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As a teacher at "Riverfield Junior High School" for five years, I had been aware that our graduates were dissatisfied with the high school they attended, "West Oldham High School." (WOHS) Inevitably I became interested in changing that situation. Any practitioner knows, however, that it is extremely difficult to find acceptable ways of making a helpful intervention in the life of any educational institution, especially a neighboring one. Staff members are often protective of their own practises, and suspicious of "outsiders" whom they do not consider "experts"—an expert being someone more than fifty miles from home.

The problems ordinarily attending any intervention were compounded in this instance by differences in the educational philosophies of Riverfield and West Oldham High School, the former having developed a somewhat controversial but nationally recognized innovative program. To make a successful intervention at WOHS, then, I had to solve these problems and, more important, I needed a theory of action that would guide my efforts.

A generous fellowship from the Ford Foundation enabled me to spend a year on the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts, on a leave of absence kindly granted by the "Oldham" School Committee. Among other learning experiences—many of which have influenced this dissertation—I worked with Dr. Richard T. Coffing in a field trial of
a "Client Needs Analysis Methodology" that he was developing. Coffing's methodology suggested a theoretical approach to solving the expected intervention problems at WOHS.

I saw that a direct client needs analysis could be expected to provide the data, and hence the credibility, that would be needed in an effort to design implementable alternative programs for WOHS. I would play an intermediary role, administering procedures that would help clients define their own needs and create programmatic responses to areas of deficiencies. While that role definition imposed constraints that were occasionally personally irritating, it did form a viable theoretical basis for action in what was to become the "Sharpe House Project." That project was carried out in the second year of my doctoral program, again with the support of a Ford fellowship, and is, of course, the subject of this dissertation.

The methodology for carrying out the project was written with the help of Dr. Coffing, whose unstinting help throughout the project year is acknowledged with gratitude. Professor David S. Flight, the director of the Center for Leadership and Administration and chairman of my committee, supervised my entire doctoral program—including the writing of this document—with sensitivity, wisdom, and wit. I am deeply grateful to him.

I would also like to thank Professor Ann Lieberman for her insightful suggestions, and Dr. Charles E. Brown for his substantive encouragement.
I am indebted, too, to the administration, faculty, and students at West Oldham High School for their cooperation and patience, and to those students who assisted me in carrying out many of the procedures, especially Freddie, Mimi, Stephen, and Richard.

My wife, Mary, nurtured me through many dark hours and helped us both endure the trials of the doctoral program. Helene Cannity deftly and cheerfully transformed the draft into its present form.

With all this help, I remain, of course, responsible for the contents of this study and its deficiencies.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of a high school is to meet the needs of its clients, the teachers and the students and their parents. Many administrators, however, make program decisions without having information about what their clients think they need. Often, the result is client dissatisfaction. A methodology for obtaining and responding to that information appears to be lacking.

Although "West Oldham High School" (WOHS) appears successful in many respects, some evidence suggests that the school is not meeting important needs of at least some of its clients. Alternative programs responding to those needs would seem to provide an answer.

Recognizing that the introduction of new programs in an existing organization can be expected to generate the kinds of problems associated in the literature with organizational change, the author proposed to develop and field test a Methodology that would involve the clients of one of WOHS's three "Houses" in a needs analysis designed to provide data
for their use in making program decisions, a process analogous to the survey-feedback techniques used elsewhere. The proposed Methodology would provide a rational framework for helping WOHS become more responsive to the needs of its clients, and it would facilitate the change process required in the implementation of such programs.

In essence, the Methodology calls for the author to identify the decision-makers, to allocate resources for the project, and to develop, field-test, and redesign two sub-methodologies.

The first of the two sub-methodologies was derived from the "Coffing-Hutchinson Client Needs Analysis Methodology, Draft I." In the present study, selected students and teachers were asked to identify and prioritize categories of their needs, to define, in response to projective hypothetical questions, the most important of those categories in operational language, and finally, to complete a survey designed to measure the prevalence of those specific needs and the extent to which they were being satisfied by existing programs. Parents were asked to complete the first step in that process.

The second sub-methodology called for the formation of a client "planning team." Under the author's leadership, that team used the needs data to write goals for an alternative program that would meet presently un-met needs. Having identified available program resources, the team studied different ways of organizing resources to meet their goals, and finally agreed on two program proposals: a small off-campus alternative school, and a set of program options that could be integrated with the
existing on-campus program.

Although the Methodology was successful in achieving its purpose, the production of alternative program designs, the administrative response to the two proposals suggests that future applicants should be careful in the identification of obstacles (the off-campus proposal was defeated when a site that had seemed to be available could not be secured) and should be certain that administrators' needs for information are considered in the reporting of data and designs (the on-campus options were cut back). As a result of the project, a program of support groups for students and teachers will be implemented in September, 1973. The author saw changes in the information and attitudes of participants in the project, but was unable to report changes in the organization beyond the immediate target of the project.

Finally, the author suggests that application of the Methodology could be useful for program design and evaluation in other secondary school settings, and describes its potential as the basis of a technology for the true decentralization of decision-making in schools.

The Appendix includes all the protocols, survey forms, and reports generated by the Methodology.
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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM AREA AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A high school is a complex social organization interrelated on many levels with the community it serves. In that community it performs many important cultural, economic, and political functions. Primarily, however, it is a human organization. As a system, its major inputs consist of students and teachers, and the human, material, and cultural resources of the community in which it exists. Its outputs, often difficult to measure, include knowledge, skills, and attitudes in student graduates, personal and professional satisfaction in the members of the teaching staff, and useful, productive citizens for the community. Thus it may be argued that the important clients of a high school are the students, the teachers, and the adults in the community; and further, that the programs and processes of the high school should be directed towards satisfying their needs. From this perspective, the purpose of a high school is to meet the needs of its clients; its existence is justified by that purpose.

There is evidence to suggest that high schools are not satisfying some needs of their clients and that programs should be changed if schools are to fulfill their purpose. Evidence of client dissatisfaction is manifest in student drop-out data, student attitude surveys, and theft and vandalism reports. Further evidence can be found in studies and essays by scholars, critics, students, and teachers (see,
for example, Gross and Osterman, 1971). The emergence and rapid
growth of public alternative or "free" schools give additional evi-
dence that some clients are dissatisfied with high schools.

If the purpose of a high school is to meet the needs of its
clients but they are not satisfied, there is reason to believe that
the school should be changed in order to make it more responsive to
what the clients need and want from it. This statement implies two
questions. First, if changes are required in a high school in the
direction suggested, it is essential to know what clients think they
need. How can that information be obtained? And second, how can
that information be used to design or revise programs that will
increase the school's responsiveness to those needs?

Identifying Clients' Needs

The introduction of changes in an organization has many
dimensions -- social, political, technical, and economic -- and in-
volves solving problems of resource allocation, behavior and attitude
modification, goal setting, and so on. Often, one of the important
dimensions of the problem is the absence of specific and focussed
information about the clients' needs as they define them. Knowledge
of those needs is vital if those who make decisions are to formulate
and evaluate high school programs that will show a higher degree of
responsiveness.
This kind of information should therefore be central to efforts at designing or restructuring academic programs, and yet is often difficult to obtain. Needs are attributes of people and can be defined by them, but are not necessarily obvious to either the decision-makers or the clients themselves. While little progress could be expected from program changes based solely on students' needs as defined by the students, often such information is not even looked for in program decisions which are made for administrative convenience or political expediency.

Those charged with responsibility for changing a school may seek information about their clients' needs from various sources. Oddly enough, a traditional source of such information has been people external to the school system. Consultants, experts in one or another specialized field or educational technique are often retained for the purpose of helping local personnel define goals and structure the means of achieving them. Such as it is, their knowledge of what the clients of one school need is typically based on their experience with other clients in other schools. Occasionally, by coincidence, their advice is valid, but as often as not their interpretation of what the clients of a particular school need is inappropriate for or unacceptable to the school community in which they wish to intervene.

Another potential source of needs data is the world of research in education. A local administrator can turn to the universities and
the scholarly journals for information about what has been learned through research — a rich and valuable source. The nature of research, however, often involves the dissection of the total educational process experienced by the students in a school in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of one procedure or program in that setting. In field experiments, it is notoriously difficult to control all the variables in a school setting (Kerlinger, 1964) and therefore it may be risky to generalize from one setting to another. Similar difficulties occur in translating to an actual school setting the results of laboratory studies of researchers interested, for example, in learning theory.

Both kinds of research are only indirectly concerned with the needs of the clients of a particular school in need of change. And even if the local administrator could find out from research sources all he needs to know about what his school's clients need, the task of assembling all the pieces of information from different journals, textbooks, and monographs would overwhelm all but the most atypical administrator.

Some information about client needs, of course, is presently available within a school. The last few years have seen efforts at obtaining client need information in large school systems through decentralization programs stressing a closer relationship between key decision-makers and the schools' clients. In these and other situations, clients have been invited to participate in management advisory boards. Some schools, especially alternative schools, have
attempted to involve clients in democratic decision-making procedures, giving students and teachers and occasionally parents a voice for expressing their needs. Other administrators have used survey techniques such as the "Delphi" procedure to involve clients in future-oriented planning. All of these efforts may be seen as attempts to make schools more responsive to clients' needs.

Unfortunately, these efforts are often more successful in providing clients with a sense of involvement than in providing those who must make program decisions with the direct, broad-based information they need. Client participation in committee meetings often does not result in effective communication, as Argyris (1968) explains in his account of "Interpersonal Barriers to Decision-Making." The students and teachers with the will and the energy to participate in a democratic process are often not representative of the majority of a school's clients, and thus the needs data they can provide are not necessarily reliable.

Even when such information is obtained from within the school, it is often ambiguous. Placing decision-makers in closer proximity to clients may result in more frequent opportunities for observation of client behavior, but, as Coffing (1972) points out,

different clients want different things, and they express themselves in many different ways -- some of which are visible, some not. For a decision-maker, interpreting client behavior can be problematic. Overt client actions such as riot, demonstrations, lobbying campaigns, and bond issue votes tend to compress information into a very few general symbols and slogans. Often the compressed
rhetoric lacks operational meaning for the decision-maker. And the actions and rhetoric can be interpreted in such a variety of ways that it may seem impossible to formulate appropriate organizational responses. The silence of many clients can be equally enigmatic... (p. 6)

Thus, decision-making in high schools is sometimes based on information about clients' needs, but only as interpreted or presumed by administrators under the constraints suggested above. Despite the presence of some of that information in the environment, decision-makers do not have direct access to it because the means of getting it are not ordinarily part of the administrative repertoire of skills. In the experience of the author, most decisions in schools are made without direct reference to the needs of clients. Miles (1967) describes this phenomenon with reference to students, and suggests a solution:

...as the raw material of the organization around which the work flow is presumably organized, children find it hard not to become passive recipients of task accomplishment efforts on the part of teachers and other adults... A major untapped resource in any school is the ideas and reactions of children about the efficacy of the educational procedures in which they are involved. (p. 11)

Indirect methods of identifying clients' needs are often apparently unsuccessful. If school programs are to be responsive to those needs, if students (and teacher and parents) are to be more than "passive recipients of task accomplishment efforts," then it may be concluded that direct analysis of client needs would offer some significant advantages as a basis for designing such programs.

A methodology for analyzing the needs of clients does exist. The "Coffing-Hutchinson Needs Analysis Methodology: Draft I" was developed
by Drs. Richard T. Coffing and Thomas Hutchinson at the University of Massachusetts for the purpose of providing decision-makers with the data they need. Coffing (1973) has further developed these techniques in his dissertation, Identification of Client Demand for Public Services. Although the methodology has been field-tested in various applications, it has not been used in a high school setting, and though presently incompletely developed, it is ready for such use.

Designing Programs Responsive to Needs

If the first problem in making a high school more responsive to its clients' needs is determining what those needs are, a second problem is deciding how to use that information to design responsive programs. That process would logically involve the use of needs data in setting goals and in determining the means for accomplishing those goals.

Ultimately, however, the introduction of new -- or the revision of old -- programs would involve some changes in the organization of the high school, because such alterations would require at the very least administrative flexibility in the allocation of financial, environmental, and human resources, and could well demand changes in patterns of human interaction and leadership. For these reasons, program design should be considered in the context of what is known about the problems of intentional change in organizations. Would the use of a client needs analysis help solve some of those problems?
Edgar Shein (1966) describes the change process in terms of the upsetting of an existing organizational equilibrium and the subsequent restructuring of attitudes and behavior of individuals in the organization. Employing Kurt Lewin's lexicon of change, he states that the process of unfreezing can be viewed as becoming open to certain kinds of information which are actually or potentially available in the environment. The process of changing is the actual assimilation of new information resulting in cognitive redefinition and new personal constructs. These, in turn, form the basis for new attitudes and new behavior. (page 43)

Part of the unfreezing process involves the disconfirmation of an individual's sense of the "fit" between his self-image, his own definition of a situation, and his image of others in the situation. A second part of the unfreezing process is the induction of guilt-anxiety, presumably associated with the disconfirmation of the appropriateness of one's behavior and attitudes in an organizational setting. A third component requires the creation of psychological safety for the individuals through the reduction of threat or psychological barriers so that they can risk the alteration of the stable equilibrium which supports their present behavior and attitudes.

Shein suggests that this unfreezing and change process must occur if new programs are to be implemented. As we shall see, a client needs analysis procedure used with a survey feedback could be expected to facilitate that process.
Information about what teachers and students (and their parents) need is implicit in the school environment, since members of these groups interact with each other daily, but this information is often not available in an explicit form which could be used for decision-making. In many schools, norms of the organization do not at present encourage individuals to be sensitive to or to seek out knowledge of others' needs. (Sarason, 1971) The school focuses on certain areas of presumed need as defined by certain members of the enterprise—primarily administrators; the institutional emphasis on achievement in cognitive areas works against the development of any further sensitivity to needs.

A client needs analysis, however, could be designed to identify some important needs of teachers and students and parents. Obtaining these data would encourage members of the organization to think and talk about their own needs and the needs of others in the organization; this process could serve to heighten awareness of new information among all groups and thus help reduce the barriers established by existing institutional norms. And the kind of information brought out by this process could reasonably be expected to have the "disconfirming" effect, in Shein's terminology, on individuals in the organization, as their "definition of the situation" and their "image of others in the situation" are enlarged by their new knowledge of others' needs.

Unwillingness to recognize information which contradicts their understanding of reality is characteristic of people in organizations. (Katz and Kahn, 1966) In the absence of procedures designed to produce
data that will be valid for the relevant decision-makers, one might predict that many individuals would wish to dismiss or ignore large portions of the data intended for their use. A client need analysis, such as the Coffing-Hutchinson methodology, could be used to produce useful, explicit data that would be valid for those who will use it and recognized by those who will be affected by the development of new programs. Such a methodology, in other words, could be used to help people become open to new information.

Finally, the use of a direct client needs analysis could perhaps help in the creation of the conditions of psychological safety required in the change process as individuals in the organization become conscious of data that they believe and that they think others believe.

It would appear, then, that a direct client needs analysis could be used to produce designs for responsive programming in a high school, and that the process implied by the use of analysis and feedback techniques would facilitate the organizational changes required for the implementation of such programs.

A School in Need of Responsive Programming

West Oldham High School (WOHS) is an example of a high school in need of change, a setting where the use of programming designed in response to a direct analysis of the needs of its clients would seem appropriate.
It is one of two high schools in a relatively affluent suburb of Boston. Oldham's 91,000 inhabitants (in 1970) had a median income of $15,381. Almost three fourths of Oldham's labor force was "white collar;" 44.1% of that force was professional or managerial. The city spent approximately $1400 in 1970 to educate each of the 17,000 students in its public schools.

At WOHS, the pupil-staff ratio was 13.2 to 1. Faculty members had an average of thirteen years experience; 80% had advanced degrees. Four out of five WOHS graduates went on to four year colleges and universities. Organized on a house plan with 500 students in each house, the school had recently developed a number of innovative programs, including technical-vocational studies, an elective curriculum in English, work-study courses, and an open campus policy. By most definitions, WOHS was a successful school in a successful community.

As a teacher in one of the neighboring junior high schools in Oldham, the author had personally observed dissatisfaction among some of the students at WOHS. Discussions with other teachers and with parents held informally over a period of several years tended to reinforce this concern.

Further investigation revealed other symptoms of a need for change at WOHS. In a survey of student opinion at WOHS conducted in May, 1971, (Silluzio, 1971), students expressed unfavorable attitudes toward their school. The same survey had been made every year since 1967, and the score on the "attitude toward school" subtest had declined annually.
Some items from the survey indicated that students felt that the school "has done little to help me to understand myself and my problems," that "the school is [not] genuinely interested in me as an individual," and that they did not "find real enjoyment in [their] school work."

Another hint of the dissatisfaction of some WOHS students came from a junior high school guidance counselor. Reviewing the progress of her school's alumni at WOHS, she was dismayed by the number of students dropping out of school, some in body, others in spirit. Too many students, she felt, were receiving grades that were lower than their previous record of school achievement would have predicted. Her conversations with these students had suggested that they were unhappy with the academic program offered them at WOHS and with the environment in which the program was taking place. Many of the students with whom she was concerned were academically well-skilled and emotionally stable, with previous records of success in school. Other students, either less stable or less well-qualified were experiencing difficulties as well.

These preliminary observations suggested to the author that WOHS was not fully meeting the needs of all its student clients, and that there was a need for more "relevant," more responsive programming. This need existed despite attempts made throughout the school's thirteen year life span to meet it. Attempted changes have been introduced with varying degrees of success by different decision-makers
using different approaches; none of them, however, was based on client need data.

The Oldham School Committee, for example, has attempted to approach the problem of changing WOHS by spending more money to increase the size of the staff and reduce the average teacher "load." In the last five years, the average number of students taught by one teacher has dropped from 130 to 95.

The organizational structure of the school has been a target of efforts to increase the responsiveness of WOHS to what were presumed to be its clients' needs. In fact, the school was designed, in 1959, to accommodate a "House Plan," which decentralized many administrative functions. Plath (1965) points out that the intention of the Superintendent and other planners was to reduce the scale of the organization and thereby build in responsiveness to the needs of the 30 teachers and 500 students in each house. As the evidence presented on the preceding pages suggests, the House Plan was not wholly successful in attaining that goal.

More recently, WOHS administrators decided to adopt an "open campus" policy which allows students to come and go as they wish during "free" blocks. Although this decision was desired and supported by students, it was, again, a response by administrators to presumed, not client-defined needs. One teacher suggested to the author privately with some cynicism that in fact it was not a policy decision at all, but rather the administration's acquiescence to its own inability to enforce the rules on attendance.
Still another area of change at WOHS has been in its curriculum. Decisions made by department chairmen have increased the number of courses offered students in many areas. The English Department has introduced an elective curriculum for juniors and seniors that allows students to choose both courses and teachers. Although the WOHS academic program is primarily "college prep," the school has also seen increases in technical-vocational offerings, including an auto-repair course and several "work-study" opportunities. While these changes appear to meet with the approval of many students and have served to make schooling more palatable for some, the pattern of client dissatisfaction described above persists.

The community has been generally uninvolved in change decisions at WOHS, except through the biennial School Committee elections. The election of 1968 saw a change in the pattern of elite rule (Alpert, 1971), but WOHS was not a target in that election, and has not been directly affected by the change. (see Appendix C.)

Finally, attempts have been made to change WOHS through the introduction of alternative programs, notably the "West Oldham Educational Project" (WO/EP). WO/EP was largely the result of "outside" intervention, formulated by a brilliant group of University theorists and researchers and Oldham administrators. The program they developed was handed to teachers and students for implementation, with little or no input from parents. Although WO/EP was presumably intended to satisfy important unmet needs of WOHS teachers, students, and parents, information about those needs was obtained through extremely indirect
methods, if at all, and it is not clear that these data reflected with sufficient accuracy the needs WO/EP was to satisfy. Furthermore, the data and plans provided by these indirect methods were not necessarily valid for many important decision-makers in the organization (especially those not involved in WO/EP, such as department chairmen and the principal) who were influential in determining the success or failure of the project.

In their analysis of the "protected subculture" strategy for innovation, Smith and Keith (1971) suggest that a program imposed on one part of a complex system should be consistent with the implicit policies and action theories of organization members affected by the program if it is to survive. WO/EP, for example, failed to survive. The author believes that the development of an alternative program, a protected subculture, is an attractive strategy for increasing the responsiveness of a school if the starting point for the design of such a program is a direct identification of the unmet needs of the schools' clients, because a program developed in that way would have a greater likelihood of meeting the criteria proposed by Smith and Keith.

Statement of the Problem

Despite an impressive array of previous change efforts, WOHS has apparently failed to become fully responsive to the needs of its clients. None of the earlier efforts was based on a direct identification of those needs, however, even though the use of such information would appear to
be of central importance to the development and successful implementation of more responsive programming.

The problem addressed by the present study, therefore, was to develop a direct means of finding out what the clients of a suburban high school think they need, and to use the information obtained in that way to design an alternative program that would be more responsive to those needs.

To accomplish the purpose of the study, the author spent eight months at WOHS during the 1972-1973 academic year carrying out the project. Consisting essentially of a field-test and feedback loop, the project methodology was written to foster the development of two sub-methodologies. The first sub-methodology, based on the "Coffing-Hutchinson Needs Analysis Methodology" referred to earlier in this chapter, was intended to produce the client needs data: information about what students and teachers at WOHS think they need. In addition to the data, an expected outcome was the development of this methodology for use in secondary schools.

The second sub-methodology was developed by the author in the context of the project; it was intended to produce a design (or designs) for alternative programming at WOHS, using the data generated by the first sub-methodology. This procedure was written to include client participation; it was expected to produce participant commitment to an implementable plan.
Although the project was not specifically intended to produce or measure changes in the organization, the author hoped to see, as a by-product of the process, some evidence of change in the information and attitudes of the clients that would facilitate the implementation of new program ideas, some evidence, in other words, that the procedure was an effective means of bringing about change in the organization.

In Chapter II, the author will describe the methodology and procedures developed for carrying out the purpose of the project, and the two sub-methodologies used in the analysis of client needs and the design of alternative programming. Chapter III will be an account of the major events of the project, and will include a detailed description of the use of those sub-methodologies. In Chapter IV, the author will analyze and evaluate the project and the methodologies, and will discuss the interaction between the project and the environment in which it took place. Chapter V, finally, will be a consideration of the potential usefulness of the project, and its implications for further research and application.
CHAPTER II
A "methodology" is defined by Hutchinson (1972) as a "systematic, standardized, operational set of rules and procedures for accomplishing a defined purpose." The "defined purpose" of this project was to use directly obtained client needs data in the design of an alternative academic program for some teachers and students (and their parents) at West Oldham High School, West Oldham, Massachusetts, in order to help that enterprise become more responsive to the needs of those clients.

Considerable work on the development of methodologies has recently been done by Hutchinson, Thomann (1973), and Coffing (1971). To draw on that expertise, the author asked Richard T. Coffing to help in writing a methodology for the present project, a set of prescriptive rules and procedures that could eventually be generalized for solving problems of a nature similar to the specific problem stated above.

A methodology for the project was developed, therefore, to accomplish the stated purpose in such a way that failure of any part of the procedure could be identified and corrected on an on-going basis. A feedback loop (consisting of a field-test, evaluation, and redesign component) was intended to make the project methodology internally fail-safe, so that when things went wrong, they could be corrected.

The project methodology was also intended to provide knowledge about the use of directly obtained needs data in the WOHS setting.
so that these procedures could be applied by other interventionists in other settings. Again, the feedback loop provided information about the overall effectiveness of the methodology.

This chapter will describe the steps in the overall project methodology, including rationale, procedures, and a brief account of what was involved in completing each step. Chapter III will discuss what happened when the methodology was applied.

**Methodology: Step One**

The complete methodology is presented in Figure 2-1. The first step calls for the interventionist, the person conducting the project, to

1.0 Identify the enterprise and the relationship of the interventionist to that enterprise.

The enterprise is the organization in which the intervention is to be made. It may be identified in terms of its location, population, and function; it may also be defined in terms of its interaction with its environment, parts of the enterprise not included in the project, and the community it serves. The step implies, of course, that the interventionist has found an enterprise having need of his services.

In many applications, this step may be a matter of elucidating what is obvious, but it is important to know clearly at the outset who and what is -- and isn't -- involved in the project.
FIGURE 2-1

MAIN STEPS OF THE PROJECT METHODOLOGY

1.0 Identify the enterprise and the relationship of the interventionist to that enterprise.

2.0 Identify the persons who have need for program design services with respect to that enterprise. Test the completeness of that list.

3.0 Identify the resources available for the project.

4.0 Develop procedures that will be followed to accomplish the stated purpose.

   4.1 Develop procedures for direct assessment of clients' needs.

   4.2 Develop procedures for design of alternative programming using needs data obtained in 4.1.

5.0 Evaluate project procedures [4.1, 4.2] on a continuing basis.

   5.1 Test logic of procedures.

      5.1.1 Have others critique logic of design.

   5.2 Field test procedures.

      5.2.1 Evaluate application of parts of the procedures under simple, available conditions such that failure of any part can be observed and gaps can be identified.

      5.2.2 Evaluate application of the whole procedure (as it exists in a point in time) under conditions such that the procedure can be observed in terms of whether it actually serves persons identified in 2.0 from their perspective.

      5.2.3 If any part fails or gap is identified, go to step 6.0.

6.0 Revise procedures and/or the purpose.
6.1 Revise.

6.2 Go to 5.0.

6.3 Recycle through 5.0 and 6.0 until the main purpose of the project has been accomplished or until available resources have been exhausted, whichever comes first.

The interventionist's relationship to the enterprise may include an account of the people to whom he is responsible and the role he is to play in the enterprise, as well as his entry in the organization. Again, this step may produce no surprises.

The present project was carried out during the 1972-1973 school year while the author was serving as an administrative intern at West Oldham High School. Responding to an informal proposal from the author, WOHS principal Nathaniel Fox invited him to come to the school for the purpose of carrying out this project as the major task of the internship. As an "administrative assistant," the author was able to participate in the administrative life of the school, attending meetings on every level, thus gaining experience which was useful during the implementation phase of the project.

While the title carried no "position power," it did give the author some legitimacy as an "insider" in the school, access to communications resources (telephone, mimeograph, etc.), and half an office. Because the title involved no responsibilities beyond the conduct of the project, the author was able to devote much of his time familiarizing himself with the school and its workings. He spent 80% of his time at the
school, either working directly on the project or participating in administrative activities which were indirectly related to the project. During the second half of the school year, the author volunteered to teach an English course as a means of gaining greater familiarity with the academic process at WOHS.

It is the author's impression that his role in the school was not clearly defined for the teachers and students. He was associated with the administration, but exactly what he was doing there must have been puzzling to many people. Most would probably have said that he was working on the "Sharpe House Project" without knowing what that actually meant. The author experienced no difficulty owing to the indistinctness of his role definition, however.

WOHS is divided into three "houses," each consisting of approximately 500 students, 35 teachers, two guidance counselors, and a Housemaster. Although the author's ultimate concern was with conditions that were prevalent throughout WOHS, he chose to carry out the project with the students and teachers in only one of the houses, Sharpe House. The three houses are roughly equivalent in their composition; it was decided to perform the project in Sharpe House because, given the existing organization, architecture, and communication network within the school, the available resources were insufficient to conduct the project on a school-wide basis. There was a precedent, moreover, for experimental or alternative programs being developed within individual houses; Sharpe House, for example, had been the site of the West Oldham
Educational Project (WO/EP), an experimental "school within a school" venture. (see Appendix)

Sharpe House resembles the other two houses in the school in that it has approximately equal numbers of tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students whose personal characteristics are similar to the students in the other houses. The student population differs only in that some twenty "problem" students who would otherwise be part of the house participate in an experimental program in another house. Despite the apparent similarity of the houses, however, the project was to be carried out only for one house. No assumption of universality was made, that the results of the needs analysis or the resulting alternative program would necessarily be valid for the rest of the school -- although, as it turned out, students and teachers throughout the school found the proposals attractive.

The faculty population, too, is similar to that of the other houses, although in the author's impression Sharpe House teachers are typically slightly more mature, slightly more conservative than their counterparts in the other houses. Because of a geographical coincidence, all the science teachers are members of Cutler House, as are the P.E. and Home Economics teachers. Art and Music teachers, for example, are members of other houses. The other departments in the school, however, are proportionally represented in Sharpe House.

The house is administered by a housemaster, Ethan Burr, who has nearly forty years' experience in education and who was the administrator
responsible for the WO/EP project. Mr. Burr remembers WO/EP fondly, and would have been glad to see it revived in Sharpe House. He welcomed the new project and the author's participation in the house, perhaps hoping that something like WO/EP would emerge.

Thus step 1.0 established that the author would be dealing with Sharpe House, an administrative unit of WOHS with a definable population. His concern would be the people directly involved in the teaching/learning process in Sharpe House and with people closely associated with the house, in particular the parents of Sharpe House students.

Step Two: Orientation of the Project

The next step requires the interventionist to

2.0 Identify the persons who have need for design services with respect to that enterprise. Test for completeness.

Carrying out this step is important because it provides an orientation for the project by defining who it is that must be satisfied with the results of the process. The project is intended to help someone or some group; this step should clarify who those people are.

The completion of this step is facilitated by the first step. The list of persons having "need for design services" would begin with the primary decision-makers associated with the enterprise, and would include the clients themselves. A test of completeness for this step might involve showing the list of such persons to some of those individuals themselves and asking them whether they can think of anyone omitted from the list.
In the case of the present project, the list began with the clients as defined by the author, the students and the teachers in Sharpe House, and included the students' parents, the House administrator, the school administrators, and school system administrators. Ultimately, the list would include the School Committee and the taxpayers of Oldham, inasmuch as they are concerned with the effectiveness of the educational programs they are paying for.

It may noted, in passing, that the author experienced some difficulty in deciding whether he was working for the decision-making administrators in the school, or for the students and teachers who would be directly involved in the resulting program. To give priority to the former group would have been more appropriate for the political realities in the school, as the author perceived them. The author's commitment to the needs of the clients, however, caused him to give priority to the latter group. This decision was a source of difficulty later in the project; it will be discussed and analyzed at greater length in Chapters III and IV.

Step Three: Resources

The third step of the project methodology calls for the interventionist to

3.0 Identify the resources available for the project.

Required for a project of this nature are such human resources as the time and energy, and expertise of the interventionist and his assistants, if any, and of other individuals in the enterprise potentially
willing to help. Needed material resources include communications facilities (telephone, mimeograph, postage) and the money required to secure these resources. Since the depth and breadth of the project are determined by the resources that are available to carry it out, a careful assessment of these resources is necessary.

Resources available for the "Sharpe House Project" included approximately 80% of the author's time and energy over a seven month period, volunteered help by several students, and communications facilities provided by the school -- local telephoning, mimeographing and supplies, but not postage. No secretarial help was available, which meant that the author had to do all the typing and duplicating for the project, a serious drain on his effectiveness and on the speed with which the project could progress.

**Step Four: The Sub-methodologies**

The heart of the project is the fourth step [of the methodology], in which the interventionist is to

4.0 Develop procedures that will be followed to accomplish the stated purposes.

4.1 Develop procedures for direct assessment of clients' needs.

4.2 Develop procedures for design of alternative programming using needs data obtained in 4.1.

The assessment procedures (4.1) must produce information about the clients' needs that can be used in the design of an alternative program. That information must first of all be stated clearly enough
so that the program designers can agree on what it means. Second, the
data produced must also be valid for the decision-makers; they must
believe it. Third, the data must be pertinent to problems and considera-
tions of program design; important areas of unmet needs must be
identified against which the effectiveness of a new program designed
to meet those needs can be tested.

Procedures for the design phase (4.2) must enable the designer(s)
to utilize existing and available resources for a viable academic
program, seeking an optimal combination of program alternatives. It
must produce a successful design, one which the program clients are
willing to work hard to implement.

The specific procedures developed for the Sharpe House Project
will be described in Chapter III. A brief summary of the results of
steps 4.1 and 4.2 is included here.

The procedures developed for a "direct assessment of clients' needs" were based on the "Coffing-Hutchinson Needs Analysis Methodology,"
(Appendix D) written by Drs. Richard T. Coffing and Thomas Hutchinson of
the University of Massachusetts. That methodology is described in
detail by Coffing (1973) in his dissertation, Identification of Client
Demand for Public Services: Development of a Methodology. Client
demand analysis is intended to provide decision-makers with information
about their clients' needs in ways that meet the criteria described
above. (page 27).
Major steps in the client demand analysis sub-methodology developed for use in the Sharpe House Project provided for the author to:

1.0 Allocate resources for the Analysis.

2.0 Determine the categories of needs that are important to the clients.

3.0 Define those categories in operational terms.

4.0 Measure the operationalized needs in terms of their prevalence and the extent to which they are presently being met.

The planning sub-methodology (4.2) in outline included the following steps:

1.0 Assemble the planning group from client population.

2.0 With planning group, write goals for alternative programming using client needs data obtained in Analysis.

3.0 Determine what resources are currently and potentially available to meet goals.

4.0 Determine what resources are required to meet goals as written.

5.0 Determine limits and requirements for alternative programs.

6.0 Develop alternative program options using what is known about needs, goals, resources, and limits.

7.0 Test feasibility of alternatives.

8.0 Determine best possible combination of program options, the best ways of combining resources to meet needs and goals.
Steps Five and Six: Feedback

The final steps in the methodology for the Sharpe House Project relate to the development of the specific procedures required in steps 4.1 and 4.2. They require the interventionist to

5.0 Evaluate project procedures [4.1, 4.2] on a continuing basis.

5.1 Test logic of procedures.

5.1.1 Have others critique logic of design.

5.2 Field test procedures.

5.2.1 Evaluate application of parts of the procedures under simple, available conditions such that failure of any part can be observed and gaps can be identified.

5.2.2 Evaluate application of the whole procedure (as it exists in a point in time) under conditions such that the procedure can be observed in terms of whether it actually serves persons identified in step 2.0 from their perspective.

5.2.3 In any part fails or any gap is identified, go to step 6.0.

6.0 Revise procedures and/or the purpose.

6.1 Revise.

6.2 Go to 5.0

6.3 Recycle through 5.0 and 6.0 until the main purpose of the project has been accomplished or until available resources have been exhausted, whichever comes first.

These steps comprise the feedback loop mentioned earlier in this chapter. The loop is intended to provide for the correction of deficiencies in a project that is covering new territory, so to speak
in the field. The methodology, it will be noted, deals with evaluation of each part of the Needs Analysis and Planning procedures, and with evaluation of the Project as a whole, as well as evaluation of each procedure.

In the Sharpe House Project, the author asked for critiques of the "logic of the design" from members of the client group and local administrators, and from members of his Dissertation Committee. Parts of the procedures -- interview protocols and survey forms, for example (see Appendix A) -- were tested on individual students and teachers, evaluated, and revised before being administered to larger populations. Through this process, protocols were re-written and one survey form was divided into two sections. A complete account of the functioning of the internal feedback loop is given in Chapter III. Evaluation and analysis of the procedures and of the Project as a whole is provided in Chapter IV.

The final step of the project methodology brings us to the present moment, as it were. It calls for the interventionist to

7.0 Report on process and product and/or implement design.

This document represents the completion of that step.
CHAPTER III
CHAPTER III

NARRATIVE OF THE PROJECT

Introduction

This chapter will recount the events of the project. The narrative is based on the journal kept by the author during the year, and reference will be made to that document throughout the chapter. Because of the participant-observer nature of the documentation and the experiential quality of the project, a first-person narration will be used throughout the chapter, even though such use is unconventional in a dissertation.

As stated in Chapter II, the project was conducted according to an overall methodology that was designed to accomplish the stated purpose of producing designs for alternative programming using directly obtained client needs data. That methodology provided for the development of two sub-methodologies, one that would generate information about the clients' needs (step 4.1), and a second that would result in designs based on that information (step 4.2). The following narrative will therefore describe in detail those two sub-methodologies, including the steps that were followed, an explanation or rationale for each step, and an account of what happened when that step was carried out.

Establishing Relationships

I used the first two weeks of school in September to 'identify the enterprise and my relationship to it' by familiarizing myself with the
operation of the school and meeting as many students, teachers, and administrators as I could. In the belief that the unregimented culture of the school would not favor a highly structured approach, I chose to talk informally with many students, capitalizing on my previous relationships with them as a teacher at Riverfield, to explain to them what I intended to do, and to gain some initial impression on a first-hand basis of the problems and strengths of the school as they experienced it.

At an assembly of Sharpe House students on 14 September, I gave a brief talk, describing the project and indicating in a general way what I hoped to accomplish and how. At that time, I hoped to complete the Needs Analysis by mid-November, and to begin the design of alternative programming by December. I invited students who were interested in helping in the process to meet with me after the assembly; six students did so. Less than half the house was present for the assembly, by the way, despite the fact that attendance was required. This fact may give the reader some insight into my reasons for using what may seem to be roundabout methods of approaching students later in the project.

I was also able to introduce the project to the students through an article in the 11 October edition of the student newspaper, Gnomon. The student who interviewed me for that story showed me the text before it was printed, and I was able to be sure that it came out "right;" the headline, however, may have given a slightly erroneous impression to casual readers: "Lehner Develops 'Free' School."
My introduction to the WOHS staff was conducted in a similar fashion. I spent considerable time in the faculty lounge of Sharpe House, chatting with teachers, explaining the project, and listening to them speak of their experiences in the school. At a Sharpe House faculty meeting on 6 September, I was given an opportunity to address the house staff to describe the project. I was able to visit several classes on an informal basis. The principal introduced me to the entire WOHS staff at the first full faculty meeting.

I met WOHS administrators at their meetings. The housemasters met regularly on Wednesday afternoons, and the "administrative council," consisting of the housemasters and the Department Chairmen, met on Friday afternoons. I began meeting with those two groups regularly to gain familiarity with their modes of operation, as well as to become more familiar to them. As the year wore on, I gradually assumed a more active role in those meetings. I also spent time with individual administrators to explain my role and my intentions.

To gain some perspective on the status of the school in the larger system, I sat in on a number of meetings in the Superintendent's office. On 15 September, I had a ninety minute private meeting with the Superintendent during which he expressed his interest in and support for the project. Significantly, in a speech to Oldham teachers prior to the opening of school, he had advocated the development of "alternatives within" the public school system, arguing the desirability of building into the schools greater flexibility of response to students' needs.
My introduction to the community came at the first meeting of the PTSA (the PTA with students nominally included), at which the principal announced, to my chagrin, that I was attempting to revive the WO/EP project, and mentioned that I had been a teacher at Riverfield. The former statement was misleading, and the latter unfortunate, inasmuch as Riverfield had been a source of considerable controversy in the community. (See Appendix B) I was able, however, to draw on the PTSA later in the year for volunteers in the planning group.

The Needs Analysis

After the two week orientation period, I began the Needs Analysis procedures (Figure 3-1), the first of the two methodologies described in Chapter II, with Step 1.0:

1.0 Allocate Resources for the Needs Analysis.

1.1 Identify the persons for whose decision-making the Needs Analysis will be performed.

1.2 Prioritize these persons.

1.3 Determine the amount of resources available for the design and conduct of the Needs Analysis.

1.4 Allocate the resources among the persons according to the priorities.

The allocation step is important because the Needs Analysis procedure is almost infinitely expandable, allowing the developer to achieve increasingly more complete levels of data. Thus it is necessary to establish priorities at the outset, the limiting factor being the availability of resources to carry out the procedure.
1.0 Allocate Resources for the Needs Analysis

1.1 Identify the persons for whose decision-making the Needs Analysis will be performed.

1.2 Prioritize these persons.

1.3 Determine the amount of resources available for the design conduct of the Needs Analysis.

1.4 Allocate the resources among the persons according to the priorities.

2.0 Determine Need Categories

2.1 For the [next] most important decision-maker, have him identify the categories of persons whose needs are important to the decision-maker.

2.2 Test this list for completeness.

2.3 Have the decision-maker identify the broad categories of need that are important to him.

2.4 Test this list for completeness.

2.5 Have the decision-maker identify the broad categories of persons who should specify the needs to an operational level.

2.6 Test this list for completeness.

2.7 Using the three lists, generate all possible questions in the form "Whose needs (list 1) for what (list 2) according to whom (list 3)."

2.8 Have the decision-maker remove from the list those sentences in which he has no interest.

2.9 Have the decision-maker prioritize the remaining questions.

2.10 If there are more decision-makers for whom steps 2.1 to 2.9 have not been performed, go to step 2.1.
3.0 Define Need Categories

3.1 Allocate the remaining design resources among the sentences, given the priorities among decision-makers and the priorities within decision-makers' lists of sentences.

3.2 Take the [next] most important sentence in the form; clients' needs for what according to the clients.

3.3 Determine the sample size to be used.

3.4 Ask each member of the sample to imagine a situation in which his needs for "x" are being completely fulfilled, and to write down everything he sees in that situation that tells him his needs are being met.

3.5 Assemble the results by breaking down written responses into single statements on an operational level.

4.0 Measure the operationalized needs in terms of their prevalence and the extent to which they are presently being met.

4.1 For each of the need categories under investigation, assemble all of the operational elements from step 3.5 into a survey instrument which asks respondents to indicate which of these elements would be part of a hypothetical situation in which their needs (in that category) were being fully met.

4.2 Determine sample size to be used and draw sample.

4.3 Administer instruments.

Step 1.1 is also critical because the sub-methodology is designed to provide data for making decisions and therefore must be oriented to the concerns of the decision-maker. Because the sub-methodology can provide him with the information he wants, and because he is involved in the process, it is a powerful instrument. Because it is time-consuming,
however, it is vital to know from the start who wants to know what -- who, in other words, the decision-maker is.

Or who the decision-makers are. At this stage in the procedure, I had developed a list of such persons, including students and teachers in Sharpe House, parents of Sharpe House students, administrators in Sharpe House, administrators in WOHS and in the school system, and so on. My assumption at this time was that I would be providing needs data for their decisions regarding alternative programming, in the order of importance listed above. While a methodology for determining and allocating the resources (1.3, 1.4) for the Needs Analysis has recently been developed by Coffing (1973), such procedures were not available to me at that point in the development of the Project; in the absence of such methodology, then, I decided to allocate 80% of available resources (primarily 75% of my own time over a three month period) to the first two categories of decision-makers, Sharpe House students, and 5% to the remaining categories.

Whose Needs for What According to Whom

On this basis, I proceeded to the second step:

2.0 Determine Need Categories

2.1 For the [next] most important decision-maker, have him identify the categories of persons whose needs are important to the decision-maker.

2.2 Test this list for completeness (by showing him other people's lists, etc.).
2.3 Have the decision-maker identify the broad categories of need that are important to him.

2.4 Test this list for completeness.

2.5 Have the decision-maker identify the categories of persons who should specify the needs to an operational level.

2.6 Test this list for completeness.

I began this step by developing a sampling of student "decision-makers." Using an alphabetical list of students in Sharpe House, I selected the name of every tenth student on that list. By this method I obtained a list of 53 students. Since the list was fairly representative of the general student population in terms of neighborhood (using zip code as an indicator) and year of graduation, but unrepresentative in terms of sex (22 boys, 32 girls), I decided to use the list as a source from which I would draw names, deliberately seeking representation by sex as well as age and neighborhood.

I wrote out interview protocols (see Appendix A/1), in which I explained the purpose of the interview, told the student that he was a decision-maker whose opinions on alternative programming I wished to serve, and asked him the questions implied in step 2.0 of the Needs Analysis Methodology:

2.1 Identify the categories of people whose needs are important to you.

2.3 Identify the categories of need that are important to you.

2.5 Identify the categories of persons who should specify the needs to an operational level.
Having field-tested the interview protocols on two students, I then proceeded to invite students from my list to be interviewed, making some minor revisions in the protocol after a few students had been interviewed. Not surprisingly, perhaps, I was experiencing difficulty in explaining to students that they were decision-makers in the process since the decisions they might potentially make must have seemed so remote.

I had used a similar procedure for interviewing selected teacher "decision-makers;" these teachers were quicker to understand that they would potentially be making decisions about alternative programming, but there remained an unresolved conflict.

In dealing with the student decision-makers...it became evident that I would be unable to identify specific decision-makers at this stage of the project, since very few students would be interested in going through the needs analysis process and making decisions on a program that they knew nothing about, using a process that was too abstract for most students to understand anyway. Many of the same problems arise in considering parents and teachers as decision-makers for whom I would provide data. (Journal, 26 September)

I decided, therefore, to revise my strategy. The decision was necessary at this point and had important implications for later stages of the project. These will be analyzed in Chapter IV.

By thinking of myself as the program designer and hence the primary decision-maker, however, I will have to perform only one Needs Analysis [the Methodology provides for a separate Needs Analysis for each decision-maker] and will be using teachers, students, and parents in this phase of the project only for testing the completeness of my thinking. (Journal, 26 September)
The decision helped me re-conceptualize the project; I would be investigating needs of people that were important to me as the decision-maker, and I would be the primary decision-maker in the design process. I would continue to involve "clients" in this stage of the project, consulting them to test the completeness of my thinking. It would not, according to this plan, be necessary to try to identify specific, potential decision-making individuals among the substantial groups of students, teachers, and parents; those individuals would be involved at a later stage,

presumably attracted to the design challenge by the kinds of problems the Needs data will call upon them to solve, and by the fact that their currently unmet needs will have been identified as ones to be met by an alternative program. In other words, they'll know there's something in it for them. (Journal, 26 September)

Finally, I would be able to use the material gathered in interviews during the preceeding week as "tests of completeness" (steps 2.2, 2.4, and 2.6) for my lists of people and needs.

Accordingly, I re-wrote the interview protocols to conform to the decision (see Appendix A/2). I had decided that I was interested in the needs of students, parents, and teachers. Specifically, I wanted to know

---students' needs according to students
---teachers' needs according to teachers
---students' needs according to teachers
---students' needs according to parents
---parents' needs according to parents

I decided, furthermore, that I was most interested in the first two categories of information.
I continued, therefore, to interview students and teachers, focussing the interviews on the categories of needs they considered important. The basic question in the interviews was "What kinds of things that students [or teachers] need do you think we should consider in designing an alternative program?"

After interviewing some 15 students and 8 teachers, I discovered that I was not getting any new information in the interviews, that the subjects were repeating each other. Since further interviews seemed pointless, I collected the material from the interviews and wrote them up in lists; for example, some items on the students' lists were

---getting my schedule the way I wanted it.
---choosing teachers and courses.
---learning things that will help me later in life.

I showed these lists to several teachers and students to test for completeness. Rather than using a random procedure, I chose to show the lists to different individuals whose points of view I knew I wanted included in the process. I asked these people if the list seemed complete to them, and invited them to add anything they felt was missing; several items were added to the lists in this way.

Narrowing the List

The next task was to determine which categories of need were most important from the point of view of the clients.

2.7 Using the three lists, generate all possible questions in the form "Whose needs (list 1) for what (list 2) according to whom (list 3)."
2.8 Have the decision-maker remove from the list those sentences in which he has no interest.

2.9 Have the decision-maker prioritize the remaining questions.

2.10 If there are more decision-makers for whom steps 2.1 to 2.9 have not been performed, go to step 2.1.

The effect of these steps is to provide information about which categories of needs are important for detailed investigation. Step 2.7 generates sentences such as "students' needs for learning according to students." Steps 2.8 and 2.9 reveal which of those sentences are more important than others.

As the primary decision-maker, I wanted these category statements to reflect the concerns of Sharpe House students, teachers, and parents. I had decided the "whose needs" and the "according to whom" parts of step 2.7; the remaining task, therefore, was to determine priorities for the middle element, "needs for want."

The material from the interviews was long and repetitive, and was expressed on different levels of specificity -- some items were quite general while others were very narrow, expressing a unique point of view. One student, for example, wanted "computer-type blackboards in every room." In order to get a priority ranking of need categories, I felt it was necessary to find some way of presenting the material to the clients so that they could sort out what was important. I developed two ways of accomplishing this purpose, which I tried with different groups.
For the teacher group, I studied the interview material and decided on six categories of teachers' needs (according to teachers) and eight categories of students' needs (according to teachers). The teachers' needs categories were

Personal Growth
Self-Determination
Professional Growth
Social and Emotional Support
Success as a Teacher/Professional Fulfillment
Control

In constructing the "Teachers' Needs" prioritization questionnaire (see Appendix A/5) I listed these six categories, and included, following each category, the material derived from the interviews which defined and illustrated the category. Thus, for "Self-Determination," I listed "participation in decision-making in matters that affect my life; control over my own schedule, sharing decisions over allocation of rewards, opportunities; knowing what's possible; a voice in what's going on."

I constructed a similar questionnaire (see Appendix A/7) to determine the most important categories of "Students' Needs According to Teachers." The categories included were: students' needs for

Self-Expression
Basic Skills
Social and Emotional Support
Self-Definition/Identity
Sense of Purpose
Learning
Self-Esteem
Physical Needs
Again, each category was defined by material from the interviews with teachers.

The two prioritization questionnaires were administered at the 19 October Sharpe House faculty meeting. Teachers were asked to "rank the categories in the approximate order of importance as you see it." The results of the survey were tabulated by simply adding up the numerical rankings of each category; the item that received the most first choices (1) had the lowest score and hence the highest priority.

The teachers present at that meeting (approximately 75% of the house staff) felt that their needs fell into the following order of importance:

1. Self-Determination [72]
2. Professional Growth [73]
3. Success as a Teacher/Professional Fulfillment [83]
4. Social and Emotional Support [93]
5. Control [98]
6. Personal Growth [117]

They felt that students needed:

1. Social and Emotional Support [50]
2. Self-Definition/Identity [65]
3. Self-Esteem [85]
4. Sense of Purpose [90]
5. Learning [102]
6. Basic Skills [115]
7. Self-Expression [122]
8. Physical Needs [158]

Because of resource limitations, the results of the second prioritization (students' needs according to teachers) were not developed further, but were kept as reference points in subsequent developments.
The top three categories of teachers' needs were used in the second phase of the Needs Analysis, which I shall describe shortly.

Anticipating that some students would have difficulty in dealing with the general category approach used with the teachers, I developed a different approach for determining which needs categories students considered most important. Instead of presenting them with titles of needs categories, as I did with the teachers, I listed the statements obtained in interviews in unlabeled groups, having eliminated redundancies. I asked students to check each statement that was a need of theirs before picking out the five most important need statements in priority order. Thus, the students were given a questionnaire (see Appendix A/4) that contained items such as

---an adult who knows me well and will help me when I need it.
---to know what it's like when you get out of high school.
---more time with my guidance counselor.
---personal help in choosing and getting into the right college.

These items were part of a group that I had identified as belonging in the "Guidance" category. Other unlabeled categories included Learning and Instruction, Social and Emotional Support, Success, Sense of Purpose, Self-Expression, Physical Needs, and Self-Determination. The form was field-tested on several students before administration.

Using the original list of fifty-four students (every tenth name on the alphabetical list), I got 42 students to participate in the prioritization. I might note at this point that 80% participation in
an exercise such as this, requiring students to come to my office
during a free period, was about as high a degree of involvement as I was
able to attain in West Oldham. Beyond making repeated requests, there
was no pleasant way of compelling a student to fill out the ques-
tionnaire, once he realized that he did not have to do it.

The checks and priority ratings of students' needs (according
to themselves) suggested that the three major categories of needs were

Learning and Instruction
Guidance
Social and Emotional Support

The specific sentences that seemed most important to students
included the following needs:

---teachers who are under less pressure to cover material
and who can explain things I don't understand in class.
---to be able to change teachers without having to change
course levels.
---personal help in choosing and getting into the right
college.
---to be comfortable in class.
---to have school be a learning experience instead of a
factory.

The relative effectiveness of the prioritization techniques used
with teachers and students will be discussed in Chapter IV. Both were
effective in identifying major areas of client needs.

Parents' Needs

I was also interested in determining what kinds of things parents
felt were important. I followed essentially the same procedure I had
used with the teachers, except that the interviews with parents were
conducted via telephone because of logistical difficulties in making direct contact with them. It might have been more convenient to use an existing and accessible parents' group, such as the PTSA, in which case interviews could have been conducted on a large scale at a regular meeting, but I felt that to do so would have biased my sample in favor of leadership types in the community who would be likely to attend such meetings. Even though the sample I did reach by telephone was biased in favor of mothers, and was not in a strict sense a random sample, I was satisfied that it was more representative of the community than could have been obtained through any other technique available to me at that time.

Using the list of students drawn from the alphabetical list, I telephoned twelve parents of students I had interviewed, drawing on my personal knowledge of the students and the sociology of the community to ensure the broadest possible spectrum of opinion. I continued the interviewing until I stopped getting new information; twelve interviews seemed sufficient.

In the interviews (see Appendix A/3), which typically lasted 20 to 30 minutes, I sought to determine what parents thought their children needed from WOHS (categories of students' needs according to parents), and what parents themselves needed with respect to the education of their children (categories of parents' needs according to parents). To test for completeness, I read each parent the items mentioned in previous interviews, asking them to add to their list anything suggested in this way. Then, in order to determine which categories were most important,
I constructed prioritization surveys (see Appendix A/7, A/8) similar to the ones constructed for the teachers, in which I asked parents to "rank the categories in the approximate order of their importance to you." I listed categories suggested by interview data, illustrating each category with examples obtained in interviews.

In administering the prioritization survey, I tried to take advantage of a scheduled "Parents' Night." I invited the parents of the 42 students I had surveyed to "stop by my office" during the evening to pick up the forms, so that I could be sure they understood the directions and the purpose of the survey. Despite my telephoned invitations and assurances that they would come, only ten parents actually did so. I sent the survey forms home with students the next day to those parents who had not picked them up the night before, but in the end, I received responses from only 17 parents. Needless to say, I was disappointed at this poor showing.

Although the sample obtained is not randomly representative, I did receive the opinions of a fairly broad range of parents, and I am including here the results of the survey as a matter of interest. It should be noted that while the results were referred to from time to time in the planning process, they were not used for purposes of decision-making by the Planning Team.

As in the case of the teacher prioritization, the results of the survey were tabulated by adding up the numerical rankings of each category; the item that received the most first choices had the lowest
score and hence the highest priority. Thus, parents felt that they needed:

1. Confidence that my child is receiving adequate academic preparation for college and/or his vocation. [31]
2. Confidence that my child is being prepared socially and emotionally to make sense out of college/vocation. [35]
3. Knowledge that someone at WOHS knows my child, cares about what he/she is doing, and can tell me about it. [51]
4. Guidance and support (help for us). [73]
5. Involvement in school. [80]
6. Sense of order and control. [82]
7. Understanding more precisely how recent changes in our culture require changes in the education of our children. [93]
8. Confidence that my child won't be corrupted in school. [111]

A separate survey form asked parents to prioritize the needs of students, as they perceived them. The parents who replied said that they thought their children needed:

1. Personal guidance. [47]
2. Social and emotional support. [58]
3. Motivation/sense of purpose. [58]
4. Learning and instruction. [63]
5. Self-determination. [73]
6. A broad range of experience in high school. [77]
7. Self-esteem/recognition. [78]
8. Order and supervision. [82]
9. Success. [110]

Defining the Needs

Having determined what kinds of needs students, parents, and teachers considered important, the next step in the Needs Analysis was to define as operationally as possible what those needs were.

3.0 Define Need Categories.

3.1 Allocate the remaining design resources among the sentences, given the priorities among decision-makers and the priorities within decision-makers' lists of sentences.
Because of limitations of time and other resources, I decided to concentrate my efforts on the most important categories of needs of the people I was most interested in, students and teachers. This decision reflected both the realities of the project and the interests I had as the designer of an alternative program. I could, at this point, have decided to concentrate all my resources on investigating six categories of students' needs, or, in the other direction, one or two categories of needs of students, teachers, parents, administrators, and so on. I chose what I saw as the middle way, seeking a reasonably balanced, reasonably profound picture of the needs of the most important participants in an educational enterprise (as I saw it), the students and the teachers, as defined by those participants themselves.

I selected, therefore, the top three categories of students' needs according to students:

---Learning and Instruction
---Guidance
---Social and Emotional Support

and the top three categories of teachers' needs according to teachers:

---Self-Determination
---Professional Growth
---Success as a Teacher/Professional Fulfillment

and proceeded with step three of the Methodology. That step required me to

3.2 Take the [next] most important sentence in the form: clients' needs for want according to the clients.

3.3 Determine the sample size to be used.

3.4 Ask each member of the sample to imagine a situation in which his needs for "x" are being completely
fulfilled, and to write down everything he sees in that situation that tells him his needs are being met.

The procedures for specifying needs within the categories listed above were derived from Coffing's (1971) "Client Demand Analysis Methodology." The primary instrument (3.4) is the hypothetical question. To determine students' needs for learning and instruction, for example, I asked individual students in my sample to

Construct in your mind a hypothetical or imaginary learning situation with people in it, materials, equipment, space, etc. In this situation you are receiving instruction, you are learning, and it's the kind of instruction, the kind of learning that you really need and want.

As you observe this situation in your mind, what are the things that tell you that you are really learning, really receiving the kind of instruction that you need? Write down what you see happening in this situation; try to get as much out of the situation as you can, making your list as complete as possible.

Phrasing of the question varied according to the need category under investigation, but the thrust of the six questions was essentially similar. (See Appendix A/9-A/14)

In the case of the student need categories, I had considered using some of the most popular phrases from the prioritization survey as categories for hypothetical questions. To help me decide, I asked three students to write responses to a hypothetical situation in which they were "enjoying learning," and two others to describe "teachers who are understanding." Comparison of these responses with the results obtained from the more general "learning and instruction" question
(see above) suggested that the more specific questions did not produce data that were more helpful than that produced by the general question; in fact, the general question produced responses that were just as detailed and were more inclusive. In other words, I got more out of the general question, and therefore decided to use those categories which were in a format consistent with the one I would be using with the teacher categories.

To obtain a sample for the hypothetical questions, I used a table of random numbers, drawing names from numbered alphabetical lists of students and teachers. In the case of the student sample, I drew names until I had at least one subject of each sex from each class -- one sophomore boy, one sophomore girl, etc. -- for each of the three questions. I assigned questions to the teacher population so that teachers of different ages, backgrounds, and disciplines would be represented. Neither sampling could be considered strictly random, but because the groups were small (ten students, five teachers for each question) I felt that I could obtain a more unbiased response through a deliberate manipulation of the population for each question than I could through the use of explicitly random procedures.

I invited student subjects to come to my office to write out their answers to the hypothetical questions.

I found that several kids seemed to have difficulty with notion of a hypothetical situation (I used the word "imaginary" to define hypothetical), and others had trouble with the word "guidance," and many had difficulty in following directions. I found I had to spend time individually explaining what was wanted, and that that effort was effective.
One student pointed out sarcastically that WOHS kids are so used to having somebody else know the "right" answer that they're incapable of thinking for themselves, or thinking that thinking for themselves would lead to anything worthwhile. (Journal, 13 November)

The hypothetical questions were given to faculty members in the Faculty Lounge, to be written at their convenience. This procedure allowed me to explain the questions and clear up any misunderstandings. I think I would have preferred to administer the questions to teachers (and students) in one session in a large group, so that their questions could have received uniform answers and so that they could have tested the completeness of their thinking by sharing their responses, one person's ideas stimulating another's. It was not feasible to do so, however, because of the press of teachers' schedules and the lack of available meeting time.

Processing Hypothetical Data

The last part of the "defining" step involves manipulation of the material obtained from the "hypothetical" questions.

3.5 Assemble the results by breaking down written responses into single statements on an operational level.

Thus, when I had received responses from all the students and teachers in my sample, I typed up their scenarios, breaking down the material into single statements that could be presented as a list. In some cases, verb tenses were changed from the conditional to the indicative, and impersonal statements changed to 'first person' so that the items listed would be uniform. One student, for example,
wrote the following description of a hypothetical situation in which her needs for learning and instruction were being fully met:

The situation would be as follows: some person, age not important as long as he was open, enjoyable, and knew something to communicate with others, would spend time with a person or persons, teaching. In many ways it would be Athenian-like [sic]. There would be educational facilities available, but their use not mandatory. Time would be spent in nature discussing botany, geology, compositional English, geometry incorporated with maps and geography, and also time spent on survival and finding one's way by the stars...

Her narrative, which went on for a page and a half, was treated in the following manner:

The person teaching me is open.
The person teaching me is enjoyable.
The person teaching me knows something to communicate with others.
The age of the person teaching me is not important.
The person teaching me spends time with me.
The teaching/learning situation is Athenian-like.
Educational facilities are available.
The use of educational facilities is not mandatory.
We are spending time in nature discussing botany.
We are spending time in nature discussing biology.
...etc.

Since I was unable to gather the respondents together for a "live" test of completeness session, I showed these lists to other teachers and students on an informal basis, asking them whether the lists seemed complete to them, and inviting them to add things they felt were missing. On three occasions, I was able to gather together informally a small group of teachers to discuss the lists. I used a similar procedure with students. All of these were effective in eliciting more items for the lists.
As a further test of completeness of the student list, I referred to the prioritization surveys which consisted, in the student version, of a number of single items that could be added to the "hypothetical" lists. I used my judgment to select out items that had not been written on hypothetical questions and to place these items in the proper needs category. I referred back to the teacher interviews as a second check on the completeness of the teachers' lists.

Defining Parents' Needs

At this point, I found that I had enough resources to see whether I could use the same hypothetical question procedure for defining parents' needs within the limited amount of time available. I wrote out hypothetical questions (see Appendix A/15, A/16) for the first two categories of parents' needs listed on page 51, and sent them home to the parents of 36 randomly selected students. Despite an invitation, in the directions, to telephone me about any questions, and despite a request that the survey be returned within 24 hours, the response was so poor that I decided to abandon the attempt. I received one telephone call from a parent who indicated considerable confusion with the question, and in the end, got back a total of five responses. Follow-up conversations with students suggested that some students had neglected to bring the questions home; others had parents who were busy, on vacation, or in the hospital; and still others evidently had found the question too difficult; three of the responses I did receive indicated considerable caution, a reluctance to write openly about the school their child was attending, presumably in fear
of jeopardizing his success. Clearly, a more comprehensive strategy would be required to obtain a complete response.

Measuring Needs

The final step in the Needs Analysis calls for a measurement of the needs that had been defined through the preceding steps.

4.0 Measure the operationalized needs in terms of their prevalence and the extent to which they are presently being met.

4.1 For each of the need categories under investigation, assemble all of the operational elements from step 3.5 into a survey instrument which asks respondents to indicate which of these elements would be a part of a hypothetical situation in which their needs (in that category) were being fully met.

4.2 Determine sample size to be used and draw sample.

4.3 Administer instrument(s).

To accomplish this step, I constructed three questionnaires: one questionnaire (Appendix A/19) for the faculty members of Sharpe House designed to measure their needs for Self-Determination, Professional Growth, and Success; and two questionnaires (Appendix A/17, A/18) for Sharpe House students, the first to measure their needs for Guidance and for Social and Emotional Support. I had originally written the students' questionnaire as a single instrument aimed at all three categories, but field-testing revealed that it was too long for some students to complete with sustained concentration within a forty minute period, the effective length of one of their "free" blocks. Accordingly, I divided the instrument in two roughly equal parts, and administered
each to a random sample of 60 students. Although this involved twice as many students, I felt that to do otherwise would have jeopardized the validity of the results.

The three questionnaires were similar in format. Each contained an introduction that explained the purpose of the survey. For example, the students were told:

I would like to use this survey to find out whether you're getting what you need as a student at West Oldham High School. In a previous round of interviews with students, I have determined that most of the needs of Sharpe House students fall into three main categories: (a) learning and instruction, (b) guidance, and (c) social and emotional support. The purpose of this survey is to determine exactly what your needs are in each of those three categories.

The instructions called for respondents to hypothesize an ideal situation, and to check off survey items that would be part of that situation; the first student questionnaire, for example, asked students to

...imagine that you are attending a school where you're really learning and getting the kind of instruction that you need and want. In that (imaginary) situation, which of the following things would be happening? Please check all the statements that are a part of your needs for learning and instruction, whether or not they are currently happening at West Oldham.

The body of each questionnaire consisted of the items from the "hypothetical questions" for that category. Because the questionnaires were long and a student's attention span is short, I sought to minimize any bias in the presentation of these items by numbering the items and using a table of random numbers to determine the order in which they appeared on the questionnaire. The first student questionnaire
consisted of 216 items, that had been listed as parts of students' need for learning and instruction.

1. I'm thinking through a book I'm reading.
2. We spend time in the city learning the organization of the city.
3. Students are not competing for grades.
4. I am not dissecting line-by-line books I read (in English).
5. Our curriculum includes Academic subjects, and emphasizes practical usage.

And so on. When respondents had completed the task of checking items that would be present in that hypothetical school situation, they were asked to

...go back over the list you have just completed, and examine each of the items you checked. Some of them are more important to you than others. Please pick out the ten most important parts of your need for learning and instruction, regardless of whether or not they are currently happening for you at WOHS. Put a circle around the numbers of those ten items.

The final step in the questionnaire asked respondents to examine each of the circled items (your most important needs) on your list, and decide whether that item is currently happening for you at WOHS. Then rate each item according to this code, putting the number to the left of the check:

1 -- It's not happening at all.
2 -- It's happening, but there's not enough of it.
3 -- I'm completely satisfied on this item.
4 -- There's too much of it going on, more than I need.

This process yielded information, then, about which of the hypothetical items were most important to respondents, and about the extent to which those needs were being met by the existing program at WOHS, as perceived by the respondents.
Administrating the Questionnaires

Student subjects were obtained by using a table of random numbers to draw students from a numbered alphabetical list. For the purposes of this survey, it was decided that a sample size of 60 to 75 students (out of the House population of 531 students) would be sufficient to generate a representative picture of the entire group. Accordingly, I invited seventy-five students to fill out the first student questionnaire (on Learning and Instruction) and a second sample of seventy-five students to respond to the second questionnaire (on Guidance and on Social and Emotional Support). Rather than attempting to use any existing classes for administering the questionnaires -- there were none available -- I set up a desk in the Commons Room, and asked students to come there during a "free" block to pick up the form. I suggested that they fill it out on the spot, so that I would be able to answer any questions they might have, and in fact most of the students chose to do so. A few insisted that they did not have time in school to fill it out, and they were permitted to take it home. In every case, I read over the instructions with each subject to make certain that he understood what was expected of him. Most students had little difficulty in completing the form in forty minutes or less.

Despite repeated requests and reminders -- some students got as many as seven, and in some cases, a personal request from me -- I was unable to get a complete return on my invitations. The first survey was completed by 58 students; the second by 60. Students who failed to
respond in the face of pleadings and threats recognized that they did not have to do the survey, and felt, apparently, that there was little likelihood that it would be to their advantage to do so. Some may have formed an unfavorable impression of the project, some were perhaps uninterested in change of any kind in the school, some were poor readers overwhelmed by the length of the task, and some may have been skeptical that anything could be done to change the school, an attitude that I found prevalent in the school. For whatever reasons, they simply would not do it.

The questionnaire administered to the faculty was similar to the ones given the students, except that it called for responses in the three need categories since it was not necessary to limit the length of the survey to a 40-minute period, and since I could count on a longer attention span from the adults. There were 90 items under the "Professional Growth" question, 62 under "Self-Determination" and 96 under "Success as a Teacher." The questionnaire was given to the entire teacher population of Sharp House to complete at their convenience; again, it was not feasible to use or call a meeting for this purpose. Although some teachers reported spending two or three hours on the questionnaire, and several indicated some cautiousness in committing their opinions to paper, the response from the faculty group was very good, 30 out of 35 returning the questionnaire.

The questionnaires were tallied by hand with the help of a number of student volunteers. We recorded the number of check marks received
by each item, and the number of priorities ("ten most important") given each item, and finally, recorded and averaged the rating given each item. In this process the only difficulty we encountered was in the evaluating those items that had been given a "four" rating ("There's too much of it going on, more than I need.") in connection with certain negatively phrased items. On the first student questionnaire, for example, the third item was

____3. Students are not competing for grades. 13 (1.2)

Thirteen students (a high percentage) rated the item "1" or "2," indicating that they felt the condition (students not competing) was not present at WOHS, that, in other words, there was too much competition for grades. A few students rated the item "4," however, apparently ignoring the logical effect of the double negative. Since I could not believe that any student would want to claim that there was too little competition in the school, I checked back with two of the students who had given the "4" rating (which I was able to do because all the surveys were numbered) and confirmed my suspicion that they had in fact been confused by the doubling of the negative, and were horrified by the thought that their opinions might be misinterpreted. This problem was discovered early enough in the administration of the questionnaire so that many of the respondents could be forewarned. In those few instances where a "4" rating seemed obviously inappropriate, it was dropped from the average of the rankings.
The Planning Phase

At this point I was ready to begin the development and application of the sub-methodology for producing designs for alternative programming. (Figure 3-2). The strategy had been critiqued (see Project Methodology, step 5.1) by the WOHS principal and the housemaster, and by other concerned individuals, including students and members of my Dissertation Committee.

1.0 Assemble planning group from client population.
   1.1 Report results of Needs Analysis to client groups.
   1.2 Use those results as basis for recruitment.
   1.3 Determine optimal size for group.
   1.4 Select group from volunteers.

Thus the planning phase of the project began with the reporting of the results of the Needs Analysis to the students and the teachers. In the week preceding Christmas vacation, the results of the survey were presented to Sharpe House teachers at their regular monthly faculty meeting (Appendix A/22). Teachers received a report package consisting of a simple account of the top priority items in the major categories of students' and teachers' needs, a "plan of attack" outlining the plans for the design phase of the project (Appendix A/24) and a "response sheet" asking interested teachers to commit some time for participation in the planning effort.

At that faculty meeting, teachers met in small groups to examine and discuss the survey results. The response sheets (Appendix A/23)
indicated widespread interest in the data; twelve teachers stated that they "would like to participate actively in planning a response to the unmet needs identified in the surveys" and that they would be willing to invest some time in that effort.

FIGURE 3-2

1.0 Assemble planning group from client population.
   1.1 Report results of Needs Analysis to client groups.
   1.2 Use those results as basis for recruitment.
   1.3 Determine optimal size for group.
   1.4 Select group from volunteers.

2.0 With planning group, write goals for alternative programming using client needs data.

3.0 Determine what resources are currently and potentially available to meet goals.

4.0 Determine what resources are required to meet goals as written.

5.0 Determine limits and requirements for alternative programs.

6.0 Develop alternative program options using what is known about needs, goals, resources, and limits.

7.0 Test feasibility of alternatives.

8.0 Determine best possible combination of program options, the best ways of combining resources to meet needs and goals.
During that same week, students were invited to pick up copies of the results of the student survey (Appendix A/21). An announcement (Appendix A/20) was made in Sharpe House homerooms; some 60 students came to get the reports, including some students who had not previously participated in the survey. Attached to the report was an invitation to people interested in working to do something about this:

We will form in January a work group to plan an alternative program to meet these unmet needs. If you would like to work with us on this project, please take some time to study the results of the survey, and using this information, try to decide which problems we need to solve. Try to put in your own words the needs an alternative program must meet. We'll be getting together right after vacation. Thanks.

A similar request was sent, in the form of a letter, to the teachers who had indicated interest at the faculty meeting. Parents were not contacted until January (see page 68).

The reports that students and teachers received presented the survey items in each of the six categories that had received the highest number of "priorities," along with the average of the "degree of fulfillment" ratings given those items. The items were arranged in ascending order of fulfillment, the ones with the lowest average coming first. Thus:

---The process of learning is not competitive. 6 (1.0)

The first number after the item indicated the number of students who felt that this was an important part of their need in that category; the second number (in parentheses) was the average of their ratings on the scale:
1 -- It's not happening at WOHS at all.
2 -- It's happening, but there's not enough of it.
3 -- I'm satisfied on this item.
4 -- There's too much of this item.

Thus, for the item given above, six students said that in a (hypothetical) school in which their needs for learning and instruction were being fully met, the process of learning would not be competitive, and that this was among the ten most important aspects of their need for learning and instruction, as they saw it. Finally, in this case, they all agreed that the item "is not happening here at all," a "1" rating -- that, in other words, they felt that the process of learning was competitive at WOHS.

In reviewing the survey results, therefore, prospective planners had information about which needs were considered important, and which of those needs were not being met by the existing program.

**Assembling the Planning Team**

In preparation for the first meeting of the planning team, as it came to be known, I had to solve several problems. First, I had to establish the faculty component, which I did in consultation with Ethan Burr, Sharpe Housemaster, drawing on his knowledge of the individuals. He and I narrowed the list of volunteers down to eight teachers we thought would be desirable members of such a team, seeking to balance the group on such variables as subject matter taught, age, and sex, and seeking, too, a measure of "respectability," that is, we wanted the work of the planning team to be respected by the other teachers
in the house, and we felt that we could help assure that outcome by selecting, insofar as possible, teachers who were admired by their colleagues. We invited those eight to join the planning team, and they accepted. The group included four men and four women, two English teachers and one teacher each from Social Studies, Science, Math, Foreign Language, and Home Economics Departments, and one Guidance Counselor. We also invited four teachers who had been involved in WO/EP to be "consultants" to the project.

A second problem involved finding time for the planning team to meet. Several prospective planners indicated a reluctance to meet in the evening or on weekends, and a variety of commitments made most after-school sessions difficult to schedule. Tuesday afternoons were reserved for Department and other faculty meetings, and were, therefore, a logical choice for planning team meetings. A request was made through the principal to Department Chairmen for the "release" of the eight teachers from departmental commitments so that they could participate in the planning sessions on Tuesday afternoons. Unfortunately, this request was the first direct involvement offered the Department Chairmen in the project, and the phrasing of the request did little to draw them in. In reality, of course, the results of the needs survey and the planning of a response to unmet needs was just as much of concern to them as to other administrators in the school, and understanding this, they were willing to "assign" the teachers to work on the project.
The third problem was completing the student membership of the Planning Team. Students were brought into the team through an organizational meeting held early in January, to which all interested students were invited. From the students who came to that meeting, and from students who had been involved in earlier stages of the project a core of student planners evolved. The formation of the student membership on the Planning Team was a much more casual procedure than was used for the faculty group. It was necessary to limit the size of the faculty group because of the "released" time request and because of limited funds available to hire substitutes for the anticipated all day sessions. No such limitations were placed on the student membership. On the other hand, we wanted students to participate according to their interests in the project. The size and membership of the student component of the Planning Team, therefore, was somewhat fluid for the initial two or three weeks, some students coming for only one or two meetings. A group of ten students did stay with the process, however, participating in most of the meetings and in the all day sessions.

Parents were not recruited for the Planning Team until the meetings had begun, when students and teachers indicated that they wanted parents to join the team. Since it was not feasible to use the kind of self-selection process used with variations with teachers and students, I contacted the president of the PTA, explained what we had done, and what we were proposing to do, and asked him to suggest parents for the team. From the list he gave me, I was able to recruit four mothers —
fathers being generally unavailable during the daytime from parts of the city for the team. No attempt was made to achieve representation of the parent community; to do so would have required more individuals than would have been convenient for planning purposes. Furthermore, it did not seem necessary, inasmuch as the broad perspective had already been achieved in the data with which the team was working.

With the agreement, at the first meeting, on the Monday afternoon for the second meeting time, the arrangements for the planning were complete.

**Setting Goals**

Following the Program Design Methodology, we moved to step 2.0.

1.0 With planning group, write goals for alternative programming using client needs data.

Thus, the Planning Team devoted its first two meetings to a review of the needs data. At the third meeting, as a means of focusing discussion, the team divided into three small groups to begin writing goals in response to the unmet needs, each group attacking one of the major need categories. Using the ideas generated by the groups, I wrote a draft of the goal statements (Appendix A/26) which I brought to the fourth meeting, where, after discussion and revision, the final draft was approved. The speed with which the goal setting process was accomplished will be analyzed in Chapter IV; it is sufficient to note here that it was greatly facilitated by the nature of the data produced...
by the Needs Assessment Methodology. Goals were written for each of the major categories of students' needs; the three categories of teachers' needs were treated as a group.

Resources

3.0 Determine what resources are currently and potentially available to meet goals.

At its fifth meeting, the Planning Team reviewed the kinds of resources that were available to meet the needs of WOHS clientele. This meeting combined steps two and three of the planning strategy, because it invited examination of present programs intended to meet the goals, through a study of resource allocation. The Team identified such human resources as time, academic knowledge and skills, warmth and humanity, personal interests, psychic and physical energy, patience, understanding of individual people, sense of humor and whimsy, ability to communicate, knowledge of the community, knowledge of career explorations, cars, interest, and money -- these resources being possessed, in varying degrees, by teachers, students, parents, guidance counselors, administrators, "experts" in the school system, university students and professors, businessmen, professionals, and others in the community. Material resources included money, building space in WOHS, building space outside WOHS, outdoor space, instructional materials, equipment, furniture, transportation, reproduction equipment, the community (Oldham and beyond), and a cabin leased by the school in New Hampshire.

(Appendix A/27)
4.0 Determine what resources are required to meet goals as written.

With its resource consciousness raised by this task, the Team broke into small groups, and using a worksheet (Appendix A/29), attempted to identify the resources that would be required to accomplish a specific goal, and the resources that were allocated for that goal under the present program. At the sixth meeting, this process was continued, helped somewhat by the use of hypothetical questions asking the planners to imagine a situation in which the goal they were studying was being completely met (Appendix A/28). I had prepared, for this meeting, a new version of the goal statements listing the relevant needs data underneath each goal statement (Appendix A/41). This document showed clearly the relationship between the needs and the goals, and was somewhat helpful in envisioning the kinds of resources that would be involved in meeting that goal.

Exploring Alternatives

5.0 Determine limits and requirements for alternative programs.

6.0 Develop alternative program options using what is known about needs, goals, resources, and limits.

With the examination of goals and resources, the stage was set for the first of the two all-day sessions held by the Planning Team away from WOHS. The purpose of this session was to begin the actual designing of alternative programs. I had defined a program as a way of organizing resources to meet goals, and proposed three models that could serve as
starting points for discussion. The first model involved the entire House as an "alternative house." I suggested that the available resources would include one teacher for every sixteen students; seventeen classrooms and a commons room; some money, as much as was available for the operation of Sharpe House last year; and a guidance counselor for every 200 students.

The second model was a "WO/EP" model, which would involve only a portion of the house and a proportional amount of available resources. The third model involved using existing facilities outside WOHS at the Peabody building where programs for handicapped students are located but where there is space available; this third model was an off-campus alternative school that would, as proposed, accomodate 100 students and five teachers. The Team discussed those models briefly as a large group, then, after half an hour for meditation, broke into groups according model preference.

Two of the three groups formed through this process chose to work on in-school alternatives. One of these two was balanced in its representation of students, teachers, and parents, and that group seemed to be the most productive and most creative of all three groups. The second group consisted almost entirely of adults -- only one student ventured into it -- and that group's proposal was the most conservative, departing the least from the existing program. The third group consisted almost entirely of students; it had the most difficulty in focusing on program ideas. The students spent much of their time discussing their objections to the existing program, and in raising ideas
questions, and criteria for their alternative program. Excited by the possibilities of an off-campus school, their ideas were the most radical and the least specific and concrete of the three groups. Despite their differences, all worked hard and seemed to have some sense of accomplishment by the end of the day.

Volunteers from each group wrote up reports of their work (Appendix A/31, 32, 33) and these were discussed at the eighth meeting. Drawing on the reports and the discussions, I wrote a fourth model (Appendix A/34), which I called a "Guerrilla" plan because its focus was on human interaction, a system of support groups for students and teachers, rather than on a physical environment, a part of a building. This model was introduced at the ninth meeting as part of the process of studying program options.

Combining Program Options

7.0 Test feasibility of alternatives.

8.0 Determine best possible combination of program options, the best way of combining resources to meet needs and goals.

In preparation for the tenth meeting, the second all-day session, I prepared and administered a survey (Appendix A/35) that listed all the program elements that had been identified/proposed to date by the members of the Sharpe House Planning Team; and asked members to rate each item according to whether it was, in their opinion, necessary for meeting the goals of the project, optional but not absolutely essential, or contrary to the goals of the project. Some
of the most popular items (Appendix A/36 included:

Flexible schedule
Flexible credit for different kinds of learning activities
Means for people to get to know each other
Faculty training for working with student groups
"Tutorial" -- individualized instruction.

The all-day session was devoted to an effort at "determining the best possible combination of program options, the best ways of combining resources to meet needs."

After discussion of the survey results, two fairly equivalent groups were formed to plan, if possible, a single program that could be proposed for implementation. Most of the students, however, were committed to an off-campus alternative school model; other students and most of the adults were more interested in the development of an on-campus alternative program. In the afternoon, I proposed a multi-stage plan, which would begin with the introduction of some of the on-campus elements, and later in the year, as the groups consolidated, would bring in more on-campus elements, and finally result in the establishment of an off-campus alternative school. The multi-stage plan was rejected, however, by the Planning Team, in favor of a total commitment to the off-campus model.

As a final compromise, I wrote a proposal for a "two-pronged" plan of action calling for simultaneous and complementary efforts at developing two programs, one off-campus and one on-campus (Appendix A/37). This proposal was discussed and approved at the eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Planning Team, and was the basis for the proposal
presented as a "Progress Report" to the WOHS administrative group on 16 February 1973. The report consisted of (a) a description of the proposed alternative programs, (b) an explanation of how those proposals were devised, and (c) the list of goals with supporting needs data. Parts (a) and (c) of that report are reproduced in the appendix (A/40, 41).

The presentation of the "Progress Report" represented the completion of the planning phase of the project, the sub-methodology intended 'to produce designs for alternative programming.' While the designs described in that report were somewhat sketchy, they represented the output of the methodologies at that point in time. (The 16th of February had been set as the date for the presentation of proposals for new programs to be implemented in September, 1973.)

The school's response to the Progress Report will be discussed in Chapter IV as part of the analysis and evaluation of the project.
CHAPTER IV
CHAPTER IV
EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The "Sharpe House Project" was developed according to the methodology described in Chapter Two. A methodology, it will be recalled, was defined by Hutchinson (1972) as "a systematic, standardized, operational set of rules and procedures for accomplishing a defined purpose." In analyzing the project, therefore, the first consideration must be whether the methodology was successful in producing the desired results. Did the following of those rules and procedures result in the "design of an academic program for teacher and students (and their parents) in Sharpe House at West Oldham High School, using needs data directly obtained from those clients"?

Response to the "Progress Report"

As suggested by the February 16th "Progress Report", the methodology was successful. Goals and program outlines were written for two alternative programs. A second measure of success, however, is the extent to which these designs were implementable, acceptable to the key decision makers in the organization. The "Progress Report" was presented to the Sharpe House faculty; in a survey of teacher response (Appendix A/38), 100% of the teachers who returned the questionnaire (75% of the staff) agreed that "the Sharpe House Project goals are important for us to work toward." Sixty-seven per cent thought that the "Off-Campus Alternative" would be effective in meeting those goals; 83% thought the on-campus options would be effective.
The proposals outlined in the "Progress Report" were also presented, however, to the WOHS administrative group consisting of the Principal, the Administrative Assistant, the Department Chairmen, and the Housemasters. After several meetings of the subject, that group accepted the "Off-Campus Alternative School" proposal, despite the fact that only the broadest outline of a program was offered. One observer commented that the group was able to support that project because it was so far removed from the school itself that it would have little impact or threat to the existing structures. Another equally cynical reading held that the likelihood of success was small enough that the administrators were confident that they could agree to support the project without ever being called upon to deliver on their promise. A more sanguine interpretation of that vote is that the group recognized the validity of the goals and the program and acted on that recognition.

Whatever their motivation, the "Off-Campus Alternative School" was accepted. After considerable effort by a group of dedicated students and teachers, however, the move to establish an off-campus school failed because no site for the school could be found. Two locations that had seemed possible during the planning phase became unavailable when a decision had to be made.

The "On-Campus Program Options" were generally rejected by the administrators, particularly the Department Chairmen. Reasons cited for the rejection included anticipated "numbers" problems: the program
would take up too much teacher time, the program would be too difficult to schedule, etc. The on-campus options were much "closer to home" for the Department Chairmen, and posed a greater likelihood of change in the school organization and in the balance of power held by Department Chairmen, Housemasters, teachers, and students, placing greater responsibility for decision-making and implementation in the hands of individuals in the latter categories. Again, a cynical observer would cite these as the real concerns of the Chairmen in their rejection of the proposal.

The Modified "On-Campus" Proposal

On the assumption that "half a loaf was better than none," it was decided to eliminate the experimental academic program components from the "On-Campus" proposal, and to proceed with the support group plan, since this could be implemented as an "in-house" program, requiring only a decision by the Sharpe Housemaster and teachers and students in the House. The Department Chairmen were in effect by-passed as decision-makers in the implementation of that plan.

The modified "On-Campus" proposal (Appendix A/39) was presented to Sharpe House teachers in writing and at a meeting in mid-March, at which a substantial majority approved it. Briefly, the plan called for the establishment of up to twelve students and one teacher, for the purpose of providing peer guidance and support as called for in the needs assessment and the goals of the Sharpe House Project. In addition, the plan proposed a support group for the faculty members involved in the
student groups, and a training workshop to prepare the teacher/leaders. As of this writing, all phases of that plan are being implemented and a summer workshop for teachers is being held under the financial auspices of the School District.

**Effectiveness of the Needs Analysis**

Tested against the realities of the organization, then, the project methodology can be judged at least partly successful. It should be recalled that steps 5.0 and 6.0 in that methodology were intended to identify those parts of the methodology that were effective and those in need of revision. The analysis which follows will attempt to present what has been learned about the two sub-methodologies—the Needs Analysis (4.1) and the Program Design Methodology (4.2)—as a result of that feedback loop.

The purpose of the Needs Analysis sub-methodology was to provide needs data that could be used in designing alternative programs. On the whole, the methodology appears to have been successful. Using the data obtained through that procedure, the program design group was able to write a set of goals and develop program ideas to implement those goals; the group was able to do so, moreover, in a remarkably short period of time—approximately twenty hours of meeting time over a six-week period.

The accuracy of the analysis was partially confirmed later in the year by spontaneous remarks made by students and teachers in a group process training session that had been set up as part of the implementation program for the On-Campus alternative. In one of the early
sessions, the trainer asked the participants to describe the needs they hoped to meet through the training sessions. It is the author's clear impression that their answers echoed much of the data obtained through the Needs Analysis sub-methodology.

The feedback loop was effective in identifying need for changes at various points in the needs analysis while it was in progress. The measurement survey, for example, was tested out on four students and revised before being administered to the sample group; interview protocols were revised and corrected on an on-going basis. Built into the methodology was a kind of internal self-correction mechanism that allowed the author to adapt the procedures to the specific needs of the clients and the environment. As suggested above, the information produced by this mechanism was useful adapting procedures to such local conditions as the lack of opportunities for large-group student sessions in the daily schedule. Since the specific changes created in this manner were made in response to the WOHS setting, it would not be useful to itemize them here.

The use of a feedback loop in the project methodology also produced information about the effectiveness of parts of the Needs Analysis sub-methodology in the context of the project as a whole. Step 5.2.2 calls for the evaluation of the "application of the whole procedure (as it exists in a point of time) under conditions such that the procedure can be observed in terms of whether it actually serves persons identified in 2.0." Since this information has implications beyond the specific conditions at WOHS, it will be discussed here.
Perhaps the most critical step of the Needs Analysis is the very first: "Identify the persons for whose decision-making the Needs Analysis will be performed." (1.1) The sub-methodology is intended to 'provide data for decision-making,' and many of the steps are written with specific reference to the decision-makers who will use the information. In addition, these same decision-makers are the focus of the project as a strategy for organizational change. The analysis/design process has been described in Chapter I in the context of survey-feedback change strategies and thus is important from the point of view of change theory: clearly, one can hope to affect the attitudes and behaviors only of those individuals to whom the survey data is fed back.

In the context of WOHS, this step posed a dilemma, because the introduction of an alternative program in a school organization as complex as that of WOHS requires that decisions be made by a great many individuals. On one level, the most important decision-makers are those individuals who are potential clients of the alternative program itself—students and teachers. They are concerned not only with the goals and the mechanisms of the program, but also with the question of whether or not to participate in the program once it has been established. On another level, the most important decision-makers are the persons responsible for the administration of the school, because they must decide whether or not to allocate the resources they control to the implementation of the program. At WOHS, the Department Chairmen control such key resources as teachers (they hire the staff in their own departments), teachers' time (they assign teachers to teach the various courses), and
money (they administer the instructional budget). On the third level, the key decision-maker is the person responsible for the design of the alternative program: the author.

Given the limitations in resources available for the project, it was impossible to perform a Needs Analysis for all three categories of decision-makers. Early in the project, the author decided to orient the Needs Analysis for his own decision-making, first of all, and second for use by the potential clients of the resulting program, the teachers and the students. The Needs Analysis was thereby totally oriented to producing data for use in the design phase. While this decision was satisfactory in terms of developing plans for alternative programs, it was less than satisfactory when it came time for the planners to present their designs for implementation. Throughout this report there is evidence to suggest that the Needs Analysis was effective in changing attitudes and behaviors in those to whom it was addressed; it was relatively ineffective, however, in changing attitudes in those not involved in the process, notably the Department Chairmen.

Thus, in identifying "persons for whose decision making the Needs Analysis will be performed," one must keep clearly in mind the purpose of performing the Needs Analysis in the first place. In a program design project, it is necessary to take into consideration the decision-makers who actually will be involved in the implementation of the design if the intended change is to take place; a portion of available resources must be allocated to involve them. (See Step 1.4)
A second problem encountered in the Needs Analysis phase of the project was the timing of the different steps in the process. Again, the resource allocation steps are intended to ensure that enough time is available for the completion of the process; but time requirements are difficult to estimate when one is not thoroughly familiar with the procedure and/or with the environment in which the analysis is being performed. Second, the "feedback loop" may encourage experimentation and revision in the process, steps that improve the procedure and the results, but which also distort the resource allocation estimates.

Both of the above factors caused the author to spend too much time on the second major step in the Analysis, 'determining need categories.' Since resources were limited, this time "came out" of the time available for the conduct of later phases of the Analysis; specifically, it meant that the "Defining" and "Measuring" steps could not be performed for one of the major client groups, the parents of Sharpe House students. While all of the steps listed for the "Determining" phase of the Analysis (2.0) are necessary, prospective analysts should be cautioned against spending too much time in performing them. It is suggested that estimates of time required for each step be made as carefully as possible and adhered to with the utmost self-discipline.

Procedures in the "Defining" phase of the Needs Analysis Methodology were intended to produce specific information about clients' needs in the categories they had requested. As suggested in Chapter Two, the project design requires that this information be "stated clearly enough so that the program designers can agree on what it means." The language
of education can be characterized by its ambiguity: often people can agree on a phrase such as "concern for the individual" or "democratic procedures" without having clearly in mind the behaviors implied by those phrases. The result is that the agreement may dissolve when the language must be translated into action.

Thus the problem in the "defining" phase was to generate information in language that was sufficiently operational to avoid ambiguity. The formulation of the hypothetical questions ("Construct in your mind a hypothetical situation... ") allowed clients to express their needs for "Learning and Instruction", for example, in terms of specific behaviors. This was generally a successful procedure, although some students required a very careful explanation of the task despite simplification of the instructions after field testing.

One difficulty arose, however, when it came to measuring these needs, to determine the extent of agreement. In constructing the measurement survey, it will be recalled, items from the hypothetical questions were reduced to single statements, and in random sequence listed on the questionnaires. These survey items were not equally operational; some were more general, others more specific. For example:

--I'm thinking through a book I'm reading.
--I am enjoying my courses.

When clients, in completing the survey, came to pick out the ten "most important" items, they were naturally drawn to the more general statements, since these included more of their concerns. In other words, clients seemed more likely to agree on the items that were more general.
Although, in my opinion of the author, this does not seem to have been a serious problem in the context of this project, it could conceivably affect the results in other situations.

A second unresolved difficulty stemmed from the apparent redundancy of several items on the measurement questionnaire. These were items that recurred in the answers to the hypothetical questions of the "defining" phase; where the language was even slightly different, the items were included on the survey because the author could not assume responsibility for deciding that such difference did not have significance for the writers. Thus the following closely related items appeared on the "Learning and Instruction" questionnaire (the number in brackets represents the "priorities" received by that item):

13. [3] I am competing only with myself.
48. [16] I do not feel pressured.
204. [0] My friends and I are not scared about getting A's.
207. [7] I do not feel tense.

Several students who completed that questionnaire commented afterwards that there seemed to be a lot of repetition, and indeed the seven sentences above must, in retrospect, have seemed to be identical, spread out as they were over 216 items. The effect of this repetitiveness can be seen when one recalls that students had ten "priorities" to distribute. Would a single statement relating to "feeling pressure" have gathered
all the priorities that were divided among those seven similar items"

A spot check of ten questionnaires showed that those students did distinguish between item 6 and item 48, for example, in that no student gave both items priority. The same holds true for items 3 and 117. But if the questionnaire had listed only item 48, some of the priorities given to item 6 [13] might have been given to item 48, which would have given that item comparatively greater importance.

Because of the method of reporting these results, the ambiguities suggested by this analysis probably had little effect on the outcome of the project. All items (on the Learning and Instruction survey) that received six or more priorities were included on the list presented to decision-makers, and that group did not choose to make close distinctions between an item that received six priorities and one that received twelve; both were assumed relatively important. Nevertheless, potential users of the methodology should be aware of the existence of the problem.

Considering the amount of time and mental effort required to complete the various parts of the Needs Analysis, client cooperation was very good once clients became engaged with the task required of them. Only the administration of the measurement survey posed some problems, but these arose more from the residual apathy that seems to characterize much of the WOHS school culture than from the instrument itself. One hundred and fifty-four students were asked to come to the Sharpe House "Commons Room" to fill out the questionnaire; despite the vigorous campaign described in Chapter III, it was not possible to get more than 80% of those students to do so. Of the delinquent 20%, perhaps one third
were not attending school full time for various reasons. The remainder simply would not do it. Informal interviews with some of these students suggested that several were unwilling to do anything for the school and could not be persuaded that they would be the ultimate beneficiaries of any change resulting from the survey. Others--precise figures are not available--may have been overwhelmed by the amount of reading they believed was involved in completing the survey and therefore sought to avoid it.

The outcome of the survey was not seriously jeopardized, in the opinion of the author, because the sample size was large enough to tolerate that number of non-respondents and because the author was personally able to persuade several potential survey 'drop-outs' to participate in the survey on the strength of his prior relationship with them. But the issue might be more serious if the methodology were to be applied in a school with a higher proportion of poor readers and/or students having a need to defy the "system" through uncooperative behavior, or in which the analyst does not enjoy some measure of trust with the students.

The record of faculty participation in the measurement survey was actually worse than the students; only 70% of the teachers returned useable questionnaires. This may partially be explained by the greater length of the faculty instrument (it will be recalled that the students' questionnaire had been divided into two sections, administered to different sample groups, whereas the teachers' instrument was not). Teachers reported spending up to three hours in completing it, which could plausibly
have discouraged some of the non-respondents. Some claimed to be too busy. Then, too, teachers may have been affected by the same sense of futility articulated by students who said, in effect, "What's the use? Nothing will ever come of this." The teacher survey reveals some mistrust of the school's administration, and that sentiment may have been transferred to the analyst and/or the process. And finally, there may have been some distrust of the motives that might have been attributed to the author's presence in the school, even though some care had been taken in the early stages of the project to explain its purpose and expected outcomes.

A minor but related difficulty stemmed from the failure to assure confidentiality of the information requested of teachers in the measurement survey. While names were not requested, the forms were numbered because the author wished to have a means of determining which surveys had been returned and because he wanted the option of grouping returns by such variables as sex, age, Department, etc. This lack of assurance may have affected the way some teachers responded to the two or three items relating to their response to the administration of the school

---There is no credibility gap between faculty and administration.
---I am teaching in a school administered by competent leaders.

or to the few items that might reflect negatively on the performance or qualifications of untenured teachers

---I am preparing new materials for my classes.
---I am planning a course I am teaching a month in advance.
The information was, of course, confidential, as teachers who asked were quickly assured, and it seems unlikely that any serious distortion resulted from the misunderstanding, but it would definitely be advisable to prevent that question from arising in future applications.

Despite the problems described above, the Needs Analysis did generate useful client needs data.

Evaluating the Planning Phase

The Planning Methodology, as noted above, was also successful in fulfilling its purpose; it produced a design for "a program (or programs) to meet the needs of students, teachers, and parents as identified in the Sharpe House Survey of Student Needs and the Sharpe House Survey of Teacher Needs..." As the purpose implies, the methodology was geared to producing a design, and while no one was interested in a design that could not be implemented, nevertheless implementation was not explicitly stated in the purpose, and in retrospect, steps were omitted that might have made the process more effective. To state this problem differently, the Planning Methodology was open-ended. It assumed that anything was possible within the limits of available resources. While this assumption helped the planners operate in a creative manner, it also laid the group open for disappointment when the realities of the obstacles to their designs became manifest.

Thus, the major weakness in the Planning Methodology was the omission of a step would have provided for the identification of such
obstacles. Had such a step been included after the goals had been written, the group would have been in closer touch with the problem that would have to be solved. For example, the off-campus proposal failed in the implementation phase of the project because no site for the school could be found. The planners had been aware that a site would have to be found, but had proceeded on the assumption that, since there were apparently several possibilities, their only problem would be in deciding which one would be best. As it turned out, none of the possibilities were available. If the group had seen the site as an obstacle early in the process, it would have been alerted to the problem and could have taken steps to make a clear determination in the matter; the group would then have been able to abandon the effort to plan an off-campus program before it had invested so much time and effort and emotional energy in the venture.

The difference between identifying resources and identifying obstacles is one of emphasis rather than substance. Identifying obstacles implies taking a harder look at the problems that must be solved at an early stage in the methodology. The same effect could be achieved by adding to the second step the warning "Be certain that those resources are actually available." The obstacles step, by the way, is derived from a methodology for "purposeful planning" developed by Jack S. Rosenblum (197). The basic steps in his process are:

1. Identify goals.
2. Identify obstacles.
3. Obtain needed information.
4. Identify alternative options.

5. Choose a course of action.

Although the author did not learn of Rosenblum's formulation until the project planning phase was well under way, the Planning Methodology used in the Sharpe House Project was similar to Rosenblum's, with the exception noted above.

One dimension of the interaction between the Methodology and the environment, is described in a confidential memorandum from Dr. Augustus Smythe to the "Central Staff" of the Oldham Public Schools. Smythe is the "District Coordinator of Program" for the schools feeding WOHS; he worked in a supportive role with the author and the Planning Team. In the memorandum, Smythe describes his frustration in assisting the planners find a location for the Off-Campus School, much of which he attributes to the lack of adequate planning and decision-making processes employed by the Central Staff. According to his analysis, the failure of the Off-Campus project could have been prevented by the use of different internal administrative planning strategies.

Smythe also describes another problem in the project Planning Methodology. He points out that throughout the planning phase though the notion of an out-of-school alternative was popular with both students and administration, none of the faculty at the first [all-day] meeting was prepared to spend the day discussing this option, preferring instead to develop plans for an on-campus alternative or a plan which would modify the structure of the entire school.
The February 16 "Progress Report" proposed that details of the Off-Campus school be worked out by the teachers and students who would actually be involved in its operation. But while seven Sharpe House teachers had "indicated an interest in working in such an alternative, yet their commitment [was] tentative and not of a sort that could be characterized as a 'groundswell' of support." (Smythe, 1973) The Superintendent wanted a clear proposal from the teachers before committing a site for the school; the teachers would not plunge in without the site. This created an impasse that could not be circumvented.

Why was the required commitment from faculty members not forthcoming? Part of the answer undoubtedly lies in the climate of WOHS, the feeling referred to above that "you'll never get anything to happen here," the result of a history of failure of the school to enact and/or support innovative projects. Teachers may simply have been pessimistic or cynical in the absence of the kind of support by the administration that would have been manifested by commitment of a site for the Off-campus school. Part of the answer, too, lies in some of the date generated by the Needs Analysis, which demonstrated teachers' concern for professional growth in terms of communication with other professionals. They were able to see how the off-campus school would meet identified students' needs, but may have been dubious about cutting themselves off from the rest of the faculty, even though their needs of such communication were only being partly met by the existing program. They may well have preferred a known evil to an unknown. And still another reason why teachers were less than wholehearted in their commitment may have been a lack of confidence in their ability to deal
effectively with the more open, more unstructured school environment the students said they wanted. For whatever reason, a restructured, obstacle-centered Planning Methodology might have been helpful in preventing the waste of energy.

An informal but important hypothesis advanced by the author prior to initiating the project was that the proposed Needs Analysis and Program Design procedures would facilitate change in the members of the WOHS organization. (See Chapter I) Specifically, the client Needs Analysis was expected to help individuals "unfreeze", become "more open to certain kinds of information...actually or potentially available in the environment." (Shein, 1966) The Planning Methodology would then cause "the actual assimilation of new information resulting in cognitive redefinition and new personal constructs." And finally, "new attitudes and new behaviors" would manifest themselves.

Generally, these expectations were realized, although specific supporting data are not available, nor was the providing of such data a purpose of the project. Perhaps the most convincing evidence that change occurred in the project participants is the outcome of the design process, the goals that the planning team wrote and the programs they proposed to their colleagues and administrators. Although the extent of that change cannot be measured because "pre-test" references are lacking, neither the organization of the school nor the entry behavior of teachers suggested great awareness of, for example, students' needs for social and emotional support, even though in the prioritization survey administered in the "determining" phase, teachers privately gave
clear recognition of students' need for social and emotional support.

One effect of the assessment and the ensuing planning work, then, was to give individual participating teachers an opportunity to express their private beliefs about both students' needs and their own needs, and to explore some of the inadequacies of the existing program with reference to those needs. The significance of this effect can be more clearly understood in the context of a point made by Sarason (1971):

It is important for an understanding of the school culture...that one not assume that the public positions taken by groups within that culture are those held privately by all or most individuals comprising those groups. Many within the school culture question many aspects of programmatic regularities and are willing to consider the universe of alternatives. However, several factors keep this seeking and questioning a private affair. First, there is the untested assumption that few others think in this way. As we have said elsewhere "teaching is a lonely profession" despite the fact that the school is densely populated. Second, existing vehicles for discussion and planning within the school (faculty meetings, teacher-principal contacts, teacher-supervisor contacts, etc.) are based on the principle of avoidance of controversy. Third, at all levels (teacher, principal, administrator) there is the feeling of individual impotence. Fourth, there is acceptance of another untested assumption: That the public will oppose any meaningful or drastic change in existing regularities.

In short, these and other factors seem to allow almost everyone in the culture to act in terms of perceived group norms at the expense of the expression of "deviant" individual thoughts, a situation conducive neither to change nor to job satisfaction... (p. 71)

Comments by teachers and students indicated their recognition and appreciation of the opportunity to confront each others' "private" positions as they had been expressed through the Needs Analysis.
Facilitating Organizational Change

The project was carried out in one part of WOHS, Sharpe House. The Needs Analysis was designed to produce representative needs data for the clients of Sharpe House, and while those data were reported to the entire House staff, only a portion of that group was involved in the planning process. It is doubtful that the project had any immediate impact on the school as a whole—nor was it intended to—although the support group model developed in the project is presently under consideration in another House as a means of working with alienated students. Did the project methodology facilitate organizational change within Sharpe House? Yes: a program was designed and will be implemented next fall; that program will make WOHS more responsive to the needs of its clients—if only slightly.

On another level, the Project Methodology seems to the author to have been effective in fostering organizational development in Sharpe House. Miles (1967) analyzes 'some properties of schools as social systems' and the problems of organizational development in such systems. He suggests four major goals for the change process, which provide a helpful framework for looking at what occurred. In outline, these are his suggestions:

1. Increase internal interdependence and collaboration.
   a. strengthen existing interdependence
   b. equalize power to create power

2. Add adaptation mechanisms and skills.

4. Develop commitment to self-renewal, organizational and personal growth and development.

The existing program in Sharpe House may be characterized by the absence of these goals in the environment. The author observed informally that internal interdependence and collaboration were very low among teachers, students, and administrators. The institution provided very few settings in which individuals had to work together to meet organizational goals. Furthermore, the organization did not provide many opportunities in which members had to talk to each other to make decisions and solve problems that they had in common.

Communication among peers, in addition to providing task coordination, also furnishes emotional and social support to the individual... If there are no problems of task coordination left to a group of peers, the content of their communication can take forms that are irrelevant to and destructive of organizational functioning. (Katz and Kahn, [1966], p. 244)

Even in those settings where the organization did call for people to get together, the level of the communication was low enough that functional interdependence and collaboration remained non-existent. Faculty, department, and house meetings, as well as administrators' meetings, tended to be controlled by the leader of the meeting and tended to be used to disseminate information. Open agendas and a free exchange of ideas, opinions, and feelings were not characteristic of WOHS meetings. These same characteristics describe the relationships observed by the author in the classrooms.

In the absence of effective communication, organizational adaptiveness was at best arthritic. As a social system, WOHS was...
predominantly homeostatic, tending to maintain "an equilibrium by constant adjustment and anticipation...[moving] structure toward becoming more like what it basically is." (Katz and Kahn, p. 67)

The development of the programs of the Sharpe House Project through the use of directly obtained needs data served to counteract these tendencies somewhat, and helped to move a part of the organization toward the goals proposed by Miles. Client members of the organization -- students, teachers, and parents -- helped decide whose needs should be considered in the design of an alternative program, and participated in the definition of what those people need. Members of the organization worked together in considering the data provided and in the design of alternative programs based on those needs data. And as the support group program moved towards implementation, both teachers and students continued to work together in preparation for its adoption.

This process served to "increase interdependence and collaboration" because it brought people together in an examination of each others' needs and in the effort to find new ways of meeting those needs. Members of a social system such as a school depend on each other for the satisfaction of their needs; the awareness and discussion of each others' needs brought this interdependence to light and made it a basis for action.

The Needs Analysis was in itself an adaptation mechanism, since it served to bring people to an awareness of some of the realities of
the existing program. One of the skills of adaptation is the ability to recognize the true nature of one's environment and to plan changes based on those recognitions, and that, of course, seems to have been an important outcome of the Project.

Miles' third point, relating to the use of data-based inquiry (see p. 96), was fulfilled in the project by the data-feedback and discussion process. His fourth point -- the commitment to self-renewal in the organization -- was not achieved. However, the support group model has the potential for making possible such commitment as an outcome of the communication it is intended to facilitate between and among teachers and students.

Unfortunately, the development described above was limited to the parts of Sharpe House -- itself a part of the organization -- that were involved in the Project, even though the needs data had some clear implications for change in the goals of the organization as a whole and in the structures used to achieve those goals. As Katz and Kahn point out,

individual or group change applies only to specific points in organizational space and is more likely to be vitiated by the enduring systemic properties than to change them. (p. 394).

Despite prior recognition by the author of the problem, the Project failed to involve members from different parts of the organization, especially the administrators outside Sharpe House, and therefore failed to gain their understanding and support for the proposed alternative program. Because of the interdependence of organizational
sub-parts, change in one sub-part can generate forces in other parts to produce related modifications, but interdependence can also mean that forces of resistance are mobilized against any alteration in established procedures. (Katz and Kahn, p. 424-425)

Thus the Project was successful in generating change within one part of WOHS, and that change has the potential for generating more change. But the Project was not effective in producing change throughout the organization because of its limited scope. Given greater resources for the Project, however, the author believes that the Methodology could have produced such change.
CHAPTER V
CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH, AND APPLICATIONS

The project described in this dissertation consists of an overall Methodology for designing alternative academic programs using directly obtained client needs data, and two sub-methodologies, one intended to produce the data, and the second to produce the designs. These three procedures have been described in Chapters II and III, and analyzed in Chapter IV. Several questions remain to be answered. First, is the Methodology ready for immediate application by other users? If not, what changes are required? Which parts of the Methodology require further development? Second, what is the potential usefulness of the methodology? Where might the Methodology be applied? And third, what questions requiring further research have been raised by this project?

This Chapter will attempt to deal with these questions, and will conclude with a brief discussion of the implications of the study.

Recommendations for Further Development

The points of weakness in the three procedures used in this project have been discussed in some detail in Chapter IV. Since they form the basis for these recommendations, they will be summarized as part of this discussion, but the reader is referred to the presentation in Chapter IV for a complete understanding of what follows.
Perhaps the central issues in the Project Methodology and in the Needs Analysis Methodology is the question of the identification of decision-makers. Step 2.0 of the Project Methodology requires the interventionist to "identify the persons who have need for design services..." and step 1.1 of the Needs Analysis Methodology requires the identification of "persons for whose decision-making the Needs Analysis will be performed." What is missing at present from both steps is a set of procedures for identifying such persons throughout the power structure of the organization. Such procedures should be developed, in the opinion of the author, to ensure both good designs and successful implementation.

In analyzing the project, the author realized that there were at least two categories of important decision-makers; the clients -- the potential consumers of the alternative programming produced by the Methodology -- and the administrators who control the resources necessary for the implementation of such programming. In an attempt to ensure the development of client-centered programming, the author chose to have program design decisions made by the clients themselves, and therefore oriented the Needs Analysis Methodology for their use. While this orientation was effective in producing apparently responsive designs and was philosophically satisfying to the author, it was costly in terms of the implementation of those designs because the resource-controlling-administrators were not satisfied and were generally unwilling to support them.
To move these methodologies beyond the state of development at the point in time of the Sharpe House Project, then, a potential interventionist will require reliable procedures for identifying both client and administrator decision-makers. If the work is to be performed for the clients, that interventionist will also require a means of presenting the work for decision-making by the administrators; a step, for example, that would determine what kind of information they will need in order to commit the resources they control for implementing new programs. Such a step might well be an abbreviated version of the Needs Analysis Methodology.

Another way of stating this recommendation is to point out that a project such as the one reported here may be successfully rooted at the client level, but if it is not also supported throughout the organizational power structure, it may be pruned, so to speak, before it can come to fruition.

A second recommendation would be for the development of procedures for allocating resources both for the project as a whole and for the Needs Analysis. These procedures should be designed to help the interventionist estimate the kinds and amounts of resources that he will require to carry his work to various levels of completion, and to help him determine the amounts of resources that are actually available for his use. Given that information, he will be able to know beforehand the extent to which he can carry out the project, how much data he will be able to provide for program decision-making. This capability is
important in planning the work, especially in the Needs Analysis which offers so many options, and in establishing reasonable expectations among clients and administrators.

Coffing (1973) has done considerable work in this area, and potential developers of this procedure are referred to his recommendations for "obtaining a service agreement."

The construction of the "measurement" survey is a third area requiring refinement. As described in Chapter IV, procedures should be designed to obtain consistent levels of specificity in that instrument, so that all of the items will be on the same operational level. Also, these procedures should be designed to eliminate apparent redundancy of items on that survey form.

In the Planning Methodology, the author would recommend development and testing of an "obstacles" step, one which would identify barriers to goal achievement early in the planning process. The addition of this step, along with the first two recommendations above, will serve to assure the production of designs that would have a higher probability of being completely implemented than did the Sharpe House Project.

On a more general level, the Project Methodology could be improved by the refinement of the major steps so that they could be carried out in a speedier, more efficient fashion. This can be accomplished partly in adapting the Methodology to the particular environment in ways that make good use of existing and potential channels of communication. As noted in Chapters III and IV, many of the steps, such as the hypothetical
questions of the "Determining" step and the measurement survey, were somewhat cumbersome in their administration, and could have been facilitated by the use of large group sessions.

Although perhaps impossible, it would also be desirable, in the opinion of the author, to find ways of making the entire process -- especially the Needs Analysis -- less complex and less time-consuming without sacrificing any of its direct, operational qualities. One way of implementing this recommendation might be through use of computerized data processing techniques in the "Determine" and in the "measuring" steps of the Needs Analysis. If such means were employed, they could open up the possibilities of on-going measurement of client needs to assist administrative decision-makers in assessing the effectiveness of new programs as well as changes in the needs on which those programs are based. While it would clearly be an enormous task, such a development could be the foundation of a new, truly responsive approach to the management of educational and other public service organizations.

Recommendations for Application

The preceding section describes some points in the Methodology requiring further development. With these in mind, it might be useful to examine some of the settings in which the Methodology used in the Sharpe House Project might be applied. The amount of development and modification would vary with the setting, and will not be discussed in this section.
Chapter I asked, "How does one go about making a high school more responsive to the needs of its clients?" The procedures developed for this project appear to offer one answer to that question; in their present state of development, they were at least partially successful at WOHS. The author can find nothing to suggest that these procedures would not be effective in other high school settings. Because the Methodology calls for the would-be change agent to get his information from the clients themselves, the process can adapt itself to the requirements of local circumstances. The effectiveness of the procedure is in the opinion of the author, independent of pre-existing conditions, enabling the user to work with clients "where they are." The methodology does not appear to be restricted to situations where the clients are dissatisfied, although the promise of improvement is undoubtedly a motivating factor for clients faced with lengthy interviews and questionnaires.

The Needs Analysis functioned effectively at WOHS as a diagnostic instrument, as a means of identifying existing problems or weaknesses. In the context of the project, the Planning Methodology translated the results of the diagnosis into action. Furthermore, the procedure was designed to minimize the effect of the user's values and preconceptions on the outcome, a factor which increases its attractiveness and its validity for other high school settings and other users.

In applying one methodology to other high school settings, the role of the interventionist/change agent is, of course, important. The
methodology provides a set of procedures; the ease with which they can be carried out depends to some extent of the personal skills of the interventionist, and on his ability to use the feedback loop to make needed adjustments. In the case of the "Sharpe House Project," the author was fortunate in that he had established positive relationships with some students prior to initiating the project, enjoying a favorable reputation as a result of his work at Riverfield Junior High. His entry to WOHS and some of the initial phases of the project were facilitated by these factors. The author was not, however, an "insider" at WOHS; he had never worked there prior to the project. Bennis (1966) points out that

...the insider possesses the intimate knowledge of the client-system...that the external change agent lacks. In addition, the internal change-agent does not generate the suspicion and mistrust that the outsider often does. His acceptance and credibility are guaranteed, it is argued, by his organizational status.

On the other hand, Bennis continues,

...a skilled outsider-consultant can provide the perspective, detachment, and energy so necessary to effect a true alteration of existing patterns. (p. 115)

To some extent, then, the author's role incorporated something of both options. It is his conviction, however, that initial advantages attached to either the "insider" or "outsider" change agent would soon disappear, outweighed by other criteria, the most important of which are personal skills.

Perhaps the heaviest demand on the personal skills of the interventionist could be expected in the second half of the project, the Planning Phase. Here, much work must be done by the planning team,
and an interventionist lacking group leadership skills would be better off assigning the leadership role to someone possessing those qualifications. In sum, then, while the interventionist's role is important in determining the success of the methodology, the qualifications are not overwhelming, and should not, in the author's judgement, deter potential users.

One possible application of the Project methodology, then, would be a suburban high school like WOHS, where change and growth are desired in the overall program. The potential user in such a situation might be an "insider" like the principal or an assistant, or an "outsider," a consultant working for the principal. Adapting the Methodology to meet the decision-making needs of the chief administrator in the school would require little modification. It could be anticipated that the use of the Methodology in this context would produce an assessment of existing programming as well as designs for revising such programming in the direction of greater responsiveness to client needs. The use of the Methodology could also be expected to improve the organizational climate when applied on a school-wide basis. This point will be discussed later in this chapter.

A second possible application of the Methodology would be in a part of a high school like WOHS. The Sharpe House Project was an example of this use, as it was intended to produce an alternative program originating in one part of the school. But the author was able to observe other parts of WOHS where a similar methodology could be usefully applied. The English Department, for example, operates an "elective"
program for juniors and seniors that requires construction of a course catalogue twice a year. At present, this task is accomplished by English teachers without any formal input from students and parents. The teachers, apparently, construct and offer courses on the basis of what they believe students need and want; these "data" are obtained haphazardly, if at all. The validity of the teachers' decisions is only indirectly confirmed through the marketplace mechanism of course registration. Many students, in fact, are denied even this medium of expressing their needs when the course they would like to take is filled and they must settle for a second or third choice.

The Needs Analysis/Program Design Methodology, however, would provide a more reliable basis for operating an English curriculum intended to be responsive to the needs of students. The assessment of student needs could include information directly obtained from the primary clients themselves and from other sources that would have concerns or useful perspectives, such as parents, prospective employers, college instructors, etc. Client participation in program design -- English courses -- could be expected to further insure the responsiveness of the curriculum.

Out of curiosity, the author discussed the Methodology informally with several members of the WOHS English Department and confirmed his analysis of the problem; there is, apparently, a need for data-based decision-making in that area. The teachers agreed that the use of the Methodology would indeed be potentially useful.
The Methodology would also be useful in other parts of a high school; again, at WOHS, the author observed the efforts by members of departmental "Curriculum Review Boards" to evaluate and recommend changes in the programs of the various departments. Although these Boards are composed of students, teachers, and parents, the membership is effectively (though not intentionally) restricted to those students and parents with the self-confidence and commitment to participate in long meetings. As such individuals are atypical in the school, the data they can provide from their own experience can hardly be expected to be valid for effective decision-making. The Needs Analysis Methodology, however, could be used by such groups to obtain broadly based data which they could, in turn, use in their recommendations for modifying existing academic programs and for creating new programs.

The applications described above have been high school settings like WOHS. The author assumes that similar procedures could be effective in post-secondary school settings, such as two or four year colleges, with all or part of such institutions as the focus of the Methodology. Other settings may be more problematic, possibly requiring modifications. For example, would these procedures be useful in urban or rural high schools with high proportions of alienated and/or non-verbal students? Would younger, less mature students be able to cope with the demands of the hypothetical questions in the "Defining" step or the extended effort required in completing a Measurement survey such as the one used the Sharpe House Project?
The author is not prepared to predict the answers to these questions. The Project Methodology does, however, provide in steps 5.0 and 6.0 the means of field testing and adapting procedures to local requirements and it might therefore be possible to develop ways of applying them in settings different from that of the present study.

Finally, the Methodology may well have non-school applications that the author is not aware of. These are, however, well beyond the scope of this chapter.

Recommendations for Research

The present study has been, in effect, an account of a field trial of a set of procedures. Several questions have been raised in the course of that trial that would merit, in the opinion of the author, further research and study.

In Chapters I and IV, the author suggested that one outcome of the Methodology might be changes in the organization. Specifically, the procedures employed could be expected to alter existing patterns of communication in the "target" population, thereby stimulating new understandings in project participants. Acquisition of new information could in turn lead to new attitudes and behaviors. While changes of this kind were of concern to the author, the project was not designed to measure them.

Thus, an important area for research would be the relationship between the kinds of procedures employed in the Sharpe House Project
and changes in the attitudes and behaviors of the participants in such a venture. Investigation of that hypothesized relationship might use instruments for measuring changes in organizational climate as a means of assessing the effectiveness of the Methodology.

It would not, of course, be possible to do a "post-hoc" study on the participants in the study reported here; a study including pre- and post-testing would have to be specially designed. Such a study might also explore a second area for research, the question of resistance to change in an organization such as WOHS. Is resistance to organizational change a necessary condition, a "given?" Are there situational factors that influence the degree of resistance among members of changing organization?

Throughout the Sharpe House Project, different individuals exhibited resisting behavior. The planning of the project anticipated such behavior to some extent; it was hoped that the methodology would reduce resistance to change through involving large numbers of individuals in a survey feedback process. Through that means, they would presumably be sharing their "private" positions, in Sarason's (1971) terminology, and discovering that others shared their views.

The results of the project suggest that those members of the organization who participated in the survey-feedback process were more open to change, and that those outside the process were more resistant, but clearly further investigation would be required to explore fully the dimensions of resistance as it relates to such variables as organizational health, hierarchy, and leadership.
Finally, a third, somewhat narrower area for research would be an evaluation over an extended period of the effectiveness of the project methodology. How long will the alternative program that emerged from the project survive? How well will it meet the needs of its clients? Will any of the other ideas generated through the methodology come to fruition? The answers to these questions are important to a complete understanding of the usefulness of the methodology, particularly in a comparison to other approaches to the design of alternative programming.

Some Implications of the Study

From a broad perspective, the present study has some interesting implications for the development and administration of alternative programming.

First, the Sharpe House Project methodology appears to provide another option for generating alternative programs and schools. Alternative schools typically have grown "organically" in reaction to painful political or pedagogical situations (Graubard, 1972; Kozol, 1972; Moore, 1972). Planned in anger and thriving on rebellion, their life expectancy has been poor and their scope limited. The methodology reported here implies the availability of a more rational source of plans for alternative programs having a more positive orientation and, perhaps, fewer growing pains. The methodology seems to offer a non-stress starting point; since it does not require utter despair on the part of clients, it therefore offers the potential for meeting the needs of a broader spectrum of clients.
Second, as suggested earlier in this chapter (page 106), the project suggests an alternative route to the decentralization of school administration. The creation of smaller units of administration, as exemplified in the House Plan at West Oldham High School, does not appear to meet clients' needs for decentralized decision-making and responsive programming, at least as identified in Needs Analysis. The involvement of large numbers of clients in the needs analysis and program planning procedures, however, could well provide the basis for a new technology for client-centered decision-making. The methodology could provide, in other words, a mechanism for the expression of clients' needs and preferences, which is, after all, a major goal of decentralizing the administration of a school.

In similar vein, the project methodology could offer new options in developing accountability in program design. The needs identified through these procedures were specified, for the most part, in operational language. Evaluation of the project and of others so developed could be based on the development of simple techniques for observing whether the specified behaviors are in fact taking place. Accountability can be ensured because the evaluative criteria are "built in" to the design.

Finally, from a personal point of view, the author feels that the project has important implications for the training of administrators. As a format for an administrative internship, the project
described in this dissertation has the potential for widespread application in graduate programs intended to prepare future school administrators to understand and meet the needs of the clients of our schools.
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APPENDIX A/1

STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL, NEEDS ANALYSIS DETERMINING PHASE
(Original Version)

INTERVIEWER: I would like to design a new alternative school program for kids in Sharpe House, one that will give people what they need. Right now, I'm trying to find out what people around here need, so that we can design the program to meet those needs.

First of all, I want to find out what kind of information I should provide for the people who are going to be making important decisions about the alternative program. Along with other students and teachers in Sharpe House, you are an important decision-maker, because you will help decide what kind of alternative program we need, and you'll decide whether you want to take part in it -- so I'm going to ask you what kind of information you need to make those decisions.

This is the first step in the process, and if it's all right, I'll be coming back to you with a few more questions later on.

Now, as a decision-maker in this process, whose needs do you think we should consider? What categories of people are important to you?
Second, what kinds of things that people need do you think we should consider? What categories of need are important to you?

Third, you've listed some general categories of needs; now tell me who are the people that should spell out exactly what the needs are in each of those categories? Who are the people, in your opinion, who could tell us what the specific needs are in each category?
INTERVIEWER: I would like to design a new alternative school program for kids in Sharpe House, the kind of school that will give people what they need. Right now, I'm trying to find out what people around here need, so that we can design the program to meet those needs. You can help me by answering a few questions now, and, if it's all right, a few questions later on.

First, whose needs do you think we should consider in thinking about a new kind of school? What categories of people are important to you?

Second, what are some of the kinds of things that people need that you think we should consider?

You've listed some general categories of needs; now tell me whom we should go to to find out exactly what the needs are in each of those categories? Who are the people, in your opinion, who could tell us what the specific needs are in each category?
APPENDIX A/3

PARENT TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL, NEEDS ANALYSIS
DETERMINING PHASE

Telephone Protocol for Initial Parent Contacts:

INTERVIEWER: Hello, is this Mr./Mrs. ________? This is Andy Lehner calling from West Oldham High School. I'm conducting an educational survey relating to the school, and I'd like to ask you for a few minutes of your time. Is that all right?

What I'm trying to do is design an alternative school program that will meet the needs of teachers, students, and parents -- needs that are not being met by the regular program. The first thing I want to do is to figure out what kinds of things people around here need, and I think its especially important to take the needs of the parents into account. Does that make sense so far?

Good. Now, the first question I want to ask is this: As you think about (child's name) education at West Oldham High School, what needs do you think (child's name) has? What kinds of needs does (name) have that you think I should take into consideration?
OK. Here's the second question: What needs do you (and Mr./Mrs. ________) have in this context? What kinds of needs do you have that you think I should take into consideration?

Here are some of the categories of parents' needs that others have given me. I'd like to read them to you and have you tell me if you think they are important, and especially, I'd like you to tell me if they make you think of other categories we haven't mentioned yet.

Are you planning to come to Parents' Night at West Oldham this Wednesday?

Parents' Night Attendance:

If yes: I'll be in Room 4213; I'd like to meet you and we could talk about this further. I hope to have a list of need categories that I'd like your opinion on.

If no: I'd like to show you my list of need categories when I finish it. Do you think it would be all right for me to send it home with (child's name)? Or would you prefer that I mail it home?

Thanks.
APPENDIX A/4

PRIORITIZATION OF STUDENTS' NEEDS ACCORDING TO STUDENTS

Sharpe House Needs Analysis

This is a list of things that some students in Sharpe House say they need. Please read through the list and check off the items that you think you need, so that I can get a picture of what your needs are.

Then go back over the list; pick out the five most important needs, and put numbers after them, "1" for the most important need you have, "2" for the next most important, and so on up to "5".

As a student at West Oldham, I need:

An adult who knows me well and will help me when I need it. _____
To know what it's like when you get out of high school. _____
More time with my guidance counselor. _____
Personal help in choosing and getting into the right college. _____
Counseling on my academic program (when I need it). _____
Guidance on different subjects. _____
Help with my problems. _____
A guidance counselor who stays with my grade until we graduate. _____
Teachers who are under less pressure to cover material and can explain things I don't understand in class. _____
Less pressure from grading. _____
Alternative ways of learning "prescribed" material, reaching course objectives.

Help (when I need it).

Teachers who don't talk too much, who don't drone on.

Tests that you can learn from.

Flexibility in my schedule to suit my interests.

Meaningful learning opportunities other than academic/college prep.

Job preparation.

Individual attention.

Courses that hold my interest.

To learn things that will help me later in life (housing, taxes).

To learn how to get along with others.

Courses between Honors and Curriculum 1 level.

Classes in which I can discuss things directly with other students.

Classes in which kids are not afraid to speak out.

Less pressure from S.A.T./College Board exams.

To enjoy going to classes.

Teachers who are understanding.

Teachers that I like.

Teachers who care about me as a human being.

Teachers who see my point of view.

Teachers I can talk to without fear of jeopardizing my marks.

Teachers I can disagree with.

Teachers who recognize that homework is not the most important thing in the world to me.
To enjoy learning. _____
To be able to choose teachers who match my learning style and speed. _____
To be able to change teachers without having to change curriculum. _____
Teachers who don't think they're better human beings than me. _____
Auto repair course available to all students. _____
To see how the things I'm learning fit together. _____
To see how the things I'm learning relate to the world I live in. _____
To have school be a learning experience instead of a factory. _____
To be able to participate in decisions on matters of school policy. _____
Going to school with people I enjoy. _____
Having at least one friend in each class. _____
Someone to call up after school. _____
A long term relationship with an adult who knows me. _____
To get to know other students. _____
To talk with other students. _____
To be known by teachers personally. _____
A more friendly, more relaxed atmosphere. _____
To be with my friends. _____
To feel I belong somewhere. _____
To feel that somebody is interested in me, that somebody cares. _____
Activities at school at night and on weekends. _____
To communicate with my teachers easily on different subjects (not just school business) without fear of saying something wrong. _____
To understand people of other races and other religions. _____
To understand people better. _____
Help in coping with drugs.

Success.

Not to be degraded.

To know what I'm doing here.

To know what value my life has.

To feel a part of the school.

To find out, through being with others, what they are really like.

To show my parents I can get good marks.

To feel that my parents are proud of me.

To recognize my own prejudices.

To know what my IQ is.

To learn how to work without being told.

To know where I'm going.

To know how to motivate myself to do things that I want to do.

A course that will help me think of what I want to do when I get out of high school, my future, and my career.

The right amount of pressure.

To have confidence in the school; to believe that I'm learning enough to get into college.

A sense of purpose.

To stay out of trouble.

Creative projects.

Opportunities for self-expression.

Opportunities for exercise other than gym classes.

To unwind.
A schedule that suits my body energy cycle. ____
To have V.D. testing available in the school. ____
To have counselling and testing on pregnancy available in school. ____
To do gymnastics without having to be a member of the team. ____
Not to have people in school feel they're better because they're older. ____
Respectable alternatives to the college prep program. ____
Less school. ____
To learn how to write properly. ____
A smoke-free girls' room. ____
Academic standards that are appropriate for my abilities. ____
To get my schedule the way I want it. ____
To be able to choose my teachers and courses. ____
Not to make choices which I won't get. ____
Not to feel trapped like a rat in a cage. ____
Time to finish tasks I've started; not to be interrupted in the middle. ____
To know what opportunities exist in the school. ____
Ways of channeling my energy into areas relating to my interests, with a minimum of "structuring." ____
Greater mobility. ____
To be able to plan a program better suited to me individually. ____
Less course requirements, because requirements cluster people together for reasons other than their interest in the subject. ____
To know what teachers really think of my work. ____
Less S.A.T. pressure -- other bases for deciding what will be taught in my classes. 

Evaluation that is helpful. 

to see things as they are in the school. 

Non-compulsory attendance. 

To have some say in what is being taught. 

To be able to cut classes. 

To be able to set my own pace. 

To learn how to pace myself. 

Confidence in myself. 

Confidence in my own judgment and standards. 

Free time. 

A greater proportion of my day available for my purposes. 
PRIORITIZATION OF TEACHERS' NEEDS ACCORDING TO TEACHERS

Sharpe House Needs Analysis

PRIORITIZATION OF NEED CATEGORIES: The following are some general categories of teachers' needs that I think we should take into consideration in designing an alternative program. To illustrate each category, I have included a few examples of specific needs that some of you have given in interviews.

Please rank the categories in the approximate order of their importance to you. (1 = most important, 2 = next most important, ...) You may cross off any categories which have no importance to you whatsoever; please feel free to add any categories to the list and include them in your ranking.

[ ] PERSONAL GROWTH (having things other than teaching classes, planning lessons, correcting papers; getting to know people; seeing others in different contexts)

[ ] SELF-DETERMINATION (participation in decision-making in matters that affect my life; control over my own schedule, sharing decisions over allocation of rewards, opportunities; knowing what's possible; a voice in what's going on)
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (working with others to develop curriculum, inputs from other classes, people, workshops; feedback on my teaching; knowing what's going on in other classes and disciplines; a place to read)

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (communication within faculty, between teachers and students, between teachers and guidance counselors; feeling comfortable, relaxed; warmth in interpersonal relationships; smaller faculty groups; administrators who are responsive to teachers; sense that I'm involved in something useful; graciousness and beauty in building and people)

SUCCESS AS A TEACHER/PROFESSIONAL FULFILLMENT (smaller teacher-pupil ratio, knowledge of where kids are at; special services -- paper correcting, tutorial services for kids; aides to prepare and service AV equipment, materials; new marking system; more receptivity in students; students correctly placed in my classes)

CONTROL (agreement on and consistent enforcement of rules; authority in dealing with students -- a way to handle kids who knock out ceiling tiles)
PRIORITIZATION OF STUDENTS' NEEDS ACCORDING TO TEACHERS

Sharpe House Needs Analysis

PRIORITIZATION OF STUDENT NEED CATEGORIES: The following are some general categories of students' needs -- as given by teachers -- that I think we should take into consideration in designing an alternative program. To illustrate each category, I have given a few examples of specific needs that some of you have listed in interviews.

Please rank the categories in the approximate order of importance as you see it. (1 = most important, 2 = next most important, ...) You may cross off items which are of no importance, as you see it; please feel free to add any categories you think are important and include them in your ranking.

[ ] SELF-EXPRESSION (taking out anger, frustration)
[ ] BASIC SKILLS (grammar, correct written expression)
[ ] SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (being treated as a human being; recognition as a human being; praise for good deeds; feeling that adults care about them; help in learning how to cope with peer pressure, set own limits; sense of belonging; less isolation; personalization)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELF-DEFINITION/IDENTITY (structure; limits; framework within which he can identify himself; &quot;knowing who I am&quot;; &quot;knowing where I stand&quot;; finding out about myself)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENSE OF PURPOSE (sense of purpose from adults; help in finding own direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEARNING (sensory awareness; variety of course offerings; coherent sequential program in English, with purpose and growth built into the program; guaranteed exposure to key concepts and skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM (situations in which he can function; success)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYSICAL NEEDS (compulsory physical activity not under control of gym)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritization of Parents' Needs According to Parents

Sharpe House Needs Analysis

Priority Ranking of Parents' Need Categories: The following are some general categories of parents' needs— as given by Sharpe House parents— that I think should be considered in designing an alternative program. To illustrate each category, I have listed some examples of specific needs that some of you have given in interviews.

Please rank the categories in the approximate order of their importance to you (let 1 = most important; 2 = next most important, etc.). You may cross off items which have no importance, as you see it, or add items which you think should be included, or suggest different categories altogether. Please return this list to A. P. Lehner, Sharpe House, WOHS.

Parents' Needs for:

[ ] Confidence that my child is receiving adequate academic preparation for college and/or his vocation

(belief that the school is meeting my child's academic needs; belief that this education will help with his/her future; belief that my child is being challenged; belief that the school is helping my child make the most of his/her abilities)
CONFIDENCE THAT MY CHILD IS BEING PREPARED SOCIALLY AND EMOTIONALLY TO MAKE SENSE OUT OF COLLEGE AND/OR HIS/HER VOCATION (belief that my child is learning how to make intelligent decisions; knowing that my child is in situations he/she can cope with; seeing my child want to be active in school activities; belief that the school will help my child enjoy learning)

INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL (feeling that WOHS belongs to all the parents in the school community; having good communications with the school)

KNOWLEDGE THAT SOMEONE AT WOHS KNOWS MY CHILD, CARES ABOUT WHAT HE/SHE'S DOING, AND CAN TELL ME ABOUT IT (having a counselor or teacher know my child well; more contact/conferences with teachers; more information my about my child's progress)

GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT (help for us in coping with our children and our problems in relating to them and in helping them)

SENSE OF ORDER AND CONTROL (not to have to step over kids when I enter the building; not to feel that the school is a "country club"; better discipline; to have child safe on the bus; for the school to encourage children to respect teachers and other adults)
UNDERSTANDING MORE PRECISELY HOW RECENT CHANGES IN OUR CULTURE REQUIRE CHANGES IN THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN

CONFIDENCE THAT MY CHILD WON'T BE CORRUPTED IN SCHOOL
PRIORITIZATION OF STUDENTS' NEEDS ACCORDING TO PARENTS

Sharpe House Needs Analysis

PRIORITY RANKING OF STUDENT NEED CATEGORIES: The following are some general categories of students' needs -- as given by parents of Sharpe House students -- that I think should be considered in designing an alternative program. To illustrate each category, I have listed some examples of specific needs that some of you have given in interviews.

Please rank the categories in the approximate order of their importance to you. (Let 1 = most important, 2 = next most important, etc.) You may cross off items which have no importance, or add items which you feel are more important, or suggest different categories altogether. Please return this list to A. P. Lehner, Sharpe House, WOHS.

STUDENTS' NEEDS FOR:

[ ] ORDER AND SUPERVISION (less free time on their hands; not to be able to get away with cutting classes; constructive, planned activities throughout the day; a tighter schedule; more control over narcotics and theft)
PERSONAL GUIDANCE (help in making decisions; career counselling; help in choosing courses; a long-term relationship with an adult who can provide personal guidance in dealing with the problems of growing up; help in learning how to take advantage of opportunities offered by school; help in setting long-range goals; personal college counselling; greater accuracy in predicting directions of job market)

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (peer-group acceptance and support; smaller, more personal school environment; pleasant, intellectual atmosphere; close relationship with teachers; not feeling lost in the school; being able to take classes with at least one friend; not feeling a stranger in school because of being part of a minority group in the school)

BROAD RANGE OF EXPERIENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL (theatre, sports, politics; making a contribution to the community; practical experiences in the areas of probable vocational interest)

SELF-ESTEEM/RECOGNITION/IDENTITY (not to be looked down upon because of membership in a minority group in the school; attention for "quiet" students; feeling worthwhile; recognition as a human being; sense of importance, success)
MOTIVATION/SENSE OF PURPOSE (motivation to become involved in other things than required courses; more "pressure"; sense of responsibility; help in seeing WOHS program in relation to his/her ultimate personal objectives; to be more serious about studies; understanding importance of education; less boredom)

SELF-DETERMINATION (being able to choose from a variety of courses; not to make choices he/she won't get; not to have their lives dictated by SAT's; better self-discipline)

LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION ("academic needs"; learning how to write properly; work-study opportunities at all levels; foreign language courses geared to usefulness; more grammar; Latin; learning how to "use one's head"; learning how to enjoy learning; spelling and vocabulary)

SUCCESS (in life; in college admissions; getting into a top college)
DEFINING STUDENTS' NEEDS FOR "LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical or imaginary learning situation with people in it, materials, equipment, space, etc. In this situation, you are receiving instruction, you are learning, and it's the kind of instruction, the kind of learning that you really need and want.

As you observe this situation in your mind, what are the things that tell you that you are really learning, really receiving the kind of instruction that you need? Write down what you see happening in this situation; try to get as much out of the situation as you can, making your list as complete as possible.
APPENDIX A/10

DEFINING STUDENTS' NEEDS FOR "GUIDANCE"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical or imaginary school situation with people in it, materials, equipment, space, etc. In this situation you are receiving guidance, and it's the kind of guidance you really want and need. As you observe this situation in your mind, what things tell you that you are really receiving the kind of guidance you need?

Write down -- in a list -- what you see happening in this situation. Try to get as much out of the situation as you possibly can.
DEFINING STUDENTS' NEEDS FOR "SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical or imaginary school situation with people in it, materials, equipment, space, etc. In this situation, you are having the kind of relationships with other people that you really need and want. You are getting social and emotional support from other people. As you observe this situation in your mind, what things tell you that you are having the kind of relationships with others that you need and want?

Write down -- in a list -- what you see happening in this situation. Try to get as much out of the situation as you possibly can.
APPENDIX A/12

DEFINING TEACHERS' NEEDS FOR "SELF-DETERMINATION"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical professional situation. This situation should be as real and as complete as possible -- with people in it, furniture, a complete environment. In this hypothetical situation, you have self-determination as a professional, and you have the kind of self-determination that you really need and want.

Please observe this situation in your mind, and write down all the things that you see about yourself, about your interaction with other people, about the environment, about interaction between people and the environment -- anything at all going on that would indicate to you that you have the kind of self-determination as a professional that you really need and want. Try to make your list as complete as possible, getting as much out of the situation as you can.
APPENDIX A/13

DEFINING TEACHERS' NEEDS FOR "PROFESSIONAL GROWTH"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical professional situation. This situation should be as real and as complete as possible -- with people in it, materials, furniture, a complete environment. In this hypothetical situation, you are achieving professional growth, and its the kind of professional growth that you really need and want.

Please observe this situation in your mind, and write down all the things that you see about yourself, about your interaction with other people, about the environment, about interaction between people and the environment -- anything at all going on that would indicate to you that your needs for professional growth are truly being met. Try to make you list as complete as possible, getting as much out of the situation as you can.
APPENDIX A/14

DEFINING TEACHERS' NEEDS FOR "SUCCESS AS A TEACHER"

Construct in your mind a hypothetical professional situation. This situation should be as real and as complete as possible -- with people in it, materials, equipment, furniture, a complete environment. In this hypothetical situation you are achieving success as a teacher; you are achieving professional fulfillment, and it's the kind of professional fulfillment you really need and want.

Please observe this situation in your mind, and write down all the things that you see about yourself, about your interaction with other people, about the environment, about interaction between people and the environment -- anything at all going on that would indicate to you that you are achieving the kind of success you need and want. Try to make your list as complete as possible, getting as much out of the situation as you can.
Dear Mr./Mrs. __________:

The following question is an important part of a survey of the needs of parents, teachers, and students associated with West Oldham High School. I would be extremely grateful if you could take twenty or thirty minutes this evening to answer it, and have your child return it to me tomorrow morning.

Should you have any questions about the survey, you may reach me at my home this evening (phone 555-2037) or at school tomorrow (phone 555-9810, ext. 322).

Thank you very much.

Andreas P. Lehner
Administrative Assistant

Please construct in your mind a hypothetical situation. This situation should be as real and as complete as possible, with people in it, materials, equipment -- a total environment. The important thing is that in this situation, you have confidence that your child is receiving adequate academic preparation for college and/or his vocation, and that you have the kind of confidence that you really need and want.
Please observe this situation in your mind, and write down all the things that you see about yourself, about your interaction with other people, about the environment, about interaction between people and the environment -- anything at all, in short, that would indicate to you that you have the kind of confidence in your child's academic preparation that you really need and want. Try to make your list as complete as possible, getting as much as you can out of the situation.
DEFINING PARENTS' NEEDS FOR "CONFIDENCE THAT THEIR CHILD IS BEING PREPARED SOCIA LLY AND EMOTIONALLY TO MAKE SENSE OUT OF COLLEGE/VOCATION"

Dear Mr./Mrs. ____________:

The following question is an important part of a survey of the needs of parents, teachers, and students associated with West Oldham High School. I would be extremely grateful if you could take twenty or thirty minutes this evening to answer it, and have your child return it to me tomorrow morning.

Should you have any questions about the survey, you may reach me at my home this evening (phone 555-2037) or at school tomorrow (phone 555-9810, ext. 322).

Thank you very much.

Andreas P. Lehner
Administrative Assistant

Please construct in your mind a hypothetical situation. This situation should be as real and as complete as possible, with people in it, materials, equipment -- a total environment. The important thing is that in this situation, you have confidence that your child is being prepared socially and emotionally to make sense out of college and/or his vocation, and you have the kind of confidence in this matter that you really need and want.
Please observe this situation in your mind, and write down all the things that you see about yourself, about your interaction with other people, about the environment, about interaction between people and the environment -- anything at all, in short, that would indicate to you that you have the kind of confidence in WOHS (with respect to the social and emotional preparation of your child to make sense out of college and/or his vocation) that you really want and need. Try to make your list as complete as possible, getting as much as you can out of the situation.
INTRODUCTION: I would like to use this survey to find out whether you're getting what you need as a student at West Oldham High School. In a previous round of interviews with students, I have determined that most of the needs of Sharpe House students fall into three main categories: (a) learning and instruction, (b) guidance, and (c) social and emotional support. The purpose of this survey is to determine exactly what your needs are in the first of those three categories.

The items in this survey were written by randomly selected students in Sharpe House -- perhaps you or one of your friends were one of them. The lists are long, because I wanted them to be as complete and as accurate as possible. I am depending on your patience and your helpfulness to make the results of this survey meaningful and useful. Thanks.

I. What do you need?

A. LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION. Imagine that you are attending a school where you're really learning and getting the kind of instruction that you need and want. In that (imaginary) situation, which of the following things would be happening?
Please check all the statements that are a part of your needs for learning and instruction, whether or not they are currently happening at West Oldham.

1. I'm thinking through a book I'm reading.
2. We spend time in the city learning the organization of the city.
3. Students are not competing for grades.
4. I am not dissecting line-by-line books I read (in English, for example).
5. Our curriculum includes academic subjects, and emphasizes practical usage.
6. The process of learning is not pressured.
7. Some classes are run by computers.
8. Travelling is an integral part of the program.
9. I can go to a class and enjoy it.
10. I am helped in my learning by the use of films and slides.
11. I am being stimulated to struggle through the difficult task of learning details to reach a complete understanding.
12. I have fields to explore.
13. I am competing only with myself.
14. My teachers are dynamic.
15. I have room to move.
16. The code of ethics we follow is simple.
17. I am getting recognition without having to do something wrong.

18. We retreat to the classroom after exposure (to nature, the city, etc.) to learn technicalities and specifics.

19. I am learning to think independently.

20. Homework is done at the student's discretion.

21. My teachers don't think they are better human beings than I am.

22. We are spending time out in nature discussing compositional English.

23. The teachers must please the students.

24. What I am learning will help me in the future.

25. Attendance does not have to be taken.

26. Our curriculum includes activities to broaden me.

27. The school really offers me subjects that deal with my life later.

28. My teachers try to use reason with students.

29. I receive an evaluation co-authored by the people in my group.

30. We have a code of ethics that is easy to follow.

31. I have enough time in between class for relaxation, study, or eating.

32. If I miss a class, it's OK as long as I talk to the teacher sometime to find out what went on in class and what was taught.
33. School runs from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

34. I have a lot of time to talk with other people.

35. Our curriculum includes work experience for me.

36. I am learning by using different materials.

37. There are places where I can learn more about special interests, such as art, wood, etc.

38. I am not interrupted in the middle of doing something I want to finish.

39. My teachers care about me as a human being.

40. I have easy access to the things I want to learn.

41. The basic necessities of learning are accessible to students, but their use is not mandatory.

42. I am enjoying my courses.

43. I am learning how to work without having to be told to work.

44. If I come to school down and depressed, I don't have to go into the Girls' Room (or Boys' Room) and cry and then go to class and try to put my head together so I won't show my feelings and so I can pass my Math test.

45. My teacher is willing to stop things to help me for a little while.

46. I am knowing a book myself without having others tell me what it means.

47. We have equipment that is fun to use.
48. I do not feel pressured.

49. We follow a code of ethics.

50. There is more independent study in subjects like history, science, and English.

51. The school is free and unstructured.

52. I have teachers who are not just in it for the money, going home as soon as they can.

53. My teachers don't take themselves too seriously.

54. I am learning what the teacher knows.

55. I am able to determine as much as possible what I will learn in the courses I choose.

56. I feel confident in talking to teachers.

57. The person teaching me spends time with me.

58. I am learning how to get along with others.

59. The code of ethics we follow does not cause too much harm.

60. Rules and limits are fair.

61. I am not wasting my time.

62. The code of ethics we follow does not make us too dependent on adults.

63. Computer-type blackboards flash daily lessons at me for intervals of one hour; I punch out answers on individual machines which serve as desks. Cards are inserted into the main computer at the end of class.
64. I can choose letter-grading or pass-fail grading in each course.
65. Students are happy to work for the school.
66. I can speak up freely.
67. I am working with small children.
68. The school and the city have developed a work-study program in which I can work for the city department.
69. The atmosphere in my classroom is comfortable.
70. I am not made to feel that the real world is a punishment.
71. I am self-motivated.
72. I am really knowing a book inside myself.
73. I am learning to work with a machine.
74. I have alternative ways of reaching the objectives of the course.
75. I work away from school a lot.
76. The person teaching me is enjoyable.
77. We are spending time in the city learning the mechanisms of business.
78. In my classroom I do not have to raise my hand for questions.
79. I learn the basic stuff such as English, science, etc.
80. I am being prepared for a job.
81. I have a chance to go to the gym more than just twice a week.
82. Students and teachers share how they feel as individuals in daily life.

83. There are no student groupings imposed on us.

84. Our curriculum includes sports.

85. If I come late to class, the teacher says, "Don't worry, you can make it up tomorrow; just try to get here earlier."

86. I can tell that I am learning because I want to go to school.

87. There is no text.

88. Every student is responsible for himself.

89. I'm really getting the hang of the learning set-up.

90. I am not left without any discipline.

91. The teachers give the students a chance to get close to other students and teachers.

92. Attitudes among students are relaxed.

93. My friends and I are not scared about going to college.

94. The teachers are more open with the students.

95. I am learning how to motivate myself to do the things I want to do.

96. I know that my teachers care if I'm not doing well.

97. We are now getting off past history and learning about the present.

98. We are learning how one deals with superiors and employees.

99. We are spending time in learning how to find our way by the stars.
100. People are not giving me stuff about facing the real world and getting a job.

101. My teachers try to present curriculum in an interesting enough way to motivate me to do without the necessity of marks.

102. People are not "grabby" about things.

103. I do not feel pressure to knock other people down to bolster my own ego.

104. Teachers trust me.

105. The person teaching me knows something to communicate.

106. I am learning to make decisions from the very beginning.

107. Our curriculum includes hiking.

108. There is less emphasis on timed tests.

109. I am learning vocabulary.

110. I am marked on all the work I do, not just on tests or school-work.

111. Classes are personal (not impersonal).

112. We pass in reports after a field-trip.

113. I am given tests that I can learn from.

114. I am learning on a one-to-one basis with someone, like having a tutor.

115. In meetings and dealings, we are learning how to make things run smoothly.

116. I am seeing how the things I'm learning fit together.

117. The process of learning is not competitive.
118. The teachers teach whatever the students need and want to be taught.

119. The teachers are not holding in what they really mean to say.

120. I am learning to work with material.

121. We follow the standard curriculum for a while to gain knowledge of the basics.

122. I am not afraid to see a teacher after class.

123. We are spending time in the city.

124. We are spending time out in nature discussing biology.

125. My classes have just four or five people.

126. I am not left without any supervision.

127. I'm rapping with my teachers.

128. I am spending less time sitting around in classrooms.

129. I am taking some practical courses to make me feel worthwhile, if not intellectual.

130. After learning the basics, I plan independent research projects, alone or with other kids, to pass in after a certain amount of time.

131. We have equipment that is expensive.

132. There is a lot of sharing.

133. I am able to pass a test.

134. I know the views of others in my class and they know my views.

135. I'm using the right judgment on what the small children I'm working with want to do.
136. Students are more involved because they like the learning situation.

137. I'm using a technique for making something, going step-by-step.

138. Kids and teachers are helping one another to learn what interests them.

139. I am helped to see the grandeur and beauty of learning.

140. The school is trying to please as many people as possible.

141. I am learning in school how to relate to myself in the best ways possible.

142. I am not afraid to ask questions.

143. I don't feel like just another student.

144. The furniture and walls are less drab and have colors other than tan, white, and blue.

145. I have a quiet place for reading.

146. School is not considered a "toughening ground" for the real world.

147. I have people I care about.

148. I have total freedom in choosing my courses.

149. My teachers stress knowledge, friendship, and humanity equally.

150. Everybody comes and goes as they please, if they have no courses.

151. I know I am learning because I want to do homework.

152. The atmosphere is relaxed and informal.

153. I am able to leave a class any time I want to.
154. A student can also be a teacher if he is qualified.

155. I have a lot of time to find out that there are many people who share my interests and feelings.

156. I do not have to read classics in English, for example, that are almost worthless in this day and age because it is only telling me what happened in the past and is not telling me what is happening now.

157. I am given time to finish tests that I take because I am a slow writer.

158. I am learning how to relate to others in the best ways possible.

159. I see how things really do happen in that great big world outside of school.

160. I am finding something I would like to become when I grow up.

161. I know I am learning because I want to work.

162. Geometry is being incorporated with maps and geography.

163. I can have a drink in class.

164. The "establishment" is taken out of the school.

165. "Free" education is beginning from pre-school age.

166. I can really tell that I'm really learning something of value.

167. I am learning how to pace myself.

168. I am able to go to class, sit down leisurely, and gain knowledge without having to be fed information like a computer.
169. I am coming out with a finished product in my project.
170. I am not dependent on other people's learning speeds.
171. Teachers approach me with honesty.
172. We are spending time on learning survival.
173. P. E. is mandatory.
174. I know that my teachers care if I can't do the work.
175. Learning is free and unbridled.
176. I am learning grammar.
177. The teacher is helping me learn by stopping the film from time to time to explain what's happening.
178. I'm getting marks not just on the basis of whether the teacher likes me.
179. I can go to a class and not fall asleep.
180. Books, paper, rulers, pencils, and other learning materials are available to me on a permanent basis; however only one book is issued to each student. Therefore, it is the student's responsibility to watch out for his own belongings.
181. All students of all ages are allowed to participate in whatever classes they wish.
182. In my classroom I do not have to sit up straight with my feet on the floor.
183. I am not afraid to talk in class.
184. I am getting praise for doing things right.
185. My teachers smile.
186. I can smoke in class.
187. The school building is open for my use whenever I want it.

188. The teachers are hand-picked by someone who knows what he is doing.

189. The teachers are complete human beings.

190. My teachers don't talk too much.

191. There is a course in listening to music.

192. I am able to choose teachers who match my learning style and speed.

193. I am allowed to set my own pace.

194. There is a well-rounded, easy-to-use resource center.

195. I am not a walking dummy.

196. I am finding something I enjoy.

197. There is a course in talking with somebody over 30.

198. My classes do not have a definite beginning or ending.

199. Good discussions in class are not stopped by the ringing of a bell.

200. The teachers love us.

201. If I come to school down and depressed, I can tell my teacher and he will accept my feelings.

202. The students are self-sufficient.

203. I am able to carry on an intelligent conversation with another person.

204. My friends and I are not scared about getting "A's."
205. I am not taking advantage of the situation to escape the bureaucracy of the system I have been taught to beat.

206. We finance broadening experiences personally.

207. I do not feel tense.

208. I ask for more work.

209. I am happy.

210. I am becoming "rounded."

211. The age of the teacher is not important as long as he/she is open, enjoyable, and knows something to communicate.

212. Students and teachers share how they feel as a group.

213. I receive a written evaluation from my instructor.

214. There are periods where I associate with other people in some kind of a discussion group, perhaps working on a project.

215. Every student is responsible for his learning.

216. Most kids do not learn unless they want to.

II. Which needs are most important?

B. Please go back over the list you have just completed, and examine each one of the items you checked. Some of them are more important to you than others. Please pick out the ten most important parts of your need for learning and instruction, regardless of whether or not
they are currently happening for you at WOHS. Put a circle around the numbers of those ten items.

III. Are you getting what you need at WOHS?

C. This is the last step, but it is extremely important. Please examine each of the circled items (your most important needs) on your list, and decide whether that item is currently happening for you at WOHS. Then rate each item according to this code, putting the number to the left of the check:

1 --- It's not happening at all.
2 --- It's happening, but there's not enough of it.
3 --- I'm completely satisfied on this item.
4 --- There's too much of it going on, more than I need.

IV. The End. Thank you for your thoughtfulness and your patience. Have a happy day.
APPENDIX A/18

MEASURING STUDENTS' NEEDS FOR "GUIDANCE"
AND "SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL SUPPORT"

Sharpe House Survey of Student Needs

INTRODUCTION: I would like to use this survey to find out whether you're getting what you need as a student at West Oldham High School. In a previous round of interviews with students, I have determined that most of the needs of Sharpe House students fall into three categories: (a) learning and instruction, (b) guidance, and (c) social and emotional support. The purpose of this survey is to determine exactly what your needs are in categories (b) and (c).

The items in this survey were written by randomly selected students in Sharpe House -- perhaps you or one of your friends were one of them. The lists are long, because I wanted them to be as complete and as accurate as possible. I am depending on your patience and your helpfulness to make the results of this survey meaningful and useful. Thanks.

I. What do you need?

B. GUIDANCE. Imagine, if you will, that you are attending a school where you're getting the kind of guidance that you really need and want. In the (imaginary) situation, which of the following things would be happening?

Please check all the statements that are part of your
need for guidance, whether or not they are currently happening at West Oldham.

1. Someone is there to help me with whatever I want to do after high school.

2. Someone is there to help me with problems about college.

3. There is someone who is easy and relaxed.

4. Guidance is available when I feel I really need someone for any reason.

5. I am receiving help that is up-to-date.

6. There is someone whom I can feel is a friend, not just another authority figure.

7. I can get guidance from another kid two years older than me.

8. Someone will help me with things that are on my mind.

9. Help is available when I'm deciding what courses to take next year.

10. I have the feeling that I can go to my guidance counselor for any reason.

11. There is someone whom I can just sit and talk with.

12. There is less emphasis on grades and class rank.

13. I have the feeling that when I go to my guidance counselor it's going to be a very friendly situation.

14. Someone is there to help me cope with my anxieties if I need or want the help.

15. I can relate closely to my counselor.
16. Someone is there to help me cope with my fears if I need or want the help.
17. Someone is there to help me with problems in finding a job.
18. I am getting help in finding out how to do what I know I want to do.
19. I am receiving help that is helpful.
20. Help is available when I'm stuck in a class and would like to switch out.
21. My teachers try to help me so I'll get better grades.
22. I receive guidance from people who are cooperative.
23. I do not receive old platitudes, stale advice, and musty visions.
24. I am receiving help that is beneficial.
25. I am getting help from another teacher about an assignment.
26. My guidance counselor is a sort-of psychiatrist without all the jargon getting in the way.
27. I am gotten into college.
28. When I see a guidance counselor, I do not run into this situation: he is thinking about someone else, he tells me something to get rid of me, not caring whether the solution he proposes is the right one for me.
29. I am getting help from another teacher in making up work.
30. I have the feeling that I can go to my counselor at any time.
31. I am receiving help that is constructive.
32. In this area, I need friends, not monitors.
33. Grades are used only as a sort of personal measuring stick to determine for me my degree of skill in a subject.
34. I am receiving guidance from someone who is understanding.
35. Someone is there to help me cope with my life if I need or want the help.
36. I can get guidance from someone who's been through the same situation I'm facing.
37. I am getting help from my guidance person when things in school don't go right.
38. I have someone telling me to finish school and get it over with.
39. I am getting help in selecting a college with a course that I could enjoy.
40. I am receiving guidance from someone who is relevant.
41. Someone is there to help me cope with my tensions if I need or want the help.
42. I am receiving guidance from someone fairly young.
43. I am receiving guidance from someone who has a personal interest in me as a person.
44. My guidance counselor knows what's going on.
45. Someone is able to guide me and help me with problems I have within the school.
46. I am recognized as a person, instead of a "student."
47. I am getting help from teachers and my guidance counselor to make sure the things I take are in my best interest.
48. Someone is helping me in adjusting my schedule.
49. Going to my guidance counselor is something that I enjoy.
50. I am getting help in selecting the right high school courses.
51. I am getting help in deciding whether to go to college or to work.
52. I am getting guidance from someone who knows me pretty well.
53. I am getting guidance from someone on a one-to-one, friendship basis.
54. I have someone who will help me out when I need it.
55. I am not getting the run-around, shuffled from one person to another.
56. I am getting help from another teacher to advance myself.
57. I am receiving guidance from someone who still can see what it's like to be growing up now, not 30 years ago.
58. I am receiving guidance from someone who is sympathetic.
59. I am receiving guidance from people who are always right.
60. I am receiving guidance from people who are responsive to my needs, rather than to the needs of the institutions and organizations of the "system."
61. Someone is helping me plan what to do after graduation.

62. My guidance person is talking to me in a way that's not "over my head."

C. SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT. Finally, I want you to imagine that you are attending a school where your needs for social and emotional support are being completely fulfilled, a school, in other words, where you have the kind of relationships with other people that you really need and want. In that situation, which of the following things would be happening? Please check all the statements that are a part of your need for social and emotional support, whether or not they are currently happening at West Oldham.

1. When I ask for criticism on such things as writing, tap-dancing, etc., it is honestly and thoughtfully given.

2. Life in school isn't a popularity contest.

3. I am cooperating with other people.

4. I am getting more out of my work.

5. I am learning from other people.

6. My teachers are fair.

7. Teachers are doing what kids want, not just what they want.

8. I am not worried about having money stolen from me.

9. I have friends who think basically the same as me.
10. I am pressured to work because I can't get going on my own.

11. I don't expect to get beaten up.

12. I am following rules (or not) according to my own feelings.

13. People give their time freely to me when I want it.

14. Teachers are getting more out of their work.

15. We have trust in each other.

16. I am not under pressure to get good grades.

17. Someone is letting me know I'm doing the right thing.

18. I am not worried about having my jacket stolen.

19. Teachers are realizing what kids can't do, as well as what they can do.

20. When I need something tangible (such as specific learning), those who can help me out in this try as best they can to help, although they are not required to.

21. Teachers really care about me.

22. I know when not to take other people seriously.

23. There is a better atmosphere for learning.

24. We don't have to have any rules at all.

25. I'm proving to myself that I don't have to know anyone to get somewhere.

26. People are encouraging me to be myself.

27. I am doing things with my friends.

28. Everyone knows each other.

29. I am happy.
30. My teachers are willing to help me during class on things I don't understand.

31. I have friends who feel basically the same as me.

32. I am listening to what others have to say.

33. The school is flexible in its approach to different kids.

34. I am not seeing school as a joyous experiment.

35. My teachers are willing to help me after class on things I misunderstand.

36. I have confidence.

37. I am proving to myself that the world isn't as prejudiced as some people think it is.

38. I am not getting involved in school activities.

39. I am doing nothing that would hurt or otherwise jeopardize the school.

40. There is a set block for lunch.

41. Everyone is always taken at his word.

42. The classes are smaller.

43. Kids and teachers are going to work in a ways that's fun.

44. I am allowed to swear in class.

45. Teachers understand my problems.

46. I want to participate in situations around me.

47. I am not expecting the school to meet my needs for happiness and entertainment.

48. I am not just racing against other kids in school.

49. There is not favoritism in the relationships between teachers and students.
50. I have a girlfriend.
51. I receive unfavorable criticism with no malice.
52. School is seen as a necessary step towards a final goal.
53. I am as quiet as possible.
54. I am brought together with others in social activities in school outside class.
55. People give their time freely to all who want it.
56. Kids are working better.
57. My teachers and I talk as people, not as students and teachers, in one-to-one relationships.
58. I am getting support from everyone around me.
59. We have a room available with a large coffee-urn in it.
60. The teacher lets me do a test over with no pressure on me.
61. I am getting emotional support for my problems from teachers and counselors, instead of having to ask kids about subjects they don't understand.
62. People are not petty.
63. People like school better.
64. I am happy with myself.
65. People are following rules (or not) according to their feelings.
66. I am proving to myself that I am somebody.
67. My teacher understands if I hand an assignment in late.
68. I am not harrassed as I walk through the building.
69. I am taken at my word.
70. I want to learn but at the same time I'm having a good time.

71. Rules can be made by those who wish to have rules.

72. I am living away from my family.

73. I am getting support that enables me to develop to my fullest potential.

74. I am helping others to develop to their fullest potential.

75. People like me for what I am.

76. Teachers and students are all friendly.

77. Kids are getting into less trouble.

78. Teachers mark a student according to what he can accomplish.

79. I am thinking about what I do.

80. My teacher doesn't act as though he's doing me a favor.

81. People are not all put in groups (such as a dummy program, house).

82. I have the opportunity to talk to kids.

83. I give my time freely to all who want it.

84. I know I have the relationships I want because I know very few people.

85. When I lose the key to the lock on my bike, and I want the janitor to cut the chain for me, he believes me when I tell him that it is my bike.

86. My teachers just do their job without playing favorites.

87. I am receiving guidance on colleges, SAT's, etc.
I can change teachers without having to change curriculum levels if I can't get along with him.

I have somebody to yell at me when I need it.

I have healthy ways of expressing my aggressions.

I have a place to be alone in.

I have a boyfriend.

There are a lot of kids I'm comfortable being with.

I don't feel I have to impress people.

People let me do my own thing.

I don't care if people support me in doing my own thing.

I do not have to associate with mediocre human beings.

II. Which needs are most important?

D. Please return to the GUIDANCE list (B), and examine each one of the items you checked. Some of them are more important to you than others. Please pick out the ten most important parts of your need for guidance, regardless of whether or not they are currently happening for you at WOHS. Put a circle around the numbers of those ten items.

E. Pick out and circle the ten most important items under SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (List C).

III. Are you getting what you need at WOHS?
F. This is the last step, but it is extremely important. Please examine each of the circled items (your most important needs) on your lists, and decide whether that item is currently happening for you at WOHS. Then rate each item according to this code, putting the number to the left of the check.

1 --- It's not happening at all.

2 --- It's happening, but there's not enough of it.

3 --- I'm completely satisfied on this item.

4 --- There's too much of it going on.

IV. The end. Thank you for your thoughtfulness and your patience. Have a happy day.
APPENDIX 19

MEASURING TEACHERS' NEEDS FOR "SELF-DETERMINATION," "PROFESSIONAL GROWTH," AND "SUCCESS AS A TEACHER"

Sharpe House Survey of Teacher Needs

INTRODUCTION: In a previous round of interviews with teachers in Sharpe House, I have determined that you feel that your most important categories of needs are for (a) professional growth, (b) self-determination, and (c) success as a teacher. The purpose of this survey is to determine exactly what your needs are in each of those three categories.

The items in this survey were written by you and/or your colleagues on the Sharpe House faculty. The lists are long, because I wanted them to be able to capture your point of view as completely and as accurately as possible. I regret that I must be the author of yet one more intrusion on your already over-burdened schedule, but I am convinced that, with your thoughtfulness and your patience, the results of this survey will be meaningful and useful. Thank you!

I. What do you need?

A. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH. Imagine that you are working in a school where your needs for professional growth are being completely fulfilled. In that (imaginary) situation, which of the following things would be happening? Please check all the statements that are a part of your need for professional growth, whether or not they are currently happening for you at West Oldham.
1. I am talking to colleagues about kids who are great.
2. I am confident in relating to the students.
3. I am having fun with kids.
4. I am learning about books I have read from another teacher in my department.
5. I am getting techniques for teaching a specific course from a teacher who has taught it before.
6. I am getting together with other teachers from West and East Oldham High Schools.
7. I am participating with other teachers in my department in an open dialogue concerning just how they evaluate kids.
8. There is no credibility gap between faculty and administration.
9. I attend workshops between departments on inter-related areas.
10. I have a say in determining my own role.
11. I am seeing whether we are fulfilling the goals of the program in my subject.
12. I am working with members of two or more departments.
13. I am learning what is going on in other departments through discussion with other teachers.
14. I am spending time with kids in one-to-one sessions.
15. I have a full involvement with my students.
16. I am talking about books I have read with another teacher in my department.
17. I confer with other teachers in my department about the goals to be met by each required course.
18. I am teaching in a school administered by competent leaders.

19. I confer with other teachers in my department about the philosophy of the department.

20. I am seeing the way other people raise questions in class.

21. I have a say in how funds are to be allocated and spent.

22. I have a means of testing the effectiveness of the program in my discipline.

23. I am assigned to classes that stretch my mind.

24. I meet with junior high people to understand the overall pattern of instruction in my discipline in the Oldham schools.

25. I have a means of improving the effectiveness of my instruction.

26. I am seeing the atmosphere in other people's classes.

27. I am keeping up with journals in my field.

28. I have opportunities to get outside ideas on curriculum and techniques.

29. I am preparing new materials for classes.

30. Students and teachers are giving as much as possible to produce learning on both sides.

31. I participate with other teachers in my department in an open dialogue concerning just how they taught a particular concept.

32. I attend a weekend workshop paid for by the city.
33. I participate with other teachers in my department in an open dialogue concerning just how they helped develop a skill in a student.

34. I have a realistic teaching load.

35. Anything that touches me as a human being touches me as a professional.

36. I am using available instructional tools in my room to fullest ability.

37. I am knowledgeable in the area concern.

38. There is respect for my mind and my opinions by the administrators.

39. I confer with other members of my department concerning our expectations for students' performance.

40. I have time to do those things I feel are important for my professional growth.

41. I am trying out new courses with kids.

42. I am getting ideas for a specific course from a teacher who has taught it before.

43. I am not asked to perform duties for which I am constitutionally unfitted, e.g., secretarial tasks.

44. I act as a facilitator more than a teacher.

45. I am planning a course I am teaching a month in advance.

46. I have time to prepare classes.

47. Funds are available for me to use for outside resources (films, trips, etc.).

48. I have a viable teaching schedule.
49. I go to the annual convention of teachers of my discipline.
50. I am reading a book that I am not teaching.
51. I am creating new courses.
52. I am attending workshops that help develop my awareness of others' potential.
53. I am talking with colleagues about kids with whom I'm concerned.
54. I am becoming more aware of students' individual qualities in terms of their work.
55. I have easy access to a good reference library of books written for teachers.
56. I am expected to give student the best teaching available.
57. I exchange ideas with other teachers about creative ways of teaching kids who are hard to reach.
58. I am able to participate in setting the goals of my department.
59. I am finding patterns.
60. I am participating in bringing about changes in the curriculum.
61. I get ideas about assignments for a specific course from a teacher who has taught it before.
62. I am putting ideas together.
63. I have the opportunity to interact with students out of class concerning school matters.
64. My daily schedule is adjusted to accommodate my bodily energy cycle.
65. I attend workshops introducing new, effective learning activities.

66. I talk to teachers after I visit their classes.

67. I understand the overall pattern of instruction in my subject area in the Oldham schools.

68. I am assigned to teach classes that use my talents to the fullest extent.

69. There is a media center for inter-related areas.

70. I have a means of testing the effectiveness of my instruction.

71. There are quiet areas.

72. I am having fun with my colleagues.

73. I am innovating within the environment.

74. I have the opportunity to interact with students out of class concerning learning experiences, e.g., trips.

75. I have the kind of authority that allows me to operate in ways that foster good education.

76. I am seeing the ways other teachers elicit questions and responses from the students in their class.

77. The environment contains materials necessary for growth in students and teachers.

78. I am feeling creative.

79. I am seeing how other people use independent projects.

80. I am becoming more aware of individual students' potential for creativity.

81. I am developing an understanding of other areas.
82. I learn what kind of teaching students expect in my courses.

83. I am exchanging ideas with other teachers across departments for creative types of teaching.

84. I learn what kinds of demands students expect me to make in the courses I teach.

85. I have time to grade papers.

86. Authority in the school is distributed horizontally, not vertically.

87. I have time to perform day to day chores.

88. I get help from other teachers.

89. I am finding symbols.

90. I participate in mutual observations with other willing teachers, not necessarily in my department, who are in no way connected with evaluating me. A casual discussion follows each observation. Two teachers observe one teacher each time.

B. SELF-DETERMINATION. Imagine that you are working in a school where you have the kind of self-determination as a professional that you really need and want. In that situation, which of the following things would be happening? Please check all the statements that are a part of your need for self-determination as a professional, whether or not they are currently happening for you at West Oldham.
1. I have the prerogative to be flexible in the use of class time. For example, I can decide to meet with half the class one day and the other half of the class the next day.

2. I am teaching in a program in which the student is expected to mature.

3. I am getting feedback on professional decisions I have made.

4. I am not expected to try to pour academic subjects into kids who are non-academic.

5. I am involved in inter-disciplinary communication within the school.

6. I am able to determine that I will do the research I feel is necessary to be a more informed teacher of my class.

7. I have self-determination in the area of course preparation.

8. I am teaching in a program in which students earn a diploma after completing three years and passing an exam covering basic concepts in four core fields -- English, math, social studies, and science. In this context, students work out their own program of studies with the help of an advisor; a student wishing to take a year of courses in art and music may do so if he can make a convincing case to his advisor.

9. I have time to review course content on a continuing basis.
10. I determine how I will spend my time in school.
11. I am teaching in a program in which students are expected to 'make some worthy contribution to their field.'
12. I do not have to become a custodial moving-van just to set up the equipment I need.
13. I am consulting "specialists" in areas of curriculum development.
14. I am deciding that my students will work with me on an individual basis.
15. I have the opportunity to develop means of measuring the growth in the learning of my students.
16. I have input into determining the number of classes I will teach.
17. I am not handed down from on high a course of study dictating what the student must take.
18. I teach a course because I feel I have something to say on the subject.
19. My performance in carrying out the process of learning/teaching is evaluated by means of a procedure which I have developed with the evaluator.
20. I am participating in determining the basis on which I will evaluate my students.
21. I design, organize, and develop the courses I teach.
22. I am teaching in a program in which students are able to spend one or two days a week visiting, living in and
working with the inner city or the Boston Symphony or an automotive shop, under the guidance of his teacher, and in which he can produce an in-depth paper or chart or model of his project.

23. I participate in making the decision to use sabattical money for foreign travel for foreign language teachers.

24. I am teaching with a faculty that can creatively offer a wide enough spectrum of courses to turn on and intrigue all levels of students.

25. I am teaching in a program in which students are expected to develop their talents.

26. I determine whether or not to work with students individually on content, thought, and expression.

27. I have time to continually develop the materials I will use in my teaching.

28. I have a say in the construction of the daily schedule.

29. I am in an environment where the desire for craftsmanship in teaching is supported by craftsmanship in administration.

30. There is a minimum of supervision.

31. I am teaching in a program in which there are specific expectations for cognitive learning for students.

32. I can decide to visit other classes within the school.

33. I help determine how money will be spent in my department.

34. I can decide to visit other schools.

35. I am not restricted to the conventional definition of the school day.
36. I can decide whether I'd like to have a longer (or shorter) school day.

37. I help determine the numbers of teachers supervising in the cafeteria.

38. I can decide to use some of my time for conferring with students.

39. I can decide whether or not to grade my students.

40. I am participating in decisions to allow released time and/or sabatticals for all teachers to pursue their field of study or a related field.

41. I can determine how I will evaluate students.

42. I am teaching in a program in which students may take (and pass) the exams in subject areas without having to take courses in those areas.

43. I can select those principles of the subject I'm teaching that students ought to learn and "return."

44. I can decide whether or not a particular students needs to attend my class to fulfill the requirements of the course.

45. I have participated in developing the means by which I will be evaluated.

46. I have easy access to educational hardware.

47. I am able to use a variety of means in developing the principles of the subject matter.

48. I am getting more input for making professional decisions.

49. I am teaching in a program in which each student has a
program tailor-made to his orientation, objectives, and interests.

50. I am teaching with an enlightened, imaginative faculty.

51. I am teaching in a program in which affective goals are expected to be taken into account in measuring student achievement.

52. I am teaching in a program in which a student is able to design a traditional course of instruction for himself.

53. I can tailor course requirements to the individual needs of a particular student, including class attendance.

54. I participate in the allocation of sabbatical leave funds.

55. I am not assigned to teach a course I do not wish to teach.

56. I determine the texts I will use in my classes.

57. I am not being observed.

58. I have help in carrying out plans for field trips.

59. I am consulting "specialists" in areas of teaching materials.

60. I can decide to attend conferences.

61. I have self-determination in the area of course evaluation.

62. I have self-determination in the area of course development.
SUCCESS AS A TEACHER. Finally, please imagine that you are working in a school where your needs for success as a teacher are being completely fulfilled, where you are achieving the kind of professional fulfillment you really need and want. In that (imaginary) situation, which of the following things would be happening? Please check all the statements that are a part of your need for success as a teacher, whether or not they are currently happening at WOHS.

1. I am staying excited about my own field by reading and taking courses.
2. There are cross-discipline courses to give students broader understandings.
3. I am staying excited about my teaching.
4. I have no more than 25 students in my class.
5. I am communicating with other teachers on a city-wide basis, K-12.
6. My students are gaining confidence in the discipline.
7. My students and I are accepting each other as human beings.
8. My students have trust in me.
9. The type of furniture is conducive to the free exchange of information and ideas.
10. Students are demonstrating their understanding by behavior appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves.
11. A projector that works is freely available.
12. I am learning along with the students.
13. I am making available to kids reading materials without having to type them myself.
14. Students are accepting themselves as having certain capacities and limitations.
15. I have the encouragement to do the things I feel are important to my success as a teacher.
16. I have fully prepared the lesson.
17. I am discussing with students interests they have.
18. I am fulfilling the educational needs of my students.
19. My legitimate requests are honored.
20. The students have enough freedom of course selection to want to come to class.
21. My students are developing their ideas.
22. The students are able to control themselves.
23. Films are freely available.
24. I am given approbation and encouragement for teaching independent study courses, especially those involving added preparation.
25. I do not feel overwhelmed by pressures of time.
26. Kids at all levels are being stimulated and motivated.
27. My students are beginning to experiment on their own in my discipline.
28. The classroom is well-lighted.
29. An enlarger that works is freely available.
30. My students have trust in each other.

31. I am serving as a resource person to a group of motivated students.

32. A tape recorder that works is freely available.

33. I see the needs of my students.

34. I have job security as a part-time teacher.

35. My students are deriving pleasure from the work in my discipline.

36. My students are exchanging ideas freely.

37. The students have enough self-discipline to come to class.

38. My departmental colleagues and I are in a continuing dialogue on the standards of grading.

39. Students' assignments are carefully planned and written to indirectly point out to students what they are teaching themselves.

40. On faculty forums I interact with others on subjects other than problem kids.

41. The arrangement of furniture is conducive to the free exchange of ideas and information.

42. I am developing my ideas.

43. I feel I have control over my professional destiny.

44. I have secretarial help for communicating with parents and students through comments on papers and individual letters to parents.

45. My colleagues and I support each other on standards for excellence for kids.
46. I have time to pursue the objectives of associations devoted to developing professional goals.

47. I am getting to know students "out of classrooms."

48. I can tell my students are excited.

49. After class, students are free to linger to clarify issues raised in class.

50. I am in agreement with my departmental colleagues on the standards of grading students' work.

51. I have assistance in distributing and collecting books.

52. The students wish to be in class.

53. My students are excited by their comprehension of the material I'm presenting.

54. I have knowledge of the individual differences of my students.

55. My students believe that the procedures used to evaluate them are fair.

56. My students are beginning to know what genuinely intrigues them about the work in my discipline.

57. I feel that it is easy for me to get help in improving my teaching.

58. My students are becoming more daring in reaching for what they don't know or don't quite understand.

59. My students want to continue working in the area I've presented.

60. I am teaching four classes.
I have the financial backing to do the things I feel are important to my success as a teacher.

My students are beginning to bring in spontaneous projects or ideas.

My students see the differences between academic and social freedoms in class.

Suggestions for new courses are being made and listened to.

I select the materials to be purchased for use in my classes.

My students believe that I have enough interest in them individually to want to talk about non-academic things with me.

I am discussing with students their educational plans.

Highly gifted kids have special educational opportunities.

Students are indicating their growth by discarding those behaviors which are no longer productive for them.

I am communicating more effectively with parents.

I am not spending my time performing needed secretarial tasks (typing, etc.).

I have a place to meet with students which is quiet and yet big enough for adequate experimentation.

Students can recognize capacities and limitations in me.

My students are finding they genuinely "love" something we have read or done, and want to do it again, want to discuss it, want to play with it.
75. My ego is being supported, as without some ego support, I cannot feel successful.

76. I can change course content to get the kids excited.

77. I am not measuring my success by how many A's, B's, C's, etc., I hand out.

78. Students are learning on their own.

79. I am interacting with others on faculty forums.

80. The temperature in the room is in the 68-72° range.

81. I am not measuring my success by how well I stick to the curriculum.

82. My students are (always) relaxed in class.

83. The classroom has plenty of windows.

84. My students are opening up about their feelings in relation to the work.

85. I am taking students out of the classroom into real situations in the community.

86. Equipment is freely available.

87. Students are understanding their own actions and reactions.

88. I have time to do the things I feel are important to my success as a teacher.

89. There is interaction and group cohesiveness among the students in my class, which I feel is more important than class size, per se.

90. I have a place to work on my own.
91. My students feel there is (almost) no limit on the questions they can ask in class.

92. I have opportunities to pursue my own goals for self-improvement.

93. I am able to obtain materials for spur-of-the-moment changes in my plans.

94. Students are able to express themselves emotionally without harming themselves.

95. There is a mutual evaluation process, in which students evaluate the curriculum, I evaluate them, and they evaluate me.

96. My students feel that our mutual endeavor is genuine and significant.

II. Which needs are most important?

D. Please return to the PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (list A), and examine each one of the items you checked. Some of them are more important to you than others. Please pick out the ten most important parts of your need for professional growth, regardless of whether or not they are currently happening for you here. Put a circle around the numbers of those ten items. Please follow the same procedure for SELF-DETERMINATION (list B) and for SUCCESS AS A TEACHER (list C).
III. Are you getting what you need at WOHS?

E. This last step is extremely important. Please examine each of the circled items (your most important needs) on your three lists, and rate each item according to this code, putting the number to the left of the check marks:

1 --- It's **not** happening at all at WOHS.

2 --- It's happening at WOHS, but there is **not enough** of it.

3 --- I'm **completely satisfied** on this item.

4 --- There's too much of it going on here.

Thank you.
ANNOUNCEMENT TO STUDENTS

Please announce to homerooms on Thursday, 21 December

NEWS ABOUT THE SHARPE HOUSE SURVEY OF STUDENT NEEDS:

YOU CAN LEARN THE RESULTS OF THE SHARPE HOUSE SURVEY OF STUDENT NEEDS BY PICKING UP A COPY OF THE PRELIMINARY REPORT FROM MR. LEHNER IN ROOM 4213 AFTER HOMEROOM TODAY. IF YOU'RE INTERESTED IN WORKING ON DESIGNING AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEST OLDHAM, YOU SHOULD BE SURE TO GET A COPY OF THIS REPORT.

(A. P. Lehner)
Sharpe House Survey of Students' Needs

A. LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION: (59 responses) The following items were among the "ten most important" of six or more students. Numbers following each item indicate the number of students giving priority to that item, and (in parentheses) the average of the "It's not happening here" ratings:

1 --- It's not happening at WOHS at all.
2 --- There's not enough of it.
3 --- I'm satisfied on this item.
4 --- There's too much of it.

--- The process of learning is not competitive. 6 priorities (1.0)
--- I receive a written evaluation from my instructor. 7 (1.1)
--- Students are not competing for grades. 13 (1.2)
--- Good discussions are not stopped by the ringing of a bell. 6 (1.2)
--- The process of learning is not pressured. 13 (1.3)
--- Travelling is an integral part of the program. 10 (1.4)
--- Teachers trust me. 9 (1.4)
--- Classes are personal (not impersonal). 8 (1.4)
--- I do not feel tense. 7 (1.4)
--- I have enough time in between each class for relaxation, study, or eating. 6 (1.5)
--- I am not wasting my time.  6 (1.5)
--- Students are more involved because they like the learning situation.  6 (1.5)
--- What I am learning will help me in the future.  14 (1.7)
--- I do not feel pressured.  16 (1.7)
--- I am not afraid to ask questions.  6 (1.7)
--- I am happy.  12 (1.7)
--- I am enjoying my courses.  17 (1.75)
--- I can go to a class and enjoy it.  25 (1.9)
--- The school really offers me subjects that deal with my life later.  9 (1.9)
--- I am learning to think independently.  9 (2.0)
--- The atmosphere in my classroom is comfortable.  8 (2.0)
--- I am self-motivated.  8 (2.0)
--- Our curriculum includes academic subjects and emphasizes practical usage.  6 (2.1)
--- My teachers care about me as a human being.  15 (2.2)
--- The person teaching me is enjoyable.  6 (2.25)
--- There are places where I can learn more about special interests, such as art, wood, etc.  9 (2.4)
--- I have people I care about.  10 (2.6)

B. GUIDANCE (57 responses)

--- There is less emphasis on grades and class rank.  15 (1.3)
--- I am getting help in finding out how to do what I want to do.  13 (1.6)
There is someone whom I can just sit and talk with. 12 (1.75)

I am getting guidance from somebody who knows me pretty well. 15 (1.8)

Help is available when I'm stuck in a class and would like to switch out. 25 (1.9)

I am getting help in selecting a college with a course I would enjoy. 18 (1.9)

My guidance counselor knows what's going on. 12 (1.9)

I am receiving help that is helpful. 11 (.19)

There is someone whom I can feel is a friend, not just another "authority figure." 19 (2.0)

When I see a guidance counselor, I do not run into this situation: he is thinking about someone else, he tells me something to get rid of me, not caring whether the solution he proposes is the right one for me. 15 (2.0)

I am recognized as a person instead of a "student." 16 (2.0)

I have the feeling I can go to my guidance counselor for any reason. 11 (2.0)

I am not getting the run-around, shuffled from one person to another. 15 (2.0)

Someone will help me with things that are on my mind. 11 (2.0)

Someone is there to help me with problems about college. 18 (2.1)

I am receiving guidance from someone who is understanding. 14 (2.1)

I am getting help in selecting the right high school courses. 11 (2.1)
--- I am receiving guidance from people who are responsive to my needs, rather than to the institutions and organizations of the system. 21 (2.1)

--- There is someone who is easy and relaxed. 11 (2.2)

--- I am receiving help that is up-to-date. 12 (2.2)

--- Someone is helping me in adjusting my schedule. 11 (2.2)

--- I am receiving help that is beneficial. 15 (2.2)

--- I am receiving guidance from someone who has a personal interest in me as a person. 28 (2.2)

--- Help is available when I'm deciding what courses to take next year. 17 (2.3)

--- I am receiving guidance from someone who can still see what it's like to be growing up now, not thirty years ago. 16 (2.4)

--- Guidance is available when I feel I really need someone for any reason. 19 (2.5)

--- I am getting help from my guidance person when things in school don't go right. 12 (2.5)

C. SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (57 responses)

--- Life in school isn't a popularity contest. 13 (1.3)

--- I can change teachers without having to change curriculum levels if I can't get along with him. 11 (1.3)

--- Teachers are doing what kids want, not just what they want. 14 (1.5)

--- There is a better atmosphere for learning. 20 (1.6)

--- We have trust in each other. 17 (1.8)

--- The school is flexible in its approach to different kids. 15 (1.8)
There is not favoritism in the relationships between teachers and students. 11 (1.8)

Teachers are realizing what kids can't do as well as what they can do. 15 (1.9)

My teachers are willing to help me during class on things I do not understand. 11 (1.9)

When I ask for criticism on such things as writing, tap-dancing, etc., it is honestly and thoughtfully given. 12 (2.0)

I am getting more out my work. 19 (2.0)

My teachers and I talk as people, not as students and teachers in a one-to-one relationships. 12 (2.0)

I am learning from other people. 11 (2.1)

Teachers really care about me. 11 (2.1)

My teachers are fair. 20 (2.3)

My teachers are willing to help me after class on things I don't understand. 19 (2.3)

I have confidence. 4 (2.4)

I am doing things with my friends. 11 (2.45)

I am happy. 21 (2.5)

NOTE TO PEOPLE INTERESTED IN WORKING TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS:

We will form, in January, a work group to plan an alternative program to meet these un-met needs. If you would like to work with us on this project, please take some time to study the results of the
survey and, using this information, try to decide which problems we need to solve. Try to put in your own words the needs an alternative program must meet. We'll be getting together right after vacation.

Thanks.
Sharpe House Survey of Teacher Needs

A. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH: The following items were among the "ten most important" of five or more teachers. Numbers following each item indicate the number of teachers giving priority to that item, and (in parentheses) the average of the "it's not happening here" ratings:

1 --- It's not happening at WOHS at all.
2 --- There's not enough of it.
3 --- I'm satisfied on this item.
4 --- There's too much of it.

--- I have a realistic teaching load. 12 priorities (1.6)
--- There is no credibility gap between faculty and administration.
   8 (1.7)
--- I have time to grade papers. 5 (1.7)
--- Funds are available for me to use for outside resources (films, trips, etc.). 5 (1.75)
--- I have a say in how funds are to be allocated and spent. 5 (1.8)
--- I have a say in determining my own role. 12 (2.0)
--- I am teaching in a school administered by competent leaders. 10 (2.0)
--- I have a means of improving the effectiveness of my instruction.
   8 (2.0)
--- I have opportunities to get outside ideas on curriculum and techniques.  7 (2.0)

--- Students and teachers are giving as much as possible to produce learning on both sides.  6 (2.1)

--- I am assigned to teach classes that stretch my mind.  6 (2.2)

--- There is respect for my mind and opinions by administrators.  6 (2.2)

--- I am expected to give students the best teaching available.  6 (2.2)

--- I am able to participate in setting the goals of my department.  7 (2.2)

--- I have the kind of authority that allows me to operate in ways that foster good education.  6 (2.2)

--- I am spending time with kids in one-to-one sessions.  8 (2.25)

--- I am assigned to teach classes that use my talents to the fullest.  7 (2.3)

--- I am confident in relating to students.  8 (2.4)

--- I am participating in bringing about changes in the curriculum.  6 (2.4)

--- I am having fun with kids.  7 (2.5)

--- I am becoming more aware of students' individual qualities in terms of their work.  5 (2.75)

--- I am knowledgeable in the area of concern.  6 (2.8)
B. SELF-DETERMINATION (items given priority by five or more teachers)

--- I have participated in developing the means by which I will be evaluated. 5 (1.4)

--- I am teaching in a program in which each student has a program tailor-made to his orientation, objectives, and interests. 8 (1.4)

--- I have the prerogative to be flexible in the use of class time. For example, I can decide to meet with half of the class one day and the other half of the class the next day. 5 (1.6)

--- I am involved in inter-disciplinary communication within the school. 6 (1.6)

--- I have input into determining the number of courses I will teach. 5 (1.6)

--- I am not expected to try to pour academic subjects into kids who are non-academic. 8 (2.0)

--- I am participating in determining the basis on which I will evaluate my students. 5 (2.0)

--- I am teaching with a faculty that can creatively offer a wide enough spectrum of courses to turn on and intrigue all levels of students. 6 (2.0)

--- I have time to continually develop the materials I will use in my teaching. 13 (2.0)

--- I have time to review course content on a continuing basis. 9 (2.3)

--- I am teaching in a program in which students are expected to develop their talents. 6 (2.8)

--- I can determine how I will evaluate students. 6 (2.4)
I can decide to use some of my time for conferring with students.  
7 (2.4)

I am able to use a variety of means in developing the principles of the subject matter. 9 (2.4)

I am teaching with an enlightened, imaginative faculty. 11 (2.5)

I design, organize, and develop the courses I teach. 11 (2.6)

I have self-determination in the area of course preparation. 7 (2.65)

I have self-determination in the area of course development. 7 (2.65)

I have the opportunity to develop means of measuring the growth in the learning of my students. 7 (2.65)

I teach a course because I have something to say on the subject. 10 (2.9)

C. SUCCESS AS A TEACHER  (items given priority by five or more teachers)

I am teaching four classes. 6 (1.0)

I have a place to meet with students which is quiet. 3 (1.0)

I do not feel overwhelmed by pressures of time. 6 (1.6)

My students have trust in each other. 5 (1.8)

I have fully prepared the lesson. 5 (1.8)

Kids at all levels are being stimulated and motivated. 7 (1.9)

My students feel that our mutual endeavor is genuine and significant. 5 (2.0)

My students are beginning to experiment on their own in my discipline. 5 (2.0)

I have knowledge of the individual differences of my students. 5 (2.0)
--- My students are demonstrating their understanding by behavior appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves. 8 (2.1)

--- I have no more than 25 students in my class. 5 (2.2)

--- I am fulfilling the educational needs of my students. 7 (2.2)

--- My students are deriving pleasure from the work in my discipline. 8 (2.2)

--- The students wish to be in class. 5 (2.25)

--- My students and I are accepting each other as human beings. 8 (2.4)

--- I am staying excited about my own field by reading and taking courses. 8 (2.3)

--- My students have trust in me. 7 (2.3)

--- I am staying excited about my teaching. 10 (2.5)

--- I am learning along with the students. 10 (2.6)

--- My students are exchanging ideas freely. 6 (2.6)
Sharpe House Project: Faculty Response

☐ I have some important unmet needs, and I would like to be consulted on further developments. I would like my opinions to be taken into consideration.

☐ I would like to participate actively in planning a response to the unmet needs identified in the surveys.

☐ I would like to be excused from other committee assignments to work on the Sharpe House Project. (List them here)

☐ I would like to use two or three "released" days in January to work on the project.

☐ I am willing to meet after school (2:30-4:00) ___ times a week to work on the project. Check days: Mon ___ Tues ___ Wed ___ Thurs ___ Fri ___

☐ I am willing to meet in the evening in pleasant surroundings to work on the project. Check days: Mon ___ Tues ___ Wed ___ Thurs ___ Fri ___
I am willing to meet (Lord help us!) on weekends.

Sat ___       Sun ___

Comments, Suggestions, & Protests:

(signed) __________________


Planning the Project:

1. Study the data from the surveys; use that data to decide what kinds of problems we need to solve, which needs we must meet, etc. Determine what additional information we will need, what other inputs we will seek.

2. Find out what we are presently doing to meet these needs.

3. Figure out what resources are currently and potentially available to meet our needs, and identify the ways in which these resources are presently being allocated.

4. Find out what the limits of possible programs are, the maximums and minimums of an academic program at WOHS.

5. Using what we now know about needs, resources, and limits, design a program (or programs) that will meet specific needs.

6. Test out (within the limits of our resources) the feasibility of these programs.

7. Determine the best possible combination of program options, the best ways of combining resources to meet needs.
Schedule of Meetings:

Tuesdays, 12:45 - 3:00 (9, 16, 23, 30 January; 6, 13 February).

Two all-day sessions (probably two of the following four Fridays: 19, 26 January; 2, 9 February).

One other two-hour session per week, to be arranged.

Goal of the Project:

To design a program (or programs) to meet the needs of students, teachers, and parents as identified in the Sharpe House Survey of Student Needs and the Sharpe House Survey of Teacher Needs, and a survey of parent needs, as yet incomplete.
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INTERPRETING THE DATA: STATEMENTS BY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

Sharpe House Project

A. In perusing the student and teacher "needs" data, I find in most areas an amazing similarity of viewpoint. Two areas emerge as being most important to both: social and emotional support and learning atmosphere/environment. Consider the following:

Social and Emotional Support

Student response: more mutual trust, care, and concern, personal relationships with teachers, warmth of group feeling.

Teacher response: acceptance as "human being" (not authority figures), trust, warm, comfortable atmosphere.

Learning Environment

Student response: less competition, evaluation instead of grades, more independent thinking, self-motivation, freedom to ask questions, higher class involvement because of "non-threatening" climate, enjoyment of learning.

Teacher response: students "learning on their own," students in class because they want to be, acceptance of the individual differences of students, excitement and interest in subject matter, free exchange of ideas.
There are certain limitations which must recognized in order to prepare a "realistic" program: physical limitations of WOHS, existing teacher schedules/load, financial considerations, and college admissions policies.

B. In student needs, the issue seems to be making school a pleasant, unpressured atmosphere in which learning progresses.

Most of the expectations of guidance seem to be concerned with proper course and college placement. There is also a demand for more personalized service.

In social and emotional support, kids being happy and comfortable seems to be a major issue. The big issue in all of this isn't the what of learning but rather how nice it is to be here.

Teachers seem basically interested in the students. They desire a course more tailored to the student in the room; time and opportunity to stay interested and interesting in the subject materials, and more of a say in school policy. Freedom to grow and improve their teaching.

C. Students on classes: most concern is for atmosphere of school: cooperation, relaxation, trust, warmth. Only the extra-school program would cost money. Student evaluation of faculty, less time-wasting and learning that pleases will include combined planning with teachers Elastic bells for good discussions seems unrealistic.
Students on guidance: will exchange grade emphasis for aid in college and vocational choice or course change. The counsellor needs more personal feeling and should offer friendly chats.

Students on social and emotional support: mostly to do with tone of school; trusting atmosphere, no favoritism, no popularity bids. "On scene" aid and flexibility are much needed. However, teacher change after start of the year may mean popularity bids among teachers. All pupils need to learn to tolerate some kinds.

Faculty on professional needs: more money will take care of fewer classes, provision of extra-school resources; however, only inclusion of faculty in budget-thinking will close credibility gap.

Faculty on personal needs: faculty seeks more say in estimating itself, deciding own program, using class time, leaping department barriers, deciding which pupils are unfit for academic learning — none of these is a money question but consultation. Faculty wishes same power in school affairs as pupils in arranging the study programs for themselves.

Faculty on teaching success: more money to reduce teaching load, which nets more planning time and to provide additional quiet places. Widespread mutual trust and universal motivation are probably well beyond pedagogical ken.
D. Guidance: trust -- honesty; a one-to-one relationship of students to their "guiders." Teachers are not policeman figures.

Education, etc.: non-competitive grades; non-formal classes; area of school where students can talk or work quietly without interruption (quiet area).

Social and emotional support: opportunity is there for students to sit and talk in a non-structured area (common room without desks?).

E. More personal atmosphere needed: if teachers had less students per class and less classes there'd be more time for teachers to meet with individual students and with small groups to discuss what's going on in class. There'd be more time for feedback for both the teachers and students.

Perhaps it would help if teachers and students could get together for other than academic reasons: e.g., student vs. teacher sports contests or better, teachers and students vs. other teachers and other students. To see each other in situations outside classroom, get to know each other better and work with each other. But a situation where school and its problems are not the focal point.

Have students and teachers work together planning curriculum (this is already being done to some extent) and in maintaining discipline together.
F. Students/Learning: It seems that there is a need for more personal involvement in the classes between student and teacher and student and student. The students want to be trusted, and want to trust the teacher, hoping to eliminate the fear of speaking in class. There is a need for practicality of applying the material, and independence in the classroom. The classes students are taking are useless, unless there is some way to apply them to our lives; and there is also a lack of useful courses that students need and can use. Independence was another strong need in the survey. Students want to be self-motivated. They don't want to be competing with each other for grades.

Students/Guidance: I get the feeling that guidance is too impersonal now. There is a need for a closer personal relationship with the counselor. People want to feel that they can talk to anyone at any time about anything, and the person they are talking to really cares. The counselor also has to know what is going on, and be able to understand what the student is going through. In picking courses, the counselor should be able to effectively guide the student to pick a course that is good for him, and is also interesting. Students want to be able to get out of a class without a hassle if they can't get along with the teacher.

Students/Social and Emotional Support: The teacher should be able to understand the students' potential. The teacher should be fair, and not expect the student to do work that he isn't capable of. Students should be able to learn what they want to. The atmosphere of learning
should be better. Teachers should care about the students as people, and treat them as such, without showing favoritism.

Teachers/Professional Growth: Teachers want an equal say in administration policies and competent administrators. Teachers want a good teaching load, and time to talk on a one-to-one basis with the students. Teachers want to have an opportunity to improve their teaching techniques, to provide the best teaching available to students. Teachers want classes that will stretch their minds as well as the students'.

Teachers/Self-Determination: The teachers are able to decide what to teach. They are teaching the course because it is helpful and interesting to the student, and the teacher has something to say in the course. Teachers and students are able to participate in evaluating each other. Teachers are teaching with colleagues who are creative and imaginative, and have a lot to offer. Teachers have time to develop and review their course. Teachers are able to be flexible with their classroom time according to the students' needs.

Teachers/Success: The teacher is teaching smaller classes; students and teachers have trust; the needs of the students are being fulfilled; students are experimenting within the teacher's discipline, and are enjoying the class; the teacher is staying excited about his field by reading and taking courses, and is learning with the students. Ideas are freely exchanged; students and teachers look upon each other as human beings.
TO: SHP Planning Team Members, Consultants & Friends
FROM: A. P. Lehner
RE: Agenda for meeting 22 January, 2:30 p.m., in Rm. 5101

Following the work session and discussion at our 16 January meeting, I am proposing the following as goals for the Sharpe House Project; I hope we can check these out for completeness, originality, and aptness of thought this afternoon.

I. Goals of the Sharpe House Project are:

A. To meet students' needs for learning and instruction;
   1. to help students and teachers enjoy the process of learning;
   2. to provide for teachers and students a supportive environment characterized by mutual respect, trust, and caring, and by the reduction of unproductive pressures and artificial competition for grades;
   3. to help students and teachers learn how to make sense out of themselves and the world they live in;
   4. to prepare students for learning, living, and working in the future;
   5. to help students and teachers make the best possible use of their time, as they see it;
6. to give students access to important learning resources within the school (art studios, wood shop, etc.) and beyond the school.

B. To meet students' needs for guidance;

1. to provide each student with guidance in personal and academic problems from someone who knows the student well, who is easily accessible to the students, and with whom the kind of rapport has been established that will let the student feel free in seeking help;

2. to give each student the information and advice he needs to understand and make wise decisions in his academic and personal affairs;

3. to give students' advisors the information, time, and leverage they need to be genuinely helpful;

4. to ensure the kind of communication among students, teachers, advisors, and parents that will allow decisions to be made in a direct, effective and satisfying way;

5. to provide students with useful information in the following specific areas:

   college selection
   college admissions
   academic opportunities within WOHS
   academic opportunities beyond WOHS
   "how to do what I want to do"
C. To meet students' needs for social and emotional support;
   1. to give each student the support he needs to do what he wants to do;
   2. to provide maximum flexibility in scheduling, staffing, and instruction;
   3. to make trust and cooperation -- rather than competition -- the basis for relationships among students and between students and teachers;
   4. to help students (and teachers) learn how they're doing as students (or teachers) and as human beings;
   5. to make it possible for people who like each other to work together, and to help people who work together to like each other.

D. To meet teachers' needs for professional growth, self-determination, and success;
   1. to place responsibility for making decisions on matters of educational policy and on the use of key resources -- instructional materials, money, and teachers' time -- in the hands of those directly concerned;
   2. to give teachers a teaching load that will make it possible for them to fulfill the goals of the Sharpe House Project;
   3. to provide teachers with the means of improving their effectiveness, including
      ---access to "outside" ideas on curriculum and techniques
opportunities for reading and taking courses in their field of interest
-evaluation by means of procedures which they have participated in developing
-continuous opportunity to prepare and develop instructional materials
-opportunities for inter-disciplinary communication;

4. to provide teachers with competent and trustworthy administrative support;

5. to help teachers provide learning opportunities appropriate for each student's orientation, objectives, and interests.

E. To meet parents' needs for:

1. confidence that their child is receiving adequate academic preparation for college and/or his vocation;

2. confidence that their child is being prepared socially and emotionally to make sense out of college and/or his vocation;

3. knowledge that someone at WOHS knows their child, cares about what he's doing, and can tell them about it.
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INVENTORY OF RESOURCES WORKSHEET

Sharpe House Project

Inventory of Resources:

I. Human Resources

TEACHERS
STUDENTS
PARENTS
GUIDANCE COUNSELORS
ADMINISTRATORS
"EXPERTS" IN SCHOOL SYSTEM
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
OTHERS IN COMMUNITY

II. Material Resources:

MONEY
BUILDING SPACE/ROOMS
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
EQUIPMENT
Operationalizing a Goal in Terms of Resources - Worksheets

Sharpe House Project

Goals and Resources:

1. Select a goal statement. Examine it carefully; study the needs data listed with the goal. Consider the implication of each statement.

2. Now construct in your mind a hypothetical school situation in which this goal is being completely met. Try to make the situation as real and as complete as possible; have people doing things, interacting, using things in such a way that they are achieving the goal you have in mind.

When you have let this situation develop itself for a few minutes, write down all the resources that you see being used in the situation. You may include anything else you feel is important about the situation, but your list should focus on the resources.
3. Now picture in your mind a situation at WOHS as you know it, in which individuals are attempting to meet the same goal (see #1 above). They are attempting to accomplish that goal using resources currently available for that purpose at this time.

Make a list of those resources (including anything else you feel is important about the situation).

4. Finally, share your list with others who have chosen to work on the same goal, for the purpose of making your list as complete as possible. Feel free to add someone else's ideas to your list; try to let their items suggest new items to you, things neither of you had thought of.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Required to Accomplish Goal</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSHS Program</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Goal under present Resources allocated for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING THE PROGRAM: SOME THINGS TO CONSIDER

Sharpe House Project

Will your program meet all the goals?
How will teachers spend their time?
How will students spend their time?
How will parents participate in the life of the school?
Who will go to the school?
What do you have to do? (What are the basic requirements)
What kinds of things can you do during a school day?
How many courses does a kid take?
Who determines what courses will be available?
Who determines how courses will be taught?
How will students be evaluated?
Who makes what decisions?
Is an administrator necessary?
What is the program's relationship with the larger school?
Why should the School Committee "buy" your program?
Who will be hurt by your program?
How will you "sell" your graduates to colleges?
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SUB-TEAM REPORT - "PEABODY MODEL"

"PEABODY" Model: An Off-Campus Alternative Program

Setting: Some off-campus location; perhaps a suite of rooms at the Peabody school. Being off campus will reduce pressures to conform to the larger institution, and will help reduce conflicts with the regular program, such as existing authority figures and scheduling conflicts (people in the halls at the wrong time, jealousy, etc.). The present WOHS environment is undesirable, restrictive, inflexible, lousy. Having a separate facility will make it easier for teachers to change; the present setting exerts strong pressures against changes.

Population: 100 students, or so -- as diverse as possible so that different kids of kids can get to know each other and learn how to work together. (We note that moving off campus will make it more difficult to get a really heterogenous population.)

Learning and Instruction: The academic program will be planned by students and teachers to meet students' needs and wants. There should be a minimum of requirements and the greatest amount of choice, but the program will enable students to meet college requirements. Courses, especially required courses, will be explained and justified to students so that they can make intelligent decisions in selecting them, and so that they
understand their purpose. Students should have a broad exposure and a chance to try out a course before deciding to take it. The academic program will seek to find a compromise between teachers' wisdom, society, the laws, and students' desires. The program will seek maximum use of the community for learning experiences. The program will preserve some access to WOHS resources, such as vocational programs and opportunities. Classes will be small, with lots of communication between students and teachers. Teachers will have to teach differently, and will need help in changing their methods; perhaps students can help. The length of the school day will vary to suit educational needs. Students will have more options on how to use their time in school and out. Instead of grades, students will be evaluated; these evaluations will be effective because students will be taking courses because they want to.

Guidance: There will be better communication in the school, closer relationships with teachers.

Social and Emotional Support: Students will learn how to work together, by working to create their own resources -- perhaps running their own cafeteria. Groups of people will be working together for a common goal. They will have opportunities to experience other living conditions and environments.

(1 February 1973)
SUB-TEAM REPORT: "SMALL SHARPE MODEL"

Small Sharpe Project

---The year would involve four nine week terms. Credits for work done would be granted at the end of each term. Credit for each course would be flexible.

---A student could take one to four courses that should total about five credits worth of work.

---In each term, an individual teacher would work with a maximum of 25 students.

---Primarily open to sophomores only.

---Courses would be open for parents as well as students.

---Summer planning time is required and should involve both teachers and students.

We feel that such a program might deal with two problems. First, for strictly pragmatic reasons, it would fit into the present school schedule and would not require major revisions of the credit system and possibly the grading system. What might be required would be revisions in the requirements for obtaining a diploma. The program is an attempt to get at the problem of personalizing education. By limiting the number of students per teacher, chances for personal contact are greatly increased.
We feel that the courses as planned would offer flexibility of content and design as they open possibilities for team teaching, interdisciplinary approaches and student input into course content and direction.

We firmly believe that human nature being what it is, some outside source of motivation and some kind of evaluation are necessary to insure that positive and concrete objectives are obtained. This does not, therefore, imply sterile, humorless, and slave-like conditions.
APPENDIX A/33

SUB-TEAM REPORT: "B AND C GROUP MODEL"

Discussion Group (B-C) 2/1/73

Tentative Program:

4 modules of 9 weeks.....5th 9 week term optional (could include outward bound, career exploration, etc.).

6 (7) weeks devoted to course work, the remaining 3 (2) weeks flexibly arranged for student-teacher planning, "recap" seminar, and evaluation.

Introductory Program:

may take 12-16 weeks, but at least 6 weeks required.

program geared to motivating students, helping students work out ideas, and communicate same.

Required Orientation: a minimum of 6 weeks, includes:

a. basic learning skills (organization of thoughts, preparation of papers, verbal and written expression, etc.).

b. placement pre-tests to determine where student is "at".....necessary preliminary to course planning.

c. basic psychology.....group dynamics.....essential to create close group feeling, and enable students to know and feel free to express their thoughts and opinions.

d. discussion of system of grading and evaluation.
At the end of orientation, students and teacher(s) plan course selection, goals, and methods to be used in evaluating learning and individual growth.

Thoughts on use of space outside WOHS:

-----may be viable alternative for Seniors who wish to explore new areas of interest...but may not be practical for Sophomores or juniors faced with SAT's and admissions procedures.

-----many courses could indeed by learned away from West Oldham, but others, such as science, art, and home economics would have to remain at West Oldham because of the specialized equipment involved.

Resources necessary for this program include: flexible scheduling, reduced class size...(15) and reduced teacher load to allow time for individual conferences, planning sessions, etc.
"Guerrilla Model" for the Sharpe House Project

guer-ril-la: (1) warfare carried on by guerrillas. (2) any member of a small defensive force of irregular soldiers, usually volunteers, making surprise raids against supply lines, etc. behind the lines of an invading enemy army. ["We have met the enemy, and they is us." Pogo]

Setting: Anywhere, including Sharpe House, WOHS, homes, cabin in N.H., Peabody School.

Population: minimum - 10 students, one teacher; maximum - 1500 students, 125 teachers.

Learning and Instruction: Students who select this program will join a CORE GROUP along with ten other students and a teacher. This group will meet at mutually agreeable times and places (for example, one evening a week at somebody's home) to meet students' needs for guidance and support; they would work on "values clarification," program evaluation, curriculum design, and personal growth. They would receive academic credit (why must we give credit only for cognitive learning?), and this responsibility would constitute part of the teacher's load. Advising and support in the group will include all members;
thus, the students might undertake to help the teacher with some of his responsibilities (corridor duty?). Another aspect of the group would be to develop learning opportunities, and to help each other take advantage of existing opportunities at WOHS.

Academic Options: (1) Off-campus learning opportunities: apprenticeships, internships combined with seminars, such as the existing Elementary Teaching program operated by Paula and opportunities developed by Phyllis. (2) Concentrated study options for seniors who have completed requirements through flexible credit arrangements, whereby a student could get credit for nine weeks' work in a single area. One way this could work would be for 25 seniors to agree on one subject area and one teacher, and agree not to take any other courses in the school; those students and that teacher would withdraw from the "catalogue," i.e., that teacher would not be available for any other teaching assignments (although they would still be part of their core groups). (3) "Explorations" type courses, essentially structured independent study courses that would allow students at all levels to explore their interests, do their thing. (4) Team-taught interdisciplinary inquiry courses growing out of Core Group and Faculty Support Group ideas. (5) All regular WOHS courses and academic options.
Evaluation: Alternative methods of evaluating student work and growth would be developed through Core Group and Faculty Support Group work.

House framework should be strengthened to support this program through decentralizing many decisions on educational policy -- curriculum (and instructional budget), teaching load and schedule, hiring of teachers, and the granting of academic credit. Even though not all teachers in the House would be part of the program, they would profit from sharing in these decisions.
PROGRAM ELEMENTS PRIORITIZATION SURVEY

Sharpe House Project

PROGRAM ELEMENTS identified to date by members of the Sharpe House planning team. Please examine this list for completeness and accuracy, adding any elements that you believe are missing. Then rate each item according to whether it is, in your opinion, necessary (N) for meeting the goals of the project, optional (O) but not absolutely essential for meeting the goals of the project, or contrary (C) to the goals of the project. Please try to get this back to me by the end of school Thursday.

1. Student support group ("core group," including group training)
2. Faculty support group. (including group training)
3. Faculty training for working with student groups.
4. Student participation in planning curriculum.
5. Non-pressure evaluation of students.
6. Non-pressure evaluation of faculty.
7. Off-campus setting.
8. Defined area of Sharpe House.
9. Gathering place for program participants.
10. "Turf."
11. Relaxed atmosphere in classes, school.
12. Concentrated study: immersion in single area.
13. Independent study options.


15. Use of community resources and enterprises: kids out of school.

16. Use of community people in school program.

17. Means of selecting students for project.

18. Four or five term school year.

19. Flexible schedule.

20. Flexible credit for different kinds of learning activities.

21. Means for people to get to know each other.

22. Regular WOHS courses -- access to.

23. Low over-all student-student ratio.

24. Specially designed courses.


26. Orientation to the program.

27. Courses in basic skills ("How to study," "How to write an essay").

28. Team teaching - combining different viewpoints, interdisciplinary learning.

29. Teachers from different disciplines, subject areas.

30. Diagnostic testing to provide needed learning opportunities.

31. Student involvement in operation of school, working together on projects.

32. Courses open to parents (and drop-outs).
33. Pressure for motivation.

34. Requirements (for college, graduation).
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RESULTS OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS PRIORITIZATION SURVEY

Sharpe House Project

Which PROGRAM ELEMENTS do we consider necessary for achieving the goals of the Sharpe House Project? Eighteen members of the planning committee responded (unfortunately, it was impossible to include parents in this sampling). The numbers after each item indicate the number of students rating it "N," the number of teachers, and the total for the item. They are listed in descending order. (10 students, 8 teachers)

1. Flexible schedule. 10 students; 7 teachers; total, 17
2. Flexible credit for different kinds of learning activities. 9-8-17
3. Means for people to get to know each other. 9-8-17
4. Relaxed atmosphere in classes, school. 9-7-16
5. Faculty training for working with student groups. 8.5-7-15.5
6. "Tutorial" - individualized instruction. 7.5-8-15.5
7. Student involvement in operation of school, working together on projects. 8-8-15
8. Student participation in planning curriculum. 9.5-5-14.5
9. Gathering place for program participants. 7.5-7-14.5
10. Faculty support groups (including group training). 6-8-14
11. Independent study options. 8-6-14
12. Non-pressure evaluation of students. 7.5-6-13.5
13. Orientation to the program. 7.5-6-13.5
14. Access to WOHS facilities - libraries, studios, shops, sports. 6-7-13
15. Teachers from different disciplines, subject areas. 5-8-13
16. Diagnostic testing to provide needed learning opportunities. 6-7-13
17. Non-pressure evaluation of faculty. 8.5-4-12.5
18. Specially-designed courses. 6.5-6-12.5
19. Low over-all student-teacher ratio. 5-7-12
20. Requirements for college, graduation. 5-7-12
21. Student support groups ("core groups," including group training). 7-4-11
22. Use of community resources and enterprises: kids out school. 7-4-11
23. Means of selecting students for project. 3-7-10
24. Use of community people in school program. 4-5-9
25. "Turf." 6.5-2-8.5
26. Regular WOHS courses - access to. 3-5-8
27. Team-teaching — combining different viewpoints, interdisciplinary learning. 4-4-8
28. Concentrated study: immersion in single area. 7-0-7
29. Pressure for motivation. 2-5-7
30. Defined area of Sharpe House. 0-5-5
31. Courses in basic skills ("How to study," "How to write an essay). 3-2-5
32. Off-campus setting. 4.5-0-4.5

33. Courses open to parents (and drop outs). 2.5-0-2.5

34. Four or five term school year. 1-0-1
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PROPOSAL FOR FURTHER ACTION

Sharpe House Project [12 February]

TO: SHP Planning Team
FROM: Andreas
RE: Further Action

I would like to propose that we work to implement the goals of the Sharpe House Project according to the following two-pronged plan of attack:

**Prong One:** Students, teachers, and parents work to develop an OFF-CAMPUS ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL for 100 students and five teachers. It seems to me that this school must be planned by the people who will take part in it. The first step this group must take, therefore, is to recruit -- this week -- the teachers who will form the nucleus of the school, along with a task force of 10 to 15 sophomores and juniors and two or three parents. Because the Planning Team has already done a substantial amount of thinking about such a school, recruiting can begin immediately on a meaningful basis. Given the needed commitment by teachers and students, I would judge that this group will have a more than reasonable chance of opening a school in September, 1973.

**Prong Two:** A second group of students, teachers, and parents works to develop a set of options that would constitute an
alternative route through WOHS for as many students and teachers as have needs unmet by the existing program but who do not wish, for a variety of reasons, to move off-campus. These options would include support groups for students and for teachers, group and values clarification training for students and teachers, flexible credit for extended learning opportunities on and off campus, special courses and evaluation procedures. More people will have to be recruited for this group as well.

Although there are some obvious differences, it seems to me that there are many elements that are common to both prongs of the Sharpe House Project. The two groups could, I think, work cooperatively to develop the following:

(a) The development of a "flexible credit" option so that we can grant academic credit for support groups, off-campus learning experiences, etc. How would credit be assigned, evaluated, and recorded?

(b) Writing a "curriculum" for support groups: developing ideas for getting them started, exploring the different uses they could have and the different roles they could play in both programs; determining what kind of training would be most useful for teacher-leaders.

(c) Designing and setting up a training program in the areas of group dynamics and values clarification for teachers and students who will be part of S-groups.
(d) Developing community resources for use inside and outside both schools. A good deal of ground work has been done through the Open Campus Enrichment Program, but both programs will probably want more in the way of work experiences, "field" experiences, internships, apprenticeships, and more in the way of opportunities for "outsiders" to participate in teaching and learning.

(e) Development of alternative courses that could be taught in either setting.

(f) Finding space off-campus for all of Prong One and portions of Prong Two.

(g) Developing alternative evaluation procedures.

(h) Developing ways for students to participate in the governance of both schools.
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RESPONSES OF SHARPE HOUSE TEACHERS TO SHP PROGRESS REPORT

7 March 1973

1. Number of Teachers Responding: 30

2. "I think SHP goals are important for us to work toward:" 30

3. "I think these goals are presently not being achieved:" 12

4. "I believe that the "Off-Campus Alternative School" would be effective:" 20

5. "I believe that the "On-Campus Options" would be effective...:" 25

6. "If I were given enough time and encouragement, I would like to participate in one or more of the following:" 7

   planning and teaching in an Off-Campus Alternative School

   working on campus with a student support group

   working on campus in a flexible time block to develop experimental courses

   meeting with colleagues in a faculty support group

   human relations and/or values clarification training workshops

7. "I would be interested in a program like the "On-Campus Options" only if it were adopted by the whole House:" 7

8. "I would be interested in a program like the "On-Campus Options" only if it were adopted by the whole School:" 2
Sharpe House Project

(a) Student Support Groups

FUNCTION: To improve communication and understanding; promote personal growth, increase peer and adult guidance for students; provide means for student participation in curriculum & policy; provide students with close faculty advisor/advocate.

PEOPLE: [proposed] 8 groups of 12 students (4 sophomores, 4 juniors, and 4 seniors) and one faculty member (teacher, guidance counselor, or administrator).

TIME: [proposed] two 64 minute periods per week -- "Homeroom" plus a contiguous block: B1, B3, B2, B4; C1, C3; D2, D4; E2 (?), E4. Also, if possible, two other blocks available for private conferences. Also, if desired, out of school meetings at night, on weekend.

PLACE: Classrooms, or, if possible, off campus settings (Peabody School, students' homes).

CREDIT: 2 1/2 "non-Departmental" credits per year, granted on a Pass-No Record basis. Evaluative criteria: attendance.

ACTIVITIES: Discussion of students' programs and goals. Discussion of learning opportunities available at WOHS and beyond. Values clarification strategies. Moral Development
exercises (Kohlberg). Human Relations training experiences (listening triads, problem solving) Projects: development of innovative courses, structures for WOHS; building furniture; school service; Outward Bound course. (Also: taking attendance two days/week).

(b) Centralized Attendance and Communication

FUNCTION: To make additional time available for teachers to participate in Support Group activities. To ensure accurate attendance records. To replace the inefficient and disliked homeroom.

PEOPLE: Housemaster, teacher, and/or secretary; all students involved in support groups.

TIME: 9:48 - 9:58 on days when S-Group is not meeting.

PLACE: Commons Room

ACTIVITIES: Students "check in" with attendance taker, read announcements posted on walls. Meet and greet.

(c) "Advisor" Role for Teachers

FUNCTION: To give students more personal guidance in setting up, living with, and changing their programs. To relieve guidance counselors of some clerical functions, "routine" problems. To provide parents with contact person in school. To involve teachers in school functioning.

PEOPLE: The faculty member and the 12 students in his S-Group.
ACTIVITIES: Teacher, with S-Group peers, advises on program, signs program registration. Helps evaluate and engineer course changes. Communicates with parents as needed. Communicates students' need to other faculty. Is available for help.

(d) Faculty Support Groups

FUNCTION: (see "Progress Report")

PEOPLE: The eight faculty members involved in S-Groups.

TIME: One two-hour meeting per week, preferably over dinner.

ACTIVITIES: Discussion of S-group activities, individual students, problems raised in S-Groups. Discussion of personal and professional issues. Creation of interdisciplinary and other experimental courses.

(e) Faculty Training Workshops

FUNCTION: To provide S-Group teachers with skills, techniques, and attitudes needed to function effectively in new roles.

PEOPLE: S-Group teachers; selected students (seniors?); consultants.

TIME: Spring, 1973—several Tuesday afternoon, Saturday workshops; Summer, 1973—three to five days of workshops.


(f) "Curriculum" for Support Groups.
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A PROGRESS REPORT

"We have met the enemy, and they is us."

—Pogo

Sharpe House Project

West Oldham High School is in many respects highly successful, with an enviable record of college placement for its graduates and a demonstrated ability to adapt to changes in its environment. But is WOHS meeting all the needs of its students? Given existing resources, could the school be doing a more complete job? Are teachers satisfied with their role in the present program?

In response to these questions, the Sharpe House Project planning team, which is composed of ten students, seven teachers, three parents, one guidance counselor, and one housemaster, has developed a proposal for a two-part alternative program. Their program is based on the results of a study of the perceived needs of Sharpe House students, parents, and teachers.

This report will describe the present state of development of their proposal, and then show the goals of the project and how they were generated.

An Off-Campus Alternative School. As one part of their project, the planning team would like to see the opening, next September, of an
off-campus alternative school for approximately 100 students and four to six teachers. Although the team has given enough thought to be satisfied that such a school would meet their goals, it was felt that the actual planning of such a school should be in the hands of the individual teachers, students, and parents involved in its operation. The team is presently investigating site possibilities at the Pine Hill and Peabody schools, and is studying means of recruiting people for the planning.

An On-Campus Alternative. The other part of the project is a set of program options that could be integrated with the existing on-campus program. Taken together, these options would constitute an alternative route through WOHS for as many students and teachers as have needs unmet by the current program but who do not wish, for a variety of reasons, to move off campus. These options could be made available to the entire school, to one House, or to a small part of one House. The options include

- support groups for students and for teachers to provide guidance and increase communication;
- training in human relations and values clarification for students and teachers involved in support groups;
- opportunities for students and teachers to develop alternative academic courses on and off campus, making greater use of community resources;
- greater flexibility in the granting of credit for learning experiences on and off campus; and
- the development of alternative means of evaluating students' growth.
Because both parts of the program would involve the use of these options, much of the planning for one part of the project would serve the other as well -- which is why they are being proposed as one project.

Precisely how the on-campus options would be integrated is still an open question. One plausible solution would involve the use of the E, F, and G blocks for support group meetings and for experimental academic courses. A student planning to take five subjects would register for three or four of them in A, B, C, D, and/or H blocks; he would take his favorite (or his most difficult) subject in the Project blocks with a teacher associated with the Project. Because the blocks come together at the end of the day, Project teachers and students could negotiate a flexible schedule to meet more precisely the requirements of their course. Support groups and seminars in English or Social Studies might meet only once or twice a week for extended sessions; foreign language classes could meet five times a week for shorter periods. Students wishing to do "field" work (internships or apprenticeships) would be able to leave early in the day, and groups wishing to go on trips would have a similar advantage.

It should be noted that these off campus options are to some extent currently available, but because of a generally poor level of communication in the school, students are often not aware of them. Furthermore, many students are, in the opinion of the planning team, afraid to take the risks involved in extending their learning environment beyond the walls of WOHS. The support groups would function to
raise the level of communication and to generate a greater degree of needed personal support for risk-taking.

**Student Support Group.** Consisting of ten or twelve students and a teacher, each group would meet for two or four hours each week and "count" as a 2 1/2 or 5 credit "course." Functioning generally to improve communication between and among students and teachers, these groups would provide

- peer guidance and counselling
- help in dealing with WOHS courses and pressures
- feedback for teachers
- a means for students to influence curriculum and program
- a forum for students' plans for independent study and/or field experience
- an opportunity for students to formulate and test out personal goals.

Groups could decide to use exercises in values clarification and/or human relations as learning tools. Each support group could also decide to undertake special projects in the community or in the school (e.g., designing a special course, operating the open campus enrichment program, building furniture for the commons room, assisting the teacher in performing some of his chores).

The teacher member of the group would serve as an advocate for the student in the bureaucracy of the school, assisting in program changes, communicating information about students' needs to other members
of the faculty and to the administration, and serving, when needed, as a personal liaison between the school and the home. Of course the teacher's role must be defined to allow personal information about students to remain confidential.

Support groups would meet at times and places mutually agreeable to members of the group. Off-campus space (Peabody School, members' homes) is available for such purposes.

**Faculty Support Groups.** This group (or groups) would consist of teachers involved in the Project, all of whom would also be members of student support groups. In these groups teachers could help each other in their work with student groups through sharing learning and problems. Profiting from the higher level of interpersonal communication, teachers could decide to work together to design interdisciplinary courses and to take collective action in bringing about changes in the school. They would also want to discuss modifications in their own teaching to meet students' needs, and would be able to help non-Project teachers do likewise.

**Flexible Credit.** Project students would receive credit for participation in support groups and for a variety of other kinds of learning experiences, including field experiences. It might be possible to find ways of granting credit for learning experiences shorter than the current year or half-year courses.
GOAL STATEMENTS AND NEEDS DATA

(For an explanation of the needs data, see Chapter III, especially page 63.)

Sharpe House Project

Goal Statements and Needs Data: As approved by the SHP Planning Team, 22 January 1973, the goals of the Sharpe House Project are:

A. To meet the students' needs for learning and instruction:

1. To provide for teachers and students a supportive environment characterized by mutual respect, trust and caring, and by the reduction of unproductive pressures and artificial competition for grades;

   ---- The process of learning is not competitive.  6 (1.0)
   ---- I receive a written evaluation from my instructor.  7 (1.1)
   ---- Students are not competing for grades.  13 (.12)
   ---- Good discussions are not stopped by the ringing of a bell.  6 (1.2)
   ---- The process of learning is not pressured.  13 (1.3)
   ---- Teachers trust me.  9 (1.4)
   ---- Classes are personal, not impersonal.  8 (1.4)
   ---- I do not feel tense.  7 (1.4)
   ---- I do not feel pressured.  16 (1.7)
The atmosphere in my classroom is comfortable. 8 (2.0)
My teachers care about me as a human being. 15 (2.2)
I have people I care about. 10 (2.6)

2. To help students and teachers derive satisfaction from the process of learning;

Students are more involved because they like the learning situation. 6 (1.5)
I am happy. 12 (1.7)
I am enjoying my courses. 17 (1.75)
I can go to a class and enjoy it. 25 (1.9)
The person teaching me is enjoyable. 6 (2.25)

3. To help students and teachers learn how to better understand and cope with themselves and the world they live in;

Travelling is an integral part of the program. 10 (1.4)
I am learning to think independently. 9 (2.0)
I am self-motivated. 8 (2.0)
Our curriculum includes academic subjects and emphasizes practical usage. 6 (2.1)

4. To prepare students for learning, living, and working in the future;

What I am learning will help me in the future. 14 (1.7)
The school really offers me subjects that deal with my life later. 9 (1.9)
I am learning to think independently. 9 (2.0)
Our curriculum includes academic subjects and emphasizes practical usage. 6 (2.3)

5. To help students and teachers make the best possible use of their time, as they see it;
   ---- Good discussions are not stopped by the ringing of a bell. 6 (2.1)
   ---- I have enough time in between classes for relaxation, study, or eating. 6 (1.4)
   ---- I am not wasting my time.

6. To give students access to important learning resources within the school (art studios, wood shops, etc.) and beyond the school;
   ---- There are places where I can learn more about special interests, such as art, wood, etc. 9 (2.4)
   ---- Travelling is an integral part of the program. 10 (.14)

B. To meet students' needs for guidance:

1. To provide each student with guidance in personal and academic problems from someone who knows the student well, who is easily accessible to the students, and with whom the kind of rapport has been established that will let the student feel free in seeking help;
   ---- I am getting help in finding out how to do what I want to do. 13 (1.6)
   ---- There is someone whom I can just sit and talk with. 12 (1.75)
I am getting guidance from somebody who knows me pretty well. 15 (1.8)

There is someone whom I can feel is a friend, not just another authority figure. 19 (2.0)

I am recognized as a person instead of a "student." 16 (2.0)

I have the feeling I can go to my guidance counselor for any reason. 11 (2.0)

Someone will help me with things that are on my mind. 11 (2.0)

I am receiving guidance from someone who is understanding. 14 (2.1)

I am receiving guidance from people who are responsive to my needs, rather than to the institutions and organizations of the system. 21 (2.1)

There is somebody who is easy and relaxed. 11 (2.2)

I am receiving guidance from someone who has a personal interest in me as a person. 28 (2.2)

I am receiving guidance from someone who can still see what it's like to be growing up now, not thirty years ago. 16 (2.4)

Guidance is available when I feel I really need someone for any reason. 19 (2.5)

I am getting help from my guidance person when things in school don't go right. 12 (2.5)
2. To give each student the information, advice, and support he needs to understand and make wise decisions in his academic and personal affairs;

---- There is less emphasis on grades and class work. 15 (1.3)
---- I am getting help in finding out how to do what I want to do. 13 (1.6)
---- I am receiving help that is helpful. 11 (1.9)
---- I am getting help in selecting the right high school courses. 11 (2.1)
---- Someone is helping me in adjusting my schedule. 11 (2.2)
---- I am receiving help that is beneficial. 15 (2.2)
---- Help is available when I'm deciding what courses to take next year. 17 (2.3)

3. To give students' advisors the information, time, and leverage they need to be genuinely helpful;

---- Help is available when I'm stuck in a class and would like to switch out. 25 (1.5)
---- My guidance counselor knows what's going on. 12 (1.9)
---- I am receiving help that is helpful. 11 (1.9)
---- When I see a guidance counselor, I do not run into this situation: he is thinking about someone else, he tells me something to get rid of me, not caring whether the solution he proposes is the right one for me. 15 (2.0)
---- I am not getting the run-around, shuffled from one person to another. 15 (2.0)
I am receiving help that is up-to-date. 12 (2.2)

Someone is helping me in adjusting my schedule. 11 (2.2)

I am receiving guidance from someone who can still see what it's like to be growing up now, not thirty years ago. 16 (2.4)

4. To ensure the kind of communication among students, teachers, and parents and advisors that will allow decisions to made in a direct, effective, and satisfying way;

I am not getting the run-around, shuffled from one person to another. 15 (2.0)

Help is available when I'm stuck in a class and would like to switch out. 25 (1.5)

5. To provide students with useful information in the following specific areas:

a. how to find out what I want to do.

b. how to do what I want to do.

c. career exploration.

d. college selection and admissions.

e. academic opportunities within and beyond WOHS.

- I am getting help in finding out how to do what I want to do. 13 (1.6)

- I am getting help in selection a college with a course I would enjoy. 18 (1.9)

- Someone is there to help me with problems about college. 18 (2.1)
- Help is available when I'm deciding what courses to take next year. 17 (2.3)
- What I am learning will help me in the future. 14 (1.7)

C. To meet students' needs for social and emotional support:

1. To give each student the support he needs to do what he has decided to do;
   
   ---- The school is flexible in its approach to different kids. 15 (1.8)
   
   ---- My teachers are willing to help me during class on things I do not understand. 11 (1.9)
   
   ---- When I ask for criticism on such things as writing, tapdancing, etc., it is honestly and thoughtfully given. 12 (2.0)
   
   ---- Teachers really care about me. 11 (2.1)
   
   ---- My teachers are willing to help me after class on things I don't understand. 19 (2.3)
   
   ---- I have confidence. 14 (2.4)
   
   ---- I am happy. 21 (2.5)

2. To provide flexibility as needed in scheduling, staffing, and instruction;
   
   ---- I can change teachers without having to change curriculum levels if I can't get along with him. 11 (1.3)
   
   ---- Teachers are doing what kids want, not just what they want. 14 (1.5)
--- The school is flexible in its approach to different kids. 15 (1.8)

--- Teachers are realizing what kids can't do, as well as what they can do. 15 (1.9)

--- I am learning from other people. 11 (2.1)

3. To make trust and cooperation -- rather than competition -- the basis for relationships among and between students and teachers;

--- Life in school isn't a popularity contest. 13 (1.3)

--- There's a better atmosphere for learning. 20 (1.6)

--- We have trust in each other. 17 (1.8)

--- There is no favoritism in the relationships between teachers and students. 11 (1.8)

--- My teachers and I talk as people, not as students and teachers, in a one-to-one relationship. 12 (2.0)

--- Teachers really care about me. 11 (2.1)

--- My teachers are fair. 20 (2.3)

4. To help students and teachers learn how they're doing as students and teachers and as human beings;

--- When I ask for criticism on such things as writing, tap-dancing, etc., it is honestly and thoughtfully given. 12 (2.0)

--- My teachers and I talk as people, not as students and teachers, in a one-to-one relationship. 12 (2.0)

--- My teachers care about me. 11 (2.1)

--- I have confidence. 14 (2.4)
I am happy. 21 (2.5)

5. To make it possible for people who like each other to work together, and to help people who must work together to respect each other;

---- I can change teachers without having to change curriculum levels if I can't get along with him. 11 (1.3)

---- There is a better atmosphere for learning. 20 (.16)

---- I am doing things with my friends. 11 (2.5)

---- I am learning from other people. 11 (2.1)

---- I am happy. 21 (2.5)

D. To meet teachers' needs for professional growth, self-determination, and success:

1. To place responsibility for making decisions on matters of educational policy and on the use of key resources — instructional materials, money, and teachers' time — in the hands of those directly concerned;

---- Funds are available for me to use for outside resources. 5 (1.75)

---- I have a say in how funds are to be allocated and spent. 5 (1.8)

---- I am able to participate in setting the goals for my department. 7 (2.2)

---- I am participating in bringing about changes in the curriculum. 6 (2.4)
I have the prerogative to be flexible in the use of class time; for example, I can decide to meet with one-half the class one day and the other half the next day.

I have input into determining the number of courses I will teach.

I can decide to use some of my time for conferring with students.

I have time to grade papers.

I am participating in determining the basis on which I will evaluate my students.

I can determine how I will evaluate students.

I am able to use a variety of means to develop the principles of the subject matter.

To give teachers a teaching load that will make it possible for them to fulfill the goals of the Sharpe House Project;

I have a realistic teaching load.

I am assigned to teach classes which stretch my mind.

I have input into determining the number of courses I will teach.

I teach courses because I have something to say in the subject.

I am teaching four classes.

I do not feel overwhelmed by pressures of time.
I have no more than 25 students in my class. 5 (2.2)
I am fulfilling the educational needs of my students. 7 (2.2)

3. To provide teachers with the means of improving their effectiveness, including (a) access to "outside" ideas on curriculum and techniques; (b) opportunities for reading and taking courses in their field of interest; (c) evaluation by means of procedures which they have participated in developing; (d) continuous opportunity to prepare and develop instructional materials; (e) opportunities for inter-disciplinary communication;

I have a say in determining my own role. 12 (2.0)
I have a means of improving the effectiveness of my instruction. 8 (2.0)
I have opportunities to get outside ideas on curriculum and techniques. 7 (2.0)
I am expected to give students the best teaching available. 6 (2.2)
I am knowledgeable in the area of concern. 6 (2.8)
I have participated in developing the means by which I will be evaluated. 5 (1.4)
I am involved in inter-disciplinary communication within the school 6 (1.6)
I have time to continually develop the materials I will use in my teaching. 13 (2.0)
I have time to review course content on a continuing basis. 9 (2.3)
I design, organize, and develop the course I teach. 11 (2.6)

I have the opportunity to develop the means of measuring the growth in the learning of my students. 7 (2.65)

My students feel that our mutual endeavor is genuine and significant. 5 (2.0)

I am staying excited about my own field by reading and taking courses. 5 (2.0)

I am staying excited about my teaching. 10 (2.5)

4. To provide teachers with competent and trustworthy administrative support;

There is no credibility gap between faculty and administration. 8 (1.7)

I am teaching in a school administered by competent leaders. 10 (2.0)

There is respect for my mind and opinions by administrators. 6 (2.2)

I have the kind of authority that allows me to operate in ways that foster good education. 6 (2.2)

5. To help teachers provide learning opportunities appropriate for each student's orientation, objectives, and interests;

Students and teachers are giving as much as possible to produce learning on both sides. 6 (2.1)

I am spending time with kids in one-to-one sessions. 8 (2.25)
I am assigned to teach classes that use my talents to the fullest. 7 (2.3)

I am becoming aware of students' individual qualities in terms of their work. 5 (2.75)

I am teaching in a program in which each student has a program tailor-made to his orientation, objectives, and interests. 8 (1.4)

I am not expected to try to pour academic subjects into kids who are not academic. 8 (2.0)

I am teaching with a faculty that can creatively offer a wide-enough spectrum of courses to turn on and intrigue all levels of students. 6 (2.0)

I am teaching in a program in which students are expected to develop their talents. 6 (2.3)

Kids at all levels are being stimulated and motivated. 7 (1.9)

Students are beginning to experiement on their own in my discipline. 5 (2.0)

My students are demonstrating their understanding by behavior appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves. 8 (2.1)

I have knowledge of the individual differences of my students. 5 (2.0)

My students are deriving pleasure from the work in my discipline. 8 (2.2)

The students wish to be in class. 5 (2.25)
Oldham's population in 1970 was 91,263. Little growth in size is anticipated in the near future. ('Oldham' Monograph, 1973)

Median income for the city is high. In 1960, median family income in Oldham was $9,008, with 43% of its families having incomes over $10,000. By comparison, four neighboring towns had median family incomes of $7,003, $6,804, $9,282, and $11,478, respectively. In 1970, Oldham's median income was $15,381; 51% had $15,000 or over.

Economically, Oldham is tied in with the city of Boston, and with the Route 128 industries. Approximately one-third of the working population is employed in Boston; approximately one-half of the working population is employed in the county (including Oldham and the Route 128 area). While the city is predominantly residential (53.5% of city acreage is residential, 4.6% is commercial/industrial) there were in 1971 a total of 1,847 firms in Oldham employing 22,030 persons with an annual payroll of $169,205,860.

71.2% of Oldham's labor force was "white collar" in 1970, 14.6% was "blue collar," and 13.2% was classified "service" or "laborer." 44.1% of the working population was professional and managerial.
Religiously, the city is divided roughly into thirds, with approximately equal proportions of Protestants, Jews, and Catholics. The neighborhoods served by WOHS, however, are predominantly Jewish. It is worth noting, moreover, that the Jewish population of Oldham has had two periods of rapid growth. The first came in the 1920's and has, as a group, established firm roots in the community, even though a Jew was not elected to the School Committee until 1950. The second "wave" came in the 1950's, settling largely in the west side of the city, the area served by WOHS. These families came, for the most part, from the dense urban areas of Boston now occupied by Blacks (Dorchester, Roxbury, Mattapan). The circumstances of their arrival in Oldham give them a world-view that reflects the struggle they sustained in making the move.

For these new [Jewish] suburbanites, the move to Oldham said something about where they were on the success ladder, about their capacity to compete in society. It symbolized that they had made it -- but had made it on margin. Sacrifice and struggle were still necessary for them to maintain their newly gained status, and, even more important, to secure the opportunity for even greater upward mobility for their children. Education had a double meaning for these people. They saw their own success as a result of their willingness to pursue an education through college and often beyond; and the move to Oldham came to symbolize the truth of their experience and the validity of their belief in education as the avenue to success. (Alpert, 1971)

The history of politics in Oldham in the 1960's is highlighted by their efforts to acquire a political "voice" in the community; school governance was the major battleground, both because of its
availability as an issue and because of its emotional significance.

An important minority population in the VOHS area is working class Catholic, a group that is not accustomed to being a minority population. Some of the more able students go to parochial schools; many of those who do go to WOHS cling together in their hostile rejection of school and the Jewish (majority) students who do so well.

Oldham also has a small, but real, population of "welfare" cases.

There are 24 elementary schools in Oldham, five junior high schools, two high schools, and one technical-vocational school. WOHS was opened in 1960, almost as an annex of East Oldham High School. Because the two schools shared Department Chairmen, who have the power to hire teachers, spend money, and arrange schedules, and because most of the Department Chairmen were located at the East High School, WOHS has been limited in its efforts to develop an independent program more closely suited to the needs of its students. This was changed in 1972, when WOHS was allowed to select its own Department Chairmen.

The elementary and junior high schools have traditionally operated with a large degree of autonomy and differ significantly from one another. Students come to WOHS from three junior highs. About one half of each class comes from the most unusual (and most controversial) of the three, Riverfield, which has achieved national recognition through the Kettering Foundation and through articles in the N.Y. Times, the English Journal, and others, as an innovative school. Riverfield stresses
personal growth through decision-making, allowing students to choose courses and teachers from a college-like catalogue written each term by the teachers and students on each of the four teams (12 teachers; 225 students). Students thus group themselves according to needs and interests, rather than ability or age (except in Math and Foreign Language courses). Students are supported in their efforts by homeroom advisors, who are given enough time each day to get to know their charges well, and who meet regularly with the other members of their team to discuss students' triumphs and failures in order to take appropriate action. Each students' work is evaluated on the extent to which he has made use of his abilities. Riverfield has also developed special programs to meet the needs of alienated students.

Daley Junior High has recently installed some innovative programs, including an in-town annex through which its students can encounter a variety of experiences first-hand. Daley has also moved to close the gap between teachers and students through the development of "cluster" groupings. About 40% of each WOHS class comes from Daley.

Even the least student-centered junior high, Harding, is influenced in its curriculum, as are the other junior highs and the elementary schools, by the leadership of the city-wide coordinators (K-9 in each subject area). The English coordinator, for example, has been responsible for the development and widespread implementation of exciting new programs in communication media study -- including film-making, improvisation and drama, creative writing and book-binding -- and for bringing reading and writing for elementary and junior high school kids
out of the never-never land of textbooks into the clear light of direct experience and personal fantasy. He has helped teachers see writing as a means of personal growth for students struggling to clarify and articulate their experiences, thoughts, and memories.

Thus, students entering WOHS have extensive experience with a wide variety of flexible and creative approaches to learning.
APPENDIX C

WO/EP AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES AT WOEP

Alternative Programs at WOHS

The West Oldham Education Project began its planning phase in 1962 as the West Oldham Experimental Project. The change in the title of the program is significant, reflecting a growing hostility toward innovation and educational experimentation in the community. It is significant, also, that the Project was planned and operated largely without community participation; when it folded, some six years later in an atmosphere of faculty suspicion and jealously, little excitement was aroused in parents. WO/EP was a noble venture, seeking to create a sense of community in a small group of teachers and students (at its height, enrollment did not exceed 15% of the school) who were more or less typical of the total population, and to give those teachers and students the opportunity to create a curriculum that would be more coherent, more flexible, and more attuned to the needs and interests of the students than was the conventional program.

WO/EP was first implemented in September, 1964, with five teachers and 105 students, all tenth graders. New students were added in subsequent years, although changes in the size and balance of the students and teachers were made. Essentially, the program sought to minimize its differences with the rest of the school's operation, including the largely unmodified use of the standard schedule. Only the five basic subject areas (English, social studies, math, French, and science) were
included in the basic program; students took "elective" subjects -- P.E., art, shop -- in the regular program offerings. They also attended large group presentations offered to all tenth graders by the English Department and others, and participated in all school-wide activities, holding, for example, a disproportionate number of elected offices. Even so, one of the major criticisms of the program by WO/EP students was a sense of isolation from the rest of the school; at least, that is one of the reasons given for the demise of the program.

By keeping the changes introduced in the WO EP program to a minimal level, by making it as similar as possible to the regular program, the planners hoped to make WO/EP a model for change in the entire school, to gain faculty and community acceptance for a new program that was not really so radical, and to stay within the bounds of the possible. They did not choose to see this alternative program as an opportunity to break loose from institutional constraints, to go beyond the assumptions and given of the conventional program, even though they had the option of developing the program within a totally protected subculture. The program's low profile was intended, perhaps, to avoid bringing down the kind of criticism that the community was beginning to express toward the more radical program being developed at Riverfield.

Heat building up in the community, however, is one of the reasons given for WO/EP's failure to survive. 1968 marked a major turning point in the relationship between the schools and the community in Oldham. Oldham School Committees had previously been the domain of the elite,
who supported a highly qualified professional staff. School governance
was considered a matter for the judgment of these professional educators
with the encouragement of the politically disinterested citizens of the
School Committee, who made and implemented policy in what they saw as
the best interests of all the students. Education was seen as too
important to allow interference by unenlightened members of the community,
who did not, it was felt, know what was good for them.

The election of Marvin Schwartz in 1968 climaxed a struggle for
political power led by a coalition of "new" Jewish voters in Ward 8
(a WOHS area) and by working class voters on the East side of Oldham.
While the campaign issues centered on Riverfield Junior High's innova-
tive program, which was similar in goals to the WO/EP program, and
an attempt to launch an elementary school lunch program (children had
previously gone home for lunch), the larger message of the election
was the ending of the elite rule of the schools and the politicization
of school governance in Oldham. (Alpert, 1971)

Although WO/EP was not directly attacked, it was suspect because
of its liberal/progressive nature, and was not strong enough to withstand
the change in climate. Significantly, WO/EP origins were in the
thinking of far-sighted administrators and some high-powered University
professors and scholars. Their July, 1963, "Interim Report" on the
development of WO/EP ideology is articulate, persuasive, and fresh,
strongly based on principles of philosophy and psychology, illuminated
by a future-historical perspective that is still valid today. Committee
work in the preparation of the report involved some extensive study of other innovative schools, many of them at the college level, and some fairly specific thinking about how WO/EP should be implemented.

The torch, burning brightly, was passed from the hands of these experts into those of a select faculty group in 1964, which was charged with the development of plans for getting WO/EP into operation. This group concerned itself with such matters as scheduling and the selection of students, and ultimately, with the running of the program itself. Through the years, however, WO/EP faculty returned to the "Interim Report" to measure their progress and success.

The Ford Foundation funded innovation in Oldham to the tune of over half a million dollars in the mid-sixties. WO/EP was one of the innovative projects supported by this grant, as was the companion project at Riverfield. Had WO/EP survived and multiplied, Riverfield students would have come to a far more congenial high school setting than the one currently provided at WOHS, Ford would have a good deal more to show for its money, and this dissertation project would never have been conceived. But the "external" source of funding for the project, with the elitist political structure and the highly theoretical basis of the program, formed a conceptual pattern that was not valid in the community at this time, and which was inconsistent with the student-centeredness of the program itself.

Alpert (1971) points out that a major community norm was the college orientation of the schooling provided its children. The
fundamental aim of high school is to prepare you for college. The aim of junior high is to prepare you for high school. And so on. Riverfield's program, as well as WO/EP's, violated that norm by setting priorities on personal growth. This violation shook up the community, destroying the political coalitions that had previously supported the School Committee and the Superintendent and that had made possible the thrust for innovation which characterized Oldham in the 1960's.

WO/EP was elite, then in its generation. Based on ideology, the program was an excellent example of Oldham's policy of looking beyond its client group for goals, and of its belief in the perfectibility of education through the use of experts.

Another alternative project at WOHS, begun in 1970 and still in operation, is the "Circle House Project," specifically aimed at the most alienated segment of the school population, kids who others simply would not be in school. The results of the 1971 Attitude Questionnaire (Silluzio, 1971) suggest that this program has succeeded in bringing about significant, positive changes in students' attitudes toward their teachers. Through changing the structure of academic requirements and teacher-student relationships, and by providing special opportunities to work outside the school and to socialize within the school. The Circle House Program has helped make school less intolerable for some sixty-five kids. While other teachers are grateful to the Program for taking a group of troublesome students off their hands, the future of the Program is by no means assured.
During the 1971 school year, Principal Nathaniel Fox let it be known that he would like to see other houses initiate alternative programs. The Watson Housemaster responded with an "Eagle's Nest" proposal aimed at the academic elite; the Sharpe Housemaster attempted to revive the WO/EP program. Neither effort came to fruition.
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