communities Director) always there to back me up. Then there was support among us, the Team members. These people (Superintendent and Director) were also risk takers. Looking back now, I feel good to know that the Team was the beginning of change.
INVESTIGATOR: Can you tell me what part, if any, the Team played in your reaching where you are now?

MEMBER TWO: Through the Team, I got the skills.

MEMBER ONE: Through the Team, I got the skills, but I had to assume responsibility for my moving. In other words, I had to seek out places to go.

INVESTIGATOR: That's right. You did that in January just before the Team disbanded.

MEMBER ONE AND TWO: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you identify a skill presented by the Team which facilitated your movement?

MEMBER TWO: The ability to "get along" with others and sensitivity skills were the most important skills. I think these skills help in my interaction with others now.

MEMBER ONE: Leadership, organization, management, content areas, human development, group processes, and cognitive growth as a result of the courses at the University of Massachusetts.

INVESTIGATOR: If you were to replicate the training or the model for change, what advice or suggestions would you give? Can you identify that experience pertinent to the replication of other teams?

MEMBER TWO: The first summer experience, where we sat with administrators, supervisors, and resource teachers to plan what we would do.
MEMBER ONE: Yes, like we did the first summer. We brought together people with administrators from top to bottom, for a definition of roles. I would also say that in order to stimulate organizational growth, one should allow roles to be further defined as the job (task) emerges.

Let people, change agents, have at least two years to find out what you are about. Each individual agent should be allowed to grow at his or her own pace.

INVESTIGATOR: How much of your Innovation Team related experiences do you utilize now?

MEMBER TWO: Very little now, particularly the decision-making ones. There is little or no risk involved in my present task.

MEMBER ONE: Ninety percent through September, 1972. Now, no decision-making, very little risks. I don't take risks because there is no support. I know how to do the task—the skills are still there—but it's too risky.

INVESTIGATOR: Risky?

MEMBER ONE: Yes. I find strength in unity, and I don't find that here.

MEMBER TWO: I also think when you talk about others replicating the model, you must have commitment. When I came on the Team, I came to get out of the classroom. I learned how to do the job and found satisfaction in doing it. I became committed after coming on the Team...

MEMBER ONE: I would make some other suggestions, too,
for those who want to be involved or start a new Team--don't take away the pain, pain made us. The unknown is easier on your learning. You know, I have found that personal interaction skills are null and void if others don't know what to do or are afraid to try.

Many resource people here have difficulty dispensing skills because of the lack of training in self-awareness. They need to look at themselves before embarking on their task. That really helped me--looking at how I appear to others, what others think of me, or what "hang-ups" others have with me.

MEMBERS ONE AND TWO: We said the Team disintegrated, but there are questions about that now. People still we're part of a grand plan. Members still identified as Innovation Team members and Team members still benefit from the experiences on the Team.

MEMBER ONE: Finally, I feel the skills that the Team members possess are too high for their present positions.

(Interview II)

INVESTIGATOR: You know about the questionnaire I have been using to interview former Team members. I would like to begin by asking that you identify the most rewarding experience you had on the Innovation Team.

MEMBER: I think to be able to work with teachers helping them reinforce skills and become knowledgable about a variety of materials and methods that were avilable. Also to work with a classroom of children, at the teachers request, to introduce skills, methods and materials. i.e. Cuisenaire rods, to let teachers see it works and help them get started.
INVESTIGATOR: Widened...Broadened...one that increased risk to shoot for...

MEMBER: Thinking back as a classroom teacher... I would take a risk. The Team gave me more foundation, background and experience so that when I took a risk I was ready with plenty of back-up.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you identify any skill presented by the Innovation Team which played a part in your movement to where you are?

MEMBER: Training part.

INVESTIGATOR: Identify that experience or incident pertinent to the replication of the Team.

MEMBER: First thing, the person should be a classroom teacher in the area which the group would function--i.e. the junior high in the junior high although there would be carry over into elementary as some instructional levels of junior high students would be at the elementary level.

That the person who recommends, has knowledge as to the character of and relationship with other people, of the potential member. It is very important that you get along with each other. If you operate on a feeling level--If I come to you and you turn me off--I won't become angry, I am going to regroup and figure some way I can possible work with this person.

Person should have skills or a skill for which you're looking.

INVESTIGATOR: Part of that is that the person come with a skill?
MEMBER: Right...I think Human Relations was very instrumental in getting to know ourselves along with the people you were going to work. Human Relations helped you be open to criticism and suggestions and known when to turn your cheek...If you had feelings and frustration toward others be able to say it so you won't necessarily kill them or tear them to pieces. I think too, when on a job all outside things stay outside and things that go on in the group stay in the group. If YOU CAN NOT operate that way--get out!

INVESTIGATOR: What of the Innovation Team skills do you use now?

MEMBER: When I think of it I use all of the Human Relations skills every day. When I pick the telephone up...more and more with parents...Math skills-learned in Math I use in the In-service workshops and in the course I teach at the Teachers College. Only other thing I have to say is the person in charge should give all members the opportunity for certain jobs... opportunity to try...if you don't, member will take back seat.

(Interview III)

INVESTIGATOR: As one of the "newer members" of the Innovation Team, can you describe the most rewarding experience?

MEMBER: To be a part of a group with a common goal...it was a reward to give the kind of assistance that I as a classroom teacher needed.

INVESTIGATOR: What part if any did the Innovation Team play in you reaching where you are now?
MEMBER: The background provided by the Innovation Team gave me something or other that says leadership. I did not see myself as a leader prior to the Innovation Team experience. The experience made me aware of how I was relating to people and how I was able to change.

INVESTIGATOR: Were you able to change?

MEMBER: Yes...my tolerance level is now very high, much higher than it was when I came on to the Team.

INVESTIGATOR: Tolerance for what?

MEMBER: For people, not for children. Co-workers, people in the field and dealing with everything. I also began to accept more responsibility.

INVESTIGATOR: Job responsibility?

MEMBER: Yes!

INVESTIGATOR: Is there any skill which was presented by the Team that played a part in your movement to where you are now?

MEMBER: Would strategizing be one?

INVESTIGATOR: Yes, if that had a part in your movement.

MEMBER: Coming on as a new person on the Team (which was already in operation) I had to strategize for power. I had to know when to talk and not to talk. You learned to be a good listener...hear people.
Become more aware of the verbalized problem and learned where to attack it or what to do about it... Management skills... dissemination skills...

INVESTIGATOR: Any particular one?

MEMBER: Reading skills... under dissemination... a consultant works with us... being able to do what the consultant did with us; being able to carry it to the field.

INVESTIGATOR: In many programs, the same model is used where the consultant imparts skills and techniques to a resource group but it is less effective when replicated, how is yours different?

MEMBER: I have a closer relation with teachers... I have warmth, understanding and I am very hospitable. Then you know, you don't know it all... you don't go in knowing all the answers, you have to be able to listen...

INVESTIGATOR: Identify that experience or incident pertinent to the replication of this team.

MEMBER: The Team has to sit together to find out--who they are... what is it they have to do... what is the job and together make a decision on how they are going to do it. In looking at who they are, look at the people's personality--outgoingness and etc. and get a mixture of all. Then look at the skills each person possesses.

INVESTIGATOR: Anything else, what about degrees, M.Ed., B.S. and so forth?

MEMBER: Depends on the job and the people you
have to work with, because lay people have a lot of skills and common sense which helps get the job done, you don't always have to have been to school.

INVESTIGATOR: What % of the Innovation Team related skills are you utilizing now?

MEMBER: All of the skills and now have a need for some more!

INVESTIGATOR: We have talk about questions I've asked about your training, do you have any other suggestions.

MEMBER: Travel plays a big part...integral part... added to the experience. Being free to make decisions and selection of materials and strategies also is of prime importance.

(Interview IV)

INVESTIGATOR: As Team Leader, what was the most rewarding experience to you?

TEAM LEADER: I will answer that in terms of talking about long-term rewards and short-term rewards, since it's five years later. Of course, the long-term ones are more real at the moment. By far, the most rewarding thing has been the building of friendships and understandings and acceptance of people, which has lasted over a period of time and has enable me to work with members of the Team and other people in varying relationships and capacities. So, to me the major reward has been a long-term one. And, I'd say, to modify just a little bit, long-term it has been the seeing of growth and development of all of us over a long period of time. That the things
which we started out together have had effects now and that we're still doing them. In terms of the short-term effects, the kinds of things that were rewarding at the time, I think the most rewarding one was a cross-cultural one, for me being a white person who really had no concept of black people as people, of black schools and urban problems as being made up of human dimension. Whatever one says, no matter what your intellectual approach about black problems were at that time, unless you've really been into it and been part of it, you are dealing with it in your mind. You are not dealing with it through experience. So, the most rewarding thing to me, on the short-term basis, was one of having an education myself of seeing a dimension of life that I just wouldn't have seen otherwise and of understanding that.

INVESTIGATOR: You also had the distinction of being the trainer as well as the leader. Were there particular skills which you emphasized more than others?

TEAM LEADER: Yes, I think one skill I tried to work on and develop was the skill of going out to the larger community and interpreting what you are doing and asking help for it. I think one of the needs, as I perceived it, of the urban situation and of the black is to move beyond the black group in influence and to be able to compete not just in technical skills but on a basis of personal self-confidence and self-worth. In other words, I wanted to see Team members to be able to go out and ask for something because, not because I deserve it, but because I can do it, I believe in it, I am as worthy as anybody else. I think that was very ambitious and presumptuous on my part, except that I still think it's the skill that's useful and the one that's needed. A second
skill, and I don't know whether I would call this a skill, but a second thing that I tried to work on in the Team, and I think I tried to work on it as much for myself as I did for the Team members, was in our understanding and practicing some sort of collective decision-making so that we understood better the nature of where authority comes from for decisions and so that we all felt in some measure more personal autonomy over at least a limited scope of decisions in our lives. And then the third thing I tried to work on was communicating both in written form and in other ways about what we were doing. I think we failed more on this one probably than any other. That was the most difficult for all of us.

INVESTIGATOR: Was it by design that in the change effort of the Model School Division we only hit at teachers?

TEAM LEADER: The original design, as I understood it and heard it discussed and saw it develop on the Advisory Committee, was to be one in which there would be attempted change in all parts of a sub-system of the larger system. The original concept was that the Model School Division would have autonomy, both administrative and fiscal, from the larger school system. At the time of that concept I think no one realized what kind of decisions they were asking for in predicting that. But it was conceived as being an effort where change would be mandated from the top for a large segment and a defined segment of the school system. The Model Schools system, for example, is as large as many city school systems. It has a population of about 20,000 students. The answer as to why the only effort that was carried forward was with the teachers is a very simple one. The only part of the projected change that could ever be imple-
mented was that part that was related to teachers. There simply was not anybody who came in and stayed long enough or struggled with it long enough to implement any of these other things. There were projected efforts with tutorial programs, with changing of the curriculum in the secondary school, of after-school programs, of leadership training programs, but none of these were ever carried out with the direction and the systematization. And you know, in that sense, as we look at it in change, I think we just have to say that my determination that the limited effort of science would be extended to a larger teacher-training effort in the form of the Innovation Team is the reason that happened. Because the change was mandated from the top and I think that's what happens in so many change efforts—you can mandate over and over changes from the top but the key question continually comes to implementation of the policy and where it is implemented. If I were me now, knowing what I know, and I had access to the funds and the sources and all the people that I had then, I would operate in still bigger ways. I would say alright, let's make all of this real and let's work as hard at making all of it real as we do one part of it. But it's an implementation problem.

INVESTIGATOR: Can you identify any transferable skills that were part of the Innovation Team's program? You are defining, in this instance, transferability as being the ability to take that skill and repeat it and teach it to somebody else.

TEAM LEADER: In all honesty, I would say that in order to really make transferable the important skills and things which I learned as a member of the Team and as the leader of the Team, you have to recreate again some
of the same conditions, or at least key and essential components of the original conditions. I have spent some time trying to think about what some of those are. In some instances we have been able to transfer the same kind of experience. For example, I think we have somewhat transferred a similar experience in Baltimore with key differences and we can look at it. In Roxbury, to some degree, and even in the main Team.

INVESTIGATOR: What are some of those components of the conditions that enable you to transfer skills?

TEAM LEADER: I think one of the skills we all learn is the skill of identifying and dealing with some of the questions of leadership, of what is real leadership, of what role should a leader take, of recognizing, defining, and accepting different styles of leadership. In order to do that, in order to understand leadership, I think, at some time, you have to put into a group in which there is a kind of free-floating situation of power. People have to sort out for themselves some of their relationships to other people in opposition to having them defined immediately by a hierarchical structure. For example, if we, all of our lives, work only under people who are appointed or who are appointed by a system or who get there by criteria of education or performance and so forth, develop totally outside of our own experience, we never do understand much about raw power and leadership ability. We end up thinking that the conditions of leadership are ones imposed totally by experience and training and sources of power from the outside of us and we consequently don't confront personally the issues, the very basic issues, of personal attempt to control people and to control people's actions which go on all the time,
whether it's one to one or one to two, or so forth. I think one very important experience in leadership is the raw group. I am aware that that's why you try to develop sometimes in a sensitivity training in Tavestock groups in various kinds of weekend or week experiences. But I think that ends up being a kind of a game because it's only temporary and you have nothing really at stake. You can leave that group and go back and apply some of your trickery to other groups but you don't still have to deal with the long-term issues. In a way, I think the value of the Team was that we stayed together long enough until, whether they like it no not, members of that group had to accept some thingsbout themselves, about what level of competency they could arrive at in the Team, about the level of risk-taking they would be able to engage in themselves, and to face up to the fact that in many cases even if they had more authority and power, they wouldn't act any differently than they're acting. So, for me, the most transferable of all the things I learned is that by letting individuals struggle together in a working group to find their own leadership and level of competency, you can develop skills of self-acceptance, understanding. It may be that there are other ways to do it in sequenced steps of training, but I don't believe it. There's no way to sequence the events. I would think there's also another category of transferable skills and that's the organizational ones of how you proceed with this, of the kind of interventions which you make at succeeding steps. For example, I see a pattern still in my mind, which I don't think many other people see, to what goes on in a group that we form in this way. In other words, one trainer or one type of trainer doesn't do the whole job. One type of teacher-training doesn't. It takes a combination of these and it takes them being differen-
Initially introduced, matching the state of where a group is with some of the interventions and I don't know of any formula which transfers that knowledge to an outside person of exactly when you do what. It has to come from some kind of an analysis of the group and its relationship to the larger system and attitudes toward itself and what's happening in it.

INVESTIGATOR: If you were to start a new group or a team based on a similar model, what would be the things you would tell them about it now?

TEAM LEADER: First of all, I would encourage them to set short-term objectives and specific objectives by which they would measure their success. I think one of the errors we made in the Team, which was a demoralizing one, was in setting the objective to really be effective in the whole system and to be too large-ranging change agents. Our theory of change, the objective conditions of the times, the resources we had at our disposal, and our own hang-ups in courage was not sufficient to support the big objective we set for ourselves. Therefore, we were doomed to be continually demoralizing ourselves. So the first thing I would say is if you are going to develop a team within an existing school system, or within an existing system now, give some very careful thought as to what the objectives of that team are. In other words, to seeing what its task is and what are really the potentials for affecting change. And, the other thing is to assess carefully what the conditions are in the system around it that are really going to be ones you can't move. I think we tried to move things that nobody could move in the Innovation Team.
(Interview V)

INVESTIGATOR: I am interviewing former Innovation Team members to assess the effectiveness of their training, and, if possible, identify any transferable skills. Can you identify the most rewarding experience or experiences you had while a member of the Team?

MEMBER ONE: You mean the Hygiene factors...(Marlow's Hygiene factors). How much time...what time period are you talking about?


MEMBER ONE: All of them were rewarding. Rewarding in the sense that each experience helped...aided in my evolution into a change agent. Diversity! Many diverse experiences.

MEMBER TWO: What specific experience...The ability to develop as an individual...freedom of movement...peer support?

INVESTIGATOR: You can blow your mind, your answer doesn't have to be in sequence.

MEMBER TWO: Skill refinement..let's see...the Team permitted me to refine some of my skills. Working with the group, but not having to conform. I guess to be able to maintain my individuality was important to me.

MEMBER ONE: In retrospect, that was sure a difficult thing--not working in the entire group, but have individuality...ignore group norms...the cliques.

MEMBER TWO: The initial clique changed.
MEMBER ONE: But, the clique changed.

MEMBER TWO: But as the group matured, the group changed.

MEMBER ONE: It was a clandish clique.

MEMBER TWO: Clan clique? It sure happened.

MEMBER ONE: It was a need...security.

MEMBER TWO: The entire group was formed for the same reasons. If I got my own group, I can defend against anything--like a turtle--leaders...baffoons...a study in itself.

MEMBER ONE: I am longing for a 3-day reunion.

MEMBER TWO: Right.

MEMBER ONE: That's Chapter Five you you (investigator)...with the group planning the sessions and documenting the process.

INVESTIGATOR: Did the Team play a major role in helping you get where you are now?

MEMBER ONE: Yes.

INVESTIGATOR: If so, what part?

MEMBER ONE: The fact is I have freedom to move about...free to choose what kind of exposure...development of skills, utilization of skills...development and utilization of skills and to assess...evaluate my skills as to whether these skills were effective and applicable.
MEMBER TWO: It was an... I was pushed... I don't know... I guess I got to the point when I realized the need to develop my own personal agenda. I knew I couldn't do it in that environment, so I had to retreat for a while.

INVESTIGATOR: Tell me this, could you have done this prior to entering the Team? You said you HAD to retreat?

MEMBER TWO: I am not so sure if it was just the Team or things that were happening the country at that time. I don't know.

INVESTIGATOR: Was there any particular skill that the Team gave you that enable you to do this?

MEMBER TWO: Yeah. The ability to see myself... how big a fool I was...

INVESTIGATOR: Can you identify that skill?

MEMBER TWO: Yeah! But I can't put it into words. I'll have to think about that one.

INVESTIGATOR: Okay, can you identify any skill of skills necessary for a new team, or for the person planning a new team?

MEMBER ONE: Setting goals, objectives... performance objectives, criteria for individuals or groups. The development of a SELF-DESTRUCT MECHANISM.

MEMBER TWO: I can't understand why you would say that.

MEMBER ONE: After a period of time, people become dead weight.
MEMBER TWO: If the self-destruct mechanism worked, people would be somewhere else.

MEMBER ONE: I think back on one of the last meetings of the Team when we were asked to answer; 1) Where you are now? 2) What have you done? 3) Where do you want to go? 4) How are you going to get there? The group manifested behavior that they couldn't handle it. Evidence of that was the joking...laughing...pairing...fight flight...____...You see, I've been reading Bion. That's a perfect example of them. All the manifestations of an immature group.

MEMBER TWO: I saw a mature group.

MEMBER ONE: How________?

MEMBER TWO: Mature in that they depended on each other. When the crisis came...group sent a lot of time on personal stuff...crisis got mature support.

MEMBER ONE: A mature group is goal oriented...work oriented. Whereas they began mitigating against these things.

MEMBER TWO: We're still human.

MEMBER ONE: I am looking at how it handles conflict, etc. I know people aren't robots, but they could handle it.

(At this point, waitress drops glasses of milk off try on Member One)

MEMBER TWO: I was thinking of a way to design a team that would not necessitate a self-
That is a 1 year, 2 year self-destruct mechanism.

Okay, that is a different kind of self-destruct than was used by the Team.

There is a different self-destruct mechanism--suicide...people with goals and can't reach it. I have done it. I have carved out the population which I am going to change. Then I find I cannot do the job. For those who can't, that's it... get farther. I believe in humans...fight... battle.

You know, I feel I would do anything for a Team member right now.

I think the Team was the greatest process for training better teachers for classrooms...better teacher-leaders...leaders. The training was better for training teacher-leaders... a beautiful model for teacher-leaders.

As you know, I am trying to get from a personal perspective your assessment of the experiences you had with the Innovation Team. Can you describe the most rewarding experience you had as a Team member?

Well, the opportunity to learn...all the new materials in the content areas, and the people with whom I came in contact.
INVESTIGATOR: Your statement is synonymous with that of other former members. Is there any one of these that stand out?

MEMBER: No...none that I can put my finger on. Everyday on the Team, I did something I could appreciate.

INVESTIGATOR: Let me ask my second question. What part, if any, did the Innovation Team play in your reaching where you are?

MEMBER: Where am I?...The Team so far actually led to things I am doing now. Like in-service course, visiting schools...the whole idea is a part of what I am doing.

INVESTIGATOR: Does anything we did help make this task managable or easy?

MEMBER: I have done arrays, lattices and games (Mathematics games). Yes, all of the Illinois Mathematic Project materials, University of Maryland Math materials, Senesh Social Studies materials...all help in answering questions about curriculum. I am a resource because people are still asking questions about the work of the Team.

INVESTIGATOR: You are talking about skills and knowledge you are using now which says something to my next question. Can you identify any skill presented by the Team which played a part in your movement?

MEMBER: Still at the same level...doing the workshops and helping teachers.

Workshops...I didn't know about workshops
prior to the Team experience. Part of my function now is to judge a consultant's worth. For example, we have one who can't communicate with teachers. I compare the consultants with the effective consultants I have seen. I use the forms we used for teacher evaluation of workshops. My experiences provided background to which I refer to help consultants in their approach... to make them effective in their performance with our clients.

Many times I interview publishing company consultants and visit their company's home base to become more familiar with their program.

INVESTIGATOR: You have talked about your present task and some of your past experiences. If you had to organize a team now, identify the experience most pertinent to the replication of the model?

MEMBER: The best approach, I think, is to have months of training in management and how to conduct workshops. It is my belief that we were short-changed as people were assembled knowing little about what was wanted and a minimum of time for us find out.

One would hope for a maximum amount of time to allow members to know each other and work together.

Provision for a Group Dynamics trainer should be incorporated in the planning...

Avoid excess of content or academic input... allow ample time for participant to learn how to be a team.

Let teachers teach for you, team observe, and both (new and old) teach together, allowing teacher the dominate role in assessing the lesson. It would be perfectly acceptable to start with "hardware".
INVESTIGATOR: What percent of hardware should be included?

MEMBER: About as much as the Innovation Team started with... The Team started with three programs, but you see, there was a lot of activities dealing with management and organization of materials that preceded the introduction of the hardware. Now we find many pieces on the shelf...

I think of the thin view we had, we were sure everyone needed it... Cuisenaire Rods, Senesh books, etc.

One needs sufficient teaching materials, but not so much that you have stuff being around.

Be sure you have an Education Development Center, but a local agency. Included in this agency should be a business manager, on hand at all times. Our present program ordered in the spring, and it's December and we have received the materials.

INVESTIGATOR: What percent of Innovation Team skills do you use now?

MEMBER: All, except the Spanish input I received.

Looking back, I would provide for a continuum... For new members I would position them 2 or 3 months before the group is to engage in the task.
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ACTIVITIES OF TEAM TO 1969
### ACTIVITIES OF TEAM THROUGH 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Formed</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Model School Adm.</th>
<th>Innovation Team</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>School system at large</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 1968-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 1967-68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 1966-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 1965-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Workshops
- Classroom Follow-up
- Planning Consultation
- Formal Organizational Relationship
- Informal Contact
- Classroom Follow-up by Innovation Team (This equals a quantitative increase in support)
- Workshops Planned by Innovation Team
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GOALS OF THE READING PROGRAM
GOALS OF THE READING PROGRAM

The primary aim in the Model School is to better enable teachers to help their students acquire the reading habit. To do so, the group proposed the following:

1. To clarify new techniques, new procedures, new philosophies in reading (and, consequently, in other subjects), and to provide the necessary materials and in-service education for their successful implementation.

2. To provide and encourage the use of an enriched supply of instructional materials, aides, methods, and training that will better enable the teacher to organize the classroom for individual learning. To help teachers meet and provide for the individual, it is proposed first of all to give them basic support in the following:

a. To assist teachers in more closely diagnosing, evaluating, and recording the specific needs of their students.

b. To assist each teacher in the implementation of a systematic, developmental skills program appropriate to his or her students' level of achievement.

3. Reading is a language act. The skills necessary to its attainment are interrelated with the skills necessary to the other language processes: listening, speaking, writing. As its attainment is largely dependent upon the effective development of the other language processes, it must not be treated as a separate entity, but as it rightfully belongs, integrally interrelated into the total spectrum of the communicative acts: listening, speaking, reading, writing.

In recognition of the above, we plan to encourage and assist all teachers to implement a comprehensive language program. It is also to be pointed out that an approach and an environment appropriate to developing heightened reading skills is one sought for in social studies, science, and math. In accordance with this objective we will:

a. Emphasize the importance of reading in all areas of the curriculum and provide ideas on how to augment its development in the different content areas: social studies, math, science, music, art, and literature.
b. Encourage the use of materials and experiences that will capture the attention of children and that will promote the effective development of language power. This will mean extensive use of films, filmstrips, overhead and opaque projectors, tape recorders, records, listening centers. It will mean bringing into the classroom and the child's life as many real experiences as possible with materials, paint, wood, animals, puzzles, games, science equipment, science experiments, and field trips to build an effective base upon which the language processes can be built.

c. Put strong emphasis upon the language-experience approach which; by means of encouraging children to express their thoughts through a variety of media, painting, drawing, speaking, writing; attempts to bring each child to the understanding that what one thinks about one can talk about; what one talks about can be written; and what is written can be read.

4. An additional objective lies in our intention to encourage the employment of "individualized reading" in which each child is permitted to select his own reading materials and to proceed at his own rate of development. This is an ideal. The employment of this program is to be urged upon those teachers only who possess a fair degree of training, experience, and expertise in the teaching of reading. To be administered properly, the program requires an expertise in classroom and student diagnosis, testing and evaluation. It requires great sensitivity to flexible grouping and a thorough going knowledge of the developmental skills a child must acquire. Though all teachers are to be encouraged to employ a more individualized approach to the teaching of reading, we feel it would be unjust to all concerned to urge the specific employment of 'individualized reading' upon teachers who are insufficiently prepared to meet its requirements.

5. Our final objective is to evolve, out of our experiences in working with the teachers of the Model Schools, a comprehensive plan for a summer reading institute. This is to be based upon the needs and desires of the teachers and will hopefully be gotten together in time to obtain sufficient funding. The institute, it is felt, would serve to provide teachers with the necessary background to meet more
effectively the needs of their students and thus meet our primary aim 'to better enable teachers to help their students acquire the reading habit'.
APPENDIX E

COURSE OUTLINES FOR U.MASS DEGREE PROGRAM

Fall Semester - 1970

Blanchard - Introduction to Educational Administration
Reed - Supervision
Eve - Workshop in Educational Administration
Weinstein - Humanistic Education
Peck - School Personnal Administration
Objectives of the Course

1. To present a broad overview of the field of educational administration

2. To understand concepts that explain why people behave as they do in schools.

3. To examine alternative strategies for developing the human resources of schools.

4. To apply knowledge about organizational behavior and management to the improvement of education.

Texts


Course Outline

1st Session - "Overview"

Overview of course. Introduction to the broad field of educational administration. The relevance of the history of management thought including the scientific management and human relations movements.
2nd Session - "Motivation and Behavior"

Defining motivation and incentive for practical purposes. Hierarchy of Needs - Abraham Maslow. Motivational Research - Physiological Needs, security, affiliation, esteem, prestige, power, self-actualization, competence, achievement, money motive. What do people want from their jobs?

Reading: Hersey and Blanchard, Chapters 1 & 2.

3rd Session - "Motivation or Ability - Teaching Evaluation"

Motivation or ability - how does one tell? The role of coaching and counseling in the improvement of teaching.

Film: Examples of Teaching.

4th Session - "Motivating Environment"


Reading: Hersey and Blanchard, Chapter 3.

Film: "Motivation Through Job Enrichment" - Frederick Herzberg

5th Session - "Leader Behavior"


Reading: Hersey and Blanchard, Chapter 4.

Film: "The Self-Motivated Achiever" - David McClelland

6th Session - "Determining Effectiveness"

Successful vs. Effective leadership. Determinants of Effectiveness - output and intervening variables, short and long term goals. Important situational variables in a leader's environment.

Reading: Hersey and Blanchard, Chapter 5.

Film: "Management of Human Resources" - Rensis Likert
7th Session - "Diagnosing the Situation"

Reading: Hersey and Blanchard, Chapter 6

8th Session - "Decision Analysis: The Foundation of Rational Management"

Reading: Ronald Howard, "Decision Analysis - A Philosophy and Language".
Case: The Slade Company

9th Session - "Where are we in our schools today and where do we want to go? Diagnosis and Prescription"

The role of administrator in a traditional model. Alternatives for school systems and their clients, i.e., differential staffing model. The role of the administrator and administration in a changing school system.
Reading: Kaufman, "Up the Down Stair Case"
Film: "No Reason to Stay"

10th Session - "How do we get there? - Understanding Change"

The levels of change. Unfreezing-change-refreezing - Edgar Schein. Activity-Interaction-Sentiment - George Homans.
Sensitivity Training for Planned Change.
Reading: Articles by Schein, Homans, and Argyris
Film: "Human Nature and Organizational Realities" - Chris Argyris

11th Session - "Participative Management and Change"

Reading: Coch and French Study and Replication(s)
Film: "Men at Work" - A Case Study

12th Session - "Coercive or Reactive Change"

The nature and use of power. The time factor. Relating control to change. Who's in charge here? Who's the enemy? The agony of planned change.
Reading: Machiavelli - The Prince

13th Session - "Individual Change"

Reading: Autobiography of Malcolm X

14th Session - "Organizational Change"

The role of the leader. The nature and importance of communication. External communication. How to break the ineffective cycle.
Reading: Quest - Organizational Change: The Result of Successful Leadership - A Case Study

15th Session - Summary and Review

Film: "Twelve O'Clock High"
(It is assumed that additional areas of supervision, and changes in emphasis, will be made to fit the specific needs of the Innovation Team.)

Readings and other assignments will be detailed later.

1st Session


2nd and 3rd Sessions

Observation of teaching - principles and skills.
   a. Interaction analysis (use of a consultant).
   b. Recording techniques of classroom action; verbal and non-verbal techniques (use of consultant).
   c. How to use video-tape equipment for classroom observation (use of consultant).

Field Work

4th, 5th and 6th Sessions

Analysis of observation data into patterns. Practice in analyzing data, using video and audio tapes (use of consultant). Developing strategies for working with pattern analysis, in preparation for conferences between supervisor and teacher, (use of consultant). Field Work

7th Session

Problems of objectives or goals; specific techniques for identifying, classifying, describing objectives at various levels of abstraction, (use of consultant). Field Work
8th Session

Preobservation Conference and Supervision Conference approaches. Human relation's issues (as introduction - extensive study to be carried out in next semester's course on Human Relations and Humanistic Education). (Use of consultant).

9th Session

Practice in Preobservation Conference. Practice in Supervision Conference. (Using video tapes, role-playing, other simulation techniques). (Use of consultant). Field Work

10th Session

A course emphasizing the following:

1. Study the role of administrators in a differentiated staffing model versus a traditional model and analyze these roles.

2. Role of the administrator and administration in a changing school system.

3. To study and evaluate the development of theory and approaches in contemporary educational administration.

4. Administration as;
   a. Management
   b. Leadership
   c. Problem Solving
   d. Decision-Making
   e. Social Process

5. Techniques of organization and administration of instructional program.
   a. School curriculum (conducting reading seminars—exploration to various approaches to reading and math)
   b. Organization for instruction
   c. Supervision and evaluation (evaluation of techniques of teaching and learning)
   d. Models for teacher training
   e. How to deal with confrontation productively

6. Alternatives for school systems and their clients.

7. How to develop and utilize federal resources, financial and human.

8. How to analyze--critical incident analysis in the school systems.

9. Administration of school finance (covers school bonds, taxes, buying and distributing supplies and equipment; also
accounting systems for finances and materials, statistics).


11. Comparative study of theories and trends in administration and their application in system operations.

12. Principles of administration organization

   a. Nature and use of authority
   b. Organization
   c. Administrative staffing
   d. Democratic administration
   e. Policy making

13. Functional administration

   a. Nature and importance of communication
   b. External communication
   c. Communication with parents

14. How to make a school system more responsive and effective to the clients it serves.

15. Psychological tests and measures

   a. Fundamental principles of testing and critical survey of representative tests of achievement, intelligence, aptitude and personality.
   b. Laboratory practice in administration, scoring, and interpretation of these tests.

Texts


Olivero, James L. and Buffie, Edward G., Educational Manpower--

During the Spring Semester (1971) the following courses will be taught in Washington to the Innovation Team participants.

James Cooper - Designing a Competency Based Teacher Education Program (Education 705, Section 17)

Roger Peck - School Personnel Administration (Education 958)

Gerald Weinstein - Special Seminar in Humanistic Education (Education 835)
EDUCATION 835: SPECIAL SEMINAR IN HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

Gerald Weinstein

This course will provide an introduction and overview of the work currently being done in Humanistic Education. The focus of the course will be on the foundations and theory of Humanistic Education and on experiencing and developing content and processes for dealing with students, teachers and administrators objectively.

The course will be taught by the staff of the Center for Humanistic Education through a series of full-day workshops organized around the following areas:

1. Creative Problem Solving
2. Value Clarification
4. Skill development in such areas as disclosing, listening, inventorying affective responses and giving and getting feedback.

Course readings will include articles and reprints for specific workshops as well as the following texts:

Humanistic Education: Toward a Curriculum of Affect, Gerald Weinstein

Making Urban Schools Work, Mario Fantini and Gerald Weinstein

Now: The Human Dimension, George Brown

Human Teaching for Human Learning, George Brown
This course is designed to help the Innovation Team develop and package teacher training packages to be used with the Washington, D.C. teachers. The course will help the Innovation Team members to clarify objectives, develop alternative instructional routes for the achievement of these objectives, and develop assessment measures for determining whether the objectives have been achieved.

Readings will include:
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