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This dissertation describes the design and operation of an unusual graduate education program: a 60-person, ten-month, Master's degree program for people with backgrounds in teaching, journalism, the ministry, social work, and other social professions, as well as for people coming directly from college. The program's primary goals were assisting participants in the development of vision, imagination, and the ability to create community. The program designers assumed that the diverse group of participants, left to their own devices, would grow toward these goals, and that the program would accelerate and intensify that growth, chiefly through requiring participants to broaden their experience, and also by providing them with a unique system of support for helping them learn from their experience.

The program's principle components were:

1. A five week summer session including an initial retreat, daily morning seminars, and a smorgasbord of over one hundred afternoon and evening workshops offered by the participants.

2. Six person committees or support groups that met throughout the year to plan, share, and evaluate experiences in the program.

3. Field work, usually comprising half of the students' time during the year, and usually including work in more than one kind of
setting. Settings included community development programs, banks, junior colleges, and museums, as well as schools of all types and levels.

4. Courses, modular experiences, and independent studies offered in the School of Education, the University at large, and the four affiliated colleges.

5. Spontaneous program activities, usually based around an MAT House.

The story of the program is presented through an account of the author's experience as the principal designer and administrator of the program. The Introduction states his view that the role of a teacher is to search for meaning in a way that helps others to search well. The dissertation proceeds to describe his search for meaning at the time of his first involvement with the MAT Program, Spring, 1970. It emphasizes his interest in helping institutions make more room for exchanges of trust and understanding between people. It describes the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts as a unique setting, offering unusual freedom, and a mixture of creativity, chaos, and power-struggles. Then it presents a chronological account of the author's work in teacher education, tracing the development of major design ideas, institutional struggles, and personal struggles related to the development of the program. It gives emphasis to the expansion of a relatively modest plan to reshape the 1970-71 MAT Program into a more grandiose plan for the 1971-72 Program. The dissertation describes in detail the development of a statement of program goals and structures, and the bringing together of a staff. It points out that for some participants, the program represented the well-springs of a new community that existed beyond the University.

The dissertation then follows the course of the program in operation.
Each of the components is considered in light of the goals and of the intended functions of broadening experience and supporting the learning from experience. The author presents these developments with sufficient candor and detail to allow the reader to regard it as a case study, and to draw his own conclusions. In the final chapter the author presents his conclusions, in part based on participants' evaluations, showing the program to be primarily successful. Participants are shown to have learned from each other and from a wide range of field experiences. Evidence is given of their full and enthusiastic involvement in the program. Almost all of the participants were able to achieve the kinds of positions they desired. Some weaknesses in the program design are observed. It is shown that the hopes of building a new community were too utopian to be fulfilled and the impact of their failure on the program is analyzed. Solutions are suggested in a description of changes made in the design of subsequent programs.

Based upon the author's experiences as a program designer, the Afterword presents his conclusions about the range of program goals, processes, participants, and resources that are available to program designers.
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INTRODUCTION

Beginning in March 1970 I, in association with a series of other people, undertook the job of remaking the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program at the University of Massachusetts. This dissertation recounts the two years of work that followed. It ends with the implementation of the 1971-72 MAT Program. Further experimentation and refinement of the Program has continued to the present date. I leave it to my colleagues to describe the more recent developments.

I believe it is important for others to know our story. Our work is one of a very few recent efforts in professional education to address directly the lack of purpose and lack of joy that many believe is at the heart of current failures in American education and in American society generally. Readers will find that our approach stands in direct contrast to the predominant trend to limit professional education to training for technical proficiency. Readers will find that our work takes us well beyond even the usual professional limits to personal struggles with values and lifestyles. We are intensely engaged in personal struggles to reconcile freedom with authority, integrity with institutional effectiveness, spontaneity with structure, and personal experience with societal experience. As such our experience not only

1. While I refer to the Program we worked with as the MAT Program of the University of Massachusetts, it should be acknowledged that there were six smaller MAT Programs at the University, each associated with a single academic Department. I will deal with these only periferally in this dissertation.

2. See section entitled "Processes" in the Afterword for a detailed argument against the training approach.
speaks to teacher education, but to any situation where idealists are seeking to reshape institutions.

We come out with a number of program concepts and structures that recommend themselves to be used by others. These are summarized in Chapter X. However, I believe readers have as least as much to gain from understanding the process of our struggles as from knowing specific successful outcomes. Accordingly I attempt to present the history with sufficient candor and detail to allow readers to participate in our struggles with us. The dissertation can be read as a case study, from which readers can draw their own conclusions as well as hear mine.

As I write about the struggles, I have in mind a particular view of what a teacher is. Let me summarize this view. We can distinguish several uses of the word teacher. There is the institutionally determined use - a teacher is someone employed to take charge of students in schools. There is the more casual use - everyone is a teacher almost every day whenever he shares facts, skills, or ideas with someone to whom they are new. There is the more discriminating use - a teacher is an expert, a master of some field of activity, from whom others learn through apprenticeship. Then there is the more exalted use, which I support - a teacher is someone who helps others to find meaning in their experience. It is this last sense of teacher that should be emphasized.

Finding meaning is seeing a pattern, an association that gives an experience or oneself a place. The teacher who contributes to meaning then helps people to learn something that leads to learning beyond that particular something. It is probably easiest to think of a
teacher in this sense as a transmitter of a well defined system of ideas—the priest transmitting church doctrine, the art critic transmitting a particular school of criticism, the kind of teacher described by Jerome Bruner transmitting the basic structure of a discipline.\textsuperscript{3}

By helping people to learn the basic forms, many individual pieces of experience people already possess come to have meaning. The same process occurs, though much less consciously, under the general notion of socialization. Personal and social experience comes to have meaning through the learning of patterns and associations, forms and channels, which are defined by human society and by one's particular culture. Most learning of this kind takes place in infancy through experience with parents, but it also continues to occur throughout life through experience with many figures and institutions. This can be regarded as the functioning of the social system of a culture. A teacher has a vital place within the social system transmitting through rituals and teaching the basic values and myths that are the channels of the culture.

The teacher who helps others to find meaning in their experiences does not have to be considered only a transmitter. We often call someone a teacher because he helps people question the culture's system of finding meaning. He can be someone searching for new patterns. A classical sense of the word teacher is that of the great man who reshapes a way of finding meaning—Socrates, Christ, Gandhi, Mao-Tse-Tung.

We are in a time of cultural turmoil. It is not only the lone rebel who is skeptical of the social system or searching for new

patterns. It is a mass phenomenon. Lacking trust in the given cultural forms, people are searching for meaning in the past and the future. Often they are giving up on the search and seeking instead to escape. This can be viewed as an exciting time of ferment. It is also a dangerous time. The well-being of individuals and societies depends on some coherence, some agreed-upon meanings. During this turmoil, teachers in schools have generally turned away from the transmission of culture and from the problem of meaning. They are more and more conceiving of themselves as being merely trainers, as masters of technical skills. I see this as disastrous. More than ever people need teachers who can help them search for meaning. We cannot profit from having teachers transmit cultural forms that are no longer compelling. We cannot expect that many great, Socrates-like teachers will arise. But we can look to a teacher to be a searcher after meaning whose search is useful to others.

The dissertation title stresses that the medium of this dissertation is the message. The struggles the reader is taken through is our Search for Meaning. Using our search to help others to search well was my principal goal in remaking the MAT Program. It has been my principal goal in writing this dissertation. I do wish I had the genius of James Agee or George Orwell, or even a James Herndon. It is the clear and uncompromising communication of a search which they achieve that I have in mind.4

The dissertation presents a primarily chronological account of two years of search. Chapter I summarizes the kind of search I brought with me to the School of Education. Chapter II describes the School of Education. Chapters III through IX describe the development and implementation of the 1970-71 and 1971-72 Programs. Chapter X presents a summary evaluation of the Program and its outcomes in the lives of individual participants and in the life of the School of Education. The Afterword looks from the present time to place the Program and its successors in the context of all teacher education programs in order to give the ideas a life apart from the particular people and institutions.
CHAPTER I
MY SEARCH FOR MEANING

I entered the School of Education in September 1969. In April of my first year I wrote for my portfolio a comprehensive summary of beliefs, questions, and concerns entitled First Year at the School of Education. The following abridged version of this paper is the best expression of my search for meaning at the point when I began my work with the MAT Program.

I began teaching high school five years ago. As I began I did not have in mind the job of getting across a particular curriculum. I began, wanting to get to know students as well as I could, hoping that would be the basis for our helping each other to understand the things we cared about. In the school I found most students having a great thirst for this kind of natural relationship with an adult. In time it became clear to me how unusual my behavior was. Most adults in the school acted as though people's personal concerns and efforts to make sense of their experiences, were unimportant or non-existent. This tended to destroy the school's credibility for me. But I saw it causing many students, new teachers, and often me, too, to distrust ourselves instead. It became my purpose to combat this problem. I was frightened that schools were convincing us not to expect anything to make sense to us personally, and then not to expect much from life. I came to the School of Education to work directly on this problem with
other people interested in doing the same. Before I had only been able to deal with it indirectly, subversively, and in isolation.

My major achievement since being here has been putting this purpose in perspective. I have begun to understand why it was and is compelling to me, while it is not to many others. I have evaluated the appropriateness of making it my central concern. My major points of understanding are as follows:

1. One cannot prove that the need to validate our personal concerns and efforts to make sense of our experiences is a great need. It becomes a focal need only if one shares my values, and it may not always even then. I value most the combination of integrative learning and self-questioning. By integrative learning I mean a process of digesting, inter-relating, and pulling together on a personal level all that is experienced. At its best it becomes more intuitive and less deliberate; it yields the feeling that one already is part of everything else. This can be thought of as the basis of creativity. By self-questioning I mean seeking to be conscious of self as the integrator and requiring that I be honest and inclusive in whatever I address. These processes require a higher level of self trust than other modes of learning that are able to exclude parts of experience and that rest more heavily on powers beyond the self (i.e. the scientific method, revelation, expert opinion). These processes also require a tolerance of self, because they are obviously impossible to hold to. They are not even consistent with each other.
2. My purpose assumes that a large part of people's on-going personal efforts to make sense of their experiences consists of the processes I value. It assumes that the energy to make these processes work is only available when one has an unusual amount of trust in his internal powers. It assumes that many people do not have that trust. Only by making these assumptions can I conclude that helping people to trust themselves is the way to promote these values.

3. The kind of values I am voicing and the needs I am associating with them are often regarded as being "merely adolescent" in the sense that they will be, or at least should be, outgrown. While recognizing that the learning I most value is not the only essential kind of learning, I feel justified in focusing on it. It is the mode we are most dependent on for joy, for keeping in touch with human potential, and for being humans.

4. The ultimate source of this purpose is my needs, which themselves are certainly entangled with my values. I recognize that some people with the same general values do not have as great a need for help in trusting themselves as I do. My own drive to deal with reoccurring feelings of low self-esteem must underlie all that I have presented. I do not think of this problem as something I will solve and be done with, but as something to be dealt with as a continuing part of my life. My major way of dealing with it is to cultivate trust relationships. This raises the question of whether my purpose of validating others' efforts to make sense of their experiences can be addressed fairly, if I do it as part of dealing with my own need for trust. I think it can.
Establishing trust between people and trusting parts of self are mutually reinforcing. I find that I am good at it, but that I must be as conscious as possible of the context set by my own needs.

Most of my activities this year have been associated with learning how to be better at validating personal concerns and efforts to find truth; or, more simply, how to be better at conveying trust. I will discuss these activities in terms of understanding the context of self, person to person contexts, institutional contexts, and the context of the universe.

**Context of Self.** I believe that the actions that feel like natural responses to other peoples' needs, feel that way because they really are natural responses to my needs. Therefore, it is essential to be aware of how my own needs color a situation.

It is especially important for me to understand my need for trust relationships. They greatly influence my behavior. When I am benefiting from them I am effective at integrating and self-questioning. I am usually strong, accepting, and unthreatened, and unusually effective at conveying trust. Without it, I am confused, unusually meek, and powerless. This latter set has characterized my responses to most new situations, especially situations with people I value who are new to me. I see this as a consequence of my commitment to being open to and having to integrate every new experience. My identity is risked whenever anything major, not previously integrated, presents itself. This makes me want to control what I am exposed to. I felt this intensely in my first experiences at the School of Education. I was facing a situation where I was to be working with new authorities on
my most valued beliefs and abilities, which before I had only shared with family and friends.

I recognize that until the middle years of college I often dealt with problems of low self esteem very differently. I aggressively sought control of situations. I tried to compete with and gain power over authorities. I behaved very much like the political personality Lasswell describes. I abruptly curbed this behavior when, at the same time, competition became more rigorous and I became more aware that my successes came at the expense of the honest integrating and self-questioning I most valued. Building trust relationships has generally been a more effective way to deal with low self esteem. In trust relationships the distinction between outside the self and inside the self is minimized. The existence of authorities is minimized; people are equal.

I often feel that I want to be all the time the way I am some of the time. I want to be better at building trust relationships. But I also want to be able to deal more effectively with situations where trust relationships have no chance of occurring. Many institutional situations demand a kind of seeking control that I have reacted against. I recognize that when I am seeking trust relationships I occasionally have a kind of destructive impatience. In the interest of having other people adjust quickly to me, I sometimes refuse to see unlikable things in them and refuse to be angry or negative in any obvious way. I do

1. Harold D. Lasswell in *Power and Personality* (New York: Viking Press, 1962) shows the typical politician to be seeking power over others to compensate for doubts about himself.
not want to take the time of having to go through working out conflicts, or take the risk of exposing what might not be worked out. This behavior shows that I do not care enough about the people to respond to them; instead, I am responding to my need for an easy trust relationship. Of course, if I can not take time to work out major negative things that exist, there can not be an authentic basis for trust.

**Person to Person Contexts.** Trust is conveyed in all kinds of situations. It is a major contributor to the love that can make families and friendships thrive. It also occurs among strangers. For example, it occurs with extraordinary frequency in hitchhiker-driver encounters. Of course, there are societal roles that exist just for the purpose of offering trust relationships: priest, counselor, psychotherapist, bartender, T group leader. My focus has been on the teacher role. I find compelling the idea of using authority that has usually created distrust of self to create trust instead. To do so means going through a process of surrendering authority, a process that re-enacts my turning from seeking control to seeking trust. The importance of this personal parallel has become clear to me as a result of my experience this semester in team teaching a social studies course at Amherst High School. I saw each member of the five man team needing to work out his ambiguity about teacher authority in his own way.

I have become particularly interested in the context set when a person is being taught at the same time he is having his first experiences as a teacher. The need for trust and the value of integrating and self-questioning is magnified by this context. I anticipate being
able to pursue this interest as Assistant Director of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program next year. Glenn Hawkes, the Director, and I are in the process of coordinating the several existing program elements and planning a new core course based on the Hawkes curriculum.\(^2\)

I am approaching the planning with several major goals. I want to make this a program where participants can get to know each other well. I want their school experience to have enough coherence that they leave expecting to make sense out of what happens in schools. I want them to be able to study their reactions to people of different ages in different contexts.

**Institutional Contexts.** Institutional contexts determine what kind of room there is for person to person contexts. For most of my life the areas of my greatest interest and greatest knowledge have been history and government—the study of institutions. However, this has not enabled me to comprehend the institutional contexts I have been involved in.

Between teaching and entering the School of Education I spent two years working in the National Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO); the majority of this time in the Director's immediate office. The function of OEO is to distribute, guide, and monitor the use of two billion dollars by several thousand local agencies that are supposed to provide services to the poor and promote participation of the poor in determining their futures. I was uncomfortable with the kinds of

---

2. An unpublished curriculum entitled "The Human Body" which brings together stages of development in our physical bodies with stages of development in our body politic.
judgements I was expected to make from my position in the institution. The perceptions upon which the judgements had to be based were not adequate by my standards. There were two great obstacles to understanding. One was having to operate on a scale that removed me from the person to person contexts my actions were intended to influence. The other was my having had little first hand experience with poverty.

Some people do have a significantly better understanding of what they are doing when they are operating at this scale than I do. They are able to exercise the kind of power Buckminster Fuller calls "the integration of specializations." He is thinking primarily of the integration of knowledge of the physical world, which requires a facility for dealing with abstractions. The integration of the more tenuous and less discreet knowledge we have of people and society requires an additional, more sophisticated facility which few men gain. Lacking this, one finds himself either projecting his own biases or accepting rather blindly other peoples' views. Faced with this situation at OEO, I resisted dealing on the scale of OEO's national program and focused my energy on the person to person context of relations between employees within OEO. These relationships were informed by the usual competition for raises and promotions, by programmatic goals, by concerns about being treated as means to ends, and also by the myth that OEO was launched as a uniquely mission-oriented and non-bureaucratic institution. My focusing on person to person contexts made me particularly useful both for dealing with employees' problems and for raising

questions about peoples' bases for making decisions.

I am much more comfortable operating in the context of the School of Education. It is possible to know almost all of the people involved. The major purpose of the institution is to affect those people. I am beginning to understand and affect the institutional structures that affect the person to person contexts here: admissions policy, financial policy, Center structures, definition of faculty and student roles. I am Chairman of the Non-Center Admissions Committee. I am also helping to write an evaluation of the role of the Non-Center. I am a member of the Ombudsman's Advisory Committee.

I will not try to give a full account of my understanding of the contexts of elementary and secondary schools. However, I do want to relate some of the understanding I have gained this year about how schools are changing. It seems certain that differentiated staffing and diverse applications of technology to schools will be accepted because they can make elementary cognitive learning more efficient. This specialization can either promote my major concerns or distract people from them. It could happen that being more realistic about elementary cognitive learning and abandoning simple autocratic traditions will help teachers to face up to their influence on students' attitudes toward themselves and toward learning. In the meantime, teachers who have refused to be authoritarian, and have established feelings of community in their classrooms, may find that
the new complexity resulting from specialization inhibits the main-
tainance of trust. I anticipate that most teachers will come to over-
value elementary cognitive learning because they will feel effective
dealing with it. They will focus their attention on the quality of
external resources for learning rather than on the quality of human
relations and the release of internal resources. I fear that a 1984
type vision of conditioning will become more attractive to many
teachers. I want to help prevent this from occurring. At the same
time, I want to promote facilities for individualized learning. I
want the power of the learning center designer, the master teacher,
and the counselor to be wedded to a Rogerian vision of freeing people
to be integrative and self-questioning learners.

Context of the Universe. The framework for defining the self
context and all other contexts is the context of universe one holds in
mind. Working this year in the Practicum in Humanistic Curriculum, I
developed a framework for understanding the need for power. Gerry
Weinstein presents power, identity, and connectedness as primary needs
in his Making Urban Schools Work. I posited as a more basic need of
man, the need to resolve his concern about the control of his life (I
see my feelings of low self-esteem as manifestations of this concern).

4. See George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four (London: Secker and
Warburg, 1949).

5. See Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E.
Merrill Publishing Company, 1969) and other works.

6. Mario Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, Making Urban Schools Work:
Social Realities and the Urban School (New York: Holt, Rinehart &
I said that one can seek to resolve this concern in three general ways: 1) by gaining power over self, over other men, and nature, 2) by gaining connectedness with the forces that he believes control him---God, nature, historical necessity, societal leaders, other people, 3) by liberation---transcending his ego, which is where the concern lies. One can pursue any one of these ways to the exclusion of the others. As I have explained, I used to depend heavily on the first way, especially on gaining power over people. I now depend more on gaining power over self (self-questioning) and on establishing trust---which on one level is connectedness with other people, and on another level yields the kind of liberation I have described before as a feeling that one already is part of all things.

This year I have for the first time sensed that these personal changes were in fact related to large cultural changes. I see that our culture in the past has emphasized gaining power over self, over other men, and over nature. It has directed our attention to what can be changed in the world in the short run. (This contrasts with cultures that have had little hope of controlling their environments and have developed connectedness and liberation strengths that invoke long run spiritual frames of reference). My generation is reacting against our cultural emphasis. One major reaction is to cultivate sources of liberation and connectedness, many of them borrowed from these other cultures (drugs, meditation, Zen, astrology). A new non-power oriented life style has emerged that emphasizes trust, personal integrative learning, and sharing rather than possessing. At its best, it promotes
individual variation and the destruction of stereotypic racial, sexual and national distinctions.

This reaction is often regarded as a reaction to the threat of nuclear and ecological holocausts, which can be seen as consequences of our culture's seeking power. My experience tells me that, in addition, it represents a more direct reaction against the process of seeking power. I believe that process is becoming an increasingly more difficult way of gaining a feeling of control over one's life. Ironically, a major consequence of our cultural emphasis has been a level of organization and technology that removes the exercise of power to so large a scale and so complex and so rapid a process that few find satisfaction in exercising it.

A second major reaction of my generation is the cultivation of a new kind of power. It is based on simple, deliberate, small scale actions---often actions of protest (sit-ins, marches, pickets; also clean-ups, creation of parks, etc.). Such actions are symbolic, for participants, if for no one else. If the symbol is powerful enough it can yield feelings of connectedness or liberation. Often, too, it yields a feeling of power. Sometimes this is simply an illusion; the influence on behavior is negligible or not what was intended. However, such actions conveyed rapidly by media, and retained in their simplicity, do become symbols for many people. If the intended effect is to call attention to a problem or to remove a simple, identifiable source of a problem this is an effective kind of power. Often though, it is aimed at very complex goals and results in destructive oversimplifications and confusions.
As I have indicated I do not have a vision or a facility that is adequate for the task of dealing with the complexity I see, the task of building new institutional contexts on a large scale. I do recognize some elements from which it may grow. First among them is the sense of potential trust among all men that comes from the experience of trust between a few men. I fear anything that gets in the way of this. Black power, the most important manifestation of the new kind of power, is often regarded as a healthy sign of blacks' building positive identity or self trust. I see it along with Women's Liberation and SDS as unhealthy because of their dependence on blaming and excluding, or even hating, other people. This trait is the core of the sickness of the old institutions that have exploited men and resources on behalf of single ideologies, religions, races, and classes. My commitment to self-questioning forces me to begin by trying to understand the "enemy", the man in the other group, in the same way that I try to understand myself. In the end I am relying on a sense of the long-run biological and social connectedness of all men.

With the writing of this paper in April, 1970, I established a terminology and perspective for understanding my search. In the paper I had used these aids to resolve major aspects of my struggle in what I called the context of self and the context of the universe. I defined major sources of my struggle in person to person and institutional
contexts: my dependence on trust relationships, the problem of unfamiliar situations, the problems of time and scale. The paper enabled me to complete a primarily reflective phase. It brought me to a point of going out to search through action, to test the personal "truths" against real institutions and people. The major arena for action was to be the MAT work. In Chapter III I will deal thoroughly with the early MAT ideas that I mentioned in the paper and begin the MAT history itself.

In the spring of 1970 I saw the MAT work as being a professional, institutional task. I continued to work more privately on person to person contexts. It seemed presumptuous to bring too much of the personal into the professional. But the separation was not easy. The struggle to reconcile personal and institutional was to be a central struggle throughout the MAT work. Let me recount here "the Woodstock experience" which was an early attempt at reconciliation that foreshadowed later MAT efforts. In the spring of 1970, two people with whom I shared a trust relationship in a peak of good feeling joined with me to conceive a plan to gather all the people we were closest to together to organize for some kind of social action. About 30 of us gathered the following Labor Day Weekend at a country home in Woodstock, Connecticut. Our idea was that the trust and energy that we had shared in twos and threes could be multiplied into a network large enough to act with power, but without the inhibiting aspect of institutions. Woodstock turned out to be not more than a social occasion, and not terribly successful socially. Among the obstacles
we were able to discern were the newness of the idea, the intensity of our expectations, the lack of concrete proposals, and the lack of time or inclination of people who were new to each other to meet.

The immediate effect of Woodstock was discouragement about working on a large scale. It made me more reserved and cautious about moving beyond my established friendships. But I was to keep puzzling over the meaning of trust relationships. Over the next year I developed a more and more positive understanding of the need for trust as being not so much a consequence of my weakness as it was an underrated common need. In the summer of 1971 I wrote the following "Thoughts on Human Understanding in Education." I wrote it as a variation on James Agee's statement on the significance of understanding in Let Us Now Praise Famous Men:

"Every breath his (a child's) senses shall draw, every act and every shadow and thing in all creation is a mortal poison, or is a drug, or is a signal or symptom, or is a teacher, or is a liberator, or is liberty itself, depending entirely upon his understanding: and understanding, and action proceeding from understanding and guided by it, is the one weapon against the world's bombardment, the one medicine, the one instrument by which liberty, health, and joy may be shaped or shaped toward, in the individual, and in the race." 7

The experience of an unusually full and clear understanding between two or more people is significant, not just as an increase in their comprehension of each other, but as an essential increase in their comprehension of themselves and the world generally. These experiences serve as fundamental touchstones for reality.

7. Agee, p. 263.
Let me describe what I think of as a full and clear understanding. It is partly that glimpse into how the world really looks to another person which you get whenever someone makes a gesture which is more honest than usual, like an involuntary smile, or says out loud something he has just realized about himself (I'm still afraid of the principal's office). These are kinds of glimpses that often occur between strangers. I particularly associate them with hitch-hiking encounters. This is the clarity of understanding I mean. A fullness of understanding usually must take place over time, as in the best times in the best friendships and loves. For the understanding to grow to fullness, then, people must value the first glimpses and seek to expand them. This understanding must be between people. It must go both ways, and not be a matter of a psychiatrist seeing into an unseeing patient.

We are not usually seeking to understand or be understood. Usually other social needs predominate. Usually we are seeking to defend, convince, win approval, beat out, control. Understanding can occur when we have come to trust each other; when we are free from having to further impress, put down, agree with, disagree with, or convince each other. To put it another way, understanding demands an integrity of communication that is not undermined by a concern about the consequences. It is the relative absence of consequences that makes meetings with people you are not apt to see again, ripe for clear exchange. It may be the proliferation of consequences that makes understanding between family members uniquely difficult.

I do not think that understanding could often come automatically or easily. The understanding I have in mind occurs only between
people who have separate identities. Crossing those boundaries can have negative as well as positive consequences. My interest is in the tension between separateness and oneness.

During an exchange of understanding we are generating and receiving great quantities of perceptions rapidly. (Sometimes the peak of the experience occurs when one is alone after the encounter.) In it we find new things to be exciting, not threatening. Two major things are going on: one, an exchange of frameworks for integrating perceptions (gestalts), whereby one gains new avenues for finding meaning; two, an awareness of getting beyond oneself to understand another person, whereby one feels a confirmation of his own being. One is able to participate in and be within a transpersonal reality. This is nourishment for the ego that is an alternative to the conquest or protection one can achieve by competing or accommodating. In the experience of understanding one is simultaneously more in communication with others and more himself.

An exchange of understanding is a key to increasing one's capacity to learn from others and from his own experience. It is almost the same process which enables first childhood learning to take place. Some elements of first learning are well established by instinct. For them to be expressed and mastered, the prime requisite is that the person be cared for, be loved. Without that confirmation of being, that feeling of being within a transpersonal reality, the infant can not afford to learn. The most obvious process by which new frameworks for learning are added is identification with a parent--I see this as a one-sided version of the exchange of frameworks. The most common learning failure in people who have suffered inadequate care or opportunity for identi-
Correption is misinterpretation of the difference between what is outside himself and what is inside (paranoia, delusions of omnipotence). The normal way of distinguishing between self and world depends on feeling within love, the feeling of interacting with a responsive world.

Beyond the time of dependence on parents and the establishment of the initial frameworks, large jumps in learning may still be dependent on confirmation and exchanges ("cross-identification"). It seems to be necessary to parents if they are to feel right about undertaking the new learning that comes from creating a child together. It seems to be a large factor in many scientific and artistic breakthroughs. It may be necessary for the refinement of integrating frameworks that constitute the most important part of our everyday learning.

Why is this factor usually overlooked? The usual sense of a learning experience is of learning knowledge or skills without consciousness of one's own gestalt or anybody else's. One thinks of his learning as being relatively objective and removed from other operations of the self. There are several explanations for this. Often it is that we are learning isolated pieces. We do make judgement that the pieces are valuable or true, but on the most narrow pragmatic basis: they enable you to perform or win praise. Their meaning in relation to other pieces is not considered. New frameworks are not being developed. More significantly we are often working consciously in a framework of science or reason, or more vaguely, the western intellectual tradition. This means that one is operating in a defined, agreed-upon framework
that many men share. To the extent that one puts his faith in this as a framework outside himself, he reduces his need for other senses of a transpersonal reality and new learning frameworks. The value of making extensive use of science and reason is easy to see. At a minimum it allows men who do not know each other, even men living at different times, to learn from and make discoveries in relation to each other's thinking. But the value is not an absolute one. The assumptions that establish a scientific framework are not always conscious, and they change. It is dangerous to rely on these frameworks absolutely, to allow them to substitute for the kind of understanding I have described. This leads, as in schizophrenia, to misinterpretation of the distinction between oneself and the world.

The MAT work came to include efforts to directly promote an exchange of understanding between participants and to make this a model for teacher behavior. But before describing this I will describe the institutional setting. It played a larger role than my own personal search in shaping our first months of work.
CHAPTER II
THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

A Unique Place. Henry S. Resnik has written in the Saturday Review,

"The most cursory acquaintance with Dwight Allen's school inspires hyperbole and metaphor. Because a vast number of activities and events are always happening at U-Mass, the image of a three ring circus comes to mind, but this fails to suggest the extent to which Allen is the center of the action. A phantasmagorical juggling act would be a more appropriate description."

The School of Education of the University of Massachusetts was reborn in September 1968, when Dwight Allen was brought from his faculty position at Stanford University to be the Dean. From that day on it has been a unique place. As part of Dwight's coming, 30 additional faculty members were added. A majority of the existing faculty members were replaced. The graduate student body was approximately doubled for each of the first three years. Grades were abolished, traditional admissions and hiring criteria were for the most part ignored, faculty and student roles were redefined, and the curriculum was reconstructed. The governance of the school, while legally in the hands of the Dean, was by Dwight's choice shared with the faculty and graduate students, a sort of Town Meeting arrangement.


2. I will refer to Dwight Allen and most of the other people at the School by their first names because this reflects the climate of the School and MAT Program. Dwight especially encouraged us to call him by his first name.
Dwight and the new people he brought here shared a willingness to leave behind the bulk of academic traditions and to risk confusion, chaos, and controversy to pursue educational change. Dwight is reported to have opened conversations with potential faculty recruits with "How would you like to join a revolution?" The circus and juggler metaphors are apt characteristics of Dwight's style. The revolution as led by Dwight features a great deal of exuberance, showmanship, and corn. He includes buttons and posters in the School of Education catalog. He ascended in a hot air balloon to call attention to the School's semi-annual educational marathon. He has sought to get a contract to write educational messages to go on cereal packages. Like a circus, the School of Education in fact contains a diversity of styles and acts, not a coherent approach. Allen's own work can be identified with computer assisted instruction, flexible scheduling, micro-teaching, differentiated staffing; most recently with combatting racism and promoting alternative schools; and throughout his life, with the Ba'hai Faith. Some of the most prominent acts which Dwight brought to the School are the human potential movement, the free school movement, new educational uses of media and technology, and program development in urban education. The School also leaves room for a measure of scholars and of more typical teachers of school personnel.

Since the first year, which was a planning year with no structure, most faculty and students have been associated with one of the School's Centers or Programs. Centers serve in lieu of departments as a basis for activity around common academic interests. Programs are like

3. Resnik, p. 49
Centers, but smaller. A few Centers have spawned close knit groups with well-defined student and faculty obligations. Most have not. Some centers have deliberately resisted the kind of obligations that would make them exclude people from outside the Center. In 1970 there were the following eleven Centers: Aesthetics Education, Innovations in Education, International Education, Leadership and Educational Administration, Media, Teacher Education, Urban Education, and Sociological, Historical and Philosophical Foundations. There were the following six Programs: Compensatory Education, Early Childhood Education, Occupational Education, Reading, Non-Center, and M.A.T..

The School was able to be reborn because Dwight is a "consumate hustler." In addition to being personally persuasive and a great dreamer and "brainstormer", he is a proven fund raiser. He and others he has attracted here have been able to raise federal and foundation grants which have amounted to more than the regular budgeted State support for the School. Such funds tend to focus the school's attention on affecting institutions and groups outside the University through curriculum dissemination, staff development, and other project activities. (Dwight himself spent more than half his time away from the University in the first years.) They also tend to focus the School's attention on short-run goals rather than its most far-reaching ideals. Dwight has been able to parlay his successes into a significant national reputation for himself and the School. The school has attracted about 3000
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graduate student applicants per year. It has been visited by most of the leading liberal educators. It may be along with Harvard and North Dakota the nation's best known reform-oriented school of education.

The real impact of the School is not easy to determine. Its uniqueness certainly challenges educators to question their purposes. But the School may lack the sense of integrity and discipline to support a sustained search for significant solutions. Putting aside the subject of the School's influence on the larger world, let us examine its impact on its faculty and students. Dr. Frank Chase, former Dean of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, wrote after a week's visit to the School:

The great strength of the School, and of its Dean is the restless and persistent quest for better ways of achieving objectives in education and social objectives through education. As a result the School can justly be described in the words of the brochure entitled "A View, A Review, A Vision" as "electric, enthusiastic, open, vital, teeming with controversy, often joyful, often noisy, and often confusing." I found supportive evidence for all of the adjectives except "noisy".

There is a wider array of options for both students and faculty members than I have encountered elsewhere. This offers an inviting prospect for socially significant and self-actualizing activities for those whose abilities put them within reach of their aspirations. It is also tantalizing to those who lack adequate criteria for choice. The alternative routes and structures are not always differentiated sufficiently to make choice meaningful; and I suspect that student choices are often happenstance in spite of the helpful information provided by Marathon Week and otherwise.

Resnik reports a more pointed view:

At U-Mass right now you can probably get the best education of any education school in the country, says one of the school's faculty. "I know some people who

are doing it. You can also get the worst." The best is available, one gathers from a visit to the school, in the pervasive mood of excitement and experimentation. The U-Mass ed school is one of those rare educational institutions where even the most far-out ideas are at least likely to be considered. The worst lurks in every corner of the school in the form of poor planning, or no planning: aimless speculations, with vaguely revolutionary overtones; and a romantic commitment to the concept of change that, without a specific program, adds up to no change.

The fact that there is no specific program for change is the result of a deliberate decision---anyone at U-Mass can tell you that the most important thing right now is to develop alternatives. Forced heartiness and camaraderies abound for the U-Mass ed school is trying to become the model of a human institution. On the basis of recent visits, however, it appears to be far from this goal. The atmosphere is casual and swingy, but it's also competitive and tense. Large numbers of students and teachers are dissatisfied, and most of those who aren't seem to be ardent followers of Dwight Allen.6

In the absence of well-defined roles and status, and with a benevolent hustler/patriarch at the top with most of "the goodies", the School does have the aspect of a wide-open entrepreneurial free-for-all. Not everyone plays, but to survive one has to, as it says on one of the buttons Dwight put in the catalog, "tolerate ambiguity".

Graduate Students. Many graduate students find the School of Education frustrating. It is not a place where you are told what to do or even offered guidance or information about what there is to do. Many find it requires most of their energy the first year to find out what exists here and to find some people to pay attention to them. While many courses are offered, it is evident that a relatively few are of high quality and that they are not the heart of the school's curriculum. Graduate students typically spend more time participating
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in funded projects, doing field work and independent studies on their own, and teaching courses themselves, than in taking courses from faculty members. The idea is to learn through action, preferably action that furthers the School's purposes. The purpose of the School may be seen as primarily to serve its students and through them the world. But the difficulty in getting attention and the lack of good teaching can make one feel it is rather to serve the world, or more cynically, the growth of its power in the world, and to use its students to do that.

Part of the Allen ethic is for graduate students to have a primarily collegial rather than subordinate relationship to faculty. There is much less subordination by academic status than in most schools. Some individual graduate students do in fact have a more influential teaching or administrative role than numbers of faculty. As there has been minimal concern about the need for faculty to monitor graduate students, the graduate population has been allowed to grow without comparable increases in faculty numbers. About 500 doctoral students and 200 masters students were admitted in each of the first three years. Among them were an unusually large proportion of people with political influence, Blacks, and counter culture types. The potential for collegial relationships between graduate students and/or faculty has been limited by this growth in numbers, as well as by the diversity of people and the entrepreneurial climate. Faculty who are open to serving as advisors are swamped. The most influential and effective people are no longer accessible. Dwight's desire to be personally accessible led him
in the first several years of the School to make himself available to anyone on short notice if they would come before his regularly scheduled day. There were many four and five a.m. appointments. But over the last two years he has had to give in to numbers.

The School has unique advantages for graduate students that are worth defending. I wrote such a defense to David Krathwohl, Dean of the School of Education at Syracuse University, in 1971. He had just participated in a site visit evaluation aimed at determining the validity of our degree programs. I wrote:

I respect the School to the extent that students and faculty, take responsibility for maintaining high standards of integrity in their own actions. We have the opportunity here to get at what we consider most important without being distracted by having to compete for external rewards or to pass narrowly defined tests. I believe we generally behave well in this situation. I find more people working with more energy and integrity here than in the other institutions I know well (Wesleyan, Harvard, Office of Economic Opportunity).

This is a school that can be trusted with liberalized Degree provisions. I am too immersed in trying to be clear enough about what learning is and how to judge the quality of learning in different realms to have a fixed point of view about what the end point of a Degree of certification process should be. I am clear that almost all institutions now err in the direction of maintaining academic cliques, not because they promote wisdom, but because they give their members status.

The report of the evaluation team was ambiguous. It praised the School of Education for its innovations and its creative climate, but it criticized the means by which this was achieved. Its recommendations included giving the faculty greater authority, limiting the Dean's authority, turning down a proposal for a Ph.D. Degree, and urging more extensive monitoring of graduate work.
To some extent the School exists within the Graduate School of the University. It has about half of the graduate population of the University. The Graduate School Deans have all along been uncomfortable with Dwight's departures from standard hiring and admissions criteria, and his lack of controls on graduate students. But Dwight received a temporary exemption from some of these restrictions from the central University administration as part of his agreement to become Dean and for four years he has had the muscle to ward off the Graduate Deans' criticisms. The School's requirements for graduation have followed the established minimum standards of the University. Doctoral students have a three-man faculty guidance committee which approves their program of study, oversees an oral comprehensive exam, and, with the addition of another member, approves and examines them on a dissertation. There are no course credit or time requirements other than one year of residence. Masters students are required to have a single faculty program advisor approve their course of study, which must include 33 credits of work for a Masters of Education Degree, or 36 for a Master of Arts in Teaching Degree.

**Teacher Education.** The new School inherited from its predecessor a large undergraduate teacher education program that included elementary education majors and secondary certification candidates. The freedom and excitement of the new School and the lure of the new pass/fail grading system attracted additional undergraduates. As many as 3,600 were enrolled at any one time during the second, third, and fourth years of the new School. The job of responding to the needs of
these students was for the most part overlooked by Dwight and the School as a whole. Few faculty were brought here because they wanted to work with undergraduates. Only a handful were brought because they wanted to work with teacher education. The major investment in faculty was made in the income-producing areas of curricular reform and institutional change. The job of teacher education was primarily left to the Chairman of the Teacher Education Center and a Director of Field Placement. They were able to draw on about six other faculty to teach subject matter methods courses, about four to teach foundations of education courses, and people in the Psychology Department to teach educational psychology. About half of these faculty had been inherited from the old School and most of them were hostile to the new School. Most of the new members can be associated with a programmed approach to teacher education. Their view was given expression during the planning year in the design of a 50-100 student model elementary teacher education program (MTEP). 7 This was the only teacher education program to bring any soft money into the School. Few of the change-oriented, anti-authoritarian graduate students were attracted to work with either the new or old teacher education faculty, though many students ran their own courses for undergraduates and held supervising assistantships.

Having for the most part left teacher education out of the revolution, the School found itself doing what other equally large and under-financed State teacher training schools do. Students were shuffled through 100-300 student certification-related classes, often taught by reluctant professors. They were placed through an impersonal, anonymous system into student teaching situations with graduate student supervisors who would be visiting about twenty students per year. The situation was probably worse than in most other mass education programs because there was less information or guidance as to what was required. Undergraduates were hurt even more than graduates by the low priority put on systematic communication, advising, and administration. Most of the faculty saddled with the administration of teacher education, when they had the choice, sought to decrease enrollment and to restrict their role to conducting the METEP program. This was resisted by the University and later by the School of Education faculty. This led to the hiring of additional teacher education faculty, the leaving of the Center Director, and, in 1971, to the reorganization of the School's approach to teacher education.

One small piece of the teacher education program that the new School inherited was an MAT Degree piece. There had been 20-50 MAT candidates per year for 15 years, including many part time students. The MAT Degree continued to exist in the new School because nobody stopped it. Given the emphasis on doctoral students, and the necessity of responding to the large numbers of undergraduates, Masters' students generally were given a low priority in the School.
did choose to admit Masters' candidates into a sort of junior doctoral program to serve people whom they valued, but who could only come for one year. The MAT Degree did not do this, but rather served a given category of students. It was not given deliberate attention in the planning year or the year after. During the planning year responsibility for advising MAT students was picked up by William Lauroesch, whose primary interest and experience lay in preparing people to work in junior colleges. When he had the chance in the next year, he dropped the responsibility for the elementary and secondary oriented MAT students who constituted the bulk of the program, so as to concentrate on the junior college-oriented students. Under Lauroesch the 1969-70 MAT Degree was administered through the Human Relations Center. The experience of MAT students was to a large extent the same as the undergraduates'. They were in the same mass, certification-related classes and had the same kind of supervision in student teaching. As graduate students they were given priority for the several existing paid student teaching positions. The courses taken outside the School of Education were pursued without real involvement of Arts and Science faculty in the program. Students were in the same position of anonymity as undergraduates, except that they had only one year to negotiate the system.

Changes in the School. Most of the characteristics of the School I have described not only fit the School when Glenn and I took over the MAT Program in 1970, but continued to apply through the end of the 1971-72 MAT Program. The most significant change in this period was the reorganization of teacher education. In Fall 1970, three new faculty were added whose major interest was teacher education. These
three with four other faculty and one student were asked to make a study of the School's teacher education program. Their report which appeared in December 1970 recommended continuing with the same number of students in teacher education, increasing the resources allocated to teacher education, and placing responsibility for policymaking and administration into a new school-wide council. In accord with these recommendations, the Teacher Preparation Program Council (TPPC) was established in February 1971. Richard Clark, who had been a leader of Dwight's innovation team, was named Chairman. In 1972 he became Assistant Dean for Teacher Education. The other TPPC members were two undergraduates, five faculty members and one graduate student - myself.

The basic approach which emerged in the Spring of 1971 was to promote the creation of a large number of alternative teacher education programs from which students could choose. In addition to providing a choice, TPPC sought to provide a more coherent experience with smaller units of students and staff working together for a year or more in classes and in the field. We developed the following guidelines:

1) The proposed program or component should have an explicit and thoughtful rationale. The rationale should include:
   a) An explanation of the goals of the proposed program in terms of teachers, learners, schools, and the wider society schools serve.
   b) An explanation of how the various components of the proposed programs are designed to reach the goals and how they relate to one another.
   c) A reasoned explication of the learning theory implicit in the program.
   d) An explicit statement of the terms in which the success of the program is to be assessed.
A major component of any program should be in the clinical area and should involve working with other learners of other ages. We do not intend that these other learners necessarily be children nor do we intend that the clinical component be necessarily designed in conformity with current student teaching or internship practices.

A major component of the program must be designed to help students to develop both the capacity and the inclination for reflective analysis. By this we mean essentially the ability to learn from one's experience. It implies learning of a second order -- an ability to reflect not only upon one's own behavior but about the assumptions upon which one's behavior is based.

As TPPC was beginning to act there were already at least three special programs in the School of Education using this approach: METEP, the Model Elementary Training Sequence Program, and, as we shall see, the 1970-71 MAT Program. By the end of the Spring there were 16 programs: Alternative Schools, Distributive Education, "Explorations!" Early Childhood, Individualized Education, International Education, Mark's Meadow, Martha's Vineyard, MAT, M.ED., METEP Integrated Day, Media for the Deaf, S.H.P., Off-Campus Program, Special Education and Urban Education. TPPC's concern was primarily with the undergraduate mass, but it also was the umbrella for the MAT Program and by Spring 1972 for three new graduate teacher education programs.

The TPPC approach has required that more faculty and graduate students do more work than under the mass system. TPPC has been able to stimulate very substantial commitments from a handful of faculty and graduate students by giving them the authority to create and lead teacher education programs of their own design. It has been able to stimulate some participation from faculty and students in most of the
Centers of the School through its control of about 65 graduate assistantships, each worth $3-4000. As we will discuss later, the TPPC approach created some problems by trying to do so much with so few resources. But given its few resources it would have been less productive to have settled for doing less. In March of 1972, the undergraduate and graduate programs were evaluated and approved by the National Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. In February 1973 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education presented one of its five "Distinguished Achievement Awards" to the School of Education for "excellence in teacher education".

There have been other major changes in the School since 1969. Most of them have taken place after 1972 and have not therefore had a bearing on the central subject of this dissertation. Let me mention briefly a few that do. In the Spring and Fall of 1972, there were major racial confrontations in the School which changed, not only the relationship between the races in the School, but the relationship between Dwight and the faculty, and the School of Education and central Graduate School and University administration. From the start, Dwight and many of those he brought with him were deliberately committed to having a multi-racial school. A third of the entering doctoral students the first year were non-white. After a poor start, minority faculty were gradually added so that at the beginning of 1972, 18 faculty were non-white and three of the five Assistant Deans were non-white. The School went far beyond this practice of making itself open to minority members with the issuance of the "Nantucket Manifesto" in the Spring of 1971. Dwight, the Assistant Deans, Center Directors, and some
other faculty decreed in the Manifesto that "the number one goal of the School is to combat racism." Many in the School strongly objected to this extraordinary policy. Most resented the method by which it was determined. But there was no open battle over these issues in themselves.

The Manifesto led to the establishment of a Committee to Combat Racism, setting more demanding quotas in admissions and hiring, holding race relations seminars and workshops, creating a race relations resource center, and issuing guidelines for combating racism to all school programs. It led to a needed increase in awareness of discrimination among many whites. It also led to people letting themselves be manipulated by the racism issue. Dwight appeared to support those people - black and white - who followed his own suggestions and policies. He seemed to shun open debate on questions of how to combat racism most effectively. The most dramatic outcomes of the anti-racism policy were the confrontations of 1972 initiated by the Third World Caucus. They occupied and closed the School in effect to call Dwight on his commitment.

Speaking, in my estimation, with the support of a majority of the non-whites in the School and a large minority of whites, they took the position that most of the anti-racism activity was only self-serving rhetoric. They held that minority people were being exploited to get attention and power for the School without being able to influence it and without being offered effective education and without the School making a real contribution to the minority communities. They felt the School only offered a means for advancement to establishment type non-whites and did not promote the long-run interests of minority people.
Many non-whites, including the deans and many of the faculty, dis-associated themselves from this position. The specific issues of the confrontation included the rhetoric associated with the Marathon, the administration of the Career Opportunities Program and other programs serving predominately non-white people, the admission to the graduate school of a dissident black student leader, and the recognition of the Caucus as the spokesman for minority interests.

The confrontations raised the question of confidence in the Dean. In order to reestablish his authority, Dwight required the support of the School's faculty and the central administration of the University. Each extracted a price from Dwight. Dwight made a number of melodramatic, sometimes paranoid, appeals to the faculty for support. Many faculty were sympathetic to the position of the Caucus. Many additional faculty felt that Dwight had treated faculty members inconsistently, sometimes arbitrarily, and even felt a sense of resentment toward how they had been used, kindred to the feelings of the Third World. This led to a public airing of personal criticisms of the Dean which added up to an expression of very limited confidence in the Dean. This change in climate combined with the growth of the School of Education led in 1973 to reorganization of the School from the center system into clusters and to the rewriting of the constitution. These changes increased somewhat the Dean's dependence on the faculty. Dwight's weakness also made it easier for the central administration to place controls on the School of Education. Faced with implementing a limitation on graduate admissions for the Amherst
campus the Graduate School was not able to hold the School of Education under 580 new admissions in 1972. But in 1973 it gave the School a quota of 123 and even after Dwight's appeals, the Graduate School still held the number to 186. These changes, along with the shrinking of available government grants, has halted the expansion of the School. Most people now at the School regard the current time as a period for consolidation and improvement of what already has been undertaken. Most faculty seem to welcome this period. Attention to the interests of minorities, including women, has become a permanent part of the School, but issues of minority group influence as well as anti-racism rhetoric no longer dominate the institution as they did in the 1971-71 period.
CHAPTER III

SPRING 1970, GLENN AND I BECOME PROGRAM DESIGNERS

In March of 1970, Glenn Hawkes was asked by the Deans of the School of Education to become the Director of the existing MAT Program. As a condition for accepting the assignment Glenn asked that a teaching assistantship be allocated for a position of Assistant Director and that I agree to take that position. Both of us were in our first year at the School, Glenn as an Assistant Professor and I as a candidate for a Doctorate in Education. We had not thought of ourselves primarily as teacher educators. However, we were eager to assume a major tangible responsibility after having so far spent our time at the School in relatively isolated study, writing and work on several small projects. We were also eager to work together. And we were excited by the style of the new School of Education that created incentives for people to explore new fields by putting them in charge of those fields. We made the decision to take the job.

The choice of Glenn Hawkes as Director of the MAT Program in March, 1970, strongly associated the Program with the values of intellectual inquiry and imagination. Glenn was one of only a handful of faculty at the School whose primary concern was with ideas. He was one of a few who could be at home in the liberal arts milieu of the MAT tradition. And he was in his own way as astoundingly imaginative and playful as Dwight. Glenn was at this time working on an article with Dwight for The Phi Delta Kappan which was called "The Reconstruction
of Teacher Education and Professional Growth Programs, or How the Third Little Pig Escaped From the Wolf".\(^1\) Glenn's area of specialization within the School had been social studies curriculum. His concern was not so much the educationalist's concern with classroom methods and published school curriculums, as it was the social philosopher's concern with the meaning of past and future and of culture. His work had included imaginative explorations of the role of the body, of play, and of time in culture, and the creation of parts of a mythology for this age. To an extent his work can be associated with the influence of Norman O. Brown, the psycho-historian.\(^2\) During this, his first year at the School of Education, he had established himself as a leader in the faculty, and as an unusually conscientious and responsive teacher and advisor, especially for minority students, who at this time suffered particularly from lack of faculty attention and sensitivity.

Glenn wrote the following self-profile for our MAT Program book a year later.

Used to take piano lessons in the home of Rebecca Nurse, who was hanged for witchcraft in 1691; attended public schools, then Wesleyan University ('61), and Harvard for a doctorate in education, after a couple of years of teaching; professional background in history/social studies curriculum, and teacher education, but no longer interested in those fields per se interested in developing a new cosmology/Weltanschung


through which social/educational reform might develop (presumptuous, yes!); was chairman of social studies department, K-12, at a private school in Texas (St. Mark's, Dallas) before coming to the school of education; enjoy writing, and will spend much of this academic year finishing some articles and books, and generally playing around in search of a resolution to late adolescence (which is actually quite a nice stage to be stuck into, so long as one has to be stuck somewhere); also look forward to being a sometimes gadfly in keeping Jon, et. al. honest in what looks to be the best MAT Program in the world.

Glenn and I met in the fall and began working together in January as part of a four-man teaching team that was implementing his human development curriculum at Amherst High School. In choosing me for Assistant Director I believe Glenn was seeking administrative competence and sense of responsibility, intellectual compatibility, and, more personally, these qualities of trust and self-questioning which had been the focus of my attention. In the spring Glenn wrote to me:

My life and work have been warmly and creatively affected through my association with Jon and his family. We have toiled and played and grown together; we have explored the world and ourselves with a little more depth and concern as we have come to know each other. I am especially impressed and moved by Jon's capacity to love and trust, and to affect others through his being who he is.

Our job was to give new and increased definition to a program which was vaguely defined. Our charge from the Deans was to make the MAT Program a distinctive program and, because the responsibility for teacher education was the burden of only a few faculty, to encourage involvement of additional School of Education faculty. The new School of Education, after abolishing all existing programs and requirements, had not formulated or put into writing a definition of the MAT Degree. A search of the Graduate School's records initiated in the spring by
Earl Seidman, the School of Education's Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, led in the fall to Glenn's receiving the following memo from Earl:

Attached is the information from the Graduate School which reflects the original requirements of the MAT Degree. We have already moved a long way from the restrictiveness expressed in some of the provisions outlined here. However, as I read it, we are still basically following the guidelines so briefly described. I think the paucity of information should not preclude you from suggesting revisions in the Program. I want to emphasize, however, that as you consider revisions, please try to keep in mind one of our original concerns which was enlisting a broader range of support and involvement in the Program from the faculty in the School of Education. Anything you can do to encourage that process occurring would be appreciated.

The attachments were first a note from a Graduate School secretary saying, "I am enclosing the only material I can find concerning the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree, as requested by Dean Gentile."

And then followed this section from the minutes of the Graduate School Council on April 23, 1954 as part of the Report of the Committee on Curriculum:

The Committee voted to recommend to the Council the request from the Department of Education for a new degree, M.A.T. (Master of Arts in Teaching) which would be offered to holders of the Bachelor of Arts Degree but without course work in Education. It is the recommendation of the Committee that in order to include adequate practice teaching for elementary school teachers the total number of credits be increased to 36, thereby making it possible for all candidates for this degree to earn 12 credits in other departments, six of which shall be in the 200 category. The Council voted to recommend this new degree to the Board of Trustees for approval.

And then followed this description taken from the 1955-57 Graduate Catalog:
Master of Arts in Teaching

This is a cooperative program between the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education intended primarily for graduates of approved Liberal Arts Institutions who have had little or no course work in professional education. The student will register in the School of Education for either the secondary or elementary teaching program.

The special provisions are:

1. Secondary school program. Eighteen hours in the fundamental education courses usually required for certification; at least twelve hours in general education courses of which six hours will be in the two hundred category (courses open to graduate students only).

2. Elementary school program. Twenty-four hours in the fundamental education courses usually required for certification; at least twelve hours in general education courses of which six hours will be in the two hundred category.

The official Degree definition being so hard to find and when we found it so vague, we were almost totally dependent on Bill Lauroesch, the outgoing Director of the MAT Program, and Dick Ulin, the Director of Graduate Studies for the School of Education, for information about how the Program had been run. We knew from them that in 1969 a junior college component had been added. The only other way in which they had departed from the original provisions was in admitting some people who had done substantial work in Education, including people with B.S. Degrees. The requirement of 18 and 24 hours in Education courses was usually followed because these are the totals specified by the State of Massachusetts for secondary and elementary certification respectively. This was usually treated as a minimum in that most states required more. The practice had become to allow students to take less than this number, if they were not interested in certification, as might be the case with junior college specialists, or if they had
already accumulated applicable Education credits. The definition of which courses apply to certification is not precisely set by the State and is to a large extent left to the University. The University had established a recommended "teaching block" in elementary and secondary Education which included student teaching and specified foundations and methods courses and educational psychology. Most MAT students had taken "the block" along with undergraduates. Practice teaching placement and supervision were administered by the same office that handled the 900 undergraduates per semester. There were ten paid internships each semester which were usually reserved for graduate students—six teaching social studies in the Amherst Schools, and four teaching English in Springfield.

Usually the 12 credits taken outside of Education were taken in the School of Arts and Sciences, usually but not always in the same Department or closely related Departments. In the case of elementary specialists the work was more likely to be widely distributed. In the case of Junior College specialists often as much as 24 hours was taken in one Department. The Program was not operated as a cooperative program. Only on rare occasions did Arts and Sciences faculty give any attention to MAT students or the Program other than have individual students in their courses. It should be noted that the Art Department and the Department of Classics, French and Italian were in the opposite position of operating their own MAT Programs, including their own practice teaching arrangements, using the School of Education just for a few certification-related courses.
Bill Lauroesch and two graduate assistants had handled the processing of admissions and degree granting procedures. For actual program advising they had often assigned students to the subject methods specialists in the School of Education. In a few cases a productive advising relationship was established, but typically it was not. The number of MAT candidates admitted had been determined by the number who applied by the spring application deadline, with 30 to 50 being the usual number. Applicants were excluded only if they did not meet the Graduate School requirement of 2.8 undergraduate cumulative grade point average. As with other graduate degree admissions, the application was normally passed on first by the program faculty, then by Dick Ulin, and finally the Graduate School. In the case of MAT applicants they usually, but not always, were also sent to the Director of Graduate Studies of the Arts and Sciences Department where he might be expected to do most of his work.

In assessing the Program we had inherited, Glenn and I were able to view the University of Massachusetts' MAT tradition within the perspective of the national tradition of the MAT Degree. Glenn and I both knew well the Wesleyan MAT Program and the Harvard MAT Program (my wife had been an MAT student at Harvard during the first year of our marriage). The early MAT programs like Harvard and Wesleyan, had been created as a response to the concern that Americans did not acquire sufficient substantive knowledge during their education. For many the concern was primarily that this nation appeared behind other nations in a knowledge race, a view that was later given impetus by the launching of
Sputnik and championed in the writings of Hyman Rickover. Secondary school teaching was seen as a critical weak spot. Many attributed this to the lack of intelligence and lack of quality college education among secondary school teachers. The purpose of the MAT Degree was to attract and prepare for teaching the best liberal arts graduates who would ordinarily be going on to do graduate work in their field. Funded largely by the Ford Foundation, the degree was initiated in many of the most prestigious graduate schools. It enabled people who qualified for those schools to earn a Masters Degree while dividing their work between their academic field and work in Education leading to certification. Soon many other schools added MAT Degrees. Its growth was encouraged by a teacher shortage. There was a need to attract a larger number of people to teaching than were being graduated from undergraduate certification programs. For this reason a few schools made room for elementary specialists in MAT Programs, even though there are no compelling reasons to ask them to do graduate work in specialized academic areas. A further incentive for the spread of the Degree was the prestige it could offer to a school of education through associating it with the higher-status academic departments and with the Ivy League origins of the Degree.


I believe that Dwight and Earl, without saying it, wished us to build on this national MAT tradition to add some academic respectability to the School of Education's conglomeration of other qualities. Their previous experience included Dwight's leading the MAT Program at Stanford and Earl's being a student in the Harvard MAT Program. Building toward a prestigious program would be useful for the national reputation of the new school and also for intra-University politics, where having a scholar like Glenn work with Liberal Arts faculty could make it easier for the University to tolerate the threatening aspects of the School. At the same time, we and the Deans were hesitant to embrace this direction. In the first place we regarded most of the other graduate departments as being mediocre, rigid, and hard to work with. We saw the School as already being nationally more significant and prestigious than most, if not all, the other graduate departments at the University. We were attracting more academically prestigious students than they were. We believed we could have admitted as MAT students people whose Ivy League undergraduate work in Arts and Sciences was more rigorous than most of the work done by the University's graduate students. More importantly, we, and most others who had been attracted to the School of Education, were not very at home with the basic MAT idea that additional academic graduate work was the best way to prepare college graduates to be better teachers. The identity of the School of Education and our own allegiances was less tied to promoting academic competence than to promoting radical curriculum reform and competence in human and institutional relations. Over the
two years of our work we turned away from the MAT tradition, in a sense allowing the School of Education tradition to cancel it out.

Glenn and I clearly had the room to create our own direction. Our first feelings in the job were of welcoming the chance to have our own program and put some of our ideas into practice. We did not have a fully developed design or set of purposes for teacher education in mind. Our plans emerged during the experience of working on our first task, which was the admission of students. We decided at once to limit applicants to people who could be full time students and who would enter in the summer or fall. This was necessary to establishing a coherent participant group. We then decided to put off the admission deadline so as to be able to interview the top 100 or so applicants. We wanted to gain a personal sense of participants as individuals. We considered their academic credentials to be quite peripheral. No explicit admissions criteria were formulated. However, we knew we were looking for people who like us were questioning the meaning of schools, teaching, and knowledge. We were less interested in people who were focused exclusively on the narrower concern of how to make themselves competent. We had a special interest in applicants who wished to make a commitment to work with a group, what Glenn called a commitment to being a community. After we had talked to many people with common backgrounds, we found ourselves seeking a greater diversity of types which meant giving a special advantage to the few applicants who had been out of college for a few years.

In all about 200 applied. They were fairly evenly divided between
people attracted by the School of Education's national reformist reputation, people attracted by the MAT Degree, and local people attracted to the University for reasons of convenience and economy. Our interviews were unusually informal. I believe most applicants found them satisfactory for the purpose of presenting themselves. I think they found us attractive as people, but vague and incomplete in our presentation of the Program. Fifty students were admitted. Three were Africans who were in exile from their homelands. The rest were white Americans. The sexes were evenly divided. A large proportion were social studies majors and the next largest number were English majors. As in previous years our admissions' decision as the Program Directors was the critical one. Approval from Ulin and the other Departments and the Graduate School was usually only a formality, though on some cases of questionable academic records we had to write several memos to overcome opposition. It should be noted that we allowed several other students to join the Program as M.Ed. or Special Students during the fall.

The admissions interviews in March and April gave Glenn and me a chance to test out indirectly with each other, as well as with applicants, our thinking about what the Program could be. In these talks, and without deliberate examination, we found ourselves basically accepting the existing Program structure of 1/3 practice teaching, 1/3 Arts and Sciences courses, 1/3 Education courses. As we faced the real potential participants and real administrative demands we felt an increasingly strong urge to clarify what putting some of our own ideas into practice would be like.
As I wrote in Chapter I, having the Program be coherent and a place where participants know each other was the central idea for me. It was for Glenn also. His experience advising graduates and undergraduates left him distressed by the inefficiency of the School and by the frustration and loneliness of the students. This specifically reinforced his intangible sense of the need to restore some of the lost sense of community in our culture. My experience as the only Teaching Assistant in the 300-student Principles of Elementary Education class had specifically reinforced my abstract concern with building trust relationships.

As we considered means of creating coherence, we were equally clear that we were against the programmed approach of a Program like METEP. Rather than seek coherence through manipulation, we sought a coherence growing out of trust and self-questioning. We were working on the subtle idea of building coherence without wanting to compel community with diversity. The clearest specific focus we had was Glenn's idea of making one of the Education courses a year-long required core course that would bring all the students together both socially and intellectually. He foresaw using his human development curriculum as a framework for the course and through it addressing the varieties of subject matter of concern to the participant group. He foresaw making it in addition a social occasion where we would eat together and enjoy a sense of community.

As we approached the end of School in June and the administrative burden of the job eased, Glenn and I gave some time specifically to planning the core course. As we talked we found ourselves wanting
to expand the core. I was enthusiastic about the theoretical content of Glenn's course, but I wanted to see the Program at least as strongly identified with a more direct questioning of teaching behavior and schools. I wanted to see a clinical course like existing strength training, micro-teaching, and human relations laboratory courses, but with emphasis put on reforming human relationships in schools, not on gaining technical competencies. With Glenn's encouragement I committed myself to creating and leading such a course. At the same time, both of us were intrigued with the idea of students having field experiences beyond practice teaching that would involve them with different ages in different contexts. Glenn especially felt the program needed this distinctive component, emphasizing a broad view of Education. So this became a third course, Practicum in Community Education. Between the three courses, the Education course third of the MAT Program was spelled out.

These were first described on paper and sent out to the students in June. Our course descriptions follow, first the seminar, then my course on teaching, then the community education course.

SEMINAR IN EDUCATION
Glenn W. Hawkes

The seminar will meet once a week, at a time in the late afternoon/early evening when all MAT's can be present. In addition to the substance of the seminar itself, this meeting time will provide the entire community an opportunity to function as a community -- a time for some socializing, breaking bread together, announcements, general gossip, etc.

5. These techniques are discussed in the section entitled "Processes" in the Afterword.
The seminar itself will divide roughly into two parts, with most of the first semester given to an investigation of certain psychological and philosophical ideas that relate to the problem of developing school curricula that "speak to the needs" of each individual, as well as to the needs of mankind as a species. The general thesis in this part of the course will be that the present foundation for curriculum development -- which begins with problems, issues, and organizing concepts of various disciplinary areas (like history, math, science, art, etc.) and then translates those considerations into courses -- is inadequate in meeting the needs of human beings, individually and collectively, precisely because that design starts with disciplines and not with human beings. Our investigation will provide an opportunity to explore a model that begins with human life, and the process of human growth and development, and then raises questions about appropriate curricula. Approaching curriculum in this manner, one has the opportunity to ask "What does the student need?" rather than "What does the student need in order to learn history, math, or whatever?"

During the second semester, there will be an opportunity to take some idea, issue, or problem which one is interested in pursuing in depth, and develop an independent study project. The seminar sessions will provide individuals with an opportunity to share the fruits of their independent investigation.

The initial list of required readings for the seminar contains five books, all relatively short and inexpensive:

- Alan Watts, THE BOOK AGAINST THE TABOO AGAINST BEING YOURSELF
- Ashley Montagu, THE HUMAN REVOLUTION
- Kenneth Boulding, THE MEANING OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY
- Loren Eiseley, THE IMMENSE JOURNEY
  And either
- Marshall McLuhan, THE MEDIUM IS THE MESSAGE

Or

Buckminster Fuller, EDUCATION AND AUTOMATION

MAT's who are teaching during the first semester might want to get a "jump" on the reading this summer. In addition to those books listed, a large number of articles and excerpted readings of various kinds will be provided in an MAT Handbook of Readings which Jon Ball and I will be compiling and editing this summer. This book will contain readings that will be utilized in relation to all three of the core courses. (If you have any specific suggestions for articles or readings that should go into that volume, please let us know immediately, and we will investigate the possibility. If you do have suggestions, it will be helpful if you provide us with a clean copy of the article you wish to share with us.)
PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHING  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL  
Jonathan Ball

Rationale

All MAT students are required to register for this course to insure that some attention is given to methods of teaching (or principles and practices of teaching, or teaching roles and styles). About half (20) of the MAT students would be in this course each semester. It will emphasize ways of getting along with and communicating with students rather than ways of studying specific areas of knowledge. Therefore, students preparing for teaching any level or subject could reasonably be in the course together.

Increases in ability to get along with and communicate with students occur primarily as a result of experiences with students and understanding and building on those experiences. Work in this course is intended to supplement practice teaching and other teaching/learning experiences. Members of the course are in a particularly good position to gain understanding from each other because as prospective teachers, they share a particularly strong interest in understanding their experience. Understanding teacher/student relationships will be viewed in a context that takes into account relationships between people generally (including those between members of the course), relationships between people of different ages, relationships associated with teacher roles in the classrooms and schools we will be in or want to create.

Format

The first thing to be done will be to decide as a group whether we can best address the methods of teaching via a course format -- weekly group meetings for a semester -- or by some other format (individual or small group study, intensive 2-3 week study, or something else). So far I have been thinking of it as a course and scheduled it that way, but this can be changed. Whether or not we so meet as a course, the specific means we use will be decided by us as a group. I have a number of suggestions as a result of my experience: class and small-group discussion of classroom situations we read or watch on tape, role-playing classroom situations as bases for analyzing our responses, making younger students part of our class as teachers and/or students, visiting a variety of schools, working in tandem with someone who is practice teaching, reading Herbert Kohl's The Open Classroom and a few other books on the attached list. I will be developing a more detailed proposed course plan for the Fall. I encourage you to write your reactions to what I have presented here and to develop your own course proposal or partial proposal for the Fall.

Sylvia Ashton-Warner, TEACHER  
George Dennison, THE LIVES OF CHILDREN  
John Dewey, THE CHILD AND THE CURRICULUM  
Nat Hentoff, OUR CHILDREN ARE DYING
Education in Community

Glenn Hawkes

Education can be pursued in any context. Students have known this for a long time, but administrators and teachers have been slow to respond. We think that professionals in education are going to soon be called on to be more knowledgeable about dimensions of "education in community" that are now important only to the most "progressive" schools, like the Parkways Project in Philadelphia (which is a school "without walls"). Education #685 will provide you with an opportunity to investigate some dimension(s) of this general concern that you deem important. This might mean that you seek to tutor in a non-school context (for example, some students here have tutored in a local jail); or it might mean that you begin a Nader-like study of local consumer patterns and attempt to involve the community in some action along that line; or it may mean that you arrange to "shadow" some political figure, a member of the local police force, a university administrator, etc.

We will have many suggestions for you, especially regarding some individuals with whom you might speak to in getting good leads on community involvement. Our major interest, however, is in your developing your own education in community project. You should have some plan(s) in mind at registration time (this is more important for people taking #685 in the Fall than it is for those who will be doing it in the Spring). The major requirement will be a diary or log related to the education in community experience and the sharing of that experience with the MAT community.

In addition to creating these core courses we were working to coordinate existing program elements. To this end Glenn negotiated in the Spring for us to be allocated a half-time secretary and the two supervisory assistantships that would normally have been assigned to
the School's Office for Field Experience to serve the equivalent 40-50 student teachers. At my suggestion one of the supervisory assistantships was given to Len Solo, a doctoral student who had founded the Teacher Drop-Out Center ⁶ and was active in the free school movement. Over the summer Glenn was pressured by the Deans to hire a young, inexperienced, and, as she later proved, uninterested, woman to be the secretary. He recruited Pat Burke to be the other Assistant. Pat was an entering Master of Education student in the Center for International Education. Glenn was impressed by her energetic, self-confident, and good-natured manner and by her past experience which included the Peace Corps, work on curriculum development, and four years of teaching. Pat was to be more involved in the creation of the 1971-72 Program than anyone else except for myself. She wrote the following self profile for the 1971-72 MAT Program Book.

My family always wanted me to be a "teacher", so predictably I fought the idea. Yet through each reluctant experience I "weakened" a little till I graduated from Queens College with a major in elementary Education and very enthusiastic about beginning to teach.

I'm restless, so I've moved and been in many different situations. I've taught 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th grades - "all" subjects, many different kids, adults, on a team, on my own, in private and public schools, here and overseas. One summer I drove a school bus. One year I worked for a Mathematics curriculum project. I spent two summers, during college, working in Mexico and learning about cultural values and human differences and similarities. This was very important, so I went to Senegal, West Africa with Peace Corps. There I directed a community center and learned about education in a very broad sense.

In my own learning I am constantly struggling for a balance between doing and thinking. Here, especially through the MAT Program, I've an opportunity for that balance. Sometimes I'm satisfied, mostly I'm still

---

⁶. The Teacher Drop-Out Center is the most prominent free school teacher placement service in the East.
searching.

Right now I care a great deal about communication between people and its importance for learning. Idealistically I always saw teacher-student communication as a key to learning but I know more now about the difficult and complicated realities of this; and I care about more communication between teachers themselves, between parents and teachers, and even administrators. One of my goals this year is to learn more about myself in this communication system - by both doing and thinking with others.

Glenn and I were uncertain how many program functions we could reasonably assume. During the planning period from March to September, Glenn and I were doing the MAT work on top of our regular full time work. Come Fall, we would officially become half-time staff members, thus giving us an operating staff the equivalent of 2½ full time people. In order to promote coherence we were tempted to have the staff take over all the functions of the program: advising, supervising, teaching, and administration. In the press of time during the planning period, our attention went to the Education course part of the Program we saw we could easily control. We did not get very involved in advising or working with teachers in relation to the Arts and Science courses. We did not involve the methods course teachers or other School of Education faculty in advising, even as much as they had been before. Our unstated inclination was to establish what we wanted to do first and then hope to attract other faculty to that, especially to attract some faculty members who had not been involved in the past. We did not seek to develop new field experience options, but instead relied on those available through the Office of Field Placement for practice teaching and on the students themselves for Community Education.
By the end of the Spring it was clear that our job would be to coordinate the advising and field placement supervision functions as well as the admissions and the teaching of the core courses. These duties plus other unavoidable administrative duties constituted a great burden, even during the planning period. In fact, the administrative demands of the Program were from the start a major factor in determining the nature of the experience. There was always the danger that the meeting of these demands would become the primary focus and that the original notions of putting our ideas into action would be lost. There was also a danger, especially for Glenn, that administrative responsibilities would be abdicated as being too bothersome and distracting. It can be observed that the only way to have had space for thoughtful planning and evaluation while maintaining administrative integrity was to begin early in the year to plan for the next year. As with any program with an annual cycle, the leaders have to be working on two year's programs at once, and if one includes follow-up evaluation, three years at once. By beginning in the spring to plan for September, Glenn and I were already too late, even though we did not have operating responsibility for that current year. The chief effect was that our planning dialogue stopped short of picturing what the year would really be like. We did not confront the total design or our basic goals, but settled for fairly abstract and unfocused starting points.

Let me state here in some detail the nature of the administrative burdens. These were picked up in the spring of 1970 and took up about
half of my time until I put them down three and a half years later. The broad scope of the demands arises from the fact that the Program is related to so many different institutional entities: almost all the offices of the School of Education, the field sites, the Departments of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Graduate School Office; and that the participants and many of the staff are new each year. The admissions process involves the following: writing and mailing program descriptions to inform people in and out of the University of the Program's existence, responding to letters from potential participants, receiving and screening applications including transcripts and letters of recommendations, soliciting and reading additional application statements, arranging and holding interviews, designing and implementing the evaluation of applicants, forwarding admissions recommendations to the offices and departments, monitoring the progress of applications through these offices, arguing for candidates when there are disagreements, writing letters of justification for candidates who lack B.A.'s or lack the Graduate School's minimum grade point average, working with admissions committees within the School of Education concerned with the recruitment of minority and female students, notifying applicants of their position in the admissions process, arranging financial aid, veterans benefits, and housing, and other matters for admitted students.

Securing Program approval and resource allocation requires the following: going through the motions of presenting the courses to be offered and the overall Program design and rationales to the Teacher
Education Center and the Graduate Assembly or, since 1971, TPPC and the Academic Dean, negotiating summer programs offerings with two other offices, negotiating with TPPC and/or the Academic Dean for allocation of assistantships and other personnel, negotiating with the Assistant Dean for Administration for office space and a telephone and Xerox budget, and negotiating with TPPC or Teacher Education Center for travel money for supervision. It should be noted that few of our decisions were subject to much scrutiny. Our feeling was usually that we could do what we wanted because we were regarded as being conscientious, but that no one would care very much or change the amount of resources we were given no matter what we decided, because our Program was given a low priority. The field experience parts of the Program require the following: negotiating in advance with school superintendents, principals and potential cooperating teachers or equivalent field site personnel; arranging for any payment of interns, placement of teams, or other special opportunities for interns; helping students to select and negotiate their placements; and maintaining this three way relationship throughout the field experience.

Advising and registering students each semester and summer involves the following: getting information about Arts and Science courses; getting current information about School of Education courses, for which there is no set catalog; making sure degree requirements are considered, including number of graded credits and upper level graduate courses; making sure certification requirements for various levels and subjects in various States are considered; and, since 1971, helping
students to reconcile the School of Education's internal modular credit system with the University's course credit system. After registration we are responsible for the following: processing degree eligibility forms, certification forms, and job placement applications, including the writing of supplementary transcripts to explain the School of Education's curriculum; transferring courses, writing individualized study contracts; writing recommendations; and keeping and correcting all records of work taken. From the moment students arrive we are also responsible for all communication between them and the School and the University and among themselves, because the School does not provide mailboxes or other means of communication to Masters' students. This means making mailboxes and copying any announcements of interest. In addition to these standard duties, we took upon ourselves special burdens such as arranging space for retreats, the weekly seminar, and special presentations; providing guidance to additional MAT students who were based in other departments and other graduate students seeking certification; conducting job placement and follow-up activities; and from 1971 on, arranging special summer sessions and renting project houses.
CHAPTER IV
FALL 1970, GETTING OUR FEET WET

The 1970-71 Program began with a weekend retreat at Glenn's father's primitive camp on a lake in Maine about 3½ hours from Amherst. Glenn, Pat and I and about half of the students attended. The weekend was unscheduled and unplanned except for meals. As it turned out time was about equally divided between playing in and out of the water, informal small group conversations, and whole group discussions. For most of us it was a tremendously exciting experience. Not until then had the students really believed that the School was as inclined to trust them and not impose requirements on them, that it was as wholeheartedly critical of conventional schools, and that it was as free of hierarchies. Not until then had the staff realized the power of these qualities. And for the first time I felt the potential for a large group to share an intimacy that I had previously associated only with 2 to 5 people. Many of us sensed that this year would be much more significant than we had expected. We dared to think school could be what we had always dreamed it would be - a chance to be supported in learning whatever we wished without interference. We were additionally buoyed by glimpses into many potential new friendships.

The first program experience after the retreat was registration. Even under the best circumstances registration is apt to be a dehumanizing experience with hours of waiting in line and filling out forms that relegate one's identity to a number. In the case of the
MAT students, this experience was made more frustrating by their having to face up to the fact of having little or no room for electives in Education and little information about what to take outside of Education. As our "Guidelines for Planning Your Program" explained, the core course requirement prevented people from taking any electives in Education unless they chose not to take practice teaching. For most then, this eliminated taking any specialized courses in their area of Education or sampling the School of Education's general offerings. There was a vast choice as to what four courses in Arts and Sciences to take to meet the 12-credit requirement. But there was little advice or information available to help students to make good choices.

All but two students took practice teaching. For all but three of them this was a one semester full-time experience for which they received 12 credits. Fifteen credits per semester was the maximum load allowed. This meant that from the beginning of the semester the Program was split into two groups: one group that was doing practice teaching, one group that wasn't. The only time they would come together was the evening seminar. The group that was practice teaching was almost totally consumed with day-to-day teaching problems. Their contact with the program was primarily with Pat or Len, and, in the case of the Amherst and Springfield interns, with their fellow interns. The other interns were all placed in separate schools. The other group, except for two experienced teachers, were preoccupied in the first semester with preparing to teach. Their
primary contact with the program was with me and the students in my methods class. The degree requirements caused them to take at least two arts and sciences courses in the first semester with my methods course, the evening seminar, and either the practicum or a third arts and sciences course. In the second semester the groups reversed programs. To complete the degree, students in addition had to stay for the summer to finish the arts and sciences requirement and, in some cases, the practicum.

Those of us who had been at the retreat were unsettled by this intrusion of institutional procedures and restrictions into our bright new outlook on the year and also by the scepticism of those who had not been to the retreat. I felt responsible for counteracting this. I became determined to see to it that the high expectations were fulfilled. At first my efforts were concentrated in my class. It was clear in the first meetings of the class that it would be very difficult to bring off. The students and I were awed by the fact that this would be the only class designed specifically to prepare them to teach and that it included people in all subjects and grade levels. I was awed by the size of the class - 25 students - too many for the kind of informal discussion and organic course development I had had in mind. I concluded after the first course meeting that I better prove to the students and myself that I knew what I was doing by developing a specific and logical course outline.

This tangible challenge for the first time made me assess my goals for teacher education. I worked intensively for about two weeks to figure out what I thought was most important in preparing
people to teach. I sought to get beyond consideration of teaching
techniques to consider the teaching act itself and all that bears on
it. Discussions with Pat and other friends were an important part of
this work. The major breakthrough came with the realization that the
problem with teachers and teachers of teachers is usually that they
do not focus on learning, but instead on the whole assortment of
rituals that are built into schools. I made the recognition of
learning the starting point and touchstone for the course. Then
I planned a course progression that, like my earlier work, moved
from questioning and self awareness out to encompass human relations
and then institutional relations. After establishing recognition of
learning, I wanted to test it in contexts that involved other
challenging and distracting factors. I developed the following
course outline in time for the class on October first:

**IDEAS FOR PROGRESSION OF COURSE IN**

**METHODS AND STYLES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING**

How I Learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>Skill learning experience and discussion. Assignment: read Knicks article, seek to increase your skill in an area where you are already proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>Reading - ideas learning experience, looking at painting learning experience, discussion. Assignment: interview each other about experience as a learner, make notes of what was learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>Discuss effect of drugs on learning, programmed learning experience. Assignment: read my paper on Human Understanding in Education, make notes of week's experience with understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10/22 Discuss role one man can have in another man's learning, use of an outside observer in our class as facilitator.
Assignment: write paper for your portfolio on the implications for classroom teaching of your personal sense of what learning is and how you can help others learn.

Role of one man in other's learning

11/2 Experience in teaching and being taught by people of other ages and cultures.
Assignment: read Piaget, visit Nursery School.

11/9 Principals and teachers join our class, respond to portfolio papers of those who have volunteered to make their's public.
Assignment: Visit a conventional faculty room, talk with faculty at an alternative school, attend School Board Meeting, read Goldhammer.

12/3 Role play principals in actual case situations.
Assignment: interview employers and/or admissions officials.

Contact with elements of school

12/10 Joint class with high school kids who have recently visited an alternative school.
Assignment: visit students who you will have in class when you intern (where applicable).

12/17 Joint class with parents of students who will be in your classes.

I was strengthened by having accomplished this organization of my thoughts. My search for processes or curriculum to express them seemed only partly successful. The adaptation of microteaching and strength training to put the focus on learning rather than teaching were successful. But other role playing classes, and classes in which I lectured were received as too vague and lacking in drama. Student evaluations of the course praised it for being flexible,
responsive to individuals and thoughtful. They criticized me for not demanding enough from students, and for not using the assigned readings and written work in a disciplined way.

While I was leading this course I had little time to work with people while they were first teaching, which had been my primary interest. And it was clear to me that they were the students who most needed attention if the promise of the retreat was to be fulfilled. Therefore I sought to write for them and myself a perspective for viewing their experience. The result was an existential analysis of the teaching act which further expanded and clarified the vision of teaching that lay behind the course outline. The following outline was given to students in the early Fall and then printed in the Journal of the School of Education in January. I printed with it a bibliography and list of School of Education resources, knowing that the practice teachers would not have the time or the contacts to locate this kind of information.

A PERSPECTIVE ON HOW TO PREPARE YOURSELF TO BE A TEACHER

(or find out if you want to be a teacher)

The first thing is to find out what it feels like for you to be a classroom teacher. The best way to find out, of course, is to do it: be a substitute, get someone to let you take over their class for a while, student teach. Next best is to be in a simulated classroom as in the Strength Training course or in a "microclassroom" as in the microteaching part of the undergraduate pre-student teaching program. Understanding how others feel as teachers is a supplement to how you feel as a teacher.

As you are finding out what it feels like for you to be a
teacher you will naturally be trying to resolve any uncomfortable feelings that come up. A way to learn, a way to prepare yourself, is to look for and face up to the sources of discomfort. I am going to describe three uncomfortable feelings that are common in first year teaching experiences and suggest ways of looking for and facing up to their sources.

I. One common feeling is simply: What am I going to do? I don't know how to act like a teacher, but I have to. How do I get initiated? It is possible that this feeling may be resolved simply by getting more information. The need may be to find alternative models for structuring a class or alternative methods of presenting subject matter.

II. Another common feeling is a more complex and devastating one: What the hell am I doing here being a teacher? I don't feel like a teacher. Something isn't legitimate. How do I get to feel right being a teacher? Even if you get rid of the first feeling by acting like a teacher (following the models and methods) you may be doing no more than performing an empty ritual. Unfortunately, performing a ritual, however empty, long enough, may enable you to bury this feeling of illegitimacy. I say unfortunately because the sources of strength in teaching. Burying this feeling, on the other hand, tends to make a teacher stop growing and eventually makes the act of teaching boring to all concerned. Let's look into some of the sources of this feeling.

To be a teacher is to help people learn. You can't feel right even if the kids like you unless there is integrity in your sense of what helping people to learn means. You may need to consider:

A. What do I really mean by learning? How do I learn? Do others learn like me? How about people of other cultures and sub-cultures?

B. What role does one man play in another man's learning? What role have I played or can I play in other people's learning?

Unless you have a sense of what helping yourself and other people to learn (teaching) is, you are not a legitimate teacher. With this sense, you may still not feel right about teaching in the classroom or being employed as a teacher. To feel right about it means going beyond such considerations as "what can I get away with?" to coming to terms with the school. You may need to consider the following:

C. The school is a manifestation of the teachers and
other staff members, the School Committee, college admissions people, employers, parents, and students. What is it like to see the school through their eyes? If I put this along side my sense of helping people to learn, what kind of "contract" do I really have with these people?

D. The School is a manifestation of all societal forces, and also an influence on these forces. What kind of "contract" do I have with the future of human society?

III. Another common experience in first year teaching experiences is: Why am I involved in teaching this subject matter? How can I be sure that it is more than an arbitrary course of study? Unfortunately this feeling often gets buried too. Again, if you are just acting like a teacher your attention is fixed on methods of covering the material, and this feeling of arbitrariness is ignored. You stop growing and boredom sets in. Confronting the source of this uncomfortable feeling can be a strength in teaching.

You can't feel right unless there is integrity in your relationship to your subject matter. You may still need to consider:

A. Why do I care about my subject? Do I care because it feels true and/or relevant to something else and/or interesting?

B. How did I come to feel the way I do about it?

You can't feel right unless there is integrity in the way you address all knowledge within which your subject matter exists. You may need to consider:

C. What else do I find worth learning? What criteria of worth am I using? Is there a hierarchy of worth?

D. What fraction of all that is worth learning is my subject matter? Why does my subject matter have boundaries?

Given your relationship to knowledge how do you want to influence others' relationship to knowledge?

In other words:

E. What can one man say about what another man should learn (and when)? What should my children learn? What effect does what is learned have on our future?
A NOTE ON THIS WAY OF LOOKING AT TEACHER PREPARATION

This is no more a way to prepare to teach than a way to learn about yourself and the world. It takes advantage of the fact that the assumption of the teacher role commonly intensifies and makes more recognizable our questioning of our identity and our relationship to other men and the world. Facing a typical classroom situation makes the search for legitimacy and truth especially necessary. This search is at the essence of learning and of learning to help others learn.

Glenn approached the evening seminar with comparable energy and enthusiasm. But the demands for this course were more awesome than for mine. There were a series of conflicting expectations caused by bringing the whole group together: our expectations for intellectual stimulation and for a feeling of community, the practice teachers expectations for attention and advice "relevant" to their teaching, The School's expectations that various administrative matters would be taken care of with the whole group, the expectation of individual students for advising and dialogue around their particular needs and interests, the expectation of many that this could be a forum for presentations by a variety of MAT participants and by visitors. At the start, Glenn's approach was to lecture about his global theories of knowledge and human development and then adjourn for a group meal. Glenn's lectures were consistently stimulating by reason of their depth, their charm, and the feeling of humanity he conveyed. They grew out of many hours he had spent reading and writing and out of his genuine need for dialogue about these subjects. But in this setting, while some found them excellent, most were dissatisfied. The press of their unre-
lated needs, and, in some cases, their lack of intelligence made them unresponsive. The group then, which was already split because of their schedules, was frustrated by the activity that was to have given them a common focus. So instead of a sense of community there was much fragmentation and eventually resentment. Here more than in any other part of the program we suffered because we had created high expectations and had wanted to do everything for everybody.

The state of mind of many of the students at this time is reflected in the following letter that a practice teacher gave out to everyone during an early evening seminar. The "First, Second, and Third Little Pigs" of the title are characters in the article which Glenn had written and distributed to the students.

A PLEA FOR SANITY - DIRECTED TO THE FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD LITTLE PIGS, AND LEN SOLO

It's a little early in the semester to begin to complain of losing touch with reality, but I've been in school most of my life and I should have started to comment when I felt it start to slip away a long time ago. I left the meeting (intern/MAT Tues. 9/15) after talking to Len feeling as if I'd bathed in a mild irritant. Let me explain: It is by no means Len - I think I react warmly to Len. He is mild, undogmatic and listens well. While we drifted away to find food, Len stood talking, a piece of bread in his hand which he's forgotten on it's way to his mouth. But in talking to Len, I found most of my ambivalent feelings about authority, structure, the teaching of subject matter poking through the surface. I found myself defending myself - instead of finding answers to a rather fundamental problem - what in God's name am I going to do in class tomorrow and how can I change a class atmosphere from rule and uncooperative to eager to learn and sharing a feeling of community. I found I was
questioning the basis of continuing to teach. How radical am I? A little? Too little? Enough to be able to function within the school? It seems important to me that I do function there. I don't expect answers from Len or anybody else about what to do tomorrow or the next day. But I came here expecting and welcoming the chance to think through the problem of how sneaky can I be and in whose camp am I ultimately? This semester I want to get away with as much as possible. I want students to learn how to learn. But I can't unbolt the chairs from the floor and create more living space. A tape recorder, a record player and some typewriters going at the same time in the class room would create a cacophony that would cancel each activity out and result in noise contests. I have 25-30 students in a room whose acoustics and furniture arrangements limit the type of activities. I have an overhead screen, use of an opaque projector, tape recorders, record players. But little space. It's a problem in logistics, maybe, as Pat would say. But it's also a question of how much can push come to shove - can I take 5 kids out of the room and deposit them quietly in the library for small group discussion? Will the librarian accept bribes? Maybe, but I doubt it. The main resource is the room, myself and the kids. We must do what we can do in the room, in spite of the room. The room belongs to the school; I can't let kids splash paint all over it. Have I been brain washed? Am I a sissy? Or are these irradicable facts - of life if not of Nature - I need people - supervisors or others - to talk to these facts, because they are where I am right now.

Pat and Len during this time conscientiously met with their students in the field and sought to respond to their almost inexhaustable needs for attention. Beyond meeting this obligation, Len's participation in the program was sporadic. Pat and I were almost always present at the seminar and she often attended and helped to play my class.

Beginning in the second week of the semester, Pat, Glenn and I met in weekly staff meetings. They were initiated for the purpose of sharing the administrative burdens of the program and for conducting ongoing evaluation and planning. In fact the administrative burden usually fell to me. We did spend time doing
evaluation and planning in relation to the evening seminar. However our frustration with the limitations on time and resources, as contrasted with the dreams of the retreat, quickly led us away from the immediate problem, and caused us to focus on how to make sure that next year would be different. We had a growing feeling, without saying it, that our program design was so restrictive that there was little chance of getting the program to do what we wanted it to do this year. After receiving a promising lead from a colleague Glenn pushed the idea of our writing a proposal for outside funding. The question of future design then became the dominant issue of the meetings beginning in October. Between October and December the basic design of the 1971-72 program was conceived and articulated. Before we follow this development which will lead us away from the 1970-71 program, let us note how the remainder of the year went for the 1970-71 students.

As I became immersed in writing the proposal, I put less time into preparing for the methods class, brought in fewer outside guests, and spent more time in general discussions. In the second semester I scheduled the class as two separate 12 person discussion groups. The combination of reduced size, my increased confidence, and the fact that students had already taught and already knew each other, made this a good setting for the kind of informal discussion group I had wanted to run. Of 13 who responded to the School of Education course evaluation form, 7 gave the course an overall evaluation of excellent, 3 of very
good, 3 of satisfactory, none of poor or unsatisfactory. Its strength was seen as its having a comfortable and open atmosphere that promoted thoughtful conversation. Its weakness was seen that it sometimes rambled too much and lacked sufficient organization. I felt that I had led the class by example to be trusting, to listen well, and to engage in self-questioning. As an informal group discussion leader I acted more consistently according to my values, than as a lecturer or creator of role plays.

Pat and Len established for the second semester weekly meetings of groups of interns in order to more efficiently deal with issues of common interest, and allow more time for more specialized attention during their supervisory visits. They were able to do this only by overcoming the potential threat that lay in their contrasting approaches to supervision - Len being extremely nondirective and Pat being directive. The Practicum in Community Education was for many a significant experience. It was primarily conducted as an independent study. A few group field experiences were organized: Len organized a series of visits to alternative schools, Glenn arranged for a day for students to shadow administrators in the Westfield, Massachusetts School System.

Many approaches were tried to get the best use out of the evening seminar. Early in the fall Glenn responded to the expressed criticisms of the course by adding to his pre-
sentation some specific, ready-to-be-used, lesson plans, and, on some occasions, emphasizing the meal and social aspect of the meetings. Later in the semester Glenn de-emphasized his role and the role of his curriculum in the meeting and urged Pat and me to work on improving the meetings. The three of us brought in outside speakers and sought to have students take turns leading the group. But while many of us enjoyed being in each other's company, the overall attendance and morale declined. In the second semester, Glenn proposed to separate his curriculum seminar from the evening meeting and to make the seminar optional. People could elect to present an independent project to fulfill the credits if they did not go to the seminar. For the half that took the seminar, it was a much more satisfactory experience than first semester's. For some of the others the project meant just going through the motions of work, but for some it was used as a chance to get at more specialized work in education that they had had interest in. The evening meetings improved, but they continued to be disappointing to those of us who had pictured the whole MAT group acting as a community. A small group of students did come to assume a major role in planning these sessions and about half the participants regularly attended.

We did not conduct a formal program evaluation. In March Glenn wrote Dean Seidman the following summary of the year, in part in response to Seidman's criticism that the program had not effectively involved other faculty, and that it instead had been
built too much around the particular personalities and interests of Glenn and me.

My thoughts and feelings about this year's program are, to say the least, of a mixed nature. We have not met many of our objectives (as stated in original program and course description); however, we have met others, and my general feeling is that this program represents a leap in an ongoing process of planning and evaluation. For better and for worse this year's students have been part of a rather extensive planning process.

As already mentioned, my feelings about the program are mixed. I guess more than anything I feel that the present program is "sleeping beauty", in the sense that we've got all of the potential - the right direction, philosophical assumptions, etc. - to bring something beautiful to life, but have yet to realize this potential. Yet this program has been more educationally stimulating, exciting, relevant, etc. etc. etc. than last year's. Many of the students actually know other MAT students, discuss problems with them, etc. - we may not have achieved the kind of community that we were seeking, but we have provided a context where lots of little groups and associations have been able to form and function effectively. Also, through a semester of trial and error, it now appears that for many of the students, perhaps about half of the original group, an esprit de corps is developing - we now have a group taking responsibility for community activities and communication. What we originally hoped for seems to be emerging, but, unfortunately, some students have psychologically pulled out, perhaps having lost faith in the community dimension of the program.

Pat and Len and Jon have been outstanding in giving of themselves to the students. Time and again they have helped set up meetings, arranged for special conferences, and the like, in their efforts to meet the needs of the students - especially those students under the internship/practice teaching pressures. The kind of personal touch that they have afforded is, I believe, something that our program has provided. For myself, with certain exceptions, I have been generally too busy or hassled in other respects to "give" as much as my colleagues.

One thing that we have all learned this year is that new programs don't just happen, no matter how good the people or how good the intentions. Jon Ball and Pat Burke, with the help of many others, have sweated blood to build upon our beginning in order to provide for a better program next year. Our present students have, I believe, both suffered and benefited from our commitment to a future program - in any event, the planning time and effort has been essential to any hopes that we have for realizing the kind of potential that we have had a little taste of this year.

While some of the students feel that they may have missed
out on some of the potential of the kind of program we're developing, I think that they share with us - almost to a man and woman - the assumptions and rationale to which we've committed ourselves. This kind of sharing has also been evident in others - out-siders - who have read our stuff, both for this year's program and for next year's. I'm suggesting that there is a rather broad base of agreement about much that we are interested in doing in this program; and that - in relation to a concern that Earl Seidman has voiced several times - the program is not tied to personalities (Hawkes, Ball, etc.), even though it certainly reflects many of our interests.

In summary, the program has been anything but a roaring success; however, there have been gains, and if our own learning has some value for us, next year's program will be outstanding. (If we get the kind of support that we are seeking it will be super-outstanding.)

A half year after the end of the program, I wrote the following summary:

The program began with an extremely successful retreat which left most participants with the hope that this year school could be what they had always wanted it to be. Staff and students found in each other an unexpected openness and commitment to school reform. This hope was substantially fulfilled for about 1/3 of the students. These were students who largely took responsibility for their own education and helped initiate activities with other students. By the end of the year they felt a degree of community and mutual respect that is unusual. However, about 2/3 of the students did not feel this coherence and responsiveness. They suffered the feeling typical of first year students at the School of Education that it is hard to get anyone to pay attention to you or explain what is going on in what seems an incoherent institution. All students received more attention than the usual first year student, but their heightened expectations led to feelings of disappointment. The basic problem was a lack of time. Pat, Glenn, and I with a half-time secretary and a supervising assistant could not do well all the tasks we had taken on. Most students found that too much was being asked of them, too. Most found little energy left for community or extra-classroom field activities in addition to student teaching and arts and science courses.

Looking back on the 1970-71 program from this point in time, I can add some observations to these earlier evaluations. A large part of our problem was an inadequate program structure
that did not realistically address the student's use of time. Another large part was a lack of resources that placed impossible demands on the staff's time and energy. We had not anticipated these problems because we had not thought through the total program design. But even more damaging than our failure to grapple with the design was the fact that we began the program without a clear sense of our specific priorities for the program. Our uncertainty about goals led to our being inconsistent and hesitant to make demands or set restrictions. Given an unusually unstructured and confusing climate already, I believe our ambiguity was the critical factor in making the program a disappointing experience for numbers of students.

I believe that the kind of program climate we were groping for - a community, a place with coherence but without compulsion - is uniquely difficult to achieve. It is probably impossible to achieve unless there is very steady, confident, non-directive leadership. Lacking this, people tend to become paralyzed over issues of authority, issues that are already crying for resolution as expressed in "The Little Pigs Letter". People lose their sense of when to take responsibility and when to ask others to take it.

In the planning of our program, participants and resources were determined first. Several seminal ideas were expressed. Then many of the pre-existent structures or processes were rather unconsciously perpetuated and
some new ones added through decisions made in June. After registrat-
on and the first classes in the fall, the staff began to rework
the seminal ideas to discover and articulate its goals. By the
time priorities were clarified it was too late to alter the
design so as to reflect them. This appears an illogical sequence.
However it was psychologically necessary for actual program ex-
perience to precede our formulation of goals and of a total design.
Until real students making real demands were present, our task
was too unrealistic to elicit the concentration and sense of
responsibility it required. Until we experienced the confirma-
tion of our seminal ideas at the retreat, we did not have the
determination necessary to see the whole design beyond the
administrative demands, or the confidence to closely search
for or defend our goals. Before this program experience Glenn
and I were too dependent on each other’s support to risk fully
challenging each other. It did not occur to us to try to
reconcile differences in our desires for the core course.
Instead we went immediately to having two and then three
courses. After the retreat we were less protective, more sure
of the validity of our ideas and of the importance of their
consequences.

My conclusion is not totally negative. I agree with Glenn
that the program constituted an improvement over the previous
year and, for at least a third of the students, was basically
successful. They experienced trust and exercised responsibility
for their own education to a degree that is unusual in graduate
school. We have no specific evidence beyond this as to whether they left the program more competent to teach. Twenty-three of the thirty-five graduates whom we were able to trace did not take teaching jobs. Four others had sought teaching jobs, but finally accepted other jobs. Two have stayed at the School as doctoral students. Others have chosen to work as a mechanic, a social worker, an art gallery worker, a VISTA supervisor, a laboratory technician, a writer and a carpenter.
FALL 1970, CREATING THE 1971-72 DESIGN

In the October meetings Glenn, Pat and I were working from a sense of obligation to find solutions to the problems we were encountering in the existing Program. We each began with a different sense of what was most wrong. These senses reflected our particular experience, and also our valuing of what we were best at, and our wanting others to avoid our biggest mistakes as beginning teachers. Glenn wanted to have more emphasis given to experiences involving cross-age and cross-cultural contact. He spoke of feeling good about Harold Taylor's notion of "The World as Teacher". Pat was excited by the cross-cultural idea, but her greatest concern was that greater attention be given to supporting students in the field, including more supervision, more involvement of cooperating teachers, and working with groups of interns and teachers to counteract the tradition of teachers' being isolated in their classrooms. I was most concerned to find additional ways to promote the kind of questioning of purposes that I had made the goal of my course. The kind of field work that interested me the most was the possibility suggested by Len of creating or participating in an alternative school and juxtaposing that experience to the conventional placements we had.

All three of us were dissatisfied with having to require students to take the arts and science courses. Usually they appeared to the

students and to us to be too remote from our basic purposes. Pat preferred dropping the Arts requirement. Glenn wished to preserve it, but to make it more flexible. He felt that our Program had something to say about teaching content. I did not have strong feelings either way. All of us were concerned to promote the kind of community feeling that seemed to be budding at the retreat. Glenn had suggested having an MAT house to serve as our meeting place and as a residence for some students. We were currently meeting in a dormitory lounge. Beyond that, we had few specific ideas for community building, but thought a sense of community would have a chance if we resolved some of the other concerns.

We felt confident that solutions to our concerns would be found if we could, as Glenn suggested, acquire outside funding that would allow us to increase our resources. But we had the sense that adding together the concerns each of us had would result in asking too many different things of students. To an extent we were competing to have our concerns be given top priority. During the first month, the planning process was the sharing, often arguing, of these different concerns. At first, there was a tension - a testing of whether it was important to have the three of us understand each other. Glenn and Pat tended to be polarized. Glenn felt Pat was sometimes overly concerned with details that had little substance. Pat felt Glenn was sometimes overly concerned with ideas that were too utopian. These differences were exaggerated by their frustration with the seminar. It was sometimes uncertain whether all three of us should work together. I valued having Pat with us. I felt that her influence was good for Glenn and
We played with a wide variety of solutions. In late October I volunteered to summarize as many of the ideas we had thrown out as could be reconciled with each other. I found myself for the first time assuming the stance of a designer. I took as the givens - 50 participants, about one year or 36 credits worth of time, and the goals and processes the three of us had advocated. A major concern was to give a balanced inclusion of the things each of us most valued. The resulting outline offered what I called "The M.A.T. Idea Reinterpreted", with a new view of each of the three major existing MAT components; a broadening of subject matter, a broadening of field experiences and a redefinition of the education courses along the lines of my course. It read as follows:

"The M.A.T. Idea Reinterpreted

I. A new view of subject matter
Subject matter is human body/environment (Hawkes curriculum)
Most real, most usable specialties within it may be ecology
social change - Nader, etc.
physical education
technology
arts

II. A new view of internship/field experience
regular school
experience in alternative school
and experience in another culture (domestic or foreign) (World as Teacher)
development of a lab school?

III. A new view of the teaching/learning process stressing awareness of how you learn
total involvement in what you learn (immersion)
developing trust as a basis for gaining understanding from each other.

Then followed a suggested sequence that specified the use of the
program time which I had expanded to include two summers:

**Suggested Sequence**

I. Students come as major in one of the curricular specialties mentioned above, with or without experience

II. Summer
   retreat
   3 week methods and styles course (immersion)
   3 weeks Hawkes general curriculum

III. Fall and Spring
    work in regular school and alternative school (one each semester) in specialty
    at same time take specialized curricular course following from Glenn's summer course
    at same time great emphasis placed on supervision
    following summer methods course, including weekly
    group supervision, involvement of cooperating teachers, access to mod methods courses, performance curriculum in METEP.

IV. Summer---intercultural experience.

By using both summers we were able to include an abbreviated form of the courses Glenn and I were now teaching and make room for three kinds of field experience. Glenn's interest in reshaping the Arts and Sciences part of the Program was emphasized through the creation of a transdisciplinary major that would grow from work with the Hawkes curriculum in the summer. It was not clear at this point whether this would involve courses or field work.

The outline then had a section on resources and concluded with some areas of question:

**Resources**
MAT House for courses, social times, where some might live
Current five person staff plus consultants, part time people to help with subject matter specialties, intercultural experience, drawn from the School of Education and the University and elsewhere need credentialed people

**Suggestions:**

- ecology: Marc Lappe, Joe Hardy
- technology: Chris Dede
- social change: Chip Wood
- international: Richard Saunders, CIDOC?
Questions
 certification
 pre-school, junior college
 scholarship students
 time to use School of Education offerings.

Consultants were added so that we could implement our idea of the Arts Program without being completely dependent on the University departments. If they were properly credentialed we saw them as having interdepartmental faculty status with the authority to give Arts and Science credits for whatever we deemed appropriate. For me personally, the consultant idea had the more important dimension of being a possible means of bringing several specially valued friends to work with us. They included primarily Chip Wood whom I listed under social change, Henry Lanford who will enter this narrative later, and Marc Lappe who is listed under ecology. I regarded them as the best teachers I knew. Not having to deal as much with the University and making a chance to work with these people, once it entered my mind, became another given in the design process. It doubled my excitement about the Program, adding echoes of the Woodstock idea. Richard Saunders was my father-in-law, an accomplished educator and sociologist who runs a community development effort I was interested to explore. Chris Dede and Joe Hardy were fellow doctoral students. I left as questions whether we would have any trouble meeting certification requirements, whether we would accept students with interests in all levels of teaching, whether we would seek resources for scholarships, and whether we could fit into the Program time to use general School of Education offerings.

The basic approach of the outline was accepted as a basis for putting together a coherent program which we could all be enthusiastic
about. We were impressed with the substance of our proposal, and encouraged because we could work together. We felt the same good feelings we had had at the retreat. We felt that we could go on to create any kind of program we wanted to. Pat and I were moved to invest ourselves very heavily into this effort. For me this was the beginning of a frenzied year and a half of activity. (I should note that my sense of mental fertility was accompanied by, and perhaps in large measure caused by, the fact that my wife and I were preparing to give birth to our second child.) I assumed more responsibility for leading an institution than I ever had before. I gave much less attention to my family and myself, a fact which with our new baby made Faith's life and our life together frustrating. Glenn was deeply committed, but he had less available time. He went on to urge me to consider myself to be the designated director for the Program if it were funded, and to see his role as being a more reflective faculty role. I felt able to accept this position because of the hope of sharing this venture with Pat, Glenn, Chip, Henry and Marc.

Between the writing of the outline and the writing of a proposal in narrative form there were several more developments. Glenn articulated a rationale for our transdisciplinary approach to the Arts. Pat proposed a new system for advising and evaluation. She suggested organizing students and staff into five-person guidance committees that would serve in lieu of a faculty advisor as a forum for participants to share their concerns as they went through the Program. I began to bring together on a regular basis the students who were
interested in establishing an alternative school. The idea of creating a whole school was unreal to me. It was hard for me to think beyond changing the attitudes of individual teachers. But I was eager to have them give it a try and sensed that the creation of an alternative clinical high school associated with the School of Education might be politically feasible. I was also eager to keep several of the students, especially David Boyer and David Rumpf, involved in our plans for next year. David Boyer had joined my class as a special student after meeting me for a cup of coffee one morning during the second week of classes. Our talks were the single greatest influence in my day to day thinking during the fall. He was an exact and powerful thinker and writer. He and his wife Wendy helped in the writing of the proposal. David Rumpf had joined the Program as a special student after being introduced to me over a morning coffee in October by a student in the Program, Terri Pomerantz. He quickly became a symbol for me of a natural, playful and relaxed approach to learning. Later in the year he created an alternative education class in Amherst High School which was the only tangible outgrowth of this school planning work.

During this period I brought Chip Wood up from New York to join us in a planning session. He had been a close friend for years. He was the Chief of Field Operations under Whitney Young in the Urban League. Chip was one of the most influential white people in the civil rights movement. As of the first Woodstock discussions, however, he and his wife Reenie had made the decision to leave New York and work on the national scale, to live near us and to work on a small scale
toward the creation of the kind of community they believed in. Chip's view of community contained elements of his faith in Christ, his wishing to build an extended family, his wish to contribute to "the Greening of America". Working together on a new MAT Program seemed to fit in perfectly with these dreams. Let me add here the profile that Chip wrote for the MAT Program Book we put out the next summer:


For the past ten years I've been involved in social work; first with children in a home for dependents, in camps and in one school; then with civil rights at the local and national level with the Urban League. I've helped organize at the block, neighborhood, and community level, and have helped mobilize nationally for peace and against poverty. During these ten years I spent most of my time away from home and away: from my closest friends.

Now I am living and working with my closest friends; feeling that is right first; and sensing there is a way to reconcile a life of action and service with one of family and friends. I look forward to being a part of the MAT community, sharing and learning. I am especially interested in exploring approaches to prejudice and learning; of testing ways to deal with racial prejudice within the white community; and of examining the relationship between cognitive learning and spiritual growth from the perspective of my own Christianity. It should be fun.

I welcomed Chip first as a friend, though his view of community, like Glenn's, was not quite real for me. I was also comforted by knowing he was an expert public relations man, fund raiser, administrator, writer, organizer, and a great political asset given the School's growing interest in racism. In his first session with us he suggested we think in terms of education for the social professions, that is, teaching in the largest sense rather than only school teaching. He saw that other professional schools and institutions other than schools

could become intimately involved in the Program. He proposed that the interdisciplinary consultants be considered MAT fellows. He saw them as being practitioners, rather than theoreticians, who would be drawn from various professions for a year or more. He also suggested that students be people with experience working in different fields. These suggestions captured a strong feeling we had shared of needing to break down boundaries between jobs and institutions, in addition to between fields of study.

During November Pat and I sat down to write a proposal. It was to have three parts: I. Introduction, II. Rationale, and III. Program Description. The Program Description came together first. Pat wrote the first draft. As with each section we sought the reactions of about fifteen other people including Glenn, Chip and Faith along the way. The following version of the program description was produced by Pat and me with Glenn and David Boyer and his wife Wendy in a 24-hour period in December just before a deadline for the submission of a proposal.

III - PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Chronological Summary

Students will come in the summer to participate in a retreat and two three-week workshops, one focused on learning and human development and one focused on the structure of knowledge. Curriculum for the workshops will grow out of this year's MAT core courses. MAT Guidance Committees will be formed in the summer to plan the students' year-long programs. In the fall and spring semesters emphasis will be given to four kinds of supervised field experiences: practice teaching in public school classrooms, work with alternative schools, work in other community institutions, and learning in other cultures. As part of the work with alternative schools, students will be participating in the development of a clinical high school which is to be affiliated with the MAT Program, and when ready, will serve as a primary field resource. The school seeks to create an alternative school within a nearby public school system.
Most participants will be involved in more than one consecutive field experience. Usually the field experience will be part-time assignments. Participants will spend the rest of their time in projects, workshops, independent studies, and courses. Students will work with their Guidance Committee and the MAT Fellows to select and, in many cases, create these activities.

**Program Components**

**Staff.** The staff must be guided in their own behavior by the Program's goals and philosophy. The power of the staff to act with vision, imagination and with a sense of community is the primary means of program impact. We have created this proposal out of the conviction that we three, with four or five others who have already been working with us as potential staff members, are in this sense a powerful staff nucleus. The staff will include a Director, a Field Experience Coordinator, and a Curriculum Coordinator (the authors), two Supervisors of Student Teachers, an Administrative Assistant to the Director, a Secretary, four MAT Fellows, and part-time consultants, such as an Evaluation Specialist, a Human Relations Specialist and a Video Technician.

**MAT Fellows.** Fellows will be half to two-thirds time staff with the qualities of an authentic teacher and expertise in a significant transdisciplinary area; ecology, social change, world culture, communication. They will be community-building, practitioners of their specialties. They will have a primary interest in the process of education and will have had experience in developing educational programs.

Fellows will be defining a new job role. They will function as community developers in Education and as subject matter advisors to MAT students. They will offer a model of teaching that focuses on helping people to learn beyond the confines of a classroom and a traditional discipline. Their primary base of activities will be the field work placement sites.

The Fellows will follow the community developer model that has grown out of Social Work by beginning with an assessment of the needs of individuals and then developing programs, projects, and combinations of resources to address the needs in a manner that strategically alters the behavior of institutions. For the fellows, the beginning points are the learning needs of MAT students and the needs of the students they teach, their parents, their faculties, members of the University and the five associated colleges, and members of the geographical community.

At the same time, Fellows will have primary responsibility for guiding MAT students in expanding, reinterpreting, and applying their subject matter strengths. They will serve as a liaison between members of the MAT program and the other schools and departments of the University.
The Fellow role is a significant new vehicle for invigorating educational institutions. We think there are numbers of practitioners with the qualities we have described who would welcome the opportunity to spend half-time or more for at least a year focusing on the improvement of public education.

Guidance Committees. In the summer each student will join with three other students and a staff member to form a Guidance Committee. Committee members will have a commitment to helping each other plan their year's program. Their primary contribution will be to stimulate others to reflect upon their learning. They also will be involved in each other's field experiences. They will be aided in making planning decisions by an information system that catalogues available learning experiences and resources. Members are accountable to the Committee for the planning and execution of their program.

Committees will be the setting for the growth of a small community. In a Committee the sharing of experience required by the planning process will help members be responsive and responsible learners. We view this as a much needed model for all teacher/student relations. Teachers, as contributors to and creators of community, should see their fellow teachers, the administrators and their students as members of a large guidance committee.

Field Experiences. Carefully chosen, supervised field experiences constitute the program's core curriculum. Most students will have had one or more of the four kinds of field experiences described above before entering the program. They will usually have two or more new kinds of field experiences in the course of the program. A combination of experiences in the public schools and experiences in alternative schools can contribute to a perspective for building a vision of teaching. Experiences in nursing homes, consumer surveying projects, political campaigns, prisons, and other community settings can add to understanding of extra-school learning. Experiences in the inner-city, on Indian reservations or in a foreign culture can stimulate a fresh realization of what world we are learning and teaching about. Direct experiences in unfamiliar cultures can also stimulate a new awareness of one's own learning process.

We approach supervision with a belief that excellence in teaching is dependent on a person being good at learning from his experiences. Our focus then is on helping students become good at observing themselves, and sensitive to the observations of others who are part of their experience. We will ask them to give exact attention to the consequences of their moment to moment decisions. And we will demonstrate in our relationships to students, the value of being in communication with one's co-workers and students. The entire professional staff of the program will spend time in the field working with students.

Communication. There will be many avenues for communication within the program: Guidance Committees, retreats, Supervisory and Fellow relationships, an open portfolio system, whole group meetings, video tape and film communication, group dynamics workshops. An MAT Program house will be rented to serve as a general meeting place for all participants and as a residence for some.
The Clinical School. The Clinical School at present is in the conceptual stage. The idea arose in the course of this year's MAT work when a number of participants, who were experienced teachers, identified a common feeling of what a high school should be. The idea grew as they and the MAT program as a whole recognized the need to develop alternative settings for practice teaching in this area.

A school planning group is now at work seeking to develop the best possible school for high school age people. They and the authors of this proposal are committed to exploring all possible ways of serving as resources to each other.

There are many potential relationships. During the summer MAT students can be involved in the establishment of the school. Throughout the year MAT students can interact informally or formally (through internships) with students in the school. This setting can be conducive to students testing directly their most important questions about learning.

While the major aspects of this description were becoming solidified in our minds, we had continued to debate what kind of students we would be recruiting and what kinds of jobs they would go to. Pat had held all along that priority should be given to helping the average teacher. This approach would also give our program design the greatest applicability to other universities. She reacted against my idea of emphasizing the elitist aspect of the MAT tradition in recruiting, against Chip's suggestion to diminish the school emphasis. I wrote a compromise position for the Introduction section of the proposal. All of us could accept that it would make sense to look for applicants who already had had some experience working to help people. It was desirable to have some preparation for teaching other than being a student. We accepted that in seeking funds we should propose to produce something unusual. I wrote:

Who will enter the program? Most of the participants will have had experiences other than that of being a student. Many will have taught, done social work, or served in the armed forces, VISTA, or Peace Corps. They will include a cross section of ages, nationalities, and races. Most participants will be graduates of liberal arts colleges. However,
as MAT's, rather than continuing to work within the field of their undergraduate major, they will expand the focus of their work to include one of the following transdisciplinary fields: ecology, social change, world culture, communication. Fifty people will be admitted from an anticipated 400 or more applicants. They will come as full-time students and spend ten months in the program (six weeks in a series of Summer Workshops, followed by two semesters).

What will graduates of the program do? Participants in the program will usually acquire State Teacher Certification in either elementary or secondary teaching. However, graduates will possess the strength and flexibility to do more than is usually required of classroom teachers. Accordingly, the program will make available to them opportunities to be creators of alternative schools within public school systems, to be master teachers, and to fill other teaching positions that place a special demand on the candidates' resourcefulness. The program will seek to place clusters of graduates together in the same school in order to increase their chances of having an institutional impact and to continue to function as a community.

Until the writing of the rationale, our conceptions of the Program had been discussed in terms of possible processes, resources, and participants. We had, of course, used our sense of the program goals as the criteria for evaluating proposed elements. However we had not tried to summarize or reconcile these criteria. I undertook to do so, knowing that I had yet to figure out what I really believed beyond what I had written for my class and the interns. After a painstaking series of rewritings with help from friends I came out with the following summary that appeared in the Introduction and then the following elaboration in the Rationale section.

What are the goals of the MAT program?

1. The primary goal is to help program participants achieve excellence in teaching. We intend specifically to assist each participant in the development of three elements in teaching which together serve as a foundation for excellence: (a) a vision of what he means by helping people to learn, (b) the ability to contribute to the creation of community (by community, we mean a context within which people can sense and act on their inherent responsiveness to each other), (c) the imagination to be able to transcend outworn conventions of educational culture.
2. The program seeks to contribute to the excellence of educational institutions by having the work of its graduates and the conduct of the program itself be catalysts for the improvement of the vision, sense of community, and imagination of the institutions encountered.

3. The program seeks to influence the reconstruction of education programs by making known the results of its efforts. We anticipate that while the number of MAT programs is now diminishing, our reinterpretation of the MAT idea will demonstrate the validity of a model that gives attention to subject matter content and the learning process. We anticipate that our model will have applicability beyond MAT programs to teacher education in general, to education in social work, religion, medicine, and law.

II - RATIONALE

Introduction

Teaching means being competent and consistent at helping people to learn. Excellent teachers can be found in any human group: parents, school teachers, medicine men, athletic coaches, business executives, kids. We approach the professional education of teachers with the intention of cultivating the attributes that these people share, rather than molding would-be teachers to fit institutional job specifications. The improvement of schools is dependent upon having more authentic teachers who are seeking, and then acting on, an understanding of the learning process.

Our program emphasizes the development of the three attributes which we have said serve as a foundation for excellence in teaching.

Vision in Teaching

A teacher needs to sustain a vision of what helping people to learn really means to him. This is rarely done. Most people see the teacher as the upholder of institutional rituals like "controlling the class", "covering the material", assigning grades or enforcing school rules, which have little to do with helping people learn. The people who criticize the meaninglessness of these rituals are, on the whole, unable to see themselves helping people learn. They are more likely, in a formal teaching situation, to take as their point of reference a stance against school authority rather than a vision of learning itself.

A vision of learning is not easily acquired. It is not sufficient to have in mind a vision of what the mastery of a discipline means. It is not sufficient to have in mind a number of teaching practices that one can call forth at the right moment. The need is for a vision
that makes one responsive and able to take initiative in a changing environment. That vision is nourished by studying what scholars have discovered about human development and by being in contact with teachers with vision. But fundamentally it is created out of one's own being. One must himself wrestle with questions such as: What do I really mean by learning? How do I learn? What role can one person play in another's learning? What can one person say about what another person should learn and when?

We seek to make the year people spend in this program a period of accelerated vision-building, a process which, for true teachers, continues in a lifelong examination of learning. We believe that a person must ask of himself that he find meaning inherent in teaching or else not be a teacher.

Community in Teaching

A teacher needs to be a contributor to the creation of community. There are a variety of other roles one person can play in another's learning, including devil's advocate, programmer, and resources coordinator; but the community building role is more fundamental. Community building opens the way for people in groups to contribute to each other's learning. A community takes as its learning base the knowledge of all the members, not just what the teacher or any one person knows. A community increases its members' capacity to understand their experience by reducing their defensiveness and enriching their sense of relationship with the world.

The conditions of contemporary society make the need for community particularly great and the achievement of community rare. Our capacity to understand our experience is strained by the quantity of information we receive and the number of rapidly-changing relationships with people and organizations we experience. These same factors make it difficult to feel responded to and to respond. Under these conditions many groups form by drawing energy from a hostile stance toward the world outside and imposing conformity on those within. They can be contrasted with authentic communities which arise from desires to expand communication with the whole of human experience.

Schools usually are not communities. Caring and communicating with integrity are lost in the schools' concern for control and the means of achieving it. The teacher who can kindle feelings of community, even if only in his own relationship with students, stands out as an invaluable aid to learning - especially as the isolation of generations is increasingly being taken for granted. We seek to have our program be an expanding community, where participants take strength from the MAT group to build community in their classes and beyond - in schools, in neighborhoods, between institutions, and between all men.

Imagination in Teaching

A teacher needs to be imaginative as he addresses the conventions of educational culture. We are outwearing the boundaries that have
been drawn between mind and body, work and play, learning and doing, formal and informal education, teacher and student, old and young, white and black, high IQ and low, sciences and humanities. A teacher needs the vision and imagination to distinguish helpful boundaries from destructive ones, and to create new combinations that will make whole what the old boundaries have fragmented. An imaginative teacher may do such things as: take into consideration the operation of his school's cafeteria when he is developing an ecology curriculum; choose to have a student advisor in the same way that a student may choose to have a faculty advisor; find ways to involve study of the woman's liberation movement in a biology curriculum.

This program seeks to contribute to the growth of imagination by creating new combinations of resources and experiences. We emphasize the combination of the learning of subject matter and learning how to teach it and the reinterpretation of the subject matter disciplines in the light of the transdisciplinary whole of knowledge.

In the Introduction I tried to make the best case for funding our Program. The statement on teaching was intended to identify the Program somewhat within the MAT tradition of professional excellence. With a glut of teachers on the market the only reason to educate more would be to set a new level of excellence. But our thrust was a revolutionary kind of professionalism that passed over the trappings of credentials and institutional roles. This was the teaching in the largest sense that Glenn, Chip, David Boyer and I had been thinking about. The three elements of vision, community and imagination were my vehicles for capturing more specifically the qualities we had in mind.

"Vision" was obviously a direct expression of my concern with self-questioning which I had outlined for the interns. "Community" was the word that Glenn had wedded to the Program. It was now the most vital word for Chip. In this statement I create a definition that fits in some of my greatest concerns: the idea of trust building, the concern with specific teacher roles, the opposition to simplistic and protective communities which were in fashion. I felt I was able
to express the idealism which I valued without using the counterculture rhetoric which I regarded as romanticized. I tried to set the idea within a historical perspective. "Imagination" was intended to cover a variety of qualities that I associated most strongly with Glenn. The crossing of boundaries was already a major aspect of the Program design. I emphasize that our idea is distinct from the anarchistic new left view in saying that there are useful boundaries as well as destructive ones.

This proposal was submitted to the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation early in December. We attached to it a budget, my course outline, Glenn's Phi Delta Kappan article, an unpublished article of his - "The Human Body as a Basis for Curriculum Development", resumes, and a beautiful description of the clinical high school written by David Boyer. Reactions from the Foundation and other readers and our own reactions to rereading it made us feel more work was necessary. During Christmas vacation Pat wrote a student profile to illustrate specifically what the Program could be like for one student. I wrote the following addition to the Rationale section. I had already stated goals, but I had not related them specifically to the processes we had designed. As I wrote this I was not only seeking to impress readers, but also for the first time really digesting the Program design. The design ideas had felt wonderful to me, but I had not yet been able to see them in a logical perspective.

Building a Program for Vision, Community and Imagination

People will come to our program with diverse kinds of knowledge and a common interest in getting better at helping people
to learn. Left to their own devices they would grow in the development of vision, the ability to create community and imagination. The intent of the program is to accelerate and intensify that growth. This will be accomplished in part by making available to participants what professional educators have learned about teaching, but principally by requiring them to broaden their experience and by providing them with good contexts for learning from their experience. Participants will have new experiences in helping others to learn and also new experiences that focus attention on themselves as learners. The growth of vision and imagination in teaching depends upon recognizing learning, not just in children in classrooms, but also in oneself and in all those one has relationships with. So the curriculum of the program is designed to give as much attention to intensifying the participants' learning in itself, as to providing opportunities to teach. Participants will normally have as their core curriculum two or more of the following kinds of experience that are new to them: teaching in public schools, work in alternative schools, work in other community settings (anti-pollution organizations, police stations, community development agencies, etc.), living in other cultures.

It is the integration of experience - the finding meaning in it, not just the going through it, that gives rise to vision and imagination. Integration is a strenuous cognitive and affective process. It requires a high-level application of concepts and a personal examination of feelings. In our program we will build on the University's classic function as a setting for people to step back from their experience to reflect. The required field experiences will be part time. In the remaining time, students will be involved in classes, workshops, projects, and independent studies, using resources from the five affiliated colleges and elsewhere. Participants will begin the program with a retreat and two orientational workshops: one in learning and human development, one in the structure of knowledge. These workshops seek to stimulate integration by asking students to look at their own learning, their human development and their chosen fields of knowledge in the light of unified conceptual frameworks, including ones they create, (See Appendices D and E). Examination of the structure of knowledge will include questioning of their traditional academic boundaries. Participants will be asked to expand their area of concentration from a single discipline to a trans-disciplinary field. In these workshops and in all phases of the program we do not view the learning of subject matter as being separate from the understanding of how to learn it or to teach it.

A program that involves so wide a range of resources and so many modes of learning has a special need for a strong coherent center. The program's center is a community of the 60 participants. Among the 60 will be 10 staff members (7 full-time equivalents) who will have been chosen for their ability to express in action vision,
a sense of community, and imagination. Support for the personal integration of experience will come from within the community. We anticipate the participants' experience in helping each other to learn will be the most critical element in their gaining in understanding of teaching. Concentrated support will come from 12 five-person Guidance Committee (each with on staff member and 4 students). In their frequent meetings participants will establish their goals in the program and then plan and evaluate their experiences as they go through the year. The larger community will be together in the summer and then throughout the year in retreats, workshops, and informal gatherings - usually at an MAT House.

The need to integrate one's experience is most acute at the moment when one is having significant new experience. So we are particularly concerned to support the integration of experience while participants are in field placements. Students will usually be assigned to the placements in clusters. The staff will have as its major function giving attention to students during their field experience. They will act as supervisors and facilitators for group planning and evaluation. The groups will include the clusters of MAT Students, their colleagues, their students, parents, and others in the community.

This first half of my addition to the rationale can be seen as an explication of the design in terms of the principles of diversity and integration. The program intends to promote vision and imagination through processes that increase the diversity of stimulation for participants. Bringing together the diverse participants is in itself a substantial part of the program. Given their commitment to getting better at helping people to learn they might well on their own achieve as much as could be achieved by design. The program does further increase the diversity of stimulation by requiring the trans-disciplinary major and the four kinds of field experiences. The program emphasizes students doing what is new to them. It makes very clear that learning is not just what happens to the kids, but also includes what happens to teachers. It points one toward the fundamental common denominator of teaching/learning rather than resting
on a more restrictive definition.

If we simply increased diversity we could be moving toward a kind of madness, the "freaking out" that comes with overstimulation without integration. With integration, learning occurs, meaning is found. Having required participants to leave behind the familiar boundaries that they had often depended on for integration we were concerned to provide special support for integration. Our support included the provision of a setting and encouragement for reflection, the presentation of some underlying concepts and questions, and the cultivation of supportive community attention. The summer courses, the house, guidance committees, and supervision were our specific vehicles of support. I thus subordinated the idea of community to the idea of vision building. I implied here what I increasingly felt inside, that the program structure was less important than the people who would be staff. It would be their modeling of these goals that I counted on. It is evident that by the time I had written this section we were beyond considering the use of arts and sciences courses, or specialization by teaching levels.

This second half of my addition to the Rationale, more than any other part of the proposal, was written to satisfy what I pictured as the concerns of potential benefactors. We realized that in order to justify funding we needed to indicate that in the long run we would attract other resources and that we would affect more than fifty people. This section picks up a number of ideas that
we had discussed, but never written down.

In building this program over several years, a major focus will be the development of a network of people who work in the institutions that serve as field placement settings. Eventually, these people will take on most of the field-related functions of the MAT Staff. They will become joint staff or shared staff, adding the MAT function to their existing functions in the institutions. In order to achieve this we must locate and develop enduring close relationships with people at the field sites who have the qualities this program emphasizes.

In our relationships with school systems we will emphasize the development of one or more clinical schools. In addition, we will seek a substantial, but less formal, involvement with several school systems. Placement of teams of graduates in these schools will be a major means of building close relationships. In relationships with other community institutions, including those in other cultures, we will seek a comparable sharing of resources and linking of staff. The opportunity to do this is enhanced by the already existing involvement of the School of Education (and MAT Staff) in work in such areas as American Indian education, educational television, the Career Opportunities Program, prison education, and the Peace Corps.

There is a similar need for building more intimate relationships with other parts of the School of Education and other parts of the University and the affiliated colleges. In relationships with the 11 centers of the School of Education we will emphasize a partnership in the preparation and placement of administrators, counselors, and teachers. In relationships with other parts of the University and the four affiliated colleges we will emphasize the development of trans-disciplinary pools of faculty, specifically interested in teacher education.

We have described the program in terms of its effect on participants. The program is designed with the intention of affecting outside groups as well. We have chosen an MAT format in order to emphasize the need for a fifth year in teacher education and to encourage the combination of attention to subject matter and attention to teaching it. The demand for teachers with Masters Degrees is increasing. The number of MAT Programs is declining. We intend that our experientially-based trans-disciplinary MAT model lead the way to filling this gap. We intend in addition that our model be applied to programs in teacher education at all levels and to programs preparing people for the other social professions. Working from a 50 person central community and using a wide range of resources and modes of learning, including multiple field experiences, can be as productive for undergraduates as graduates, for city-planners and lawyers as for teachers.
We intend that the program immediately begin to influence the redirection of our School of Education's 3500-person undergraduate teacher education program. We have proposed to limit the scope of our program to 50 participants in order to be able to give close attention to testing and perfecting our model. But already we are succeeding in having our program conception regarded as a seminal model by the Teacher Preparation Program Council, which has responsibility for teacher education at the University, (the MAT Director Designate is one of eight Committee members). We anticipate that under their direction the undergraduate program will move from its present fragmented state into a number of coherent alternative programs. The future picture of undergraduate teacher education is likely to feature the juxtaposition of programs growing from our wholistic model and programs following a performance criteria model.* (*The Model Elementary Teacher Education Program, a nationally significant competency-based program, is now in a preliminary stage of implementation here.)

We associate ourselves with the reformist tradition of the School of Education. We intend that our relationships with schools and other institutions in the field serve to support strategic efforts at reform. We intend to provide leadership for the pooling of educational resources. This will be a primary job of four of our faculty-level staff - the MAT Fellows. They will occupy a significant new kind of position as resource developers for a group of institutions (after a trial period a number of institutions will share in sponsoring the Fellows).

We have been able to describe the major thrusts of our program in terms of its impact. We think that they point for the future to a new kind of educational configuration - a community of learners affiliated with a consortium of colleges, public schools, and other institutions. But we cannot predict exactly how our efforts will grow. Our program is essentially open-ended. It will change as we learn and as the needs of society that we are responding to change.

There were two things we could offer to other institutions: the field work that our students would perform, and the broad talents of the MAT Fellows. I stated here the most optimistic picture of the institutional and resource commitments they might engender. Whereas as Glenn, Pat and I had gotten almost no commitments, even from people in the School of Education, it was possible that by using interns more strategically and adding
the efforts of the Fellows we could make some gains. The most far-reaching possibility of creating a new "educational configuration" seemed remote, but with backing from a foundation might have proved the right idea at the right time. I had in mind Chip's dream of a community-based interprofessional program. At the same time I tried to rationalize our being an MAT program while numbers of MAT programs were being closed out, Yale, Wesleyan, and Chicago among them. We gathered that the reason for their termination was that in a time of financial cutbacks, the teacher glut and the interdepartmental character of the programs made university departments vote against these programs before they voted against their own "bread and butter" programs. However in writing the proposal I read that this was evidence that others shared our belief that the MAT idea needed redefinition. The part of the Rationales that seemed most real to me was the claim that we would influence teacher education within the School of Education.

At the time of adding Pat's student profile and this new section of the Rationale I also added the following page on Program evaluation:

IV - PROGRAM EVALUATION

We are searching for evaluation techniques that directly address our program goals. We have identified the following:

1. An analysis of participants' portfolios would produce data on participants' reactions to all major activities of the program.
2. An edited videotape of Committee meetings would offer a relatively spontaneous expression of participants' evaluations of themselves and of the program.

3. If we added to that videotape a tape of the same Committees' discussing a viewing of their original taped session, the quality of participant self-evaluation would be made visible.

4. Our observation of students in the field at different times in the program, and before entering and after leaving the program, would enable us to assess their progress in terms of the program view of excellence in teaching.

5. Longitudinal studies of graduates, using questionnaires and/or periodic observations, would enable evaluators to assess the long-run progress of graduates and gauge their effect on education.

6. Interviews and anecdotal information would enable us to assess the institutional impact of the program.

I was not very concerned with formal evaluation. I was immersed in figuring out what we should try to do and how to get the resources to do it. I knew our real goals were long run; they addressed life-long learning. It would have been appropriate for us to undertake an ambitious twenty-year longitudinal study. I did not consider the use of short run behavioral objectives. For the short run I had thought about how to raise the quality of our self-questioning and communication. I believed that this was the key to keeping us all honest. I saw the use of written communication. I believed that this was the key to keeping us all honest. I saw the use of written communication in the Portfolio and the use of video-tapes as adding important occasions for reflection. The video-tape idea was a direct reference to the kind of work Henry Lanford had been doing.
CHAPTER VI
SPRING 1971, RESOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Seeking Outside Resources. A major impetus for our creation of the program design and rationale was the hope of increasing our resources through outside funding. It was not the only reason. We had found much of it rewarding as a conceptual process and we intended to do many of the things we had proposed even without funding. We regarded our primary need as being full-time salaries for me, Pat, Chip and other MAT Fellows, preferably at a faculty level. We were uncertain how long we could tolerate the sacrifices and indignity of continuing to do full time faculty work for half-time assistantship pay. We were doubtful that we could attract the other staff we needed without good salaries. We also desired adequate travel money, help in renting an MAT House and scholarships for students. The planning effort was so far running in a temporary patched-together manner; powered only by our idealism. In addition to our need for the resources themselves, we needed the confirmation of our idealism that an outside grant could bring. In processing our proposal through the deans' offices in the School of Education's sign-off system we were encouraged to put in a large budget. We requested $25,000 for a five month planning grant to begin in February. We requested $175,000 for the first year of operation, with declining amounts for the second and third year. About $75,000 was in salaries, $50,000 scholarships, and the remainder in travel, rent, overhead and supplies, including video-tape equipment.
We sent letters and a summary of our proposal to the Ford, Hormel, Kettering, and Rockefeller Brothers Foundations. Of these, only the Rockefeller Brothers showed serious interest. A Foundation representative met with Glenn in New York in December and then with Pat and me in Amherst in January. He turned us down in February. We surmised that he had been critical of our lack of precise goal definitions, our idealistic view of human nature, and our lack of a strategic plan for institutional impact. In addition he, like some other foundation officers, indicated he was no longer very interested in the MAT idea. He may also have been skeptical of us as novice teacher educators. In retrospect I think we may have been hurt, too, by other School of Education people with whom he met, who probably had other projects they preferred to see funded.

I mention the Rockefeller possibility first because we gave it the most attention. However, from the end of November on we worked on a great variety of funding schemes. Our first approach had been to Dwight, because we thought his assistance could be our most valuable asset. I presented our plans to him, with an emphasis placed on our alternative school idea, knowing this was his most recent interest. I was given a big push to do so by the students in the planning group who by this time had gained a lot of momentum. I wrote him a letter on November 30 which included the following statements:

We are at a point where we are prepared to create an excellent MAT Program and affiliated school. We have a vision of what
teaching should be and what a school should be and significant new programmatic approaches to them. Beyond this, we are concerned to be in a position to have the maximum national impact. We think the best strategy is to identify ourselves with the vehicle you have been promoting - the vehicle of creating alternative schools within public school systems. The school being planned should move toward becoming part of the Amherst School System. The MAT Program should prepare to place most of its graduates through groups like the School Management Study Group into positions where they would be helping to create alternative schools within public school systems. This would mean that most people would be accepted into the MAT program after having some teaching experience or other experience beyond being in college, and that graduates would be thought of as prepared to educate and create beyond the confines of the usual classroom teacher role. We would like to take this a step further to make what we are doing part of a new emphasis in the School of Education. This School of Education should make itself the center of communication and learning for people interested in alternative schools within public school systems. We should make this the place for interested teachers, administrators, and high school students to come as short term observers, workshop participants, or degree candidates.

Neither this meeting nor a subsequent 5 a.m. meeting before the talk with the Rockefeller representative was particularly fruitful. Dwight offered some ideas for the proposal including making it a joint graduate/undergraduate program, and negotiating with school systems to pay our interns and use them in place of new teachers they would have had to pay more to hire. He did not offer to lend his influence in securing funding. I believe he was pleased with the direction we were taking and perhaps was interested to test out how well we could function without help. But I think he saw our program as too idealistic and lacking in strategic impact to give it any special support. In the spring I learned through Dick Clark of funding pos-

1. Mose and about a quarter of the participants failed to write a profile.
sibilities through the New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE) section of the New England Regional Commission and through a School of Education alternative schools task force that was writing a proposal for the Office of Education. I later learned that Dwight was a member of NEPTE, and, as the one most involved in interesting The Office of Education in alternative schools, had been setting up a number of grants for the School of Education, including a $300,000 grant from the Office of Education for a center for alternative school efforts.

From February on I concentrated on finding ways to fund the one or two most marketable pieces of the program. We sought unsuccessfully to get money for placing groups of students and an MAT Fellow in a single site for the year. We developed proposals to help staff a wilderness ecology center under NEPTE, a proposed Model Cities alternative school in Springfield, a Boston court outreach project, an internship program in the Martha's Vineyard Schools, an experimental high school outside Montpelier, Vermont, and pre-college training program for exiting servicemen at Fort Dix, New Jersey. There was also an effort to make a portion of the MAT Program part of an Office of Education-funded Urban League program to train staff for their street academies. There were efforts to join in a proposal from Donn Kesselheim to train teachers for urban alternative schools using Outward Bound.

There were also more specific efforts to fund the MAT Fellows and the rest of us apart from any particular site. We presented a resource development proposal to NEPTE using the following open
ended approach:

The primary programmatic commitments of the eight of us whose resumes are attached are:

1. to each other, as a combination of people who, working together, can be unusually productive for ourselves and for others.

2. to a structure for learning that has as its nucleus a community of not more than 60 people, and as its other components affiliations with diverse institutions and other resources throughout the world.

3. to an emphasis on reforming the social professions: journalism, law, medicine, religion, teaching, public administration, city planning, social work, psychology, etc.

Working as an MAT Program at the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts is one good way for us to pursue our commitments. The MAT format gives us an opportunity to highlight the value of combining disciplines, combining theory and practice, and combining the learning of subject matter and learning to teach. The School, as a leading reform-oriented public institution, gives us immediate access to numerous valuable resources and immediate opportunities for becoming widely visible. In addition, being at the School of Education gives us an opportunity to contribute to the overall success of an institution we value.

Another good way to pursue our commitments is to create a new educational configuration that would not be bounded by a primary affiliation with a single School and University, a single professional category, or a particular degree. This would at first be much more difficult than working from recognized accredited, degree-giving structure. However, it would be a more direct approach to our long-run goals. We would eagerly reshape our proposal along these lines if you believe this approach could fall within the Commission's area of interest.

Attempts were made to fund potential Fellows individually. Chip was in a position to lead the Urban League project and also to receive support to help Dwight with his newest interest, combatting racism. However, he was so discouraged by what he saw as the School of Education's exploitative approach to the Urban League negotiations
and lack of integrity and good judgement in dealing with race
relations that he chose not to become closely associated with the
School. He did accept admission as a doctoral student to make it
possible for him to be considered an MAT staff member. Marc Lappe,
whom we had hoped to attract as a Fellow in ecology, was offered a
faculty position at nearby Hampshire College. I worked it out for
him to be offered a courtesy appointment at the School of Education
that would involve him with our program. We had also hoped to
involve his wife Frankie, a dancer and nutritionist. However,
Marc elected to accept a different position. There were also
several unsuccessful efforts to get funding for Henry Lanford.

We undertook several last ditch funding efforts in April as
a result of the urging and assistance of John Thomson, an entering
MAT student. He was an extraordinary personality to have come
into our group. John added to our mix of innocence and idealism
the words and schemes of a veteran of international marketing and
journalism. He wrote the following of himself in the Program Book.

It's taken a while - 36 years - but I seem to be moving
into what will cease the need to make a differentiation between
life and vocation, between what I'd like to do and what I'm
doing.

The desire to be involved in education has been there for
years, but total involvement was always something to do later.
Later is now.

What was, was education ranging from standard (Harvard)
to commerce (Pillsbury, Colgate, my own business) to journalism
(Marketing/Communications, National Observer, Time) to geography
and social studies (50 countries in five years).

Somehow, it has all contributed to who I am, which is
someone who wants to get deeper understandings of the whats and
hows of learning, communications, individualism, community.
He unsuccessfully sought to get funds from a former employer to support, first, the whole program, then, just the summer session, and finally, a variation of the Fellows idea that expressed his strongest interests. His final proposal read as follows.

A Proposal for Visiting Fellows
to
The Master of Arts in Teaching Program
at
The School of Education, University of Massachusetts

During the 1971-2 academic year an important aspect of MAT student field experiences will be to spend a week or more participating in the professional activity of a member of the community not vocationally involved in education. The objective is to give students a sense of what the businessman or lawyer or doctor or politician does professionally (including how, in a larger sense, he teaches others); what his feelings about education are; what ways the noneducator can be involved in the pursuit of excellence in education.

It is proposed that as an extension and intensification of this activity, Visiting Fellows be invited to participate in the MAT Program in Amherst. Visiting Fellows would come for one or two weeks, would typically live in a house with MAT students and would take part actively in all aspects of the Program. While in residence, the Visiting Fellow would be involved in the following kinds of activities:

- Graduate seminars
- Faculty/staff meetings
- Practice teaching
- Experimental teaching projects
- Educational television production
- MAT life

The presence of Visiting Fellows - drawn from all segments of the community on the basis of their interest in education - would provide MAT students exposure throughout the academic year to the attitudes, suggestions and criticisms of concerned, sensitive non-educators. Working with prospective teachers, Visiting Fellows would have an unequalled opportunity on the one hand to observe existing classroom conditions and on the other to encounter the most progressive professional thinking about how U.S. education can be improved.

It is hoped that a continuing relationship would be maintained between Visiting Fellows and the School of Education, including the inviting of groups of two students and/or staff to visit Fellows in their home communities. It is anticipated
that Visiting Fellows would return to their communities stimulated to take part in solving the crisis in American education.

During the 1971-2 year 8 to 12 Visiting Fellows would be invited to Amherst. Each would be provided living accomodation but would be expected to underwrite his own food and travel expenses. Cost of the program for the initial year is estimated at $1,200.00.

School of Education Resources. Our only support was to come from the School of Education. In February TPPC came into existence (See Chapter II). By the time of their third meeting they had selected me as the graduate student member. I believe I was chosen because I had taken an active interest in the work of the Kesselheim committee and had supported with my actions, as well as my words, the creation of alternative programs. I was also identified as a critic of METEP and as being outside the Teacher Education Center group. In the beginning of March the MAT Program presented to TPPC a summary of the proposal and request for a faculty position for me as director, a double assistantship for Pat as field experience coordinator and four summer assistantships, plus the three assistantships and half-time secretary we had now. With high praise for the program design, TPPC gave us the three assistantships and helped us to negotiate for a half-time secretary. Our allocation was comparable to that received by other programs in terms of the ratio of assistantships to students served.

At this time Glenn chose to ask for a partial leave of absence for the following year. Having struggled conscientiously for two years to be responsive to all students who needed help, while pursuing his own desire to teach and write, working closely with
many doctoral students, working with the MAT Program, and participating in a wide range of School affairs and off-campus projects, he needed to reduce the number of his obligations. He may have been encouraged to do so by seeing it as a way of helping me. He requested that he be put on quarter time status. He recommended I take over the job of Director and receive his salary. The Deans and TPPC agreed to give me a half time lectureship and make me Program Director. The recognition this position gave me seemed just enough confirmation of our faith to sustain our enthusiasm in the face of the failure to attract other resources. Pragmatically it meant we could definitely go ahead and have a program. Pat and Chip were willing to work for assistantships. We could pay two additional staff and perhaps attract more as volunteers.

For me personally this was a time of unique hope and satisfaction. I had not before found a significant institution which was as congruent with my values as the School of Education, for all its shortcomings. It seemed auspicious to be achieving some success here. In addition to the MAT position and membership on TPPC, I felt good for having been asked to serve on several other School of Education committees, having been asked by Jim Cooper to write a review of his new textbook, having passed my doctoral comprehensive exams, and having been invited by Dwight to ride with him to and from a speaking engagement in Concord, Massachusetts. Much more important than this feeling of institutional success however, was the hope of being able to fulfill my dream of
working with my closest friends. Best of all I felt I was on the brink of putting together for the first time a viable institutional professional life with my already rewarding personal life. I was to write the following of myself in the Program Book.

I was brought up to be permissive, to be a liberal social reformer, and to be playful. My experience since high school can be seen as split between two realms - a realm of intimacy with family and friends, and a realm of work in the larger world. My experience in the intimate realm has for the most part been rich and rewarding. It has come naturally to me to give and receive love and trust, to be able to look at the world through others' eyes, to be a husband and father. Until last year my experience in the realm of work had been anxiety-ridden. I had anxiously experimented to find out who I could be - a college drop-out, outdoorsman, a high school teacher, a governmental leader, a psychiatrist (a role I contemplated rather than actually tried), a man without a career who plays and learns. What rewards I got came from forming new intimate worlds within the larger world. And these rewards were undermined by my sense that they got in the way of my using my powers responsibly, of my being effective at work.

In the past year, I have begun to feel ready to be doing what I am doing. I have been able to orient myself to learning from both realms and to see teaching as an activity where both realms legitimately come together.

The resources we received did not appear adequate to support our total proposal. The lack of faculty status for Fellows meant we would not have adequate staff and academic clout to create and credit transdisciplinary courses of study. We would only be able to provide for the work in Education. We were not going to be able to bring students on scholarship or to pay for an MAT House. At this point I proposed abandoning the Arts part of the Program so as to leave students freer to pursue the various field experiences which would count for Education credits. This would have meant offering a Masters in Education Degree instead of an MAT, a change
that would not have significantly affected who applied to the program or what jobs they could get after graduating. However, Earl and TPPC turned my proposal down. I think they believed that having an interdepartmental degree like the MAT Degree, which we actually controlled gave the School some leverage in negotiating with the Graduate School on other issues. TPPC was also reluctant to let us abandon the transdisciplinary part of our proposal.

Because I was to be involved with the MAT Degree, Mort Appley, the Graduate Dean, took an interest in my appointment. My appointment violated the University rule that only a member of the graduate faculty could advise graduate students, much less direct a program for fifty graduate students. The issue was resolved in a meeting as summarized by the following memo from Dean Appley to Earl Seidman.

Further to our meeting of May 12th with you, R. J. Ball and Richard Clark, it is our understanding that the Master of Arts in Teaching program (MAT) will be the responsibility of the Teacher Preparation Program Council under Dr. Richard Clark for the coming academic year. Mr. Ball will act as program coordinator, reporting to Dr. Clark and the TPPC. It is further understood that in the Fall we will jointly examine the MAT program along with participants from cooperating departments and seek a pattern for that degree program (or programs) for the future that is consistent with the overall philosophies of TPPC and the University.

In the meeting Dean Appley had expressed opposition to our flexible admissions and degree-granting procedures. He later had an assistant go through our student records to raise questions about applicants who had not taken all their Arts' work within one department. Earl had responded by threatening to impose arbitrary School of Education requirements on candidates from any other department that wished to
implement an MAT program. Further discussions occurred in the spring and fall. New MAT programs were begun in French and Public Health. I helped in developing these programs and in advising the students they admitted. I set up a cooperative arrangement with the Art Department whereby students could take our core program and a basic 12 credit program in Art.

TPPC in May and again in September held retreats at which the Masters programs and the MAT Degree were discussed. The following is Dick Clark's summary of the May discussion.

In discussing the rationale for graduate level teacher preparation programs, a central theme recurred: that in graduate programs we can get people who know themselves, the world, people, very impressive and very different people from those who are typical undergraduates. With this group, we seem to have a greater potential for a process orientation and cross disciplinary approach. We also have the potential for placing people in teams with undergraduates to enrich the programs of both.

We have some problems. Living within the MAT format, we are under constraints which operate against the transdisciplinary notion. Within the School, we are dealing with a group of people at a degree level which is third in our order of stated priorities (with doctoral students, and undergraduates both receiving higher priority and thus higher resources).

Particularly, preparation for community colleges, and preparation university roles which encourage teaching as the major reward of activity, bode for further discussion and refinement of our master's level programs.

In working with Dean Appley next year, to study the master's situation, it was suggested that we have a pretty clear idea of what selection criteria, transdisciplinary processes, and career goal notions we have in mind. In other words, the rationale on our own part should be quite clear before we start engaging in discussions outside. To achieve our integrative curriculum with the multidisciplinary approach, it seems appropriate to be thinking about an M. Ed. Program rather than an MAT program for the 1972-73 school year. Regarding our posture with other departments in the University, it was suggested and received enthusiastically that we take a similar approach to that which was taken earlier this year as we developed alternative programs. Namely, that we don't become territorial, but rather that we invite other departments to develop their own MAT programs. TPPC
would become the group with which other departments would negotiate, and we would be responsible for negotiating certification with alternative programs thus generated, but again, we would encourage other departments to go ahead and develop their own master's level programs using the precedents of classics, French, PE, home economics, speech, and art as possible models to be followed. The results of such a process could not only serve to free the School of Education to do more specifically what it thinks is appropriate at the master's level, but also to stimulate interest and an appreciation of some of the problems faced in preparing teachers by faculty members in Arts and Sciences.

In September I wrote the following memo to Dick Clark in order to present a logical context for discussing our program. I have omitted here a second part describing existing programs and degree requirements.

This paper is intended to lay out some of the issues and some of the basic information members of TPPC and others making decisions in this area will probably be dealing with.

We do not begin as we began the TPPC examination of undergraduate teacher education with a set number of students to be served. We begin with the question of whether we want to serve graduate students at all. Do we want to have teacher education programs for which graduate students are specifically admitted to the University? Do we want to make teacher education resources available to other graduate students who are here in Education or other parts of the University?

Some Major Concerns.
1. The shrinking job market for teachers and raising of some States' Certification standards suggest for the future that people will need to have Masters Degrees to enter teaching. We may choose to encourage this trend rather than resist it. One way to do so while keeping our commitments to present and future undergraduates is to emphasize a five year program (which could also be offered as a four year program with summers, see INSITE program at Indiana).

2. Graduate programs offer the opportunity to attract different kinds of people into teaching, people of different ages with different kinds of experience behind them. If we are seeking to bring about change in schools, it may be important to break with the custom of bringing people
directly from 16 or 17 years of being students into being teachers. It also may be that people with other experiences behind them are best able to use the kinds of resources and experiences this School tends to offer.

3. Graduate programs lend themselves to promoting new kinds of specialization and generalization in teaching: Junior college teachers, trans-disciplinary generalists, teacher-counselors, masters teachers, health educators, media educators, teachers without schools (in hospitals, prisons, community agencies, and other settings).

4. Graduate programs can be offered to in-service teachers and thereby promote relationships with schools and other institutions in the field (the North Dakota strategy of in-service/pre-service interchange comes to mind).

5. To generalize from 2, 3, and 4 above, graduate programs have the flexibility to be more innovative more easily than undergraduate programs.

6. An MAT graduate program may be a good way to encourage fruitful interdepartmental cooperation. It may attract resources to teacher education from outside the School of Education. It may respond to the needs of graduate students who are associated with other departments.

7. Graduate students may serve as resources or serve to bring in resources for the undergraduate teacher education programs.

As we shall see in discussing the legacy of the 1971-72 program in Chapter X, TPPC and the School of Education failed after all this talk to take further initiative in the area of graduate programs.

Participants - Staff. From February on I wrote letters and held meetings designed to attract and hold all the best people I knew as potential staff. A major target of this effort was Henry Lanford, my closest friend since we had met in college and an extraordinary adventurer and teacher in the largest sense. I associated my insights about how people learn and the need for vision in teaching most strongly with him. In the past year he had led a video-tape communications project in a racially tense New Haven high school as a Visiting Lecturer at the Yale Graduate School of Art and
Architecture. He was now living on Plum Island, Massachusetts to study underwater diving and bathospheres. He was to write the following Program Book profile:

I am 27 years old, not married, and usually do not hold a regular job. I am particularly interested in two areas: the life and the experience under the surface of the sea, and human communication. I was born and raised on a beef cattle farm in upstate New York, one of five children, and I majored lightly in physics as an undergraduate and studied architecture and planning at the University of Oregon for three years ending three years ago. Since then, I have been primarily concerned with becoming knowledgeable and realistic about myself. During that period I have worked as a human communications technologist largely following principles learned in training at the National Film Board of Canada. I have travelled in the United States and Canada more than most people and have never been to another continent. I was married for three years and divorced for three. At my best I am usually able to see into other people and thus give to them, though that ability is itself a gift which is more something to enjoy and use when it comes than something "I" can produce at will. I sense the greatest potential for my own growth is in becoming better at calm simple observation, and I believe the same is true for all groups of people. I seem to be becoming more religious. I sense that the world outside and the world inside are mirrors. What I enjoy more than almost everything is when someone really laughs from his or her belly.

By the time of the TPPC approval we had held several meetings at Henry's house on Plum Island which involved the alternative school group and Pat, Chip and me. At Pat's suggestion we had also included in our planning Bob Pearson, a doctoral student in the Center for International Education. Pat recommended him as being unusually conscientious and honest, and as having an appetite for the kind of unusual approaches to teacher education we were using. He wrote the following Program Book profile:

I came into an interest in Education by way of an interest
in literature and a variety of cross-cultural experiences with the Peace Corps. I have a B.A. from Brown University in American Literature and an M.A. from the University of Michigan in English Literature. While working toward my Ph.D. in English with the intention of becoming an English professor, it began to dawn on me that what I really enjoyed was the teaching and that my doctoral program was becoming increasingly meaningless. My wife was just finishing up her M.A. in English at the time, and a visit to a Peace Corps recruiter convinced us that the Peace Corps was an appropriate way to seek our fortune. Our two years in Afghanistan tuned us in to the fantastic effect culture has on one's perception of the world and eventually led to future Peace Corps assignments on the staff of the P.C. and as cross-cultural coordinator for a Peace Corps Morocco Training Program. I have also worked for the P.C. and Vista in Washington. At present I am a doctoral student in International Education at the University of Massachusetts and am interested in working with the MAT Program in developing curriculum and teaching methods for cross-cultural and non-western studies.

In March Bob joined Glenn, Pat, Chip, and me in making a definite commitment to the program. He was offered the third assistantship. By April, Henry decided to join the staff as a volunteer with the plan of splitting his time between working with us and developing a diving project for the Department of Fisheries in Newfoundland, Canada. It was the six of us who constituted the staff during the admissions process. Chip was able to be available a slight part of the time. Henry appeared sporadically.

I was extremely pleased to have so strong and diverse a staff. Having their personal support made me confident. However, I was still hoping for a larger staff and by the end of the school year did find opportunities to gain others. I had for some time pursued an association with Paul Chandler, who was officially an undergraduate student in the Career Opportunities Program (COP), but actually a creator of COP, a major spokesman for the campus third
world community, and an extraordinary leader. He wrote the following Program Book profile:

I have been active since the early sixties in social struggle from Mississippi to New York, from SNCC to the Black Panthers to Brooklyn CORE. I was among the original developers of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Independent People's Board in 1966 and the founder of The People's Voice, an underground paper. I taught in Ocean Hill-Brownsville in 67-68. I've spent three months in Africa in the intercultural schools, and six weeks in the British primary schools. Now I am a student and teacher trainer at U. Mass. I am a member of CORE, Christians and Jews United for Social Action, the New York City Youth Board. I've spoken on campuses across the country on urban problems.

It is what I hope to do, not what I've done that counts. I hope to learn with people in the MAT Program. I hope that we can together assume our rightful historical role, and save the nation.

Paul agreed to be a resource person for the program. Numbers of other people sought to join us in the late Spring as our program proposals spread around the School. We eagerly accepted the offer of Barry Kaufmann, a doctoral student in elementary science curriculum, to work with us as a volunteer while he held a half time position in the Head Start training program. He was an extremely energetic, knowledgeable and effective teacher. He wrote the following Program Book profile:

Where does one begin when everyday is a genesis? The past is the present. All that was is. A kaleidoscope of being.

The early years (the first 25) were spent in a section of Brooklyn that social-economic theoreticians would characterize as being an environment of poverty and deprivation. In the beginning there was the block - not the neighborhood, not the school - only the block. Everything was learned on the block. Hey, Barry, ya wanna play stick-ball? No! Fagget!

Where could you go to be alone? Punch-ball, stick-ball, and who was leading the National League in home runs. All you could do is cry. But men do not cry. Why not? Where could you go to be alone? Friends - do they love me? Hey, do ya wanna play Monopoly?
Please, I'll be your best friend. Where could you go to be alone?


Then there is Gail. She is the yin and the yang. All that is is Gail. Words serve to delimit a limitless spirit.

The School of Education. A genesis of being.

We will live and learn together - we will live and love together - only then will we KNOW each other.

Data for those who need it

1960-1964 B.A. in Biology - Hunter College
1965-1969 M.A. in Biology - Hunter College
1969-present Ed.D. in elementary science education
1964-1969 Teacher in the New York City Public Schools.

IS THAT ALL THERE IS MY FRIENDS?

Mose Tjitendero, an exile from Namibia or South West Africa, who had been an MAT student, agreed to work with us as a volunteer. I had come to respect him as an articulate, thoughtful, and gentle teacher. Finally Chip's closest friend, Gary Smith, chose to quit his job to come live in Montague and work with us. Gary wrote the following MAT Program Book profile:

I feel people can learn only by mastering a posture of passivity and patience and acceptance. I think a teacher must passively experience his student's perceptual realities in order to bring them together with his own understanding. The teacher is mostly a learner, learning how to communicate, learning the difference between himself and others, learning who he is.

I've just spent seven years trying to get rich in data processing. Each year I traded more of me-in-harmony for me-in-security. If it sounds like I was doing things backwards, it's because I was. Integration of self and profession requires annihilation of the idea of profession. I must learn, practice and teach human communication to know me - and you. This will free us from each other by making us so much closer.
Pursuing goals which don't ratify my soul now will cause me to lose my soul before I achieve the goals. Wealth is now, not later.

I don't feel especially good about myself now. I have much confusion, self-doubt, and self-misdirection.

I am uncomfortable putting myself on this page. If we deserve each other at all, we at least deserve to know each other first hand.

1941  Born Indiana
1961  Married Cathy
1964  B.A. Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana
1964-67  Columbus, Ohio
         Programming
1967-71  Silver Spring, Maryland (Washington)
         Programming
Cooties-------Jennifer Lea  Age 9
          Dierdre Kai  Age 7

I was able to have Henry and Gary admitted as M.A.T. students. Mose became a doctoral student in the Center for International Education. Bob Pearson learned that he was to receive a grant to write a Middle Eastern studies curriculum. He decided he would give up his assistantship to Henry and/or Mose depending on what else they could get and continue to work with us as a volunteer. I was able to get another assistantship from TPPC for Gary to serve as administrative assistant for the graduate teacher education programs. Some summer money became available, most of it through Glenn's decision to share his summer salary. The final staff member to join us was Beth Anderson, who became the secretary, and as it turned out, also counselor and friendly critic. She was married to Eric, an incoming MAT student.

I felt that the bringing together of this staff had been a greater accomplishment and more difficult than the creating of the Program design. They constituted an immeasurable resource. Collectively they represented exactly those qualities we had in mind when we wrote of vision, community and imagination. I did not at this point regard as
obstacles the fact that some of the staff were close friends, while others were new to each other; that some were on salary, while others were volunteers; or that some were conventional, some bizarre, some radical, and some oriented to the counter-culture. I welcomed their diversity as being likely to keep us honest.

Participants - Students. We approached the admissions task much as we had the year before. The School's growing reputation led our applicant pool to increase to about 350 people. All but three of the people who were admitted to the Program had applied because they had heard of the distinctive qualities of the School of Education or of Dwight. Later, about a third of our students indicated they would not have gone to graduate school at all if they had not been admitted here. Admissions was a full time job for us from March on. About 150 students were interviewed, most by two or three of us. Our criteria for admission were not formulated explicitly. We tended to favor people who were older and had previous work experience. Individual staff members tended to give priority to other specific criteria: involvement in self-questioning (Henry), contribution to cultural mix (Bob), interest in classroom teaching (Pat), experience in another profession (Chip), contribution to mix of points of view (me). Acting as leader I resolved these differences by supporting the candidates who had enthusiastic support from a single staff member, rather than candidates with broad but less enthusiastic support.

By August there were sixty-two program participants, including eleven staff. Forty-eight were M.A.T. candidates. Five were M.Ed.
candidates. There were twenty-seven women and thirty-five men. Seven were black. One was Latin American. Twelve were 30 years old or older, twenty-two were from 25 - 29, twenty-eight were 21 - 24. Twenty-nine of the sixty-two were or had been married. Ten had children. There were two couples where both husband and wife were in the Program. The geographical origin of participants was as follows: Massachusetts - 15, other New England states - 7, New York - 9, Middle Atlantic states - 10, the South - 4, the Mid-West - 4, and Africa - 2. Four did not hold B.A.'s. Of those who did, three had graduated more than ten years ago. Twelve had graduated from elite private colleges or universities, four from University of Massachusetts, ten from other state universities, and fourteen from other schools. Twenty students studied both elementary and secondary education, seven worked mostly in elementary, fourteen worked in secondary, and ten spent most of their time in other areas - special education, adult education, counseling, program development, education for correctional systems and hospital clients. Areas of academic concentration were as follows: English - 23, social sciences - 15, math and science - 5, fine arts - 7, languages - 2. Past experiences of students included full-time teaching - 13, community organizing or social work - 7, Peace Corps - 5, Teacher Corps - 2, journalism - 5, military service - 5, research - 2, regional planning, programming, the ministry, public relations, insurance adjusting, underwater diving, acting, silversmithing, film-making, marketing consultant, art gallery director, State Department of Education official, and an African liberation spokesman. Sixteen had done graduate work, six had received Masters'
degrees.

The diversity in the students that appeared on paper was matched by the diversity of attitudes and styles they exhibited. Bob Pearson was to spell this out in a memo to all the participants written half way through the Program year. In commenting on our problems in becoming a community he spoke of a split between a "right think" group (an in-group in the Program) and a "wrong think" group (or out-group). For purposes of my understanding and anticipated dissertation writing he shared with me privately his categorization of the group. He categorized Henry, Chip, Gary and fourteen students as being "right think", Barry, Glenn, Paul, seventeen students and me as being in the middle and Pat, Mose, twenty-one students and himself as being "wrong think". His definition of these categories is a good expression of the range of types in the Program.

**Right Think**

Alternative, free schools  
Self-discovery, self-knowledge  
Going to Canada, hitch-hiking as field experience  
Commitment to community togetherness  
Heavy, moral-laden goals, pursuit of TRUTH  
Total revamping of society  
Profession of poverty, odd jobs  
Long hair, beards, headbands  
Barefoot, hiking boots  
Tattered, unmatched clothes  
Committees personally oriented of confessional nature, serious  
Autonomy of MAT Program, separation  
no need for rest school  
Extreme positions, solutions  
Burning report cards, abolition of evil grades, politicizing of kids

**Wrong Think**

Regular public schools  
Study of funded knowledge  
Taking a U. Mass. methods course  
No particular wish for community, satisfaction with small groups  
Skeptical, belief in relativity of values, truth etc.  
Basic acceptance of society as is  
Desire for steady job, material comforts  
Short hair, mustaches, side burns  
Regular shoes  
Regular clothes, matching, no patches, rips, etc.  
Committees fun, teaching oriented, no soul-baring  
Resources of School of Education just as important as MAT resources  
Middle of road positions, solutions  
Concern with teaching subject matter, relation to kids without politicizing
Right-Think
Holier than thou rhetoric
Serious
Left
Don't get along with parents

Wrong-Think
Hesitation about claiming self right, resentment, heavily moral rhetoric
Humorous, skeptical
Middle
Don't mind parents

I regard these as well conceived, but, as he acknowledged, over-simplified categories. And I agree with his categorization of people except in about ten cases where I see him being too influenced by the factor of whether he was comfortable with a person. This diversity he defines is of course what we had had in mind in seeking to juxtapose different points of view. His judgement that this led to polarization rather than integration will be evaluated in Chapters IX and X. However, it should be noted that as early as the admissions process several of us sensed the tendency for counter-culture values to become "in" and sought to combat this. Accordingly, the students I most strongly supported during the admissions process and during the year were articulate, influential people with few counter-culture attributes. There were only six students that clearly fit this category: John Thomson, who has already been described, and five equally impressive people, Terry Sweeney, Jean Moss, David Mpongo, Cynthia Barksdale and John Doyle whom we will describe in Chapter VII. We considered these people "real finds" as the School of Education could not be expected to attract such people as easily as more typical graduate student types, and that we had no money to support them or their recruitment. Later in the year we were able to help six students receive aid from other programs and Centers. There were no other significant obstacles in our admissions procedures. We were able to get everyone we wanted
admitted by the Graduate School. It was often a humiliating and time-consuming experience to get students with low grade point averages admitted. For example, I had to write the following letter to justify the obvious to Arthur Gentile, Dean Appley’s assistant. It was written for the signature of Norma Jean Anderson, who was given the new position of School of Education Dean for Graduate Affairs, in effect replacing Dick Ulin.

FROM: Dr. Anderson  
TO: Dean Gentile  
RE: Application of David Mpongo

This is an elaboration of an earlier brief memo justifying the admission of David Mpongo as an M.A.T. candidate. Your office had questioned his admission on the basis of his 2.12 undergraduate cumulative average.

Mr. Mpongo is a 31 year old leader of the National Democratic Party of Rhodesia and an extraordinarily knowledgeable, articulate and charismatic teacher and statesman. He has been his party's representative in London and in the Middle East and at the United Nations.

Mr. Mpongo has been hired to teach social studies at the Mt. Herman School for next year. He has worked in several schools in the Philadelphia area and helped to lead workshops in African Studies for the Philadelphia Board of Education.

Mr. Mpongo attended Lincoln University in Philadelphia on a State Department scholarship. He attributes his poor academic record in the first two years there to personal problems. In his third year he had a 3.6 average.

We regard Mr. Mpongo as among the top five of the more than 300 applicants to the Program. He would make an immeasurable contribution to this Program. We have doubts about his capacity to benefit from it.

The most outrageous case was the case of Terry Sweeney, who first was rejected by the graduate school (without notifying us) because he had a low grade point average. After several special appeals, Terry was assured by Dean Anderson that he was admitted as a provisional student. But he was rejected again in December. This prompted the following letter from me:
Norma Jean,

To my great distress, Terry Sweeney has still not been admitted. Kathy Sukanek has told me that Gentile will not say yes or no on his status, but wants to see his application. Knowing Terry's personal situation and his value to the School I find this an intolerable bungle. There is no way I can operate our Program unless students can believe me when I relay an assurance from the Deans they are admitted.

Gentile is expecting the attached reapplication. I have written a draft of a memo for you to send with it, which fits the facts as I understand them.

Terry was finally admitted as a regular M.Ed. student, then became a doctoral student, and is now the coordinator for the 1973-74 Masters Program that succeeded the MAT Program.
CHAPTER VII
JUNE AND JULY 1971, STAFF WORK

It was not until late May that the press of the admissions process had subsided and we were able to begin the job of making the design operational. By May, Chip had moved to Montague. Under his initiative we arranged with a realtor and ten incoming students to rent an MAT House. At the end of May I began to turn our attention to planning for the program field experiences. We had not thought through in detail this aspect of the Program. We had felt secure in assuming that an almost unlimited number of varied placements were available to us through the staff's contacts and through the School of Education. We had not established an alternative school or other special practice teaching arrangements, but we knew the School was being offered more placement possibilities than it could fill. However, we now began to face a series of questions including the following: To what extent was the staff going to direct the choice of field experiences? To what extent was the staff going to set up field placements for students? When would placements be determined? How much time would students have for field experiences in light of the requirement of 12 credits to be taken in Arts and Science courses? How many field experiences, of what length and at what locations would we expect students to have? What options were we obligated to provide to meet certification needs?

My own interests in the field work centered on the identification of specific people who like staff members could serve as model teachers in the largest sense. My faith lay much more in our finding "the right
people" than in the idea of simply designing diverse experiences. I had incredibly succeeded in bringing "the right people" to be on the staff. This raised the utopian hopes that I had held for Woodstock, that an association could be formed with all the other best people/teachers whom we knew. Thinking of the extraordinary contacts around the country and the world that we had, especially through Henry and Chip, it seemed we had accessible to us the very best resources for serving our goals. I was eager to make these possibilities known to all staff and through them to students. I knew that for this to have meaning it would have to involve more than conveying information. This demanded that staff members and then students develop a special level of faith in each other. I did not dare to evaluate the chances of this happening because I did not know what to do if it did not.

I was not prepared to discuss my attitude toward field experience with the staff as a whole because I felt it would be unreal and threatening until there had been some time for their faith in each other to grow. I was prepared to go ahead with developing more "regular" placements that we would draw from in addition. At the same time, I had to be on guard to leave room open for what I wanted to occur. I knew that some staff felt that students should take most of the responsibility for developing their own field placements and that some felt placements should be limited to the Amherst area so that we would remain a geographical community. At this point I decided to follow Pat's suggestion to seek more information from students while keeping our options open. I sent the following letter on June 1:
TO EACH MAT STUDENT:

We are greatly excited by how good a collection of people the program will be.

We want to keep you well informed as the program develops. We are continuing to plan for the summer and the year and will send you in late June a full up-to-date description of the shape of things. In the meanwhile this letter expresses a number of fairly pressing concerns and information.

We will first meet together at a weekend away from Amherst for a Retreat beginning Friday, July 30th. The retreat, like many of the Program activities, is intended to include your families. Details about the retreat (like its location) later.

We are developing a good list of a wide variety of possible field situations. Ordinarily, you won't decide what you want to do until August or September, but we need some information from you now in order to prepare a sufficient selection for you.

First, please let us know what your needs are with regard to certification so we can have the necessary kinds of field situations available. Please tell us if you need certification and for what subjects/age groups and if you are particularly interested in certain states. Second we need to know about the extent of your mobility. Among the potential field placements are many very good settings within commuting distance of Amherst. But as you might guess we are finding a greater number of really extraordinary placements when we move to the larger field of New England, America, or the World. It is our hope that most of you will be able to spend something like two weeks to two months outside the commuting area (but not more). Let us know if this is realistic for you given your learning needs, the needs of your family if you have one, finances, etc. (with rare exceptions field experiences will be without pay or travel money, though some might provide room and board). Tell us whether or not you'd be interested in situations; 1-in other countries, 2-in far parts of the United States or Canada, 3-at a distance of several hundred miles, and 4-in New York or Boston or similar distances. Third, usually we would hope you won't decide on types of situations until we all get together and help each other determine our needs, but if there is any particular kind of situation you know now you will want to be in, please tell us now so we can work on finding one for you. Fourth, if you know of any extraordinarily good situations that should be on the list for people, let us know where it is and whom to contact.

We have one field experience possibility that may be lost if we do not place people in the next couple weeks. This is in the Social Studies Department of Amherst High School.

We have arranged with ten students to rent an "MAT House" within walking distance of the School of Education. They would have rooms there. Two large front rooms would be MAT community rooms - for lounge-library-meetings-office use. We propose that
each participant contribute $15.00 to cover the expenses of having this space for the year, and to make the house economically feasible for the tenants. Later on we will send to each of you all a list of books we have found particularly useful in our growth. Perhaps there are some you'd like to suggest as well.

If you would like to share housing with one or more other MAT students, send us a note on that too.

We hope you have a good summer. We very much look forward to our coming together to work and learn.

Best wishes,
Jon Ball
Pat Burke
Glenn Hawkes
Henry Lanford
Bob Pearson
Chip Wood

It was in the next week that Barry, Mose and Paul made definite commitments to work with us. I quickly set up an all day staff meeting at Glenn's home in order to catch everybody before they left the School of Education, the semester having already officially ended. In this first meeting of almost the whole staff, (Henry had gone to Newfoundland), I was anxious to have them get to know each other and to get from them some ideas about field experiences and about staff responsibilities in the summer session. We spent a good morning at Glenn's talking about ourselves. The people who were meeting for the first time seemed excited.

In the afternoon we dug into the planning issues. I had thought the basic plan for the summer session was pretty well set as being an intensified and shortened version of my methods course and Glenn's seminar. This is what the proposal had stated. However, when I filled the rest of the staff in on the nature of these courses, they were dissatisfied. Glenn, Barry, Chip, and Paul especially seemed to
feel it was too purely theoretical and too formal to serve as an
appropriate beginning. I acknowledged that I might have been too
exclusively concerned with setting an intellectual framework for the
year. They pointed out the need for participants to get to know each
other and to be introduced to the School and the general area, and
the desirability of offering some more tangible experiences from the
start. Glenn suggested that in addition to the courses we have a
series of workshops and brief field experiences that could be presented
by staff, students, and outsiders in the manner of a mini-marathon.
This was enthusiastically supported to the degree that I felt that
my sense of the Program identity was threatened. I thought we needed
the summer to be a primarily reflective time to accomplish the inte-
gration we had planned. I was distressed that we were spending our
time going back to redesign the summer instead of beginning to figure
out the field experiences. These feeling which I only partly revealed
caus a me to let go of my leadership role in the meeting. I did not
step forward to see that we really dealt with field experiences.
Sensing my resistance, Chip helped by leading the group on to a couple
of other decisions. One was that we develop a catalog of field experi-
ences descriptions for students. The other was that the staff and
later the students write profiles of themselves to help the group get
to know each other. The profile idea was a reflection of our good
feeling about the morning session which had been in effect an oral
sharing of profiles. The meeting ended with a plan to meet for several
days in June at Bear Island, my parents' summer home on Lake Winnipe-
saukee in New Hampshire. In the meantime we were each to work on ideas
for resolving our conflicting concerns about the summer. For the first time, I was apprehensive about my ability to lead the staff. I felt I had become out of tune with what was otherwise a very positive and enthusiastic group. I could accept without great concern that making a departure from the proposal had bothered me, but I was distressed that I had been as seriously threatened by it and that I had not found comfort in the good spirit of the group. I sensed that the addition of the new people with the new ideas had been too much to digest. I had lost some control. I missed Henry. I felt an urge to go back to the more intimate world that I had already established with Henry, with Chip and with Pat, rather than going ahead with trying to expand it. Chip's help had been reassuring; I wished he were the official Program leader.

I went ahead to Bear Island with my family and from there sent the following letter to the staff with an enclosure from Chip.

The water, the woods, and the mountains await you. It is really perfect up here. (I think Pat, Chip and family, Paul, Glenn, Bob and family, and maybe Mose and maybe Henry will make it for next Wednesday and Thursday, the 16th and 17th. Try to come Tuesday night (before 11:00 p.m.) so we have two full days).

Several things that would be good to work on ahead of time (and mail to the rest of us if you are that far along); your plan for the kind of two week or longer seminar you'd like to see in the summer session; list of books to recommend to incoming students or to require in connection with seminars or committee work; a one or two paragraph brief description of yourself to be put in a directory of students and staff which all of us would get.

Attached is a summary description of the summer session that Chip wrote after our meeting at Glenn's for you to react to. I think we should send out something like this, or more detailed with the reading list and descriptions of staff to incoming students after the 17th.
Also attached a description of a field placement situation - Mass, Ave. School. I think getting comparable descriptions of 20 or so situations would be good for a preliminary catalog to send out. Where it's appropriate let's start having people at the field sites start writing these.

MAT PROGRAM - SUMMER SESSION - JULY 30 - SEPTEMBER 1

A beginning four week concentration by the MAT community, exploring together fundamental questions regarding the nature of knowledge, learning and teaching; focusing on the ideas of vision, imagination and community in education.

From our planning to date, at least three things seem to be important in helping to create a useful summer session. First, the MAT community needs to get well enough acquainted to allow for the creation of committees at the beginning of September. Second, a philosophical framework for the year's experience in class and field should be constructed during the summer session, building on the foundation of the MAT Proposal. Third, this framework needs to be related to specific experience and expertise of students and staff, to traditional curriculum and to potential work situations, both during the MAT year and beyond.

Because we hadn't reached any conclusions on how to most adequately deal with the above concerns, each of us is to propose at least a 2-week structure to share, at our next planning. We are generally agreed that the summer session will begin with a two day retreat the weekend of July 30, 31 - August 1 to be followed by four weeks of morning and afternoon sessions. We have suggested that sessions dealing with philosophy and general questions be held in seminar fashion with no more than fifteen students, continuously for at least two weeks. Sessions relating to specific case studies or subject matter should probably be numerous, small, diverse and held daily or for 2-3 days at a time. Field experiences, evening rap sessions, and general community activity (highlighting wiffle ball) round out the possible uses of summer session time. There is agreement that families of students are welcome to all MAT Community activities with Committee and Seminar sessions the only possible exceptions.

MASSACHUSETTS AVE. SCHOOL, SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Begun in January, 1971, the Mass. Ave. School is a state funded institution attempting to evolve an innovative, imaginative program for 13-16 year old boys and girls for whom the public schools have failed and many of whom have been involved with the Springfield Juvenile Court. The maximum enrollment is 25, at the present time there are about 15 students. They are black, white, Puerto Rican,
beautiful and very turned off to traditional educational methods. In September the school will have a staff of four or five, the Director and his wife, both of whom have M.A.'s in counseling, one full-time teacher, and an MAT from U. Mass, and resident graduate student from either AIC or Springfield College, and a woman teacher from the community. There will also be a number of undergraduates from nearby colleges working as tutors with the students, the facility itself is a three-story house near Winchester Square, with a wood shop, arts and crafts room, and video-tape studio. The general situation is one of informality. Interns can expect to be involved with all aspects of the school, the students and their families, the tutors, the staff interns of day to day activities and developing future programs, and the greater community in terms of trips and getting students involved in apprenticeship programs. Anything is possible at this school, so far there is no formal program; it's an excellent opportunity to become vitally involved in school building the way it should be done, cooperatively and communally.

Steve Gold - teacher
Mike Wartman - director

Pat, Bob and his family, Chip and his family, Barry, and Faith and I took part in the Bear Island sessions. Henry was still in Newfoundland, Glenn in Louisville, Paul in New York and Mose had to teach in Worcester, Massachusetts. Glenn sent the following letter, (which is a fine representation of his spirit), proposing that the content he had originally planned for a seminar be offered under the workshop format:

Dear Jon, and other good folk:

It's about 5:30 now, have been up for a couple of hours - which may be reflected in my typing (spelling is another problem altogether). I guess i'm getting like Dwight with these kinds of hours - it's a fantastically productive time for work (and play: was just playing with the ways in which notions about flexible scheduling, differentiated staffing, etc., may be unconscious, educational attempts to provide a generation with the kind of education which will help mankind become polymorphos perverse - e.g., as we modularize and differentiate we prepare for negotiations with other parts of the Human Body which may possess different functions and schedules from those which have characterized this society for many years, and thus we prepare for the integrated experiencing of pleasure throughout
the Human Body.) (Have also been trying to write an article for PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, entitled "Psychology Tomorrow.") The workshop here goes well thus far. Barbara Love and I are working/playing with about thirty-five teachers from the Louisville schools, all of whom will be involved in some dimension of team-teaching in the coming year. The business reason for dropping this line to you relates to the August workshop (which, if we're going to play some too, we might call a "plork-shop"): I would like to provide us with about 10 or twelve articles and excerpts from a couple of longer manuscripts on which i'm working; and hold eight or ten discussion sessions based on those readings. I envisage the discussions mixing concerns of an historical-psychological-philosophical nature with concerns more directly related to the learning/teaching context of schools. If it seems reasonable and desirable, i'd be interested in forming some smaller groups of three or four - to begin developing "integrated" curriculum resource units, e.g., some people might like to develop a curriculum around the theme of "cultural and evolutionary time as reflected in human beings today," or "mutual aid in the animal kingdom," or "the mouth," or... Actually, i would not think that the plork-shop would be the best place for developing a very complete curriculum design; however, it might get some people started in that direction, and provide a basis for curriculum seminars during the academic year (which might be one good way to involve me during the year).

At Bear Island we completed the planning for the summer session. We decided to have a "smorgasbord" of workshops in the afternoons and evenings and to include in the morning both a seminar like mine and one focused on larger societal issues. We asked students to read five books in common and to expand the catalog to include descriptions of the workshops. We created a plan for organizing the staff and students into seminar groups and further defined other staff responsibilities. Again I put off focusing on the field experience situation, but we did decide how to proceed in assembling the field experience catalog. The substance of our decisions is expressed in the letters (included below) which I wrote to the absent staff members and to students. Before getting to them I will describe the dynamics of the
meetings.

My apprehensiveness about my role made me a hesitant leader. But in a rather stumbling and inconsistent way I made myself hold on to the leadership position in the discussions. Whatever my weaknesses, I saw clearly that I remained as the only staff member that all staff members knew and had some faith in. The sessions contained a mixture of highs and lows. We experienced feelings of confidence from the substantial accomplishments of the sessions. We experienced feelings of uncertainty from having tensions between members of the group exposed. The exposure of the tensions can be viewed in part as a reaction to my weakening as the center and go-between for the staff. During the Spring, when I had felt like a strong leader, staff relationships had been remarkably smooth. At the same time the expression of tensions can be viewed as a necessary phase in the group's coming to know each other.

A major source of tension was Chip's great disappointment over the evident limitations on staff commitments. The absence of almost half the staff and the lack of preparation and willingness to take responsibility by some who attended were painful blows to his dream of a community. His feelings reached a breaking point when Bob announced that he would miss the retreat and the first half of the summer session. He explained that he had accepted an offer to lead a group of teachers on a tour in Africa. Chip denounced Bob's lack of commitment, arguing that we could not achieve what we proposed if staff were each thinking just about doing their own thing first and
then participating on their own limited terms. This established an antagonism between the two of them that they were unable to overcome all year in spite of a number of deliberate efforts by both to nurture a positive relationship.

Bob's position had been one of being willing to work and to give up his assistantship for the good of the Program. But he was increasingly apprehensive about being expected to do work that went beyond the cross-cultural area in which he felt competent. He felt increasingly confused by the special level of faith and utopian dreams that were present. However he did not waiver in his sense of obligation to do what I expected of him. Pat had no such reservations about her competence, but she began assuming an uncharacteristically passive role. She understandably seemed to suffer ambivalent feelings toward the upcoming year. She had had to make room in her vision of the Program that we two had largely created together for all these new people, including my two oldest and most intimate friends. It was uncertain whether these new people would constitute an addition in the rewards coming to her or simply a reduction of her importance to the Program and to me.

I felt I understood equally well the feelings that Bob, Pat and Chip had. I felt compelled to be supportive and accepting of Bob and Pat. My disappointment at Bob's decision to be gone was balanced by my feeling good that he was getting something he wanted for himself. I sensed that he was already giving more than should be realistically asked of him. I had similar feelings about Pat and also Glenn. Chip's
demand for more commitment to the Program seemed arrogant to me, because of the little that the Program could give in return. I was prepared to continue to serve as the central figure, as a king of broker who could make good use of these other people on their own terms. I sensed that Chip might be right that we had to engender a higher level of commitment to succeed, but I thought this could only happen through a growing faith in each other. At the same time I felt that Chip had made such an extraordinary life's commitment to me and the Program that he deserved almost anything he felt he needed. However, it was clear to me that I owed it to him, not Bob or the others.

As I have indicated my behavior in these sessions was impeded by my self doubts. This was most evident to me in my relationship to Barry. He was the only staff member who was at all threatening to me. He was more of a stranger and at the same time more familiar with the School of Education, with education and with programs with some relationship to ours (Antioch, University Without Walls, etc.) than the others. I liked and respected him very much, but I did not know if he would have this special level of faith in me and other staff. I worried in a slightly paranoid way that he saw what I was doing as foolish. He seemed to be most enthusiastic about the aspects of the Program that I least understood. The worst of this was that he seemed to reinforce the counter culture aspect of Chip's dream that I reacted against. At Bear Island my most heated statements were made in defending my picture of the Program against several of their suggestions that smacked of this aspect for me: our reading Siddhartha, our encouraging

non-intellectual workshops, and the addition of the issues of society seminar. Barry seemed to be increasingly interested, powerful, and committed.

Here are the letters I wrote after the Bear Island sessions:

We missed you here... The primary thing in my mind now is the need to have a meeting of those who didn't make it with most of the rest of us. I think a meeting on July 6th in Amherst would work for me, Henry, Mose, Glenn, and Barry and Chip...

We have made some decisions. It seems very good to have Barry as part of our staff. Barry will definitely participate fully in the summer; we hope he can in the fall. We hope that Paul, Barry, and Mose will at a minimum be full time in the month of August and then during the year participate on (if not lead) one committee, attend weekly staff meetings and be attached to one or more field experience sites.

The enclosed letter being sent to incoming students outlines the summer session. Assuming all staff can participate we have agreed to the following teams for leading the morning seminars. They were chosen with the sense that these pairs would work well together as personalities, have complimentating areas of experience, but with consideration to not putting people who are already closest together. I have not included Glenn here, assuming his role will be primarily with workshops, but this is not yet decided.

FIRST TWO WEEKS
Paul and Jon
Henry and Mose
Pat and Chip
Bob and Barry

SECOND TWO WEEKS
Paul and Pat
Henry and Barry
Mose and Jon
Chip and Bob

Call Chip right away to make any changes in the core readings or other parts of the letter to MAT students. We expect to send out another letter soon with directions to the retreat, short descriptions of staff members, and whatever else you and the rest suggest. Gary Smith will be on as an Administrative Assistant about July 15th.

We have figured that each of us needs to do the following things:
- Get together with our two team members to begin to plan the morning seminars;
- Carry on negotiations with any field sites that we know we want to have and may lose if we wait until late August.
- Send a paragraph description of our experience, what we bring to the MAT Program, to be included in the next letter--most of the students only know about a couple of us--send this to MAT Office, School of Education right away.
- Send by July 9th, in time for assembling catalog:
  1. Paragraph descriptions of at least 3 workshops, or a workshop series, you will offer in the afternoon-evening of the summer session.
2. Paragraph description of field experience situations (about 5) that you think are particularly valuable or will be particularly in demand. If possible have them written by people at the field sites. Include numbers of people that can come, lengths of time they can come for, estimated costs if any; any living arrangements you have made, whom to see to work out a placement - you or someone at the site.

3. Sentence descriptions of all other field experience possibilities. These will be listed in two categories - those definitely available, those needing more investigation by students or staff. We need all the same information on these two.

4. Bibliography of recommended books, with short descriptions and publishing data if possible. Except for Pat and Bob who will be in Africa up to the last minute, we hope to spend the week of July 26th together in Amherst making final plans for the retreat and the summer session, helping students get settled, getting the catalog out, etc. Is this feasible for you?

Dear MAT Students.

Thank you for your thoughtful responses to our last letter. We hope to hear from the few of you who have not yet written.

The experience of students looking for housing this month indicates that apartments are expensive and hard to find. Finding a place to live is the only arrangement you need to make here before coming to the retreat on the evening of July 30th (probably near Sanford, Maine) and arriving here for the summer session on August 2nd. Registration for the summer session will be limited to the two required MAT courses and will take place in our meeting the morning of August 2nd. Registration for the fall and other decisions about your year's work schedule will be made with your committees when they are formed near the end of the summer session.

We have developed a format for the summer session. Participants will meet in 12-15 person seminar groups in the mornings, each led by two staff members. For the first two weeks, groups will investigate what is learning and what is the role of one person in another's learning. For the second two weeks staff and students will move to new groups and investigate the role of education in society. Participants will be offered a choice of workshops each afternoon and sometimes in the evening. The workshops will address the same questions discussed in the morning through a specific activity or idea chosen by the workshop planner. During the first week workshops will be offered by staff members. During the next three weeks each student will offer at least one workshop. Some initial workshop ideas are learning to make bread, cardboard carpentry, education in Afghanistan, meanings in childbirth, Piaget's work, drugs and political awareness.
Several times a week we will have lunch or supper together, sometimes inviting people to speak about the School of Education, the University or available field experiences.

We have chosen 5 books to serve as core readings to give us a common point of reference. They were chosen because they raise the kinds of questions we most want to investigate. We would like you to read these before the summer session begins.

James Agee, *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*  
Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*  
Ralph Ellison, *The Invisible Man*  
Hermann Hesse, *Siddhartha*  
Charles Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom*

Before the summer session begins we will have compiled a program catalog consisting of a more detailed rationale and description of the summer session and the committees, descriptions of field experience possibilities, and a bibliography. As we indicated in the last letter we would like to have your suggestions for unusually attractive field sites and books.

We will write again soon.

Sincerely  
Jon  
for the MAT Staff

The five books that we chose were a good representation of where the Program identity stood at this point. It had become more diffuse. I was somewhat concerned that we had moved too far away from teaching which was to be the integrating focus of the Program. I was more enthusiastic than ever about moving the focus from school teaching to teaching in the largest sense, and from a strict concern with how to help kids learn to a broader concern that included looking at how the Program participants themselves learn. But now it seemed that the participant's self-development might become the only concern. In the extreme case it might mean everyone "doing their own thing" without caring about helping others to learn. The books, like the workshops, were adding to the diversity of experience. I saw only Agee and Silberman as contributing to the integrating framework I had counted on for the summer. I was concerned also that the catalog might become
a sort of Whole Earth Catalog\(^2\) of "groovy" things to do rather than a more discriminating expression of means of building vision.

The next meetings were not until the end of July. The written materials for students were not put together until then. They ended up being given out at the retreat. I stayed on at Bear Island and in addition to writing the things we were all to do, I wrote a statement expressing my view of field experiences. I began writing it as a letter to people who might be able to offer placements. When I finished I saw it as an important statement of the identity I wanted for the Program and sent it to the staff and intended to add it to the catalog. It also addressed the problems of logistics and authority that had been unresolved. I took into account the interests students had expressed in response to our June 1 letter. I left the choice of experiences up to students with the advice of their committees, believing that a more directive approach would undermine the community climate we were committed to. Here is what I wrote:

**MAT FIELD EXPERIENCES**

We are seeking to make accessible to MAT students the best possible field learning situations. There will be 50 students, most of whom have had at least two years experience in teaching or community work. Some have already had distinguished careers. Some are Black. A few will be Spanish-speaking. All are exceptionally well-qualified to teach. They have been chosen from more than 350 applicants. Had we sought to have only students with scores of 700 or better on Graduate Record Exams, or only those with 5 years successful teaching experience in public schools, or only those who had attended Ivy league schools, or only those who had worked in community organizations in cities, or only those who had earned over $10,000 a year, I think we could have filled our Program. Instead, our criteria was interest in and potential for helping people to learn.

---

2. The Whole Earth Catalog, (Menlo Park, California: Portola Institute).
Every student will be required to have more than one field experience in the period from September 1 - May 30, including experience in schools and other settings. Students will make their selection of field placements as a major function of their work with their six-person Guidance Committees (Committees will be formed near the end of August--see Description of MAT Program for full description of Committees). The selection of field experiences will involve consideration of the student's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher, his learning style and what he needs to grow; and consideration of what the student and field situation have to offer each other. Students may choose situations that have been developed by the MAT Program or develop their own. The immediate task for the program staff is to identify and communicate to program participants what in general are the most promising field situations. To get started we plan to compile one or two paragraph descriptions of field situations, preferably written by people from the field sites, to form a catalog of field situations. We expect to have 30-60 such descriptions. We will also catalog shorter descriptions of another 100-300 less-developed field experience possibilities. We need to have these entries in hand by July 17th so that we can duplicate the catalog in time for the student's arrival. For each field site we should have information on how many people could go for what length of time (1 week to 2 months full time to half day every day for the year), what living arrangements if any can be made or need to be made, what costs to students or payments to students are likely, whom students should contact to learn more about a situation. The catalog is intended to suggest possibilities. The actual working out of a placement should be done in person with people from the field site, or if that is impossible, through MAT staff if they are in close contact with the site people. People from the field sites are encouraged to come to Amherst to meet with students in August. Students will visit field sites in August and early September.

Some thoughts on what makes for good field experiences----Field experiences need to offer something of special educational value to make them worth pursuing. This is underlined by the fact that most program participants could be earning full pay for carrying out interesting educational jobs, rather than working for little or nothing while paying tuition. The need of some participants for practice teaching to meet Teacher Certification requirements (the period of apprenticeship idea), is not the primary justification for field work in the MAT Program. For one thing, our interest certainly goes beyond experience in classrooms. Those who expect to become classroom teachers and those who do not both will have experience in and out of classrooms. We are interested in situations with inspired teachers (teachers in the largest sense), in unusual institutions and unfamiliar cultural settings. We are interested in finding strategic vantage points where students are able to observe well, be involved with clients and colleagues, view the institutions or community as a whole, perceive vested interests in himself and in others. We are interested in settings that involve
conflict not just those that are in harmony with our Program assumptions. We are interested in good juxtaposition of experiences. We will usually place students in teams. Our staff or someone at the field site intimately connected with the MAT Program will play a major role in developing good communication between MAT students, and people in the field site (in a school this would include parents, students, teachers, etc.). We are as interested in MAT student's understanding of his own learning as much as his helping others to learn and observing learning and teaching by others. Guidance committees will meet bi-weekly through the year (communicating by letter and tape when geographically apart) to evaluate and share experiences in this spirit.

At about the same time we received the following letter from Albert Norman, an incoming student. I include my reply after his letter.

Dear Jon and MAT Staff:

A member of the Young Lords Party was asked what questions he would ask of someone desiring to enter the school he (the Young Lord) was running. The Young Lord suggested two questions:
1. Have you ever had a good orgasm?
2. Would you be willing to carry a gun for something you deeply believed in?

If the answer to either question was "no", said the Young Lord, a person was not really ready to learn.

You have sent us a list of five books. Rather than suggest five of my own that I found much more satisfying personally, I wish to use the Young Lord example to explore perhaps an alternative to the reading of five books, which, I feel, could have been drawn out of a hat (and I hope they were). I suggest that we each formulate questions that we have about what we plan to do during the MAT period, questions about ourselves as individuals, as teachers, as students, as just plain old human beans, etc.

Questions like:
1. What am I doing in the MAT to begin with?
2. Is everyone a teacher?
3. Was my education relevant? To what?
4. What do I expect from the MAT staff?
5. How can we eliminate competition, coercion and fear from the learning process? Are any of these elements desirable?

Let each MAT person (by that I mean staff and "candidates") come up with his own five questions instead of five books. Finally, the most important fact about the Young Lord example: he was asked what his opinion was. His questions are beautiful and distinctly his. The five books on the list are distinctly yours. They do not take into account our experiences. For example, I vastly prefer Soledad Brother to Invisible Man, in which the black nationalist is portrayed as a fanatic. And so on, for
each book. I suggest that if we must find common ground to talk together by working solely in the realm of books (that is excluding films, long walks, experiencing...) that each person read five books of their own choosing and come to the meeting possibly to share the experience of those books with everyone in the group. I am sure that there will be plenty to talk about, compare and contrast among 50 people who are all anxious to talk about themselves and the future.

I hope my suggestions will help us to get together in an equal and meaningful way. I offer them with that hope.

My regards to all,

Albert Norman

Bear Island
July 16

Dear Albert,

I found your letter full of meaning. Henry, Chip, and I have discussed it at length. I am eager for you and I and other staff and students to have a chance to discuss it. We have mentioned the letter and offered a brief response as part of a letter we have sent this week to all MAT participants.

Let me explain my own response more fully. You beautifully expose the limitations and dangers of giving students reading assignments:

1. Questioning of oneself directly is central to learning. Reading per se is not.
2. To assign readings is to bypass individual responsibility and individual differences.
3. Reading is too often exalted over other mediums of experience, especially in schools.

I think we are appropriately sensitive to these limitations and dangers in giving the readings the place we do in the Program. The Program as a whole is one that emphasizes self-questioning, individual responsibility, and learning from a variety of experiences. The major Program requirements in Education are (1) to spend time in the summer session and in committees questioning oneself and taking responsibility for one's own education and helping others to do the same, and (2) to participate in more than one kind of field experience that is new to the participant. Given this context, I think that asking participants to read the five books is unlikely to violate their integrity or restrict their openness to experience. And I think it will prove useful to have read these books in common. For example, our having read The Invisible Man may make it easier for you and I to question and quickly identify for each other our feelings about the qualities of black nationalism.
I think it is reasonable to have the staff make some decisions like the decision on readings. We are operating with the assumption that learning for all participants can be increased by having a few participants, a staff, spend more time doing planning and having a staff make some decisions about how everyone will spend some of their time. This distinguishes our Program from one where participants as a group decide everything about what they are participating in. A major goal of mine for this year is to learn a lot more about what this means. How can a context be set which most directly helps a community to form and grow?

As you can probably tell, your suggestions have challenged me to understand what I have been doing in new terms. I trust we will explore this together more fully and also that your suggestions for the Program will be used, though not as a replacement for the readings.

With best wishes,
Jon

I had very much welcomed this opportunity to define myself against an effective anti-authoritarian challenge. I saw this letter as a strong statement that like the field experience statement put me in the proper leadership role of articulating some boundaries for our Program vision. Albert had picked on issues on which I was very sure of myself. And by his attempts to put me down he gave me a chance to show that I was not disposed to be defensive.

While I was at Bear Island Chip took responsibility for following up on our problems with the graduate school, completing administrative arrangements for the special summer session, and greeting students as they arrived - helping them arrange financial aid, housing, etc. Pat had gone to Africa upon receiving an offer just like Bob's. I returned in the third week in July in time to help Gary move to Montague. From that point on we had his help and the help of Beth Anderson as our secretary. We had by now developed an outline for
the contents of the catalog which we elected to call the MAT Program Book:

Goals
Overview of Activities
Summer Session
   Retreat
   Seminars
   Workshops
Committees
Field Experiences
   Rationale
   Catalog
Participant Profiles
Course and Other University Resources
   School of Education
   University
   Five Colleges
   Libraries
   Bibliographies of Particular Interest
Miscellaneous
   Guidelines for Planning and Registration
   University Calendar
   Map of Campus
Dialogue

We undertook to write a draft for the book to serve as the basis for the staff discussions in the last week. Chip wrote sections on the retreat and field experiences. Bob before he left wrote a section on workshops. I wrote the rest. Gary began assembling the profiles, the catalog of field experiences and the workshop descriptions. Beth began the awesome job of typing the book, having emphasized from the start that she was not a professional typist.

In the last week of July Gary, Chip, Henry, Mose, Barry and I met everyday for two or three sessions of several hours each. Pat had returned from Africa, but attended only some of the sessions due to illness. Sometimes our families also attended. Paul remained in New York. Glenn by now had limited his role to planning the retreat,
offering his workshop, occasionally appearing at other program activities, and serving as chairman of my dissertation committee. I entered these meetings with my confidence having been renewed through my writing and through several weeks of working well with Chip. I was excited and strengthened by Henry's return. The others also seemed to be enjoying a feeling of well-being. From the start the meetings were less tense and more cheerful in spirit than the meetings at Glenn's or Bear Island. The focus was no longer the testing of each other or the defending of our positions in the group. We seemed to have confidence that the staff was a viable group. We clearly focused on preparing ourselves to serve the students.

Several of the meetings were extraordinary. They stand out as realizations of exactly the kind of learning from each other we had envisioned in planning Woodstock and in writing the goals for the MAT proposal. We helped each other to expand and integrate our thinking through the raising of diverse views and the provision of an unusual degree of trust. Just as we had envisioned, we extended to a larger group the high quality of dialogue we had achieved over the years in special friendships: Chip and I, Henry and I, and Chip and Gary. The interaction of these pairs set the tone for the group in a way that made room for, rather than excluded the establishment of additional bonds. Bonds grew between the four of us and bonds began to develop between each of us and Pat and Barry. Mose remained more self-contained seemingly not particularly moved, but not threatened either, by this intimate dimension of the Program. I had wondered whether Bob would
have gained strength from and contributed to our rare communication, or if he would have distrusted my intimacy with Gary, Chip and Henry. The substance of the meetings was sometimes the development of ideas for our seminars. We were concerned both with abstract ideas and specific techniques for individual classes. This worked to the advantage of the dynamics of the group because Chip and Henry, who tended to be the most forceful members during abstract discussions, turned to Barry, Pat and, to a lesser extent, me, as being the more experienced and expert educators. Most of the time the substance of the meetings was, as we had planned, the discussion and rewriting of our drafts for the Program Book. As we worked to be able to present the Program structure and goals to the students in a convincing way, we found ourselves further clarifying and taking more seriously the familiar Program concepts. The words of the draft were studied carefully and the style was refined to reflect the spirit of the group. When we finished the statement of goals was unchanged from the final version of the proposal, but the other sections were changed. We will look at the other major sections of the Program Book as we come to the activities that most directly relate to them in the next two chapters.

The concern that got the most attention was how to express our desire that participants be committed to each other. On the one hand, Chip pushed us to emphasize sharing and giving to each other. On the other hand, while I shared his hopes, I was uncomfortable pushing people toward being in a community, especially before they knew who the other members were. I knew that at this point many students, in-
cluding the six I have described as specially valued did not see themselves as ready to assume this kind of obligation and would have been confused by any pressure. In the supportive climate of these staff sessions this was not a point of antagonism. Rather we compromised in good faith, often under Henry’s leadership. One area of compromise was our position on the inclusion of the families and friends of participants in the Program. They were encouraged to participate in the retreat, the workshops, and whole group sessions, a position that was satisfying to Chip. They were excluded from seminars and their attendance at committees would be at the discretion of each committee, a position that was satisfying to me. Another area of compromise was our description of the operation of committees. We described it as more than a sharing of professional interests, which was satisfying to Chip, but distinguished it from a T-group where personal problems are discussed for their own sake, which was satisfying to me.

This week of planning together restored and seemed to secure our high expectations and confidence. There was a strong center to the Program that gave me the feeling I had had a year before, that we could make the Program almost anything we wanted it to be. The quality of the week stood as a touchstone for the kind of interaction we sought. The Program Book stood as a tangible representation of our intentions and could be depended on as government depends on a constitution.
CHAPTER VIII
AUGUST 1971 - LAUNCHING THE 1971-72 MAT PROGRAM

Our history moves now from consideration of the growth of some ideas and the interaction of a small number of people to the more complex phenomena of the implementation of the ideas and the interaction of the sixty-two participants. The Program Book described what we expected to happen. The following "Overview of Activities" and "Summer" sections were written in the last week of July.

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

We come to the Program with diverse kinds of knowledge and a common interest in getting better at helping people learn. Without benefit of prior organization and planning we would grow in the development of vision, the ability to create community, and imagination. The intent of the structure is to accelerate and intensify that growth.

Fifty students and ten staff members will spend ten months in the Program. We are coming together at the beginning of August for a two-day retreat and a month of intensive seminars and workshops. At the end of August we will form committees consisting of about five students and one or two staff members each. Committees will meet bi-weekly or more often throughout the year. In these committees members will share their experiences and plan and evaluate their work in the Program.

During the Fall and Spring semesters students will spend about half their time in two or more field experience situations. A major function of the staff will be to help MAT students and their colleagues and students at the field sites to communicate effectively. In addition to these experiences there will be opportunities to take courses and do projects in the University at large. At least 12 credits of work will be taken outside the School of Education.

There will be gatherings of all participants at least once a month. Often there will be speakers or other programs people feel to be of special interest. Opportunities to meet informally will be encouraged by the existence of the MAT House. Outside participation in the committees and seminar groups is at the discretion of these groups. Families and special friends are encouraged to attend all other program activities.
SUMMER

Participants are beginning the Program together in the summer. Unlike the time of field experiences or committee and course work during the year, this period is one sustained time when all participants will be together in Amherst. It is hoped that we will gain from this time together by participating in the continuing creation of our year's Program, by acquiring an awareness of what experiences are available this year, by sharing a more immediate vision of the meaning of learning and teaching, by building a sense of community.

Four weeks of seminars and workshops form the nucleus of the summer session. In addition, we will meet together at least weekly as a total community, often at mealtime, to share experiences and hear from others outside the Program. This will provide us the opportunity to hear from several field placement people, School of Education Faculty, and other University faculty and students.

At the end of August, committees will be formed and committee work begun. Between the end of seminars and the beginning of fall classes on September 10th, people will work together in the committees helping to arrange each other's course and field work for the year.

The Retreat. The Program Book contained the following description of the retreat which had been written by Chip:

If we started a year long Program immediately with seminars and workshops, it would probably take longer to get to know each other and feel comfortable and creative together than if we spent a long weekend together free from distractions and formal expectations.

The retreat is intended to be that long free weekend together. It will be a time mainly for our being together -- talking, eating, swimming, playing, making music. We hope families and special friends of MAT participants will feel that they are as much a part of things as they would like to be.

The staff is eager to share with everyone how we got together and why we are a part of the Program and what some of the basic concepts of the Program are, and where we are in our planning. We're just as eager to understand more fully how you came to the Program and what your hopes and expectations are.

The retreat will be the first time when all of us come together to begin working together to make the MAT Program year the best possible experience for each of us individually as well as for the MAT community collectively. Our work from the retreat on is based on a joint commitment to teaching and learning within the context of the community we share beginning with the retreat.
On the evening of July 31st I returned to the Hawkes' Camp as
the leader of the best group of people I knew and holding the highest
expectations as I thought of the last week with the staff and remem-
bered the last retreat. Like the last retreat, this one was unplanned,
except for the arrangements for food and sleeping which Glenn had
again handled. People arrived over a period of several hours and put
together their own picnic suppers. Then as it grew dark (and there
is no electric light in the camp) they gathered above a big campfire
sitting on logs that had been laid by Glenn's father into a hill to
form a primitive amphitheatre. Standing by the fire I felt the
presence of the group above me as an audience waiting for me to begin
the program. We had had in mind giving some information about the
weekend and the year. Fifty-two of the sixty-two participants were
there, about half with a spouse or friend, four with children. I
looked up at them without being able to see faces, the fire spot-
lighted me as if I were on a stage. I was awed to have together this
quantity and variety of people that before I had only seen individually
in interviews, or intimately in a staff meeting. I told them of my
awe. I felt alone and isolated. I introduced myself, finding words
from the self profile I had recently written. Then, struck with
stage fright, I asked other staff and students to follow my lead and
introduce themselves. About five did. There were awkward silences,
and an absence of interaction. I sensed shyness and I sensed some
resentment of my authority. Glenn explained the rules of the camp.
There were too many of us and not enough light. I sensed that not
enough was being said. The Program was not coming to life. People wanted to be given something to react to or within — more of who we were and what we had planned. The fact was, as Eric Anderson later observed, the energy they needed had been put into the Program Book. Through Herculean effort, Gary, Eric, and Beth had typed, duplicated, assembled, and delivered the Program Books to the camp that evening. I announced that they would be given out in the morning. But now it was dark and, in any case, not a time to read; but a time to be with each other. I rather stiffly summarized some of what the Program Book had to say. Again I sensed some resentment at my authority and at the distinctions we were making between staff and students. Glenn and Norma Jean spoke in a more relaxed way about the School of Education, among other things. Norma Jean agreed that she would offer a workshop on racism. The group awkwardly broke up for the night.

For most of the following two days it rained. We were overcrowded and damp. The getting to know each other went on. For some there was great tension, a sense of urgency about getting to know people and finding a viable role. For others it was more casual and enjoyable. I wandered around anxiously looking for places to offer "leadership and vision". I was excited by the people that surrounded me, but isolated in my uniquely difficult search for a role. I was only comfortable while I was playing football or water games or answering requests for information. I felt embarrassed with other staff. I felt that my stage fright had represented the loss of a center for the Program. I listened passively for suggestions about what I should do. After a day of no organized activity, Chip and numbers of students urged
that we organize people into groups to discuss the Program goals. Chip, Paul and I spent several hours trying to get groups going. But the other staff and most other students failed to become seriously involved. The only other structured activity of the retreat was the viewing of video-tapes. Henry had edited and brought along some tapes of planning sessions and several students had made tapes while the retreat was going on. Many watched the tapes, but seemed to treat them simply as entertainment. No sustained discussion was generated.

I was stunned by the retreat experience. Suddenly I did not know who I was, just when I most needed to be clear and alert. My first need was to explain to myself why this retreat was so different from last year's. I believed it was mostly me. I lacked the confidence and charisma to lead a large group. Glenn had had it. But this year there also were the obstacles of a larger number of people and poor weather. Several weeks later I realized that there also had been a much higher level of expectation in students as well as in us, coming into this retreat. There was a great pressure (almost like at Woodstock) to be effective and to get to know each other. A month later, written evaluations of the summer session gave a less bleak picture of the retreat. Eighteen of the twenty-seven participants who responded rated it as a primarily positive experience. They cited their enjoyment in meeting the new people in an informal way and the feeling that it was an exciting and appropriate way to begin a Program. Five respondents found it primarily negative, indicating the same feelings of anxiousness that I had felt, in addition to feelings of having been physically inconvenienced and uncomfortable. My impression, taking into account those who did
not write an evaluation, is all but about ten of us found the retreat fruitful.

By the end of August I came to believe that the major factor in my discomfort at the retreat had been that the situation was so new to me. As I have shown in Chapter I I almost always have had a problem with new people and new contexts. Until I get to know people as individuals and sense some specific trust and communication between us, I do not know who I am with them. My recognizing this as a version of a problem that I had had and seen disappear many times was comforting. Nevertheless, the retreat experience had undermined my picture of my Program role.

Seminars. The regular summer session routine of morning seminars and afternoon and evening workshops began the day after the retreat. We first met in the cafeteria of the laboratory school that is attached to the School of Education to register for the summer session and to identify seminar groups and meeting places. The groups had been divided randomly using an alphabetical list. We had written the following description of the seminars in the Program Book:

Beginning August 2nd, participants will meet in seminar sessions for about two to three hours each weekday morning for four weeks. For the first two weeks the focus of the seminars will be an investigation of learning. The seminars are likely to touch on such issues as how do we recognize learning, how do we accept differences in learning styles, the relationship between learning and play, the importance to learning of a sense of trust and community, what is the most worth-while learning, what is the significance of one's subject matter specialty. For the second two weeks, the focus of the seminars will be an investigation of the relationship between education and society. The seminars are likely to touch on such matters as comparison of various formal and informal educational patterns, the relationship
between teacher's contracts and feelings of obligation for man's future, the social consequences of different approaches to curriculum, relationship between our cultural backgrounds and our attitudes toward education, the meaning of education in the light of our being among the ten percent of the world's population who are wealthy, the relationship of learning to social change.

The seminar activities will be carried out in groups of about fifteen with one or two staff members in each. There will be four new groups for the second two weeks.

I had pictured these seminars as being like the methods class that had just concluded in May. They were to be the essence of the vision-building and integrating thrust of the summer session. I had assumed that my seminar group would be successful and that in addition I would be able to help other staff members who were less experienced or had a less strong vision of teaching. I realized in the first session that these expectations were almost as unrealistic as the expectations I had held for the retreat. The seminars were unlike the Spring methods class. The participants did not yet know each other. Our expectations were too high. I proceeded with a new version of the course outline that I had created a year ago. I was the only staff member in my group, Paul having returned to New York. My group was plagued by dissonance. Many of us were impatient about getting to know each other and some were resentful of the authority of the staff. I found myself assuming an uncomfortably formal teacher role just as I had in first taking the methods class the preceding Fall. More than in the Fall the students were impatient and disposed to resist my lead. Several criticized my emphasis on theoretical issues and urged that we pursue more tangible and more playful subjects. I vacillated from day to day, sometimes following such suggestions, and sometimes defending my original approach from...
what I regarded as anti-intellectualism. I wished that like the year
before I had had a chance to earn the student's respect through a
counselling and information-giving role, before I had had to be the
leader and teacher.

My seminar experience like my retreat experience was more negative
than that of most other participants. Henry's group was organized so
that each day was given to one or two people to talk about their
life's experience. For some this seemed to be extremely rewarding,
for some too threatening. Mose seemed to have assumed a student rather
than a staff role in the group. Barry, who was later joined by Bob,
assumed a more typical college seminar leader's role. The competence
of his presentations combined with the relatively docile composition
of his group made his group work well. Chip and Pat had confidently
provided a structure for their group that included many tangible
activities. Whereas all participants in the program seemed impressed
by the collection of people that surrounded them, Pat and Chip's
seminar was the only one to serve as a comfortable vehicle for inter-
action. Their group asked to be able to stay together rather than
switch for the second two weeks of the summer session, and later in
the year they held a reunion.

In retrospect I believe that few participants had had a strong
appetite for the kind of reflection I had had in mind for the seminars.
While they were capable of being highly reflective, they were at this
time more eager to do something active. In some cases this desire
could be connected to social discomfort. In some cases it could be
connected with needing a change from past university experience. There
was a minority who desired a more typical seminar. They were frustrated that, with the exception of Barry, we were not ready to assume the typical professorial role. And they were frustrated by the other students. We did switch seminar groups after two weeks in order to give us broader exposure to each other. While the seminars had not yet generated as much fruitful interaction as we had hoped for, we felt impelled to go through with the plan so that everyone would at least know half the other participants before they were to choose their committees. Some of us were also motivated to switch by a desire to find a more congenial seminar group. Attendance in the daily meeting for the first seminars and the first half of the second was almost perfect. The second seminars were impeded and, in the second week, almost dissolved by the competing concerns of forming committees, selecting field placement, and selecting courses.

Workshops. The Program Book included the following section on workshops:

Much of the time in August other than mornings will consist of workshops conducted by the MAT staff and students. They will vary in length according to the subject matter and interest and can be anything meaningful which the workshop organizer wishes to teach. It is hoped that each of us, staff and students, will bring his interests and skills to the group in this way and will experiment with ways of making his presentation. Staff members are prepared to give the workshops the first few days, but the students should plan to start giving them as soon as they can. Workshops will be scheduled in afternoons and evenings. Family and special friends are welcome.

It is hoped these workshops will accomplish at least three things. First, they should permit us to get to know each other as people; the primary resource of the MAT Program is the people in it. Second, the workshops should be a good format for us all to get to know each other's particular interests and skills. Third, we hope these workshops will provide concrete examples of some
of the concepts discussed in the morning sessions, such as the inter-relationships between teaching and learning, personal learning and teaching styles, etc. There should be opportunities to experiment with one's own style of teaching and to observe the relationship between content and method of presentation.

Following are descriptions of the workshop offerings prepared by staff members. Students should plan what they would like to present and prepare brief descriptions beginning as soon as possible, for duplication and addition to each person's program book. Scheduling of workshops will be coordinated by the MAT secretary.

The book came to include over 100 workshop descriptions. They were offered by 44 different people. I include below 12 workshop descriptions that Beth picked to represent the range of content in the workshops for purposes of a write-up for future program applicants.

**Life With the Land**, Skip Schuckmann. The implications of reestablishing our awareness of our place and condition in the biosphere are fantastically widespread. I have some knowledge of subsistence farming techniques and pitfalls which one may encounter in getting back to the land. It would be nice to do a year long laboratory on this subject but let's try an hour or two now to get our feet wet. Also of interest might be the worth of self-supporting schools, intentional communities, agriculture in our life and times.

**American Mythology**, Barb Mackey. What myths are operative in American society? Are these myths real, and should they be dealt with as reality? How do they affect us? It is my hope that the participants in this workshop, through the identification of some living American myths and the evaluation of the importance of their effect, can discuss American culture from a new and exciting perspective. A book which I have found helpful in developing my own ideas about the importance of myths is **Myth and Reality** by Mircea Eliade.

**Political Workshop**, David Mpongo. A political discussion on the dynamics of African Nationalism. It is aimed at bringing about an understanding of how Apartheid works in South Africa. MAT fellows shall also be able to listen to Nelson Mandela's defense during the Rivonia Trial. Mandela, a national leader, is serving a life sentence at Robín Island in South Africa.

**Theater Games: Communication and Learning**, Frank Murray. An exploration of certain sensory and emotional experiences connected with theater art that I feel have important personal and group benefits particularly as ways of communicating. Be prepared to spend some time "doing" as well as observing and discussing: bring a small object you are familiar with; think about a task you do fairly regularly, but don't usually think/observe
too much about; charge up your playfulness and imagination for optimum operation.

Paolo Soleri, George Jepson. I have participated in, and have slides of Paolo Soleri's workshops in Arizona. The main theme is materials through working with them. The major materials are steel, concrete and clay. The end results are studios, houses, passageways, model bridges, blisters, blunders and a fantastic learning experience.

Trip to the State Department of Education, Sheila Wilensky. The people I could arrange for us to meet are knowledgeable about certification requirements, grants for innovative projects (Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965), equal educational opportunity (people responsible for withholding 21 million dollars from Boston public schools), and there may be a possibility to meet with Commissioner Sullivan and try and see what he's thinking and also see a state legislator.

Diagnosing Learning Disabilities, Anne Ciesluk. Various tests will be available for inspection and/or administration. These tests are methods used to spot dyslexia, minimal brain dysfunction, etc. in children. Looking at the systems of diagnosis is a good way to begin to understand learning disabilities and their remediation. This will be an opportunity to discuss biological/environmental influences on learning, the problems inherent in testing and labeling children, etc.

The Arab-Israeli Crisis - The Arab Point of View, Bob Pearson, Nancy Hamilton. Most Americans are familiar with the Israeli point of view in the Arab-Israeli crisis. We feel that both sides should be understood if the true complexity of the situation is to be comprehended.

Movement and Poetry, Allan Berman, Debbie Roose, Ann Kindon. Why does poetry always stay on the page? What does poetry sound like and look like? Can we connect things in our heads with our bodies? Come move, groove, and emote in a communal situation with us (and have fun, too).

Sanity/Insanity, Sheila Wilensky. Society highly values its normal man. It educates children to love themselves and become absurd, and thus to be normal. Normal men have killed perhaps 1,000,000,000 of their fellow men in the last fifty years. Experience may be judged as invalidly mad or as validly mystical. The distinction is not easy. In either case, from a social point of view, such judgements characterize different forms of behavior, regarded in our society as deviant. People behave in such ways because their experience of themselves is different.

- The Politics of Experience

R. D. Lang has contributed a great deal to my conception of sanity/insanity. Who should determine when a human being is insane? This workshop is for people who have tried to figure out what sanity/insanity is for themselves. Let's talk from our own experiences.

Macrame, Anne Cherry. Try the art of creative and decorative knotting in a relaxed atmosphere. All of us will be novices - I
have some written instructions/diagrams available, and some materials (string, yarn, beads). Anyone with experience will be welcome, as will thick corrugated cardboard, pins, string, beads, vines(?), etc. Also, I would be interested in setting up a MAT craft center which would make instruction and materials in various areas available to the MAT community through the year.

Southeast Asia: Bai Nigh Craab*, John Thomson. Some thoughts on the current civil and uncivil disrepair in the seven countries of Southeast Asia. We'll glimpse at religious similarities, linguistic differences, ethnic mixes, political/ideological sensitivities, cultural peculiarities. What it will all add up to is not a single answer, but an exchange of information and ideas about one of the world's more fascinating areas.

*Phoneticized Thai for: Quo Vadis?

The workshop descriptions like the profiles make visible the richness and diversity of the participant's knowledge and skill. The workshop descriptions can be viewed as expressions of participants' attitudes toward learning. Among them were several short field experiences, including visits to schools and other institutions and hiking trips. Some were concerned with teaching specific subject matter specialities or other aspects of classroom teaching. A larger number were of a general cultural nature. Many had a counter-culture emphasis: rock music, crafts, breadmaking, life with the land. Adding them up, more fit into a kind of Whole Earth Catalog of skills and information than into the examination of basic concepts that I favored. The following description is the workshop I organized which best expressed the kind of content I had hoped we would emphasize.

Afternoon Workshop Offerings

THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNICATION IN UNDERSTANDING AND INFLUENCING PUBLIC EVENTS

Jon Ball, Henry Lanford, Nat Rutstein, John Thomson, Chip Wood

We would like to join in a discussion that we have looked
forward to having for a long time. The experiences of the five
of us* have caused us to be awed by the impossibility of com-
municating the complexity of real events. How is it that parts
of the complexity are singled out and become powerful symbols
and parts are lost? What people with what motives create the
accepted representations of the complexity? How can one be
realistic about what he knows, and act? as a social studies
teacher? a Congressman? a journalist? a director or editor? a
polltaker? a community organizer?

How does the duration of an event effect its impact on a
particular problem? How does the depth and duration of in-
dividual commitment effect the impact of an event on a given
problem? What does this mean about our ability to effect events
from different roles and vantage points?

We hope to examine these complex questions both generically
and from the particular perspective of a single event - the Poor
People's Campaign. The Workshop may take one, possibly two days.

*Our experiences include being a war correspondent, chief of
public relations for the D. C. Urban League and a coordinator
for the Poor People's Campaign Solidarity Day March, TV News
Director, and assistant in the Office of the Director of OEO,
interviewer and film producer for the White House Conference on
Hunger and Nutrition, poet.

While the workshops only occasionally contributed to my interest
in building a framework for integrating experience, they contributed
substantially to meeting many group needs. For many participants the
program first came alive with the workshops. The format turned people
loose to express themselves in action. It was one of those rare in-
stances where an institution avoided setting constraints on people
and used its power to legitimize people "doing their own thing". The
experience of attending workshops was rewarding for most of us, though
of course the workshops varied in quality. We did not urge people to
attend any set number of workshops. Sixteen of the twenty-seven who
responded to the summer evaluation questionnaire attended workshops.
We were greatly pleased by the number attending and giving. The only
inadequacies in our implementation of the workshops were occasional mix-ups in the scheduling of workshop times and places and the notifying of participants. Several times we gave out the wrong information or scheduled too many for the same time and as a result some participants ended up having no one or just a few attending their presentation. Almost everyone came to the mailboxes which we had set up outside the MAT office everyday to get daily schedules. Generally workshops proved to be a good way for participants to get better acquainted. But being short lived experiences, they rarely brought people close enough together to reflect on their behavior during the workshop.

**Whole Group Meetings.** We met about twice a week as a whole group during August. Usually we met inside or around the MAT House. Often we had a picnic lunch or a pot luck supper. Several of the sessions were organized to introduce field experience opportunities we particularly valued. Among the speakers were the directors of the Springfield Urban League, the University of Vermont Counseling Center, and Munson State Mental Hospital. We also had meetings with staff from a veterans' education project at Fort Dix, the Hampshire College Early Identification program, and a community development project in Charlotte, N. C., with which Glenn was involved. Most of the whole group meetings were aimed at introducing participants to the resources of the School of Education, the University and the Amherst area. I invited Dwight to speak at one of the luncheon meetings. His remarks were a collection of selections from his current speeches on racism and alternative schools and then some
personal pats on the back and some personal criticism of the program. While he is usually a fascinating and provocative speaker, his effect on most of us that day was alienating and depressing. He restated with emphasis that masters programs were the lowest priority of the School. He presumed to know from his years of experience that students were now feeling high about the program, but would be down and come complaining to him in October, and then later feel high again. He praised our plans for what he called peer advising (the committees). He chided us for not recruiting more minority students. He threw out the suggestion that if anybody were interested in starting an alternative school he should contact a Jerry Graham in Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

Another occasion aimed to acquaint students with the resources that were available was an afternoon open house for faculty. I sent out the following letter near the end of the summer session.

Dear Faculty Member,

We, students and staff of the MAT Program (Master of Arts in Teaching) invite you to an open house from four to six p.m. on Tuesday, August 31, at 1013 N. Pleasant St. We are inviting members of the School of Education faculty and other faculty members from throughout the University who have expressed an interest in graduate teacher education. We hope to learn from you more about what is available to us at the University. We are eager for you to learn about the sixty of us and our program.

Most of us see ourselves as atypical MAT candidates in an atypical MAT Program. Most of us have already worked for several years in schools or other social institutions. Some are pursuing a second career. Most of us see ourselves studying teaching in the largest sense, not just classroom teaching. Most of us will undertake two or more field experiences as part of our program here. They will include such activities as assisting a community organizer in Washington, shadowing an international banker in New York, and interning in a mental hospital, as well as practice teaching.

We have been here for a month in a special summer session
working hard together at developing a clear vision of what it means to help people learn and of how one contributes to the creation of community. For the remainder of one year the focus of our activities will expand to include work through the University and the variety of field experiences.

If you are not able to come Tuesday, we hope to find other opportunities for us to get together during this year.

Five of the approximately 80 faculty whom we had invited attended. One from outside Education attended. One other faculty member sent a note of acknowledgement. Many faculty were away at this time. But many more were demonstrating that they lacked the appetite for any additional involvements, at least for ones which offered no political or material benefits to them. I had been worried before Dwight's talk and before the open house that I would be embarrassed by low attendance by MAT people. Whole group sessions after the first week tended to draw only about half of the participants. But after these sessions had taken place, I rather felt embarrassed that the School did not seem worthy of the MAT people. Most participants began to feel somewhat hostile and resentful toward the School. These feelings were reinforced by the specific behavior of several influential participants and by several other encounters with the School of Education, especially those stemming from its efforts to combat racism.

Chip by example conveyed a cynicism about the School which he had acquired in his dealings in the Spring. He was especially resentful now to see that we claimed so little of the School's attention and resources. Albert Norman, who had written the letter opposing the required readings, made a more deliberate effort to influence people's attitudes. He began the year with a deep sense of responsibility for
challenging the authorities (me, the University, the government, etc.) when we violated what he saw as the people's interest. We had few direct confrontations, but he strongly influenced the climate of opinion. One focus of his interest in the summer was the People's Community Union, an Amherst group that ran a food co-op and a free newspaper. He and Barry distributed to participants the Union's pamphlet "Surviving at You Mass". I regarded the pamphlet as a mixture of thoughtful advice and ideological rhetoric and as such a good reflection of Albert. It contained such statements as "the university is built to serve the needs of American capitalism, not your needs", and "it functions to fit you into a life-denying system". In addition to offering workshops, Albert called several whole group meetings on his own to get people started "functioning politically in Amherst". Another focus of interest for him was a letter writing campaign to protest the murder of George Jackson and the government's holding of political prisoners. This led to a confrontation between us in which after a lengthy talk I turned down his request to have the Program sponsor the duplicating of a plea to "Flood San Quentin with Letters!".

The behavior of the School of Education was more distressing to me than Albert's. The workshop that Norma Jean had promised to offer turned out to be a role playing game - Star Power, that we were pressured into making a whole group activity, to take the place of seminars on two mornings. It was actually led by Jim Adler, a white member of the Committee to Combat Racism. The game is designed to reproduce the behavior of economic classes. All players give up some
money and then under the rules, some players are put in positions of power where it is easy for them to get more money back than they put in, while others are put in loosing positions. In Jim and Norma Jean's minds the game was supposed to make us reveal to ourselves "how racist we were", in that the powerful would be willing to take the obvious built-in course of exploiting the weak just as whites continue to exploit blacks in the real world. The game was played in two groups. In my group the game did not "work". The majority of strong and weak got together before money changed hands to put their faith in a single leader who promised to give their money back. For some of us this was a happy expression of the community ethic that our program had sought to promote. However, Jim and Norma Jean were frustrated and treated us as if we had failed and had not played fair. It was in fact a legitimate reproduction of economic democracy within the rules of the game. In the other group the behavior of the participants had been more ambiguous. It led to more heated exchange at the end of the game.

The Star Power experience left most participants regarding the School's efforts to combat racism as an imposition rather than a contribution to their education. Later there were additional experiences that added to the participants' hostility toward the anti-racism activities and the School generally. Albert and Chip found an increasing number of participants joining them in defining the program as separate from and opposed to the School. Feeling quite alone, I resisted this trend and defended aspects of the School and tried to promote interaction. I was more convinced than ever that
we needed the larger institution. I did not have a sense that we were moving toward the new kind of independent community we had sometimes dreamed of. And the School of Education as I have indicated was as sympathetic an institution as I knew. I could see that the Program's survival next year depended on our being more politically successful in the School than we had been the year before. As I viewed it, this did not depend so much on me as on the staff and students. They would have to become know in the School.

Staff Work. We had two major kinds of concerns that we expressed and acted on during the summer session: setting up the field experiences and meeting the needs of individual students with special problems. We will discuss the development of field experiences in the next chapter. The students we were most concerned with included a few who did not feel at all at home in the group, two who arrived late, and three who sought to be admitted at the last minute. The staff did not address these problems as a group. Our time together was limited to a hurried half hour before seminar session in the early morning and we were able to do very little as a group. Most of these individual problems came to Beth and me. We were the most accessible to students because we were in the MAT office next to the mailboxes. I was particularly concerned that several of the students were so uncomfortable in the program that they would not stay. They included some of the students I have said I most valued: Jean Moss, Terry Sweeney and John Doyle. They had avoided the retreat and had acted withdrawn in the first weeks. Jean and Terry were extremely
anxious about having taken the risk of leaving their jobs and moving their families to join a program they knew only a little about. Once there they did not understand what was going on. In addition Jean was having trouble moving into a new home, a problem many had to a lesser extent. Beth and I worked at bringing these three and others whom we recognized to be having problems into the program.

During the summer I chose to admit Cecilia Vilakazi as a transfer from the Teacher Corps Program, largely because she was black and already settled in the University. I turned down the request of a woman who lived with Henry during the summer, to be admitted as a special student. I turned her down on the basis that she was not willing to make a commitment beyond the first semester. This involved a difficult series of discussions because she had already put herself in the position of a participant through coming to the retreat, offering workshops, even submitting a profile. My decision involved acting against Henry's desires and in the end influencing her to leave Amherst. I also turned down the request of an entering School of Education student to join our seminars. He had been turned down as an applicant to the program in the Spring, but then was admitted by Dwight as an M. Ed. student. He had come to the retreat, primarily to help do video-taping. I had uncomfortable dealings with two admitted students, who without notifying us did not arrive until well into the summer session. I resented their violation of what I regarded as the program's contract. I allowed them to join, but my relationship with them continued to be impeded by my resentment throughout the year. We had made an arrangement with one student, Jeff Amory, to miss the
summer session. He had been admitted to the program before we had set up the summer session. We had encouraged him in his desire to be an Outward Bound instructor for the Summer and then serve as a Teaching Assistant for Donn Kesselheim's alternative school teacher education program. In addition to making arrangements for these students, there were also minor administrative tasks, such as continuing to advise MAT students who were staying on from the previous years, supporting the participation of last year's students in the summer session, working toward possible funding arrangements with groups such as the University Without Walls Program and Dwight's National Alternative School Program.

Most of the time the staff was immersed in these kinds of specific concerns rather than the general concerns we had about the progress of the program. Meanwhile I was worried that the building of vision and of community feelings had not begun. I could see that I had been too impatient in expecting these to emerge at the retreat. But now the summer session, which we had designed as a context for establishing these aspects of the program, was coming to an end, and I still felt most people were "doing their own thing" without serious self-questioning. I did not know what the cause of the problem was, except that I was part of it. I was not the confident, but subtle non-directive leader I wanted to be. The feeling of impotence I had had at the retreat had persisted, though less acutely, in the seminars and whole group sessions. I was only getting to know a few students. I did not know who I was. I did not sufficiently understand what was going on around me.
In retrospect it is clear that my reactions did not reflect the general feelings of participants. Indeed, I know now that Henry, Chip, Gary and several students found the month of August, 1971, one of the most productive periods they had ever had. Of the 27 who responded to the summer evaluation questionnaire, two-thirds concluded that they felt part of a community, only two that they did not. One-half expressed that they had experienced significant new understanding of learning and education. During the summer session all but a few participants felt more cared about and were more thoughtful than students in the 70-71 Program and very greatly more than graduate students generally.

My negative feelings during this period were primarily a reflection of my disappointment in myself. This in turn diminished the effectiveness of the staff. My self doubts got in the way of good communication between staff and kept us from establishing a constructive sense of accountability. Tensions between the staff members grew. What time we had together was often spent in defending ourselves or quizzing each other. We did not convey a sense of personal interest or support for each other. For example, there was a particularly upsetting meeting when Pat pushed Chip too hard to account for his work with a particular student. And I, after seeing Chip resist this, told Pat she was not being trusting enough of him in such harsh terms that she was deeply hurt.

I later discovered that most staff had continued to have basic faith in me. They had assumed I would be able to have a good effect on them and the other participants just as I had in the past. But
I felt isolated even from my closest friends, feeling that I had no chance of meeting their expectations. I felt most comfortable with Beth and working individually with the students who most needed what I thought I could give. I did not see myself as being in the center of the Program. This led me to become more concerned with strengthening the boundaries of the Program as a means of control. We had, of course, de-emphasized the conventional organizational and academic structures of grades, credits, courses, and reading and writing assignments. We had deliberately blurred distinctions between people with different degrees, faculty and students, tuition paying students and others with common interest, paid staff and volunteer staff, friends and people who were new to each other. We had intended to put in place of such boundaries a mutual commitment to the basic program goals and to each other that was to grow out from the staff nucleus during the summer session.

I now sensed that in addition to the failure of the nucleus, the Program boundaries we had assumed in the Program description were being eroded. Not only University traditions, but our position in the School of Education was being rejected. A few participants had missed the retreat and even half of the summer session. Many failed to attend whole group meetings. We had let Star Power intrude into the seminar format. I had acted to shore up the boundaries in preventing two hangers-on from joining the Program, in giving a firm answer to Albert's letter, and in turning down his request to use our duplicating funds. I went into the Fall looking for more steps to take to make people feel accountable for contributing to the goals
of the Program rather than just "doing their own thing".
CHAPTER IX

FALL 1971 AND SPRING 1972, THE 71-72 PROGRAM IN OPERATION

The daily interaction of all staff and students during the summer established the sense of relationship with each other and with the Program's concepts that was to be carried through the year as people went their more independent ways. It made participants approach the fall with high expectations, but only vague and incomplete notions of how to act on them. The summer session may be said to have ended and the year-long patterns begun with the formation of committees and the choice of initial field placements and fall semester courses. For most, this period of transition was hectic and frustrating. They did not know many other participants well enough to be ready to select committees or work well with committee members. And, in any case, committees were formed too late to be useful in making the other choices. Instead, participants on their own had to choose field experiences without adequate information about the choices, and had to choose courses with virtually no information. The staff lacked the information or the sense of direction to exert effective influence during this period. Too much was happening too fast for us to see the consequences of the decisions that were being made. As a result the registration period was the low point of the year for most students, just as it had been the previous year. After the semester got underway most participants found their work increasingly satisfying. Most found it better than they had expected before entering the program, but not as wonderful as they
had thought it would be during the summer. By second semester most were quite satisfied. From February on there were fewer changes in feelings in that most had found what they believed was the best way to use the Program, and were working with that, rather than seeking new possibilities. I will now go on to consider the year's experience by following each of the major Program elements as they began with the decisions at the end of the summer, and as they developed over the fall and spring.

Committees. We had written the following description of committees in the Program Book:

Committees will usually have six members including one or two staff members. They will meet frequently at first, and at least once every two weeks during the year. We see the committee as the nuclear community for each of our year's experience. During the summer we will be getting to know each other through seminars, workshops and community meetings. In the third week of the summer we will decide together how to make committee choices. Our best sense now is that participants need not give high consideration to common subject interests and common field placements as criteria for forming committees.

Committee members are expected to share, plan, and evaluate their experiences together. In committee sessions they will decide what field experiences, courses and other activities they will pursue. It is intended that the basis for making these plans be a full evaluation of one's strengths and weaknesses, needs, interests, and goals. Acknowledging that we are first accountable to ourselves for what we do, we are asking that participants share with their committee how they are thinking about what they are doing. By listening carefully to each other, committee members will help each other to be precise and realistic about what they mean. (It will also help each committee member to understand each other's decisions.) It is hoped that committee members will become involved in trying to know each others points of view. Dealing with personal problems for their own sake however, is not likely to help committees function productively. The process of seeking a deepening understanding of how one person affects another's learning can be one of the most rewarding functions of the committee. The process of learning with each other's help in committees will be a major source of insight into teaching.
The exact nature of committee activities will be determined by each group. Committees are the prime communication mechanism and mechanism of accountability for the program. Staff members and/or other representatives from each committee will meet regularly to promote sharing of information and on-going evaluation of the program as a whole. Committees can determine what parts of their discussions will not be shared with others. Committees may choose to structure their sessions in a variety of ways and will be able to make use of video or audio tape playbacks of their sessions. Committees may expect to visit each other in field situations, undertake readings and other "homework" experiences in common, go together on retreats, camping trips, visits to New York City, etc. Committees may invite others to join their sessions with other committees, to meet jointly with other committees.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of the whole program will be carried out largely through committees. Committee members are expected to address the issue of what makes for good teacher training, and how should a program account for its actions to the institution and taxpayers (people) who support it.

In addition to evaluation by staff and students, the Teacher Preparation Program Council (TPPC), which is responsible for all teacher education at the school, will be evaluating our program with an eye to making recommendations for the future of the Masters program for teachers at the school. Committees are requested to invite a member of TPPC to participate in one of the sessions during the fall.

As the time for the formation of committees approached, the staff debated more fully than before how they could best be constituted.

The statement that "participants need not give high consideration to common subject interests and common field placements as criterion for forming committees" represented the point of view that Henry and I had most strongly pushed. We had in mind emphasizing diversity so that people would be stimulated to investigate differences in their basic assumptions. Bob, and to a lesser extent, Pat, favored forming committees around common interests and activities. Common sense told them that this was necessary for getting people to share.

Bob's personal interest from the start had been closely tied to being able to work with a committee that specialized in cross cultural
issues. We resisted this position, putting our faith in the staff and other participants' ability to form strong bonds without needing any obvious shared interests. We counted on this as an expression of the basic program dynamic of the integration of diverse experience.

Work with committees was the part of the Program other than the summer that the staff had most looked forward to. It was seen as the most significant context for making their personal contribution. Bob, Pat, Chip, Henry, Barry and Gary were prepared to work with two committees. Mose chose to work with one. I chose to work with one rather than two, hoping it would give me a greater chance to work as program leader. Most of us had strong desires to be together with other staff members on committees. I worked out the following staff assignments for the ten committees: Mose, me, Henry, Bob, Chip, Barry, Barry and Gary, Gary and Pat, Pat and Bob, Henry and Chip. I had very much wanted to work with another staff member, but having limited myself to one committee, I felt obligated to give others that opportunity. I put Paul on my committee, but I did not expect him to become a regular participant.

After determining the staff assignments, we decided to have the whole group discuss how to form committees. I had favored a process that took into account which people each participant wanted to work with and also guaranteed a mixture of ages, sexes, and backgrounds. Most of the staff had assumed that people would choose whom to work with on committees so that they could begin with some bonds already formed. When I presented the question to
the group the major concern turned out to be, not Bob's concern about the need for common interests, but anxiety about who would be chosen and who would be left out. This concern led many to favor a random assignment. The outcome of the discussion was a compromise in which most of the selection was done randomly, but that people who had expressed an unusually strong desire to work with a particular person or persons had their choices taken into account.

We encouraged committees to meet almost every day before registration. Our hope was that each participant would have a chance to express his interests and receive some reactions from the group as part of the process of making field site and course selections. We had counted on this as the means by which the staff members and others would bring the program goals and guidelines to bear on what students chose to do. I had counted on staff members using these sessions to encourage participants to pursue new kinds of field experiences, including especially the experiences with the model teachers we had identified in compiling the Program Book. Lack of time and lack of staff discipline kept these expectations from being met. Many participants had already made field and course decisions. The five who chose to work at Amherst High School had in fact had to make their decisions even before the summer session began. Most others did not find staff and other committee members good sources of the information they needed. Staff members had not had the time to share with other staff the
information they had. Students missed committee meetings to go visit field sites and seek out people who could help. Our expectations for the occurrence of intimate exchanges were premature. Participants did not yet know each other well enough to expect to receive any personal or insightful advice. It took a number of weeks of being self-conscious before many committee members were ready to give much of themselves.

Committees did not have a chance to function reasonably until after their initial functions had already been left behind. Their operation during the year was relatively successful. Six of the ten committees met almost every week. The others were somewhat frustrated by difficulties in finding times to meet when enough committee members were free and able to get to a common place from their disparate field locations. After suffering from these problems, Barry combined his two committees into one. From then on his committee and mine met about every other week. During the second semester Bob also combined his committees to overcome logistical problems. Henry's committee met infrequently and then disbanded. A majority of participants attended 80-90% of their committee meetings. About 10 of the 60 participants attended sporadically. Two-thirds of the participants reported on the Evaluation Questionnaires that they felt "very much a part of their committees".

According to the 44 respondents to the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire, meetings were apt to include discussion of "your obser-
vations of the group dynamics of the committee" (37 responses), "the problems you face in your field situation" (36), "your selection of a new field placement" (33), "your ideas about your life goals" (28), and "your selection of courses" (24). It should be noted that committees did not do all that we had expected. The formal and demanding tasks of keeping portfolios, doing "homework", inviting TPPC members and other guests were not undertaken. They appeared to be excluded by the predominantly casual climate and the staff's hesitation to initiate new requirements.

To further assess the success of committees we must consider more subtle variables that pertain to the substance of committee meetings. Bob Pearson identified three such variables that affected committee function in a paper written in January. First he said,

The chief cause of the "success" or "failure" of a committee seems to be due to the degree of agreement as to the purpose of the group between the students, but more particularly between the students and the members of the staff who "lead" the group.

He went on to characterize people's sense of purpose as being either "to compare problems related to teaching" or "to help people to grow and know themselves". He presented a second variable that is closely related to this:

One other factor tended to affect the functioning of committees, this factor having to do with the predominant, overall philosophy of the group based on the view of the majority of its members. Groups that tended to think alike on these overall philosophical issues tended to stay together; groups who split on these issues tended to be less stable and in some cases broke up.

At its worst these issues tended to reflect a kind of "right-think" and "wrong-think"; at best they merely reflected different points of view. Summed up in their extreme "right-think" and
"wrong-think" form they would appear like this. (And he included here the list of characteristics he had conceived which I presented in Chapter VI.) If a committee were composed of people representing both extremes of these opposing positions, the tension within the group was too much for the group to stand. On the other hand, if there were a degree of unanimity within a group on these issues, particularly between the staff and the students, the common ground became a cohesive force. To some extent, a certain pride kept these groups together, the "right-think" groups feeling that they were the in-group (which by and large they were) and or the true path to knowledge, the "wrong-think" group's feeling a sense of security and togetherness in a group which would not buy the more radical, and to some, naive, beliefs of the progressives.

These two variables do seem to explain some of the differences in committee function. Of the six committees that met regularly, three seemed to have almost no reservations about their success: Bob's, Chip and Henry's, and Pat and Gary's. Bob's was the only committee with all "wrong-think" participants. Chip's was the only one with all "right-think" participants. Pat and Gary's was all "right-think" except for Pat who was "wrong-think". In this case she seemed to move with Gary and the rest of the committee toward the personal growth purpose rather than pushing for a focus on teaching. The committee that Bob and Pat shared had 5 "wrong-think" and 2 "right-think". The 2 "right-think" dropped out of the committee. The rest seemed to function well and in the second semester merged with Bob's other committee. Chip's other committee failed to jell though they met regularly. It contained 2 "wrong-think", 3 "in the middle", and Chip as the only "right-think". His efforts to lead the committee toward a personal growth orientation represent the kind of conflict between staff and students Bob referred to.

Mose's committee had 4 "wrong-think" and 2 "in the middle" and seemed
to function smoothly, but without much impact on the participants.

Barry's combined committee and mine had the most diversity: Barry - 4 "right-think", 3 "wrong-think", 6 "in the middle"; and mine - 2 "right-think", 5 "wrong-think", and me "in the middle". These had similar problems in attendance and led to similar frustration for the staff members. The collapse of Henry's committee with 3 "right-think", and 3 "in the middle" seemed to be a case of conflicting personalities and Henry's own sporadic attendance rather than other factors.

Bob offered a third variable:

Another variable that may have had an effect on the success of the committees was the degree of "reality" associated with the committee. The original idea was that each individual on the committee would be experiencing "reality" in his everyday life, whether as a teacher interning in a school, or as a person experiencing something new in a non-school-related field experience. Each individual would then bring this "reality" with him to the committee and make it come alive for the rest of the committee. The committee members would thus share, and new perspectives on experiences would be brought out by the diversity of the group, thus heightening the learning process. In actuality, this ideal was difficult to accomplish for the variety of field experiences and types of schools was so large that it was difficult for anyone but the most articulate to bring alive a place or experience to others that had never experienced it themselves. Had groups been divided along the lines of public elementary schools, free schools etc., this problem of bringing reality alive might not have been so acute, but with the great diversity within each group, more than words proved necessary. Thus, committees that took to visiting each other's sites tended, for some purposes, to be more successful, for then there was some shared experience to discuss in committees and projection, identification and empathy were less difficult.

Bob's committees did practice the visiting of sites. This was indeed successful. Chip in the second semester took the idea one step further by influencing nine of his ten committee members to spend most
of the second semester working together in one school system. Chip's success was in turn a major influence on the program that succeeded the 1971-72 Program. At the same time, the original idea of being able to share the diversity of experience through words seemed to have succeeded in Gary and Pat's committee and in one of Chip's committees before the spring. In the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire, ten participants supported the more limited view that committees should have been formed around common subject matter or grade level interests, 19 preferred random selection, 13 personal choice, and 5 maximizing diversity.

Field Experiences. The Program Book contained the following description of field experiences.

The MAT Program's core curriculum will be the field experiences of each MAT participant. Usually, each participant will have at least two separate placements. A combination of experiences can contribute to a perspective for building a vision of teaching. These include experiences in conventional schools, nursing homes, consumer surveying projects, political campaigns, alternative schools, prisons, and other community settings. Experience in the inner-city, on Indian reservations or in foreign cultures can stimulate a fresh realization of what world we are learning and teaching about. Direct experiences in unfamiliar cultures can also stimulate a new awareness of one's own learning process.

We recognize that program members come with a wealth of varied experiences in education, business and community work. Many have taught, been involved in intern programs, Peace Corps, or other activities. The goal of the MAT field experiences, then, is not to duplicate these situations, but to provide new opportunities for participants to engage in learning and teaching that will increase their ability to communicate effectively, observe critically, and recognize growth in themselves and others.

Sometimes program participants will be placed in the field alone, sometimes together. MAT Committees will discuss, select, and share the field experiences of their members.

The staff approach field supervision with a belief that excellence in teaching is dependent on a person being good at learning from his experiences. Our focus then is on helping
participants become good at observing themselves, and sensitive to the observations of others who are part of their experience. The entire staff of the program will spend time in the field working with participants.

Ideally, field experiences will be dynamic relationships involving commitment, and providing continuity to each participant's life. One way of viewing the MAT Program and particularly its field experiences is as an ever expanding network of people with ever growing resources committed to the goals of building vision, imagination and community among people.

The catalog section of the Program Book began with the following directions:

CATALOGUE OF EXPERIENCES

Following is a catalogue of possible field experience settings. It is only a partial list - anyone of us should feel free to add to it. However, it is no more than a list of possibilities to be investigated; it does not give adequate information for making any decisions except to narrow your choices. In each case a final decision will be preceded by a joint personal exploration by you and the people at the institution in question. That exploration will in turn be preceded by an expression with your committee's help of what your needs are.

The list has two parts. Section I consists of situations where the staff has already made contact and begun to arrange for the placement of one or more participants. Section II lists other situations where placements seem possible and desirable, but where nothing has been prearranged. In considering a location from either list, you should treat it only as an idea for a relationship, a mutually beneficial relationship for you and people associated with that institution, which does not yet exist but which may or may not develop.

A number of people from possible field sites will visit during August in order for us to learn more about them and they about us.

Even after coming to a clear understanding of what kind of field experience would be most beneficial to you, there is still a series of practical factors to be dealt with. This includes complicated questions of time - such as how full time the role would be, whether you wish to be doing course work at the University at the same time, and how much of a daily commute or a weekly commute is acceptable - all of which concerns likely vary with the time in the year. There are also questions of possible salary (seldom possible), living arrangements, and family needs. In addition could be considerations of whether a particular experience can be counted as practice teaching for certification purposes.
Help with those practical matters will become more available with time.

I include here a representative sample of the 125 field placement possibilities the catalog came to include.

I am not including any of the regular practice teaching opportunities that were available in nearby rural, urban, and suburban schools.

**Union - 32.** Union - 32 is a brand new high school (7-12) for people from five cooperating towns in the East Montpelier area. It will open in September with about 800 students and a new and exciting staff and administration; all working very hard to make an "open high school" where every teacher is personally responsible for a small group of students. Each student is encouraged to take a diverse program both in terms of content and learning style (small group, large group activity, work programs, etc.). Approximately 40% of the student's time will be for Independent study. But the school will only work through its people and so the staff has been carefully chosen. There are many arrangements for paraprofessional (community) staff. The core teaching staff is diverse in background and style. Team leaders have already been working/planning together.

**Videotape component of Challenge for Change Section of National Film Board of Canada (based in Montreal).** This group is developing new methods of using video media to enhance communication as a basis of social change. Their work is characterized by a combination of extraordinary creativity and innovativeness with a high degree of professionalism and quality. They seem effective at using video media to focus in humanness so as to make it the basis from which to view our institutions and our technology. The work is aimed at community development in the most literal sense. Experiments are underway in schools, prisons, Indian reserves, rural communities, and urban neighborhoods.

**New School Without Walls - Hartford, Conn.** A Hartford area public high school is opening with 50 students this fall. The principal is Gene Mulcahy who is a doctoral student at U. Mass.

**Rural New Hampshire School.** There is a wonderful elementary school teacher in a six room school in Ossipee, N. H., who may be able to accept interns. He is remarkable in his resourcefulness, patience, self-reliance and caring.

**Westfield Detention Center.** Some inspired efforts to help young people in trouble are being undertaken in Westfield, Mass. Interns may be welcome.

**Shadow Toy Designer.** This is a possibility to observe in a designer for a toy manufacturer an educator whose operational definition of learning is play.
Shadow Ass't Dean of Admissions at a University. This is a possible opportunity to shadow an assistant dean of admissions (female) at a highly competitive small university which has just begun to admit women.

Shadow "Natural Childbirth" Obstetrician. This is a possible opportunity to shadow a "natural childbirth" doctor who is as concerned with his patients' emotional experience as with their physical one. His respect for his patients' dignity and their authority over their own bodies and experience, and efforts to help them reap great joy and satisfaction from n. c. exemplifies the best in teacher-student relationships.

An Inspired Federal Executive. Spend several weeks with the leader of one of the largest federal agencies, a man with extraordinarily impressive understanding of the good uses of government. His work is principally the implementation of his vision through relations with congress and his superiors in the executive branch, and through the administration of his organization. People find him unusually articulate, broad in his interests and comfortable to be with.

Fort Dix - College Discovery. College Discovery is an experimental educational program offering servicemen and women, who are almost out of the Armed Forces, an environment in which to learn. The school is legally an extension of Staten Island Community College, geographically located at Fort Dix in New Jersey, financially funded by the GI Bill, and philosophically committed to learning by living.

The Revitalization Corps. Billed as America's Citizen "Peace Corps", the Revitalization Corps is a totally volunteer organization working in six cities, primarily in the black community in areas of education, community organization and development. The Corps sponsors tutoring projects, "fresh air" programs, and other service ventures. The Corps is the creation of Ned Coll, its director, who has devoted full-time at practically no pay for the past seven years to provide meaningful volunteer service in Hartford, Harlem, Newark, Red Bank, Watts, Jackson, and Denver. Interns desiring to work with the Corps could spend anywhere from several weekends or nights on a commuting basis, or several weeks on a live-in basis in the Hartford community working with the Corps. Room, board and all other expenses would be the full responsibility of interns.

Newfoundland Extension Service. The Extension Service of Memorial University of Newfoundland does very high quality community development and adult education work, mostly along very isolated coasts. One of their particular competencies is in the use of film and video media. We have good contacts with several people there.

John and Laura Phillips. This young couple has been living in Toronto about five years working with young people in several "free schools" and in more informal settings. John is a very
good photographer, and much of their work with young people has revolved around photography, including teaching children to read through their own photography.

Betty Puleston. A married woman of about forty, Betty on her own uses video to help develop communication among local teenagers. Strong racial tensions and deep drug situations are included pretty directly.

Indian Reserves in Canada. We have contacts which could probably provide introduction to people on several different reserves.

The Dancers Workshop (Ann Halpin). This seems to be one of the best places to learn what one's body is and what movement is. They have been particularly interested lately in community and how ritual and movement function in community. Much of the recent work has been racially mixed. The workshop is involved in teaching.

Street Academy System of Springfield, Inc. The Street Academy of Springfield, Inc., an outgrowth of the Action Lab for the Education of High School Dropouts at the School of Education, attempts to provide an alternative route to college and professional careers for the serious minded high school dropout. After a successful eight week pilot program with black, white and Puerto Rican students, S.A.S.S.I. has opened a full-fledged prep school after the model of Harlem Prep in New York.

Head Start Centers. There may be unlimited opportunities to work in Head Start centers throughout all of New England. This will include work with not only pre-school children, but will involve community organization, paraprofessional training, and some supervision of undergraduate early childhood majors.

Windward Institute of Oceanography. This small institute in Rowayton, Conn. is very active in finding direct and meaningful ways to help people of all ages learn about the sea. Their research vessel on Long Island Sound is generally full of children doing things.

Marc Lappe - Institute for Society and Ethics in the Life Sciences, Hastings, N.Y. The institute is developing methods of discussing and developing ethical standards in the life sciences. Marc Lappe, formerly a cancer researcher, is an unusually effective and gentle teacher. He is knowledgeable in all realms of biology, ecology, and medicine. He has been teaching at the University of California and the Free University of Berkeley.

Adams-Morgan School District, Washington, D.C. One of the truly community-run school districts in the country. Integration and parent power are not just words in this district.

Boston Museum of Science. The Museum needs interns for a full semester. Money available. For more details speak to Carl Hoagland at the School of Education.

The Corporate Complex. We are currently negotiating with a leading manufacturer of aerosol products for three students to spend a week working with top executives of the firm. Students will have the opportunity to observe the concerns of top business management, to explore problems in business and the community from
their viewpoint. We are hopeful that our negotiations will include a living cost grant from the company, whose main office and plant are located in Milford, Conn.

Most participants chose to have multiple and challenging field experiences. All but six had more than one field experience, and half had more than two. Almost everyone spent some time working in schools. Half worked in non-school institutions for at least one placement. Almost everyone worked with more than one age group.

The Program bore little resemblance to the usual teacher education program with a single practice teaching placement. Thirty of the forty-four respondents to the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire did rate the need for certification as a major factor in their choice of field experience. Twenty-nine rated the desire for something unfamiliar and challenging as a major factor, making it the only other widely-cited factor. Two-thirds of the respondents to the Year End Questionnaire said they would expect to see "having access to unusual field experiences" as a very important part of the Program when they look back on it in five years.

Students' choices represented somewhat less use of the unusual opportunities that were available than we had expected. The unusual ones that were chosen included the founding of an alternative school in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, work in the Chase Manhattan Bank, in Newfoundland, in the Boston Children's Museum, and with experimental schools in England, California, New Hampshire, and Ithaca, New York. Given the diversity of experiences many participants had had before, the choosing of more usual roles nearer to Amherst was not necessarily narrowing. A Black MAT student from Tennessee commented that for her
being in the affluent University community of Amherst "was a field experience". For the thirty-nine who had not taught before, practice teaching itself may have been as intensive a broadening experience as they could have had. In retrospect, I would judge that it was of major benefit to the Program that most people stayed near enough to Amherst to make frequent interaction possible.

Most students chose to work in classrooms at least part of the year. Aside from those mentioned above, they were located in 16 different area schools, including elementary, secondary, and junior college levels; private, public, and parochial; traditional and experimental. Many of the placements included work with administrators as well as in classrooms. Their field work included the creation of new courses and programs, an evening group for Amherst High School students, and a school within a school plan for the Mt. Hermon School. Many students spent at least part of the year working in "remedial" or "correctional" programs. This included work with Headstart, the Hampshire College Early Identification Program for disadvantaged children, Genesis School, Westfield Detention Center, Hampshire County Jail, Springfield Urban League, and in the administration of the University Year for Action Program. Others spent some of the year in other roles in the University, most of which offered some needed financial support. These included being on the staff of the Urban Education Center's teacher education program, the campus drug counseling program, the Teaching in Alternative Schools Program, and the CEEBS Program. Others held Teaching Assistantships with the Educational Research Center, the Art Department, and the English
Department. Another was a major program developer for the Media Center, another a member of the School of Education's Committee for the Recruitment of Women.

We intended that learning from field experiences be supported by the development of strong relationships between participants and people at field sites, by supervision from MAT staff, and by contact with other MAT participants. The grandiose dream I had had for a network of special people at field sites around the world would have put participants in contact with model teachers who would have had some commitment to our program. Few of the special people who were finally included in the catalog were used. Instead participants were usually in the position of building their own relationships in the field. This often led to the establishment of a good rapport with field site staff but seldom to finding model teachers.

The lack of contact with model teachers in the field made it especially important that participants receive supervision from staff. In fact the contact with staff was uneven in quantity and quality. In the first semester Chip and Pat were conscientious supervisors seeing each of their 8-10 students at least once every two weeks. In the second semester Chip concentrated all his committee and field work in Montague where he also took on internship positions. The 10 participants who worked with him there received daily attention. The rest of the staff gave less attention to the field than we had planned. They were discouraged by the fact of participants being distributed among many sites, their own lack of
time, their lack of knowledge of the particular sites or fields of work, and by my lack of direction. The only sites with more than three students at a time were Stockbridge with five, Amherst High School with seven, Belchertown with five, the Common School in Amherst with four, and Montague. The burden of supervising all students all year long was too great for a largely half-time and volunteer staff. Bob, Barry and Mose could contribute little to supervision because they had commitments of half-time or more to other jobs in the School of Education. Few of the field sites most recommended by staff were used. Therefore staff were less attracted to visiting most sites than we had expected. They tended to spend a disproportionate amount of time in a few chosen places. Henry's involvement was an extreme example of this. He gave all his time to leading the Stockbridge School effort at its conception, then left for a month in Newfoundland taking two participants with him, then returned, but was not much involved with field sites, and finally left for a second month's trip to Newfoundland. I allowed staff visits to the field to become a low priority as part of a general lowering of expectations for myself and for others. As a result some students were visited even less than the usual three times per semester required by the undergraduate student teaching program.

The characteristics most valued in supervision according to respondents to the Fall Questionnaire were as follows:

1. 19 is experienced in the kind of work I am doing
2. 16 develops a close personal relationship with me
3. 13 participates rather than observes
The quality of supervision when it was offered may often have been inadequate. As in committees, our conscious emphasis was on personal communication and support, not on more specific professional expertise. We did not carefully match staff experience with specific professional expertise. We did not carefully match staff experiences with specific site characteristics, so participants often failed to get specific help when it was desired.

Participants had frequent contact with each other during their field experiences. We stressed this contact to supplement staff visits. Contact came through being placed with fellow students in the field, through committee and whole group meetings, and visits by MAT people to field sites. Half of the participants did visit others at their field sites. A quarter brought people from their field sites to other MAT activities. We asked participants to rate on the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire the importance of these and other factors in contributing to their learning from field experiences. Their responses were as follows:

1. 38 freedom to try out whatever I wanted
2. 29 being placed in the field with other MAT people
3. 25 rapport with the staff of the field site institution
4. 19 supervision by MAT staff
5. 19 being confronted with an alien field site
6. 16 finding an exemplary master teacher
7. 14 visits by other MAT people
8. 14 the support of my MAT committee during this time
9. 4 being placed without other MAT people

The Year End Questionnaire showed similar results with a smaller number of respondents. This indicates that freedom was valued even
more than the factors we have discussed. The staff and participants had succeeded in finding sites that would trust our students as the unusually competent people they were, rather than giving them the usual apprentice teacher treatment. Participants expressed on a variety of occasions the desire for more attention in the field, the fullest expression being a paper by Albert entitled "No Intern Is An Island (Or: How To Keep An Intern From Becoming An Outtern)". But several were grateful to have been left alone and many saw "being confronted by an alien field site" as contributing to learning. I was continually concerned that people who were away from Amherst and had few staff visits were not getting any benefits from the program. Dan Nickerson, who spent all year at Stockbridge, for one thought this concern was unnecessary. He wrote,

All institutions and staff are too self-conscious. Too confused about their role and draw the people they serve into their confusion and sense of their own role. Jon is excellent at serving people without involving them in his role conflicts and therefore serves people well.

He felt my legitimizing of his self-education was the proper contribution of the Program.

The Stockbridge and Montague field experiences bear further explanation. In Stockbridge three full time interns and four part time, all without regular teaching experience, ran a fully operative K-12 school for a year. During the later part of the year they had 47 students and were forced to turn away applicants. I considered the interns' experience close to the best possible preparation for teaching in any kind of school. All the fundamental relationships between parents, children, teachers, and school officials that are usually
hidden were exposed and had to be responded to. All the basic questions about how to structure education were lived through.

With assistance from me and Dwight's National Alternative Schools Program, the Stockbridge interns sought on several occasions a share of the local town School budget. This failed, but the School has been able to continue as a high school using teachers from the community.

An offshoot from the Stockbridge School, "the School on Wheels", was a good expression of the School and of our Program. This was a two month journey across the country for two Stockbridge students and two MAT students (who were not interns at Stockbridge). Their written report spoke of experience with urban life, seven natural wonders, environmental awareness, arts and architecture, American history and cultures, literary skills, health survival skills, and human relations. Their statement on human relations was as follows:

The human relations aspect of the trip probably is the most difficult to write about. The most important thing to remember is that each of us shared in the others' problems because of our proximity. Those problems ranged from homesickness to identity crises to concern about people in trouble at home to intense needs to be alone, to all of the other eccentricities of which the human being is capable. Sometimes we found it easy to be open and loving with each other and sometimes we didn't. We were physically together, whether or not we were tuned in to each other's needs at the moment. This situation plus the changeability of our environment placed a responsibility upon each of us to be especially tolerant and forgiving. Probably, if our group had been larger these interpersonal relationships would have been a little less tense and exhausting. Also, we were always called upon to deal with unexpected happenings and decisions which always accompany this kind of travel. In short, we learned a lot about ourselves and each other.
Chip's work in Montague centered around the initiation of several courses in the junior and senior high schools and a creative expression course in an elementary school. An especially interesting aspect of the high school's prejudice course was a student exchange between Montague students and some students Albert was teaching in Amherst. The students' reflections on the experience of being an outsider and on the differences between the working class school and the University-suburban school, stimulated great interest in the Program and in the schools. Viewed on video-tape they became the focus of further conversations between students, teachers, administrators, and interns.

The creative expression course was also highly successful. Chip's description of it shows his sensitivity to the regular staff of the school and his consciousness of the long-run impact of his work.

CREATIVE EXPRESSION PROJECT

The group of staff members, which includes "representatives" from each of the creative arts (music, drama, visual arts, writing, dance), is at the school every afternoon and meets twice a week with each of the four classes. In addition to being involved in the project, two members of the team are working with the "morning curriculum" with two classroom teachers.

The site of the project, The Central Street School, is a four classroom elementary school with students in the first through fourth grade levels who come from generally lower-middle-income economic backgrounds. The school has limited facilities and minimal economic resources.

The project and the activities are designed to enrich the school curriculum and to promote integrated and interdisciplinary school experience through the use of the creative arts as the unifying basis for the curriculum of the project and for the approach to the processes of expression and of learning. The primary aims of the content of the program are to stimulate and to enhance self expression and creative expression, and to promote both the "concept" of self and the awareness of the self as an integral and responsible member of community and of environment. Of utmost importance to the staff, in regard to the development and coordination of activities, is the consideration for the
existing school structure; the group seeks to involve and to work cooperatively with the classroom teachers. In addition to developing complimentary activities which are more a function of the project itself, the staff explores ways to be a resource for classroom teachers and seeks to present projects which are directly connected to the content and subject matter of the existing curriculum. For instance, in the fourth grade, in conjunction with a science unit about the concept of "theory", the group set up a series of experiments or activity centers (which dealt with various theoretical concepts involving such subjects as pendular motion, color, water, and changing states of matter and energy) to illustrate and to enhance the understanding of "theory".

In addition to creating these courses, Chip developed a community orientation program for MAT people that included visits to Montague factories and talks with town officials. Chip's work in Montague set the example for the more community oriented program that succeeded ours.

Use of University and School of Education Resources. Our emphasis on field work and interaction among participants left little time for the 12 credits of work required outside of Education or for School of Education activities outside the MAT Program. Some students were able to fulfill the Arts requirement through taking independent studies that bore a relationship to their field work. Most took standard Arts courses. Twenty-one of the forty-four respondents to the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire felt that dropping the requirements for courses outside of Education would improve our Program. Eleven felt they would have "missed some good opportunities" had they been free of it. I continued to favor dropping the Arts requirement, believing that most students had already had access to academic resources comparable to those of this University and would again in the future. I was concerned however, that the Program not encourage the devaluing of the academic or the intellectual. I was reassured by results on the Year-End Questionnaire that showed two-thirds of the respondents had read sixteen or more books.
during the year. I was also pleased that at mid-year, students had requested we form a reading and discussion seminar about American education. This was undertaken under Barry's leadership but failed to keep going due to problems of scheduling. At the end of the year sixteen students stated that if they had had one more semester to spend in the Program they would take additional courses. The only other activity to be named as many as ten times was having wider teaching experiences.

I was upset by the fact that our work kept MAT people from exploring more fully in the School of Education. There were many unique opportunities there. There was also, I believed, an obligation for us to be a part of the School. However, with only a one year Program and given our goals, the coherence-building activities and the field experiences had to be given a higher priority. Twelve respondents to the Fall Questionnaire felt they would have missed a lot that they had gained from the School of Education if the Program had not been attached to it, seven thought it would have been a better Program, and twenty-two that it would not have made much difference.

During the year students felt much more a part of the MAT activities and their field site than of the wider institution. Respondents expressed the following feelings of affiliation when we asked how much they felt a part of the listed entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your Committee</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other MAT groups</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A Field Site group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The whole MAT Program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The MAT House group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The School of Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Another Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Another Department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The five Colleges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whole Group Sessions and Other Activities.** We felt a need for having other activities in addition to the three major components of field experiences, committees, and work in the University. We wanted to keep the whole group together. We had been one Program in the summer. There remained things we could do as a whole group that could not be done if we were totally fragmented by committees and field sites. We needed to continue to inform participants of the resources available to them. At first I was particularly concerned to have them be more attuned to the School of Education and to each other's field experiences. I organized whole group meetings such as the one described in the following notice:

ATTENTION MAT PEOPLE

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 21

We anticipate continuing to have meetings of the whole MAT community every week or two throughout the year. Next meeting on Tuesday, September 21, will meet at 3:30-5:30 behind the MAT House.

---

1. Respondents in some cases marked more than one column.
In case of rain we will let you know with a notice on the mailboxes about relocation.

We have a preliminary agenda:
1. A discussion with Dick Clark, who is the Chairman of TPPC which is responsible for all teacher education at the School of Education.
2. A discussion about the governance of the School of Education with officers of the School Council (the Legislature), and the nomination of a Masters student representative to the council.
3. A discussion of the Racism Retreat and the implementation of measures to combat racism in the MAT Program and the School of Education.
4. A report on where people are in the field and a discussion of supervision/liaison arrangements.
5. A report from Stockbridge and any other field sites that are seeking more MAT involvement.

Please leave a note in Jon's mailbox letting him know the best time for you for regular community meetings. We will try to find the best time for everyone. Please try to make this Tuesday meeting even if it conflicts with stuff (if you can!)

Dwight Allen is having a Graduate Student Openhouse at his house Wednesday, September 22, at 7:00 p.m. Directions for his house can be gotten at his office.

Meetings such as the one described were disappointing just as some of the summer whole group meetings had been. Between a third and a half of the participants attended. The effect of the meetings was to make the School of Education more distant rather than closer. I was unable to arrange this meeting with Dick Clark. Earl later agreed to come to speak but twice had to cancel out at the last minute. The talk by the Chairperson of the School Council, Barbara Love, was disastrous. She presented so cynical a view of the exercise of power in the School, that no one at the meeting was willing to serve as a representative to the School Council. Barbara, who is black, later became Chairperson of the Committee to Combat Racism for the School. Her presentation to us and our experience with Star Power combined with the notices sent out from the School about combatting racism
made most participants contemptuous of the School's anti-racism activities. The typical student's impression was that the School was not interested in what we were doing, but that it was willing to presume to preach to us about our being racists. While I was not as cynical about the School, I felt that work like Chip's prejudice class in Montague and the sharing of experience between diverse students in committees were more appropriate means of combatting racism than the School's highly publicized efforts.

By the end of October I had adapted to the inclinations of the group to emphasize social and participant-centered gatherings and to limit outside involvement. The following notice reflects the new approach.

About half of us had supper together last Monday night at the MAT House. Having each person bring a dish of food to share led to an extraordinarily good feast. Most stayed afterward to see Albert's tapes of Belchertown and to hear from Terry about his work in the Hampshire County Jail. We are planning to get together again MONDAY, October 25th, 5-7 p.m. which will be at the end of another 3-day weekend. After supper Jeff will probably have a film about Outward Bound. I would like to have a brief discussion about evaluation and planning for the MAT Program and arrange for some times for a fuller discussion. Let Beth know if you want to plan anything for that night you would like to have publicized. Bring your families, friends, students, co-workers.

Asked in January what kinds of whole group activities interested participants the most, respondents stated a preference for continuing this approach. The results were: presentations by MAT people about their field experiences - 27, suppers like we've had - 19, workshops - 18, parties - 12, and listening to guest speakers - 8. With this in mind we continued to have these kinds of meetings over the rest of the year.
Attendance at the meetings continued to be about 20 of the 60 participants, often many of the same 20. Another third attended about half the sessions. The absences reflected, in some cases a lack of interest, and in others the same logistical problems that committees had suffered. People found it hard to respond to our ad hoc scheduling of meetings when at the same time they had commitments to regularly scheduled courses and field work obligations. There was also a problem of finding an adequate meeting place in bad weather. The MAT House had an attractive porch, terrace, and lawn space for meetings in the summer, but neither the two living rooms or the dining room were comfortable for more than twenty people at a time.

Gatherings of participants were not limited to scheduled group meetings. The best aspect of the MAT House was undoubtedly the experience of those who lived there and the informal comings and goings of others. The House was an attractive colonial house; a ten minute walk from the School. While we maintained an office at the School with a phone, typewriter, and Program records, it was mainly oriented to serving people outside the Program. The House, as we expected, became the physical center for people in the Program. Five out of six participants said they felt at home there with most visiting it at least ten times a semester. About eleven participants lived in or around the House at any one time with a total of about sixteen living there at one time or another between field experiences. Another four to six were usually eating their meals there. The extremely diverse people for whom the House was home were remarkably successful in working out a rewarding way to live together. More than half of them cited this
as the aspect of the year that most contributed to their learning.

Fourteen other participants shared homes with each other during at least part of the year. Groups of eight to twenty people frequently got together for sports and parties, as well as occasional workshops and sessions that called for people with particular interests. There were regular MAT Spanish classes, cross-cultural studies groups, meet-at-the-laundromat groups, and basketball, soccer, and football players groups. Reacting to the growing community climate, fourteen respondents to the Fall Questionnaire said they would like to continue to be part of the MAT Program after the year ended, "if it were economically feasible for us to continue as a group." Twenty-six stated they would like to stay to the end of the year, none that they would like to leave. In the spring about ten participants created a "Teacher's Collective" to help people stay together after the end of the Program. It helped people to find employment in the area and was to be a means of staying in touch with each other and possibly changing schools together. About a third of the participants did in fact remain in the Amherst area.

In spite of this evidence of a strong community, some of us were dissatisfied with the level of group interaction. The staff's inability to make as many field visits as they wished and the logistical problems of arranging meetings did leave many of us feeling less in touch than we had expected. Our concerns, like mine in the summer, were that some people might be lost and that only certain types of people felt comfortable in the Program. Dissatisfaction with the level of communication among the group led Albert to propose a new mechanism of communication through the following notice.
Dear Everyone,

Suggest we start an MAT Up-Dater, needn't be more than a page every two weeks, to tell the MAT community what everybody is doing, has on their minds, etc. Could be distributed at the Sunday dinners, or in the mailboxes. Should help tighten communications. Everyone would be asked to write a sentence or two about what they're doing and needs they have or foresee, messages, and so on.

For instance, Robin Keeler wanted to buy the Teacher DropOut Center Packet. If he had listed it on the MAT Up-Dater, I could have told him I had a copy (which all worked out). Or maybe I could say IS anyone interested in working next semester at Belchertown? In helping me build a portable math lab for the 1st grades? In compiling a resource book for teachers? etc.

Would look like this:
Robin: Would anyone like to buy the TDOC pamphlet? If so, we'll all have to chip in 40¢.

Henry: I am looking for a broken dirigible with aspirations. Can anyone help me?
Mr. Barrett: I'd like to get that intern fellow off my back--any suggestions?

Such a newsletter would also provide a good history-on-going, of the Program, for us to look back on, and for next year's candidates to check out. Every two weeks we can look back and see where people were at, what their needs were.

Power to potatoes,
Albert

Albert's idea did not bear fruit until the following year when as a staff member he edited a more ambitious journal.

The staff's dissatisfaction during the fall led to the holding of what became known as "January Days." Chip described the idea to the group as follows:

After a month off for most of us at Christmas, we are proposing four days where we would be together again as a whole Program before second semester. There are many things we might do: morning coffee and discussions of second semester field projects, morning workshops similar to the summer ones, afternoon and evening sessions where individuals or groups of people present assessments of their own learning during the first half of the Program, where we dig into questions about how we've seen ourselves as teachers, change agents, raps about our future, job openings, groups of us working together, social times, snowball fights, feasts, maybe a square dance.

January Days was aimed at reviving the sense of the Program as a single
group of people, meeting the needs of people who had failed to get sufficient attention during their field experiences, and working on improvements in the Program. Fifty participants attended at least part of January Days. About ten workshops and twenty reports on field experiences were offered. It appeared to be successful in the same way that the summer had been. Many, especially those that had been isolated in their field experiences, seemed to have been excited to regain some feelings of the Program as a whole. Many found it rewarding to have a chance to discuss their field experience, though at some sessions attendance was disappointingly small. January Days also provided a convenient and painless setting for accomplishing the necessary registration tasks for the second semester.

January Days served as a major forum for Program planning and evaluation. Chip's plan for Montague was implemented. This was an effective way to meet the needs of students for more attention in the field, of committees of "more reality to share" or coherence, and of staff to reduce the demands on their time. At January Days I presented the results of the Fall Evaluation Questionnaire with a ten page report of the program, directed in part to the Deans and TPPC. The report included a restatement of the goals of promoting vision and imagination in a new form as being the promoting of an existential view of teaching and a broadening of the liberal education of teachers. I was seeking a fresh and less grandiose way of stating the by now familiar phrases.

I summarized my view of the year and the outlook for the future in a section of the report.
I am convinced that the primary program concepts are sound. The School of Education should give more emphasis to the kind of struggles with community building, existential inquiry, and broadened liberal education that we have promoted. In this age, when people more than ever before are questioning the meaning of their experience, to be a teacher is to have the ability to help people find meaning; and that ability is nourished by the struggles I speak of. I think these concepts have been the key to our appeal to applicants and to the unusual involvement of staff and students during the year. We are in tune with the needs of the times.

We have been learning how to implement these concepts. This year's program design is a great improvement over last year's. It still represents only an early exploration into an area where little is known. Our experience so far leads us to offer these recommendations and considerations for next year: The requirement of work outside of Education should be dropped, chiefly to leave more time to use the unique opportunities present throughout the School of Education. Financial aid should be made available to make it possible to attract more minority group students, poor white students, and older students. Admissions procedures should be changed to allow more qualified people with diverse experiences, but without B.A.'s to become participants. If there is increased diversity, efforts to encourage interaction need to be increased. The size of the program could be increased. The program should consider concentrating field experiences in several institutions or geographical areas, acquiring more MAT House-type buildings, and dividing the program into 10-15 person clusters.

It was at January Days that Bob presented this "right-think, wrong-think memo." His original idea had been to apply his theory to the whole group and only later used it in analyzing committees. He had shown it to me earlier and we had agreed it could serve as an excellent basis for discussion. It read as follows:

To: The MAT Community
From: Bob Pearson
Subject: Togetherness

By coincidence, the other day, I attended an MAT meeting in the afternoon and a committee meeting at night. At each meeting the reverse end of the same question was asked which led me to believe the question was widespread and unresolved. At the afternoon meeting the question was asked in this form: "Why are there so few of us in the 'community' participating in the planning and decision-making?" At night the question was asked in this form:
"Why do we not feel like participating more in the 'community'?
In discussing this last question it appears that a sizeable number of people feel there is a king of "right-think" and "wrong-think" in the MAT Program that is hindering communication and limiting the participation of many. Obviously, the form of this "right-think" is very subtle and hard to define. It is often communicated non-verbally rather than verbally. A rough attempt to try to define "right-think" and "wrong-think" follows: (Here he enumerated the "right-think/wrong-think" characteristics which he presented in Chapter VI.)

Now obviously people do not fit neatly into one column or the other, but it seems to me that those who primarily fall into the "wrong-think" category are the ones who do not feel comfortable in the MAT total community meetings.

My purpose in sending out this memo is, to the extent that it has validity, to help the communication process between those who feel comfortable when they participate in community events and those who do not. May people try to understand where the other guy is coming from.

I believe Bob's memo was an accurate analysis of the climate of whole group sessions and staff meetings at the times when someone, usually Albert or Chip, was criticizing "right-think" people. Albert, his wife Corky, Chip, and Henry often had a charismatic effect on those who shared some of their needs and interests. To an equal extent they were capable of threatening some who had differing needs and interests. However, I believe that Bob overstated the extent of these feelings. Many "wrong-think" people did not participate more, simply because their needs and interests did not lead them this way. Analysis of participant responses at year end shows that there were no significant differences between the people identified as "right-think" and "wrong-think" as to the quality of their experience, what they felt part of, what aspects of the Program they used and valued, or what they perceived as Program failures. I think it was somewhat paranoid for Bob to use the "right" and "wrong" labels. I believe there is some truth to the view that Chip expressed that Bob was
seeking to rationalize his guilt for not participating more fully in Program activities. People in the "wrong" group, who by his categorization outnumbered the "right" 21 to 14 (17 were put in the middle), were apt to be as comfortable in the Program as a whole as people in the "right" group. I also sensed that on a one-to-one basis and in informal situations, as opposed to committees, people in the different groups interacted with no feelings of polarization.

I summarized my reactions to Bob's memo and the outcome of January Days in a memo to participants in February:

**Progress of the Program this Semester**

About 85% of us attended some part of January Days. Most sessions seemed to be very successful. Some did not have adequate attendance. The sessions on reading and on the progressive tradition have led to continuing activities. The sessions that focused on peoples' field experiences underlined the peoples' widespread desire to receive more attention from the program while they are doing field work. Staff members will not be able to give much more time to visiting than they did during the first semester, but many others in the program have made commitments to do so. Several people have changed committees. The one committee that had for a time stopped meeting had resumed. Two committees have combined. The other committees have continued as they were. I have the feeling, from January Days and from a lot of talks, that the program has come to maturity in the sense that most everyone has figured out how to use the program and the University to his benefit. I do agree with Bob in his memo that a "right-think" myth has inhibited some from initiating activities and from participating in some large group activities. I don't think the right/wrong polarization has characterized most people's lives here. I observe that most people have come to feel enough at home to have productive relationships with a diversity of people.

Our experience over the rest of the year confirmed my observation that the Program had "come to maturity" in January. This was to be expected for a one year program. It takes half the year for people to become fully in tune with it. Over the remainder of the year it can be used comfortably. By then, there is not enough time left to invest
in major changes so that almost everyone is ready to work with what exists. For those of us who had planned the Program, January marked a point of change in a larger cycle. This cycle had begun in September, 1971 with the surge of creative energy that gave birth to the Program proposal, which in turn led to the gathering of participants in the spring. By January, after having launched the endeavor and established a pattern of activity for the year, our energy seemed to diminish and we began a more passive and reflective phase.

While the record of the Program was primarily a successful one, there were strong elements of sadness in our reflections. For me the isolation and confusion that had stunned me at the retreat had continued though in a milder form. My urgent dreams of resolving my personal and professional experiences by working harmoniously with my closest friends had not come true. The staff's disorganization and lack of investment in each other that had kept us from operating well together during the summer continued to inhibit the growth of the kind of rapport that I assumed we would have. We did not often talk meaningfully about our relationships or about the quality of the staff work. Program experience led us as a group of friends to become more distant from each other, rather than more close. I will seek to explain why in the next chapter.

January also marked the beginning of a new cycle--the birth of the Education in Community Service Program that succeeded the MAT Program. At the same time that I was withdrawing to a reflective position to try to understand what had happened over the past year, I was the central figure in planning for the next year. I was able to attract five students from the MAT Program to work with me - Albert, Terry,
Jeff Amory, Bill Simmons, and John Anderson. Our work followed from my recommendation in the January Program Report:

The program cannot expect to return the current staff or to attract as large and effective a staff without an increase in funding. With a moderate increase a new kind of staffing pattern could be instituted. One staff member would be a permanent faculty member. Several would be drawn from the previous year's group of staff and students. Others would be selected from the applicants to the program. People would be told they could apply as staff or students—both would get the same degree, but somewhat different experiences. Such a pattern is suited to our program model. The model is essentially not a fixed design. It is a process model. The program is initiated each year out of the staff members' personal struggles with the program's three primary concepts.
CHAPTER X
CONCLUSIONS

As I have stated in the Introduction, I have intended to present our story in a manner that will enable readers to draw their own conclusions. Having reached the end of the chronological history, I will now give my summary of the meaning of our work. I will consider a variety of tests of meaning. I will describe the place of the Program as a teacher education program, its place in the lives of the participants, the place of its design as a model for other programs, and the legacy of the program within the School of Education. In the Afterword I will analyze the range of program goals, processes, participants, and resources that our work brought to mind.

The Program As A Teacher Education Program. By the most visible tests of what a teacher education program is supposed to do the Program was unusually successful. As I have shown we were able to attract a large number of qualified applicants including many with the most prestigious academic and employment backgrounds. Fifty-three of the fifty-seven to whom we offered Masters candidate slots chose to come to the Program. Forty-nine of the fifty-three who entered then went on to graduate in June or September as planned.1 Almost all of them then went on to the kinds of jobs they wanted. It should be noted immediately that these most visible facts do not necessarily indicate that participants possessed any specific qualities or underwent any specific

1. Of the remaining four, one died, one became a mother and is continuing as a part time student, one dropped for primarily financial reasons, and one dropped out because of a psychological crisis that was not closely related to the Program.
kind of change while in the Program. They indicate only that participants were willing to remain in the Program and that employers wanted to hire the same people we chose to admit.

More can be learned from looking at the employment experience of graduates in some detail. We have been able to trace the employment experience of forty-six of the forty-nine graduates. Just over half (24) are now teaching. More than a quarter (13) are doing advanced study or hold leadership positions in education or related areas of social action. Nine have returned to earlier areas of interest outside education or may be said to be pursuing their self-education. Three of the forty-seven had difficulty getting the kind of jobs they wanted. Two who had sought teaching jobs took a year to find them. A third failed to find a job in his field of special education. The rest were able to do what they had chosen to do right after graduating.

Of the twenty-four who are teaching, half are in secondary schools, eight in elementary, one in Headstart, three in alternative schools that span the elementary and secondary levels. Twenty-one are in public schools, two in alternative private schools, one in parochial school. Of the thirteen who are in other roles in education or social action, four are active Doctoral students in the School of Education (two in the Center for Leadership and Administration, one in the Human Relations Center, and one is coordinator for the Education for Community Service Program that succeeded the MAT Program). Others are working as staff members in a Career Opportunities Program, a Teacher Corps Program, the Hampshire College Early Identification Program, a community action program, a neighborhood youth center, a
community outreach program, and a Federally-funded women's curriculum project. Three others became doctoral students and staff members of the Education for Community Service Program after graduation, but now hold other positions in education included in those listed above. Four have returned to earlier areas of interest outside of education. They are working in city planning and international marketing, and studying ocean engineering, English, pottery, and drama. Three are pursuing their self-education in a more general way while working as a waitress, a landscape gardener, and a computer programmer.

The fact that our graduates got the kinds of jobs they wanted is not automatically an indication of program success. Certainly the success rate of graduates in finding teaching jobs in the cases of those that sought them was unusually high. But numbers of teacher education programs would only have been satisfied if more of their graduates had chosen to enter classroom teaching. Others would have been especially satisfied if their graduates had gone on to leadership positions or higher degrees. The point of view of our staff was more complex. As we stated in the program literature, we had a special interest in bringing people into classroom teaching from other occupations. We also had a special interest in calling attention to the teaching and learning that takes place in institutions other than schools. Given these interests we were disappointed that less than a third of the participants had come from other occupations. We were disappointed that four of them chose to return rather than to move into formal teaching. We were pleased that ten other participants chose education and social action roles that were not confined to
classrooms. At the same time, we had admitted many students knowing they were committed to classroom teaching, including several who had already been teaching. We intended to help them explore further the meaning of teaching, including the viewing of teaching from non-school roles, but we did not necessarily intend to have them change their commitment. In retrospect I believe two of these students failed to question teaching in a serious way and might have profited from searching further in new roles, rather than returning directly to teaching.

We also had chosen to admit many students who were not committed to working as teachers, but were committed to exploring the meaning of teaching and learning. In most of these cases we intended to help them search through direct experience as well as in theory. Some of the staff intended to have that experience motivate these people to commit themselves to a teaching or social action role. They were disappointed that three chose to continue their self-education. They were pleased that ten chose to enter teaching. All staff agreed that the Program should be oriented to preparing people to help others learn, rather than to promoting self-growth for its own sake. However, my point of view was that it was desirable to have within the Program a few who could stand apart from this mission and help us question our altruism. I was content with people's decisions not to go into teaching.

I would now like to address the less visible and more profound test of what a teacher education program is supposed to do--the test of what qualities graduates bring to their jobs, or more specifically, what impact a program had on their qualities. The most straight-forward way of determining impact is to compare the performance of participants in
a teaching situation before and after being in the Program. Ideally a comparison is also made between the change in participants and the change undergone by a comparable group which did not go through the program (control group). We did not use this approach. Lack of time and resources would have made it impossible in any case. But in our case, we would not have considered it fully appropriate, because we did not see our primary goal as being to change aspects of teacher performance that would be revealed in short-run observations. To this extent our goals diverge from the accepted goals of teacher education programs.²

The Program in the Lives of the Participants. Our primary goals as stated in the Program literature were to accelerate the ongoing life processes of building vision, community and imagination. The goal of building imagination was later expressed as extending the liberal education of teachers. With these goals we are in the same position as those who seek to measure the impact of a liberal arts education. We want to find the meaning of the Program in the lives of our participants as they follow a diversity of paths into and out of the Program. While the assessment of before-and-after teacher performance would reflect some of the changes that interest us, the ideal means of evaluation would be a longitudinal study that followed the larger patterns of change in attitudes, values, knowledge, skills, and accomplishments. This being impossible, we have relied on our observations and a year-end evaluation program impact by participants.

² See the sections entitled "Designs" and "Goals" in the Afterword for an analysis of the relationship between possible goals for teacher education and their consequences for evaluation.
I asked several questions on the Year-End Evaluation Questionnaire that were designed to indicate the extent to which participants had experienced growth in vision, community, and imagination. I will first present the information they yielded and then analyze the nature of the growth that it indicates. We asked participants to show which of the following phrases "describes what it was like for you this year," with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very Often True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Occasionally True</th>
<th>Never True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflective and self-questioning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making demands on yourself</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaged with a variety of people</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported by other people</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finding tangible satisfactions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Threatened by people different from you</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pressured by group opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Controlled by external authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I considered factor one and two to be tests of vision-building.

Asked afterward to compare this year to other years, participants gave the following responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>More Often True</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Less True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflective and self-questioning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making demands on yourself</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I considered factors three and four to be indicators of community feeling and factors six, seven and eight to be indicators of lack of community feeling. In comparing this year to other years, participants gave the following responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>More Often</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Less True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaged with a variety of people</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported by other people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Threatened by people different from you</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pressured by group opinion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor five was regarded as a quality most participants were seeking, and without which the achievement of other goals would be frustrated. Factor nine was regarded as a quality most participants were seeking to avoid and which would interfere with other goals. In comparing this year to other years, participants gave the following responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>More Often</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Less True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Finding tangible satisfactions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Controlled by external authorities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In another question, which was mentioned in Chapter IX, we asked participants which of the following characteristics they "expected to see as having been important to you in this Program when you look at it five years from now." The results were as follows:
1. Association with a good group of people
   | Very Important | Somewhat Important | A Little Bit Important | Not Important at all |
   | 23 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

2. Access to unusual field experiences
   | 20 | 6 | 1 | 4 |

3. Became more responsible for your own actions
   | 14 | 4 | 6 | 4 |

4. Degree and certification
   | 10 | 12 | 6 | 2 |

5. Clarified life's objectives
   | 6 | 10 | 6 | 5 |

6. Demystified school
   | 6 | 6 | 5 | 8 |

7. Acquisition of specific competencies
   | 5 | 9 | 9 | 6 |

8. Access to courses, faculty, University resources
   | 5 | 8 | 8 | 7 |

Factor one was associated with building community. I associated factor two with growth in imagination and factors three, five and six with vision building. Factor seven, like the "Finding tangible satisfactions" in the previous questions, was not a goal given priority by the staff. Factor seven and the traditional factors four and eight were included for purposes of comparison.

The Year-End Evaluation Questionnaire also included the following, which directly addressed vision building.

One way of summarizing what's happened this year for me is to consider what kinds of struggles I have been most conscious of this year as compared to other years. I think of struggles centered around the following positions:

- Self growth
- Establishing structures
- Teaching what you know best
- Making immediate radical changes
- Cognitive learning
- Doing your own thing
- Teaching what you believe is right
- Affective learning
- Making mutual commitments
- Giving opposing views equal weight

Comment on whether these or other struggles have been much in your mind this year and how this compared to past years. If you do not perceive these as struggles please state that.
Three quarters of the respondents wrote that most of these struggles had been very much in their minds this year and that they had been more central to their experience this year than other years. The struggles between "establishing structures - avoiding structures," "making immediate radical changes - working for changes that take years," and "doing your own thing - making mutual commitments," were the ones most commented on, though each of the others was cited as most important by at least one respondent.

We also asked participants which of the following job characteristics have been important to them as they have been looking for a job. They gave the following responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>A Little Bit Important</th>
<th>Not Important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Being with people you care about</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chance to influence an institution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Being in a particular part of the country</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chance to be your own boss</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Harmony with goals of institution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Recognition/future career possibilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Being with a particular population group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then asked what would have been important if they had been looking for a job a year earlier. They responded that the first three factors would have been significantly less important, with number three, "being in a particular part of the country", having little importance. Four
and five would have been slightly more important. Six, seven, and eight would have been significantly more important.

I regarded factor one and, to a lesser extent, factor three as indicating a valuing of community building. Factor seven was seen as indicating the valuing of a narrowly defined community. Factor two suggested active and idealistic vision. Factor five suggested a more passive vision. Factor four and six were seen as evidence of having active goals, but not necessarily of the idealism we associate with vision.

The responses to the Questionnaire indicate that we were successful in building vision and community. The goal of building imagination was not investigated here. The primary characteristic of the year was that people were reflective and self-questioning. They were more so than in other years and also significantly more responsible for their own actions and more involved in the kinds of struggles I had identified. They left the Program being more interested in having an impact on institutions. The characteristic of the year participants expect to remember most is their association with a good group of people. They were more significantly less alone and more engaged with a variety of people than in previous years. At the same time, they were more supported and no more threatened by people different from them or pressured by group opinion than in previous years. They left being more interested in being with people they care about. They were more interested in being in a particular part of the country, which in most cases meant the Connecticut Valley region. These qualities which reflect vision and feelings of community were all much more highly rated than the
traditional concerns of degrees and certification, attaining specific competencies, having access to courses, and earning good salaries and recognition.

There are a number of reservations to be expressed about these results. First, as I stated in Chapter IX, only half the participants responded to the Year-End Evaluation Questionnaire. The low response can in part be attributed to the normal end of the year mix-ups as people started off on their different ways. But it may be presumed that some of the half that did not respond had less interest in and less sense of obligation to the Program than those that did. This suggests they had a more negative experience. My opinion, however, is that their responses would not have altered the basically successful pattern that emerged. In any case, a more serious reservation can be raised stemming from the vagueness of the goals that were used in this analysis. I did not employ here the critical distinctions we made in the program literature between an authentic community that expanded communication with the world and a narrowing ingrown community, and between an active vision of learning and a theoretical vision based on a stance against schools. And indeed it was these lesser versions of community and vision that represented the kinds of failure we felt most vulnerable to. We can be somewhat reassured by the fact the respondents did not feel more threatened by people different from themselves or more pressured by group opinion, and that many found themselves in the middle of the struggles I had identified rather than fixed to one end. But the nature of the community and vision we nurtured needs to be investigated further. To do so means looking
more closely at how individual participants changed.

This brings me to my most serious reservation about the consideration of these results— that is that the meaning of the changes in individuals is easily lost in these summaries of changes in all participants. While we wanted all participants to grow in vision, community, and imagination, we often had in mind different kinds of changes for different participants, just as we had had in mind different job outcomes. Indeed, we often deliberately admitted people because their needs and strengths complimented others'. We wished to have many participants be more contemplative, but we felt some were already too self-involved and we were most interested in having them become engaged with a variety of other people. We were pleased that many came to value chances to influence institutions, but we were pleased in another case to have a student say she had become "less angry about the inequities of our corrupt society." To thoroughly analyze the meaning of Program outcomes would lead us toward considering each participant individually. By turning to look at processes instead of outcomes we get a less complex picture.

The Program was built on the assumption that the healthy development of vision, community, and imagination (or a healthy search for meaning), involves a dialogue between opposing views, an exchange of understanding, a balancing of thought and action, a combining of broadening and integration. In other words, participation in these processes is assumed to be productive for people with varying needs. Acknowledging that I have not undertaken to prove this assumption, I will go on to consider to what extent the Program consisted of these
processes. This will be part of our consideration of the validity of the Program design as a model for other programs.

The Program Design As a Model. Let me again summarize our rationale for the Program design. As I explained in Chapter V, we sought to combine a broadening of experience with support for integrating experience. Broadening was to be brought about by having diverse participants encounter each other and a wide variety of new field experiences. Support for the integration of experience was to come through a sense of community among participants, the development of intellectual frameworks, and attention from staff. A third key to the design was the weakening of the usual University structures of course credits, grades, and faculty authority. In place of this was to be the more subtle authority of the staff and the Program Book. The milieu for the Program was to be established in the summer. The workshops were to sound the keynote for the broadening of experience. The seminars were to launch the building of intellectual frameworks. Support was to be specifically encouraged by the retreat and the existence of the MAT House. The summer field experiences were to contribute to broadening, while committees, staff visits to sites, and whole group meetings were to support integration.

I believe the basic dynamics of the design are valid. Others should consider using the whole design with some modifications as a model if they share our unusual program goals. People with other goals may still find individual components of interest. I have already acknowledged that the whole design suffered for our trying to do too much too quickly with too limited resources. This was the criticism most often voiced by TPPC and by participants. We erred in the creation of
the original proposal by trying to squeeze into one year all the things that Glenn, Pat and I were committed to. We erred again in not cutting back what we proposed to do when we failed to get substantial resources. In fact we did seek to eliminate the Arts component. But when we were forced to keep it, we were unwilling to take another part out, and proceeded to act almost as though the Arts requirement was not a factor, though it was intended to take up to a third of a participant's time. Trying to do too much meant that the broadening aspect of the Program superceded the integrating aspect. This was most pointedly true of the Arts component where we had to give up on having the transdisciplinary Fellows we had counted on to perform an integrating function. Even if the Arts component had been eliminated, as it was the following year, it is still doubtful that all the diversity of experiences could have been effectively integrated. It is obvious just in terms of logistics that participants could not make good use of the field experience catalog and also be within reach of staff or of community activities. The solution worked out by Chip in Montague was to save the integrating aspect by putting aside the field experience catalog and having a portion of the participants limit their field experiences to a geographical community. This became the model for our successor. Nevertheless I hold the hope that a catalog like ours could have a place in a program like ours. It would seem to require that participants spend a longer time in the program, that more resources be made available to support field visits, or that the integrating elements be strengthened in other ways.
The elements of the Program that were designed to promote a broadening of experience tended to be more widely appreciated and used by participants than the integrative elements. The use of the workshops was particularly impressive. I was initially disappointed that use of the catalog of field experiences was not more far-ranging and touched less on the model teachers we had identified. Nevertheless, by the end of the year most participants had indeed undertaken diverse and unusual activities. Given our goals, the success of these program elements must be viewed with ambiguity. On the one hand, they are truly exciting expressions of imagination and resourcefulness. On the other hand, by themselves they represent more of "doing your own thing" than "building community and vision." Our choice to have a diversity of participants was the broadening element we most fully embraced. Our successor in fact sought to increase diversity. We believed that the dialogue between diverse participants was the most interesting and challenging contribution of the Program. We were encouraged by the evidence that we could bring diverse people together without a "right-think/wrong-think" polarization.

The major questions to ask about the success and applicability of our design concern the elements that were to serve as a basis for integration. Some weaknesses are obvious and were quite easily addressed in the subsequent designs as we shall see. I did not effectively organize the staff. Seminars were too short and in most cases too abstract to serve as an effective beginning for the Program. Most committees would have benefitted at least from building some
activities in common, as Bob had suggested, if not from forming themselves around interests. Participants should have had more attention in the field. Lack of attention was cited more often than any others (12 times) by respondents to the Year-End Questionnaire when asked to comment on weaknesses you see in the Program.

The more profound questions have to do with the more general creation of an identity or center to serve as a basis for integration in the Program. We sought to replace the usual University structures that define boundaries of a Program with commitments to a set of concepts and to staff and fellow participants. These concepts were created and articulated by the staff. They came to participants through reading the Program proposal, the admissions interview, discussions at the retreat, and finally the reading of the Program Book. In a typical hierarchical institution participants would make a commitment in the form of a contract to follow certain structures or have sanctions used against them. We saw the concepts of the Program Book as an alternative democratic kind of constitution. We expected them to elicit a sense of faith and trust. I was confused during the Program by the ambiguity of the commitment participants made to the concepts. People came with the highest expectations, but their expectations did not agree enough with mine or each others. We believed that we had spelled out a distinctive and subtle view of teaching. It marked us off from the myths and traditions of the primary culture and the counter culture. It became clearer to me later that the ideas did not constitute a simple, easy to grasp myth. Read less carefully, they seem to contain something for everybody. The structure was subtle; we were trying to
straddle the boundary between in and out of the University and between program requirements and self-direction. Read less carefully, it seemed to offer freedom to do your own thing.

The Program concepts required a strong staff to give them life. (The Program design depended even more on some trusted "founding fathers" than on a sound "constitution".) At the start I personally depended more on my faith in my friends whom I saw embodying the Program ideas than in our statement of the ideas. The source of integration for the Program that I could best envision was the staff. The whole group would be reached through staff in committees and in the field. The role played by the staff was for me the most disappointing element of the Program, in part no doubt because my expectations had been so extraordinary. Before the retreat the staff had had some difficult times together, but also some wonderful exchanges of understanding that could serve as touchstones for what we wanted to create with participants. After the retreat all our times together were difficult. We failed to function well as a group. Some of us had, in addition, periods of functioning poorly as individuals.

Let me trace what happened in my relationship to the staff. It appeared to parallel in a more intense way the staff's relationship to participants. In asking staff members to join the Program I was very flexible in the commitments I asked of them. Knowing of their commitment to me personally I was very accommodating, dealing with each individual on his own terms, valuing their particular strengths and making room in the Program identity for them. The model of teaching I believed in was these specially valued people "doing their own thing". My initial
faith kept me from seeing any need to work on reconciling divergent staff views. Under these circumstances there was not enough common commitment among staff. The subtlety of the central ideas and my accommodating nature made it easy for individuals to diverge. Individual staff members tended to see the parts they wanted to see, commit themselves to doing what they wanted to do, and avoid seeing or taking seriously the rest. It was not the same dealing with them all at once as it had been one to one. I seriously overlooked the power of differing, underlying dreams and needs that drove us. I did not see fully Chip's community dream, Chip and Gary's need to reject institutional ways of operation, Henry's need for freedom. The conflicts between our needs undermined the mutual faith we depended on. With this source of inspiration and support diminished we became less effective.

The differences we have cited between the success of different seminars, committees, and field sites to an extent reflects the effectiveness of staff members working on their own. This shows some staff members to be highly effective while about half failed to participate as fully as even their half-time commitments would allow. Participants found both great strength and great weakness in staff members. When they were asked "what three or four people have you learned most from this year", half the people they listed were staff members. The failures cited most often after lack of supervision visits were "staff members being too much into their own thing" (seven times) and "the staff's need for more experience" (four times). Our lack of identity also opened the way for some participants to distrust our unusual
reliance on each other.

During the year I had often had an exaggerated picture of the damage caused by weaknesses in the staff. My perception of the Program was limited and twisted by my disappointment in myself in relation to the staff. I felt I had failed to meet their expectations and I was unable to receive strength from being with them. We grew more distant. I was at times stunned that this merger of my personal and professional existence had injured my personal life rather than strengthened my professional life. I was frightened by the loss of a center for the Program. I felt impelled to shore up the Program boundaries - define who is in and out of the Program, resist challenges by Albert and others to the authority of the Program. In fact the boundaries were left almost completely open. The staff generally was not inclined to push people to stay in a Program activity for its own sake. We were committed to our goals, but we had the humility to recognize that our Program was not necessarily the best way to serve them. This left participants unusually free to participate or not without consequences. That is, they could earn credits, get a degree, and get certified without having to meet very specific requirements. The fact that the Program still stayed together is evidence that participants did commit themselves substantially to the concepts and to each other. However the staff's permissiveness combined with our lack of common commitment probably diminished participants' willingness to feel accountable to each other. This was evident in some committees. Some participants were eager to share feelings in workshop, but hesitant to make the greater investment in each other that an effective committee requires.
I have presented my conclusions about the staff experience in some detail because I believe the staff role is the most demanding part of our design. It requires idealism, tolerance, and the subtle exercise of authority. People without these qualities have no chance of carrying out such a program. I have concluded that our Program was generally successful and that this can be attributed in large measure to the staff's possession of these qualities. I have also concluded that the weakspots within the Program can be attributed in large measure to the staff's excess of idealism and tolerance, and its hesitancy to exercise authority. This is underlined by the fact that I was forced as Program leader to become less dependent on trust and more willing to act alone.

To consider further the applicability of the Program design as a model we must acknowledge the unusual advantages and disadvantages presented to us by the School of Education. It gave us extraordinary freedom to create any kind of program structure we wished and, at the same time gave us the ability to attract extraordinarily able and diverse participants. I can think of no other school that could be at once so open, so inexpensive to attend, and so well known. Without unusually able and more mature applicants the Program might not have been able to weather and gain from the stressful Program processes. A major problem for the Program was the participants' discomfort with the balance between what we gave to the Program and what we received from the School. The lack of regular pay, job security, and attention was especially damaging to the staff. It put us in the position of being unnaturally dependent on each other for receiving appreciation.
I usually felt that I understood and accepted the terms of our exchange with the School. The School could not afford to fund an ambitious teacher education program at a reasonable level. Beyond meager part time salaries, the rewards to the staff could only be their learning, their feelings of accomplishment, and graduate credits. The unusual part was that I and others were willing to try to run an ambitious program anyway. Most other staff and participants were usually confused about this arrangement and harbored resentment. I also felt resentment when I was most pressed by the School. At the same time, I always held the hope that if we did a good enough job contributing to the School through our participants, we would move up as a priority. But, partly because of the participants' resentment, the Program often did not appear to be contributing to the School as much as to be using the School.

**The Program Legacy.** As I indicated in Chapter IX there was sufficient interest in the Program on the part of some participants and on the part of Dick Clark and TPPC that it has been able to continue under the name of The Education in Community Service Program (ECS). It has survived tremendous obstacles to achieve an increasingly refined design and to acquire a more substantial resource base. (I will not describe the obstacles except to say that the current ECS Coordinator, Terry Sweeney, compares the ECS story to the voyage of "The African Queen".) One consequence of the obstacles was that Program admission was restricted, as part of an overall limit on graduate admission, to 38 in 1972-73 and then 14 in 1973-74. It is expected to rise again in 1974-75. I have already mentioned the major
changes in design. Diversity was limited by dropping the Arts require-
ment and limiting field experiences to a single geographic community.
Staff and student teams were assigned to a specific community for the
year. At the same time the diversity of participants was increased by
including in-service students and by further emphasizing non-school
roles.

We wrote the following description for the 1973-74 Program.

EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE
A Program for the Promotion of Educational Reform in Teaching
and the Human Services

The purpose of the Education in Community Service Program (E.C.S.)
is to help people in a variety of educational roles become effective at
grappling with the complexities of the human and institutional relation-
ships which characterize contemporary America. E.C.S. regards the key
to effectiveness as being the acquisition of a frame of reference for
teaching and learning that is independent, wholistic, and open-ended:
independent, in that it is not bound to the ideology and ritual of a
particular institution or movement; wholistic, in that it takes into
account one’s life-long learning experience and the full range of
learning resources available to him; and open-ended, in that it en-
able one to accept new possibilities rather than being threatened by
them.

The program participants will include school teachers, corrections'
personnel, community organizers, journalists, clergymen, lawyers, and
people in other educational roles. Some will be continuing to occupy
these positions and will participate in the program on an in-service
basis. A few will be preparing to enter such positions for the first
time. Grouped into teams, participants will study and become involved
in the learning processes of a given field site/community. There will
be 3 or 4 of the E.C.S. field sites comprising communities of a rural,
suburban and/or urban character and very likely a State prison. The
in-service participants will be recruited from these sites.

Part of the year’s experience will be working as a site-team on a
prearranged task involving a cooperative effort between various insti-
tutions and professions. Some of the tasks under consideration are
helping to develop an alternative school, improving a community's
counseling network, developing "a yellow pages" of learning resources,
conducting environmental education projects, developing methods for
family-based education and cross-age teaching, programming a cable TV
system, and helping to establish or improve half-way houses and nursing
home. In addition to the team task, participants will individually
undertake community internships that place them in unfamiliar institu-
tional roles. Additional activities include on-site presentations by community and University experts, reading seminars, University courses and independent study.

Participants will be encouraged to define learning in terms of the group, as well as the individual experience. Learning from each other the E.C.S. team, itself a microcosmic community, will draw on the wide range of backgrounds, philosophies, and directions represented in its composite make-up. In short, participants will learn to use each other as resources while they are seeking to tap existing but unrealized opportunities of the field site community.

The program will begin with a summer session. Participants can arrange to meet Massachusetts state elementary or secondary teacher certification over the course of the year.

The description shows that we had become less grandiose in our Program design and in our goals. We no longer counted on our abstract concepts and ourselves as staff to serve as the Program Center. Associating groups of participants with geographic communities added a tangible and powerful coherence to the Program. It also caused a shift in emphasis away from reflection and toward action. I have regarded this change as both a loss and a gain. I came to hold a less rigid attitude toward Program changes after the 1971-72 Program. I gave my impressions of the new directions in an article for the ECS Journal, the Program publication which Albert had created.

WHERE IS ECS GOING?

ECS is an experiment, a highly complex one, where goals as well as methods of reaching them are being tested and modified. I am presenting here a critical view of five goals that are now part of or could be part of ECS.

I see the basic design of ECS stemming from two goals. One is to gather a diverse group of participants and have us learn from each other. This goal was expressed directly in the ECS workshops where we took turns presenting things we knew to each other. More significantly it will hopefully be expressed over the year through the more subtle exchange of attitudes and ways of thinking. A major reason for having the summer session, the project houses, and committees or support groups was to help this exchange to get started. The second goal is to have us learn from involvement in a variety of roles in one community.

These goals taken together do not describe the carrying out of a degree program in the usual sense. There is no body of knowledge that
we are required to master. There are rarely any specified experts we are required to hear or read or be apprenticed to. All there is is what we could do on our own anyway without a University, only here we can get a degree and certification if we do it.

But what we could be doing, we may not be doing unless someone gives it legitimacy and gets us organized to do it. If these program goals are valid it is because they point to learning that is often overlooked. Because of our habits of turning to experts (real or imagined) we may not see what can be learned from those around us. We may not often have people who are different from us around, and when we do we may not seek to learn from them. Honest communication with them may seem too hard. Because of our habits of going to school we often overlook the learning that goes on in the whole life of an individual or a community. We may see only the school life. We often are not attuned to the value of mutual support between individuals and between institutions. For example, many of us as teachers may see ourselves in our classrooms as being isolated from other teachers in a school isolated from families and community institutions.

Not being a degree program in the usual sense means that we are forever having to define the program and our own needs and purposes in relationship to it. The two goals I have mentioned name processes. What the outcomes will be, what will be learned, is left to the individual. Sometime some of us are quite comfortable with that. We can go on to describe ECS’s purposes in a general way as being to invigorate our teaching, or to help us see teaching in perspective, or to help us develop our own vision of teaching. But all of us at times want to have the program come together around some more specific goals that describe outcomes. I will discuss three such goals that have been advocated and implemented in some of the sites.

One goal is to increase our command of the technical skills and knowledges involved in teaching. Even humanists recognize that there are useful tools for dealing with groups of people, areas of subject matter, and institutions which can be directly taught. People new to formal teaching may seem especially in need of these tools, though perhaps tools can not be learned effectively until people are teaching and experience the need for them specifically. In any case there are experienced people, who have identified specific needs which to their minds are more immediate than their need for invigoration or increased perspective. To ignore these needs would be counterproductive. At the same time, giving them a low priority in ECS has been a deliberate step. As individuals and as a society we have a rhythm in our lives where we go through periods of seeking tools and then periods of seeking vision. While most teacher education programs are responding to the former need, ECS has so far felt the greater need was to respond to the latter.

Another goal is to make a contribution to our host communities. We can assume that our presence in a community for a year will somehow benefit the community. We can also assume that our approach to learning in the field will include trying out ways of improving the the community. The point in question is how we decide what we try out. If we approach the decision seeing ourselves as students we
would regard this year as a period set aside for our learning. What we gain from it will be expressed in contributions in our work in the long run. In this spirit we might be highly experimental in our approach to this period, feeling freer to take risks and learn from failure than in our non-student working years. We would be unlikely to spend much time doing what we have already mastered and usually get paid for doing. If we approach the decision with a strong sense of accountability to the host communities our approach will be different. Of course, almost a third of us have committed our personal future living and working in these communities. ECS as a program may also seek a continuing relationship with the host communities. In this spirit we may compromise our personal learning goals. We may be cautious, limiting ourselves to doing what we already know will succeed and doing what will be appreciated.

A third goal is to increase our ability to place our actions within a global perspective. ECS's focus on specific geographic communities is important to simplifying and giving coherence to our otherwise broadly-defined undertaking. However, just as seeing the meaning of our school lives requires seeing our whole lives, seeing the meaning of change in Montague requires seeing beyond Montague today. It requires looking to the past and the future, to the nation and the world. It requires being attuned to other overlapping communities, e.g. communities of television watchers, of black people, of economic interests. Again I think of a life rhythm with periods of learning experientially, and periods of learning abstractly. ECS so far has given priority to the former. The classic philosophical function of the University and educators has been played down.

Finally, I want to underline how much we are our own experiment. The initiators of this year's program, and last year's and the year before's, were in a position to create almost any kind of Masters program in teaching they wanted, and to recruit or select students from among several hundred applicants. This year, as last year, the program will probably be greatly modified by participants as we go, and some people will stay on to be initiators of next year's program. We have before us a great range of possibilities, perhaps, if we choose, even that of giving different degrees, or no degrees, and to affiliate with other communities or universities, or, with none.

A final aspect of the Program legacy is the acquisition of a resource base outside the School of Education in the Falmouth, Massachusetts public schools. After a score of proposals and negotiations with potential funding sources I concluded an agreement that brought the Program to Falmouth for 1973-75 and perhaps beyond. Under the agreement Falmouth contributes half of the Coordinator's salary, salaries
for participants who intern in the school, and release time for Falmouth teachers who are in-service participants. These resources, the close association with the schools, and the two-year commitment have led the Program to take on still more coherence and stability.
AFTERWORD

REFLECTIONS ON DESIGNING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Designs

A program design can be thought of as an organization of people and resources into some process (often described as a curriculum) to promote some goals. Usually a program is identified by what it is supposed to do to participants. It may be a program to help people read, to make them physically fit, to make them good teachers of ecology. Usually the design specifies how resources are to be used - as in a programmed learning program, a master teacher led program; or how participants are to interact - as in a T group program. There is more to a design than the offering of resources. A program is more than a library, or a drop-in center, or a telephone network. It is more than a gathering of people.

I do not find a set of general categories for programs that is adequate to the task of surveying the varieties of program design. Instead, I will proceed by looking at the variation within each of the elements mentioned above: participants, resources, processes, and goals. In looking at each case, a key characteristic is of course the element's possible relationships with the other elements. For the sake of simplicity then, we are almost required to think of the elements as being designed in a sequence. Most accounts of the design process hold that there is a single logical sequence in design which begins with a choice of goals and then goes on to either participants, processes and resources, or processes, participants and
resources. This chapter will follow the first mentioned sequence. However, it is not absolutely necessary that either of these sequences be followed. One can begin with the decision to use a particular group of resources and make the rest of the elements fit in around that. For example, one can decide to use the faculty and facilities of a college that already happen to be available and after that determine how they can be combined into what process for whom with what purpose. One can begin by choosing participants and then later select or let the participants themselves select goals, processes and resources. As I indicated in Chapter II, this is approximately what happened in the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts during 1968-1969, the first year that Dwight Allen was the Dean.

Realistically, designs are not conceived in the abstract as pure conceptual exercises, but in response to given situations. In most situations, political and economic forces outside the designer's control will already have defined one or more of the program elements. Often the population to be served is defined, or the setting, or the budget. Often the availability of participants and/or resources is limited to a set time. The goals and processes of reaching them are usually present, but only vaguely defined, such as - improve teaching through workshops, improve health through checkups, relieve poverty through community action. Rarely is a discreet measurable goal specified - such as raise reading scores to the third grade level, lower the infant mortality rate to 5 per 1000, raise incomes above $4,000. Often a degree or certificate is specified. A degree may in a vague way
symbolize goals and processes, though it may simply represent time spent in a setting.

The program designer's task can be thought of then like an architect's. He is organizing a structure for which some of the specifications have already been determined. But he has leeway to consider a great variety of possibilities as he works toward a good total solution. He may approach the task sequentially; in the case of the architect this might be from the bottom up. But the sequential approach runs the danger of limiting his imagination. Many of the choices are apt to be determined by convention unless a deliberate effort is made to rethink the potential of each element. So he instead may play around with a myriad of possibilities at the same time, including possibilities that relate to different elements. The danger here is of course that he is not assured of coming upon a congruence between elements which provides sufficient identity for the structure.

We will proceed to play around within each of the elements: goals, participants, processes and resources without assuming any particular specifications.

Goals

Categories of Goals. From the start it is useful to distinguish between goals on the basis of how broadly they are conceived. The most narrowly conceived address only how the teachers who are the program participants will be changed. Most programs go beyond this to regard the changing of the teacher as a vehicle for effecting the teacher's students. This conception may be broadened further to include the
participant's impact on parents, fellow teachers, and others. A significantly broader kind of goal addresses not just the participants' direct impact on individuals, but their effect on institutions -- which may constitute a more enduring and larger scale impact on people. Goals of this kind include affecting a curriculum, a school, schools generally, teacher education, or the teaching profession. Goals on this level are often associated with specified strategies for change, such as integrating math and science courses, building trust among a school's staff, developing a new staffing model for schools, demonstrating a new format for teacher education, establishing a new academic standard for teachers. Beyond the goals related specifically to teaching lie the broader goals of affecting universities, communities, a society and mankind as a whole.

A good observer will be able to at the same time view a teacher education program in terms of its most narrow effect and its broadest effect, whether or not the designer has intended this. Designers must work with narrow goals in order to make decisions about how to treat participants. To explain why the specified changes in participants is desired requires making reference to a broader conception. Many designers regard the proper criteria for judging a teacher education program to be change in the performance of the students taught by the participants.¹ But it can be said that these changes in students need to be seen in the light of broader goals, ultimately in the light of goals for mankind.

Goals may also be distinguished on the basis of how quickly one expects to achieve them. We can think of a goal as being short-run if it describes an outcome that may be achieved by the end of the program. This is apt to be a narrow goal such as having participants be able to write behavioral objectives or diagnose dyslexia. The achieving of broader goals is more complex and apt to take longer.

Schools, professions, and societies are hard to change in the short-run. But sometimes broad goals may be attempted in the short-run, such as changing the ideology promoted by a school (by indoctrinating teachers), or changing the power structure of a community (by teaching teachers to organize students). A short-run goal is apt to be measurable. Program evaluation is usually conducted on the basis of short-run goals. A long-run goal may be a narrow goal, one that is limited to an effect on participants, such as making people capable of life-long self-renewal or giving people the toughness and dedication to survive as school teachers. It is hard to measure the impact of programs through long-run outcomes. Long-run outcomes are logistically hard to observe, and once they are observed, it is difficult to trace the part the program played in causing them.

In this chapter we will analyze the variety of short-run goals in teacher education by looking at the kinds of teacher competence a program may seek to effect. For our purposes, teacher competence can be divided into three areas—competence in relationship to knowledge, competence in relationship to people, and competence in relationship to a specialized teaching context (usually schools). These will be explored individually and then seen in combination.
Knowledge. Competence in relationship to knowledge can be distinguished from the other areas of competence if we think of knowledge as the content of teaching as opposed to the process. Later we will consider to what extent every process has its own content to convey. Competence in relationship to knowledge has been viewed as the only significant characteristic of a teacher by most people during most of history. This seems to be the predominant view in higher education today as expressed in the criteria by which college teachers are hired. This view is supported by the common sense approach to learning among adults. If you want to gain knowledge, whether intellectual knowledge or practical skills, the person who can help is someone who knows it well. And when you have learned something well you are ready to help others learn it. About the only people who take a different view are contemporary educationists and some psychologists. To find an antecedent to their concern with process, motivation, method, learning strategy and organizing learning environments one has to turn to religious training. Churches have usually emphasized that people need to have the right kind of guidance through the right process, rituals and rites in the right context and settings if they are to gain understanding.

A designer must distinguish between the varieties of knowledge in which a teacher can gain competence. Formal education defines knowledge primarily in terms of academic categories of subject matter, the liberal arts; math and the sciences, the social sciences, the arts and humanities, and the tools related to them. Most would
quickly acknowledge that what is taught under these subject titles in most schools is greatly diluted with busy work and should not be confused with genuine knowledge. One possibility for the designer is to seek to give teachers the knowledge to be able to teach academic disciplines with integrity. This goal was the impetus for the creation of the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree programs. As I indicated in the Introduction, the value of each of these liberal arts disciplines is that its methods have produced structures through which people have been able to find meaning in major areas of human experience.

By entering a discipline the accumulated observing and thinking of others becomes accessible. In addition it can be said that these disciplines taken together contain basic methods of observing and thinking and of taking one's bearings in time and space that one can use himself.

A designer should recognize that the body of knowledge contained in the liberal arts need not be categorized in the traditional manner. Many would consider competence in relationship to that knowledge to be the prime requisite for teaching, but see dangers in continuing to address it through study of separate disciplines. Questioning of the traditional approach stems largely from concern about the relationship between the acquisition of knowledge and its application, both in terms of efficiency and morality. Over the last 30 years this has been an increasingly urgent concern. Buckminster Fuller, speaking as one concerned with global efficiency, points out that

as a consequence of comprehensively undertaken specialization we have today a general lack of comprehensive thinking. The
specialist is therefore, in effect, a slave to the economic system in which he happens to function. The concept of inevitable specialization by the brightest has become approximately absolute in today's socio-economic reflexing. The fixation is false and is soon to be altered.  

We have a dramatic example of the folly of narrowly-conceived application of knowledge in the malaria eradication programs in Asia—-their outcome being a population increase which increased death by starvation and undermined efforts toward long-run economic solutions. Disease control in much of the world can only be regarded as net gain if it is part of a larger effort which includes population control and increases in food production. The knowledge which we need to be able to act wisely often spans more than any single discipline. It should be considered then whether knowledge can be most strategically gained through focus on a problem area such as poverty in India or race relations in America, or on a transdisciplinary area, such as the theory of systems or the theory of communication; or on interdisciplinary areas, such as ecology or psychohistory.

The occurrence of Nazism and the Second World War dramatized for many people basic questions about the relationship between knowledge and its moral use. The occurrence of Nazism in a country which was deeply associated with the intellectual and scientific achievements of western culture brought into question the general moral worth of our

knowledge. The willingness of men like Werner Von Braun and Albert Speer\(^3\) to lend the power of their scientific and technological knowledge to Hitler's purposes specifically brought attention to the need to wed knowledge to a responsible social vision. Since Hiroshima this has been a matter of great concern with reference to American atomic scientists. The destructive application of biological and psychological knowledge in biological warfare and brainwashing also aroused concern. More recently new knowledge in these fields has raised more subtle and ultimately perhaps more fundamental questions: including questions about psychosurgery, euthanasia, behavior control through media.

As C. P. Snow wrote in *Two Cultures*\(^4\) the danger of the scientist without a responsible social vision is matched by the danger of the irresponsible romantic who seeks to be innocent of the powers that are at our disposal. For example, the romantic wonderkind movement among young German intellectuals in the 1920's may have contributed as much to the tolerance of Nazism as the indifference of technocrats. Snow sees that people both in the sciences and humanities need to see their work in a context which gives it an ethical dimension. He goes on to make his main point that they need to be more in dialogue with each other. Snow sees arrogance in the polarization of sciences and humanities, a loss of the humbling perspective that can come through
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seeing one's discipline from the outside. One's knowledge is not pure, but relative and needs to be viewed with a measure of skepticism. One of the strongest illustrations of this is Thomas Kuhn's thesis that in every era the sciences proceed on assumptions that are largely unconscious and socially determined. The breakthroughs in science, he shows, can be associated with revolutions in social assumptions. A designer needs to consider the importance of a consciousness of the relativity of knowledge and also a sense of the relationship between different kinds of knowledge.

Finally it should be considered whether dialogue between "the two cultures" contained within the western intellectual tradition is sufficiently broad to provide a sound moral or practical perspective. There are several other cultural traditions that have served as forums for far-ranging human inquiry. After all, Barzun's case for the value of knowing our tradition may apply equally well to the Chinese knowing the Chinese intellectual tradition, or our knowing the Chinese intellectual tradition. At a minimum, it may be that the liberal arts taken as a whole can only be kept in perspective through considering knowledge gained from outside the western tradition.

This chapter has stressed the liberal arts because they are seen as giving meaning to experience, as yielding understanding, as equip-


ping one to be an effective learner. However, it should be emphasized that the achievement of these goals is not only a matter of effective manipulation of abstractions, but of thinking integrated with feeling and action. Facility with ideas and theory needs to be accompanied with personal involvement and direct experience. This need is foremost in the minds of therapists when they picture effective human functioning, and also in the minds of many thinkers in other cultures. It is rarely recognized by educators. Occasionally this is put into practice in schools. For example, Head Start guidelines define "reading readiness" in terms that include having a variety of direct experiences. But non-abstract dimensions of understanding generally have been taken for granted in formal education. They have been left up to the circumstances of home and work. Educators have been intent on providing vicarious experience and offering theoretical knowledge on the assumption that it is more valuable, or that it is less accessible elsewhere.

Today there is a powerful argument for changing this stance. James Coleman has written,

In the past, one of the child's roles, but only one, was that of student in a school setting directed toward his self-improvement. His task was to learn, and a teacher had authority to make him learn. This student role has always been a curious one because it has no goal directed toward the environment, only the goal of self-improvement.

The child also had other important roles involving productive activity: helping care for younger brothers and sisters; working at home, in the store, on the farm, at the shop; or merely surviving in a hostile environment. These were roles in which he was not a student but a young person with responsibilities affecting other people's welfare. And they were probably more important to his development than his student role.
These activities, however, have largely disappeared as the child's world has become information rich and action poor. The external environment can now take over many of the classical functions of the school, but there is nothing to take over the classical functions of the non-school environment.\(^7\)

A designer should consider then making teacher competence in non-abstract dimensions of understanding a goal for teacher education. We will give more specific attention to the choices available by considering the view of knowledge promoted by a number of recent movements growing out of the counter-culture. They may be regarded as relatively young and tentative reactions to the emphasis on the intellectual dimension of understanding and as such contain aspects of over-reaction.

The human potential movement seeks to promote emotional or affective growth (as distinct from cognitive growth). Our tradition leads us to try to keep our emotional lives private or within the bounds of our intimate relationships, except in the case of illness when we can turn to psycho-therapy. This movement extends the notion of using therapy to treat illness to using the therapists' techniques to promote increased health. It assumes that there are means to emotional growth that can be deliberately acquired. Increased health is described chiefly in the terms of the humanistic psychologists: becoming increasingly integrated and self-aware and increasingly open and non-dogmatic in our interaction with others. The movement for minority and women's studies is an approach to the liberal arts through a concern with identity or self-awareness. There are movements closely
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allied with the human potential movement to promote physical self-awareness and fruitful physical interaction with others. They include giving attention to the meaning of body functions and events: eating, defecation, breathing, copulation, movement, birth, illness, death. They include giving attention to cultural forms that give meaning to body experience: games, sport, Yoga, massage.

The movement toward manual crafts and skills has as its distinctive thrust a valuing of tangible accomplishments. The mechanic or potter or farmer, more than the academic or the bureaucrat, can see the consequences of his work and whether they are positive or negative. Often this movement can be associated with simplifying life, with disentangling from the complexity of abstract intellect and institutional relations. It may emphasize tools that support self-sufficiency. To focus on skills and crafts may be regarded as a choice of lifestyle with significance only for that individual. Or it may be regarded as a conscious political statement for the society as a whole.

On the one hand, these movements are usually represented as being idealistic, and I have brought them up as having something to contribute along with the liberal arts to the ideal of gaining understanding. On the other hand, they may be regarded as allied with a contrary view that it is not fruitful to be seeking understanding beyond what is necessary for survival in one's given situation. I am considering the eastern view that global transcendent understanding comes through knowing the tangible, personal, and necessary. I am also considering the more common cynical view that it is not good for
people to understand more than suits them for their economic and social roles. With the former view a teacher becomes a guru. With the latter view a teacher becomes a technician, who like his students, need not have a consciousness of the meaning of his work.

The designer's choice is not simply what kinds of knowledge are valuable, but to what extent he should seek to have a teacher be a specialist in one kind of knowledge, in affective education only, in one academic area only, in liberal arts only, or in one cultural tradition only. A teacher needs to have enough depth of knowledge so as to possess some genuine competence. At the same time in order to possess understanding and a perspective on any single area, he must have a breadth of knowledge. Which direction takes precedence is usually resolved through consideration of what learners a teacher expects to be communicating with. The more knowledgeable and older the learners, the greater depth of knowledge a teacher is thought to need. The younger the learners and the less they already know the more breadth of knowledge a teacher is thought to need. In practice this often degenerates into teachers of younger people simply having less knowledge.

Teacher/Learner Relations. The consideration of the relationship between the teacher and the learner brings us to a second area of teacher competence. Before discussing this area separately, the large area of overlap between it and knowledge competence should be acknowledged. This is the area of preparing curriculum, or preparing knowledge in a form that makes it accessible to the learners. Many who consider knowledge competence to be the primary characteristic of a teacher do see a need for this additional competence, at least with younger and less knowledgeable
students. An electrical engineer would be seen as needing some knowledge of the cognitive capacity of six year olds to be able to write a program or teach a lesson on magnetism that would succeed in first grade. At the same time, the person who knows Piaget's findings does not necessarily become ready to teach that lesson through a quick reading up on magnetism.

As we have said, the teacher's relationship to knowledge, rather than his relationship to learners, has usually been considered the basis of teaching. Learning usually has been seen as resulting from the teacher's manipulation of subject matter and not his manipulation of learners. Today some would hold that a teacher with human relations competence can help people learn anything whether the teacher has knowledge of what is to be learned or not. This can be explained in part by Coleman's observation that the teacher no longer needs to serve as a primary means of access to information. He can concentrate on helping people to work with available information or to learn how to learn. Another part of the explanation of the change of view is that until recently people were not very conscious of differences in how learners could be treated. Custom, not deliberate choice, has determined how teachers and learners interact, as much as it has how parents and children interact. There has been little sense of there being a value in the teacher adjusting his approach to meet the needs of learners. If the learner failed to learn, it was attributable to his being evil, dumb, and/or lazy. If anyone could do anything about it, it would be the learner himself. People have usually not been seen as unique individuals with differing needs, but instead have been typed by role or class. Through most of history there has been only a minimal
sense of differences between children and adults. A dramatic example is Da Vinci's portrayal of the fetus in utero as having the proportions of a full grown man.

A further point of view which most clearly separates teaching from knowing is to conceive of teaching as a drawing out of what the learner already possesses, in contrast to teaching being a putting in what the teacher possesses. Of course, we do learn from experience without the intention or control of a teacher or parent. We learn in utero. This view of experience makes the teacher's role of participating in learning a two way process. The student, as well as the teacher is considered to already be experienced and knowledgeable.

Competence in the human relations aspect of teaching ultimately means being able to act toward people in a way that helps them to learn. Many would see this ability as so entwined with one's total personality that a program could not hope to make someone competent who is not already "a born teacher". Many would see this competence as being an art resting heavily on intuition, and not a rational matter, drawing simply on a combination of skills and knowledge. Even with this view it is useful to the purpose of clarifying goals for teachers to analyze what definable skills and knowledge go into competence. Designers may consider these characteristics as possible goals for teacher education programs, though perhaps a program at best can only add a little to what participants already possess.

To act toward people in a way that helps them learn may be thought of as having three components. A first component is knowing how people function so one can recognize the larger dynamics of what is happening
to a learner and how he can be affected. This includes knowing general
personality patterns and patterns of human development. This is a ration-
ale for teachers to specialize in knowing one age group or another kind of
group: such as people with high I.Q.'s or with physical handicaps. A
second component is knowing the learning process, so one can recognize
when learning occurs and so one can think strategically of the part his
actions can play in it. As we will explain more fully in the Chapter
entitled "Process", knowing learning may be seen either as an exact
knowledge of a sequential process, or a more generalized knowledge of
interaction within a context. Finally, after being able to observe
knowledgeably a learner and his position in a process, there is the pay-
off component of being able to carry out an action that is appropriate.
This may require being able to arrange knowledge in an accessible form
as we discussed in the section on the overlapping competencies. It may
require the competence of a theatrical actor to dramatize what is to be
learned. It may require being free from having to defend oneself to be
free to act in others' interest. It may require being able to enter a
mutual relationship, so as to draw out, through sharing.

Contexts. In addition to having competencies in relationship to
knowledge and people, a teacher can be considered to need competence in
relationship to specialized learning contexts. In the usual case, the
context is a school, though given the broadest definition of teaching,
it may be seen as appropriate to give the same attention to a variety
of other contexts: homes, hospitals, churches, bars, communities. For
the purposes of this chapter we will be focusing on schools. To a large
extent, a context is a set of boundaries that determine what form know-
ledge can come in and what form learners can come in. In schools knowledge comes through the people, materials, and media that are available, and often through the structure of a set curriculum. Learners come by age and in groups, from within a geographical area. The context is also a physical setting and organizational setting that sets boundaries for the relationships between teacher, learner, and knowledge. A school setting includes forms like schedules, staffing plans, grades, graduation requirements, and school rules that channel and ritualize behavior.

Many who value one or both of the other areas of competence we have discussed would attach little importance to the deliberate pursuit of competence in relationship to schools. It can be said that if one really has knowledge and is competent in human relations he is a teacher and can proceed to teach effectively whatever the context. The specifics of the context are incidental to the basic activity of helping people to learn. It can be added that one has already in any case had sixteen or more years as a student in schools to gain an understanding of that context. Many would be suspicious then of the motives of those who put emphasis on this area of competence.

This goal began to get attention only with the development of mass public education. As James Koerner has shown, it was the pressure of a new profession - the educationist/administrator, and new institutions - the teachers' colleges and schools of education, that created the now common assumption that teachers need to study schooling. Koerner takes the cynical view that this requirement in certification laws was primarily
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instituted to protect the otherwise precarious position of this new establishment. As well as directly providing educationists with jobs, it can be a way of protecting current school practices from criticism. When people are required to go through this initiation into school, there is a chance to indoctrinate them into accepting the boundaries of existing forms and rituals which they otherwise might test. At worst, educationists preoccupied with "not rocking the boat" may emphasize this "competence" and reject people who have the other competencies as being potentially dangerous to them. Competence within the school context may enable people to function successfully in terms of an organization without being competent in relationship to knowledge or people.

If we put aside the definition of competence used by such employers, we can take a more positive view of the introduction of the study of the context of school. With the existence of a great number of relatively standardized classrooms and schools, it makes sense to organize specialized inquiry into how they work and how to use them well. This approach is obviously distinct from initiation in that it involves evaluation and questioning by would-be teachers, with an eye to what could be, as well as to what is. For example, it requires that one approach practice teaching not as a passive apprentice but as a learner who is testing, criticizing, and comparing the work of his cooperative teacher to others. It is not viewing a school through what it says about how it operates. It is investigating beyond that to expose myths, to understand school board politics, to understand what lies behind faculty gossip.

It is obviously useful to a teacher to know about materials and methods that bear directly on his classroom teaching. It is also worth
his knowing how a school as a whole works. At a minimum, this is useful
to surviving in schools, to avoiding being fired and to feeling somewhat
in control of one's fate. One is merely a victim until the myths and
rituals of the organization are demystified. Looking beyond the teacher's
well-being it can be seen that the same forces bear on students and shape
their responses. Part of the teacher's role then may be to influence
students' interpretation of the organization that surrounds them. This
is apt to be a particular problem to the beginning teacher who is often
himself just coming out of a student role.

The study of the context of school may be approached more broadly
than we have so far indicated. It may constitute an inquiry into the
foundations of education. It may mean asking the liberal arts disciplines
what they can tell us of what education has been, could be, and should be.
This breadth of inquiry is especially necessary to those concerned with
the broad goal of changing schools. Sound criteria for the evaluation
and reform of schools derive from being able to see schooling from the
perspective of sociology, history, philosophy, economics and other disci-
plines. This would be necessary for example, for discriminating among
the kinds of choices in knowledge and human relations goals we have
surveyed in this chapter.

So while we find the apologists for current schools stressing com-
petence in relationship to the specialized learning context, we also
find the most serious critics of schools turning to this study. To
take the most extreme case, Ivan Illich focuses on the study of school-
ing as preparation for abolishing formal schooling.9 Before we are

free to consider alternatives to schooling he believes we must understand historically and personally how schools came to monopolize our way of viewing education. As Marx studied capitalism to be able to purge society of its evils, the educational revolutionary must study schools. Illich, of course, does then go on to look at incidental learning contexts, both actual and potential, that could be more used if schools were cleared away.

**Conclusion.** The three narrow goals of competence in relationship to knowledge, teacher/learner relations, and learning contexts are not mutually exclusive. They overlap. Usually a designer addresses all three of them, just as State teacher certification requirements address all three. There is great variation in how fully a designer develops and applies competency goals. Some construct an explicit model of teacher competence; others may only have in mind some general directions. Some would plan for students to reach specified minimum standards of competence and others for them to advance along a specified continuum. Others might have in mind different models or directions for different learners.

We have discussed the choice of goals primarily in terms of competencies because this is a convenient way to survey the scope of design possibilities. But to only consider what a designer wants a teacher to be able to do is a dangerously narrow approach. It tends to assume for program participants too passive a role. They are viewed as being technicians who, like soldiers of fortune, can be plugged into any institution or system - either the establishment of Illich's learning web or whatever else. The designer is in the same position as the architect Speer if he in this manner separates knowledge from its application.
In addition to effecting what a person can do, a designer must come to grips with what a person will do. This is usually given some consideration. Competency goals are often combined with broader goals that address how the competency will be used, with what effect on others. This may point toward, at one extreme, indoctrinating participants to use their competence in a certain way. Or it may point toward accepting or encouraging participants to have goals of their own. Designers usually overlook the possibility that participants could be encouraged to decide what competencies they wish to acquire. However, even with this view, the considerations of goal choices remain significant. Every designer must take responsibility for influencing participants' goals, even if he is not seeking to control them. With this approach, unusually great importance is given to what participants bring with them to a program. This brings us to the subject of the next section, the choice of participants.

Participants

However powerful are a program's resources and processes, its achievable goals can be thought of as only an adding to or modification of what participants come in with. Even sufficient brainwashing programs fail to get standard results from all participants. Many more typical programs upon evaluation appear to do no more than call attention to or legitimize what participants already possess. So a designer must consider goals, processes, and resources in relationship to the characteristics of incoming participants. Often goals are set and participants are chosen on the basis of their need for, or ability to reach the goals. In other cases resources and processes are determined
and participants are chosen on the basis of their ability to use them well.

As we indicated before, it is possible to instead identify participants before the processes, resources, and even goals are set. Participants can be chosen as being especially worth investing in by reason of their great ability, their great need, or their capacity to educate each other. The other elements can be chosen on the basis of their appropriateness to these participants. Or the choosing may be done by the participants instead of a designer. In that case a designer's impact is wholly in the bringing together of participants - in the design of the admissions process and the context set during it. This approach risks the possibility of ending up without a program, should participants not find common goals, or for other reasons decide not to work together.

Special consideration should be given to the potential for participants to serve as the resources for a program. This is obviously desirable from the standpoint of economy, but is usually dismissed as being too likely to result merely in a sharing of ignorance. In many minds having a program requires having a hierarchical relationship between an expert staff with its authoritative curriculum and the less expert participants. Many who hold this view would accept that people with great knowledge can learn from each other as colleagues, as was the case in the early academies. Experts are not thought to need programs to guide their sharing of knowledge. But people with less knowledge are.
However, if we accept that human relations and contexts as well as knowledge affects learning, it becomes much harder to generalize about who can best learn from whom and how. People may often learn better from people with less knowledge. For example, it is common for college students to learn more from their peers than from more knowledgeable faculty members. Competence in teaching and learning may be widely distributed. With this in mind the designer of teacher education programs should consider the unique opportunity presented by having participants whose common purpose is becoming effective at helping people to learn. Learning from and teaching each other with a consciousness of the learning process may be a key to effective teacher education.

It remains to be defined what people should be considered for participation in teacher education programs. By definition participants will be people who are teachers or are considering becoming teachers. Usually this will mean people who are thinking of employment in schools. I have been using a broader definition of teacher which would include anyone who is seeking to be competent and consistent at helping people to learn, whatever the setting. This most obviously includes anyone in a human service role. A designer may consider just people who are already thinking of teaching, or he may, by using some other criteria, select people whom he will seek to interest in teaching.

A designer may seek to distinguish among those who express an interest in teaching according to their motivation. He may seek to determine how much they are oriented to serving others' needs versus meeting some needs of their own. He may seek to determine how much it is the teacher's job rather than authentic teaching itself which is of interest. A designer may seek to distinguish among people according to their competence in
the areas we have discussed. A designer can choose to work with those who are already most competent, or those who most need to add to their competence, or those who are competent in one area and not in another. Most designers consider some combination of motivation and current competence.

A designer may seek to distinguish among people according to their effectiveness as vehicles for carrying out broader goals. The designer may choose to work with in-service teachers or others for whom job placements can be prearranged to insure that participants will actually end up working in schools. He may consider a person's interest in and point of view toward specific broader goals. For example, does he care about teachers' gaining a larger say in school policy? Does he favor a permissive approach to child rearing? He may consider a person's potential to be a leader in the arena of broader goals. Broader goals may also determine some more general characteristics for participants. For example, a designer may choose to help redress the racial and sexual imbalance among teachers in an area by having participants be black men.

A designer may seek to distinguish people's capacity to contribute to each other. He may seek to balance the competencies of some with the learning needs of others, the predisposition to lead with the predisposition to follow. He may seek diversity, juxtaposing different ages, goals, backgrounds, and points of view to stimulate new thinking. He may seek to limit diversity so as to make it easier to find a common basis for building a group.

Given the designer's intentions in regard to the choice of participants it is necessary to consider the process by which participants will
actually be brought into the program. The next chapter, "Processes", will consider the entrance process as a beginning and all important part of the program's process for those who do enter the program. It needs to be considered here how the process affects the choice of participants. The way in which information is sought out or conveyed, as well as the substance of the information, affects who becomes participants. Intended and unintended messages are conveyed by the process. Therefore as a designer considers what evidence he will take of participant characteristics he at the same time needs to consider how participants feel about his gathering the evidence. For example, seeking confidential references may make some participants feel not trusted and therefore suspicious of the program.

Finally we should take note of some obvious tangible determinants of who will participate. The pool of people who can participate will be limited to the audience that hears about the program. It will be limited to people who can meet any program pre-requisites. It will be limited to those who can afford the cost of the program in terms of time and money. It will be limited to those who judge it worth the cost, in terms of the experience it offers, but also in terms of any degrees, certificates, or other credentialing it offers.

We now turn to the processes that the participants are to enter.

10. One should also consider what meaning the process has for people who do not enter the program.
Processes

The design of program processes is generally recognized as being the essence of the design job. Often it is seen as the entire job, the determination of goals, participants and resources being made before the job begins. For the sake of simplicity we will assume such a situation for this discussion. The designer then can view the design of processes as being deciding how to organize or manipulate participants and resources so as to reach the goals. In the typical university program this will mean designing the formal curriculum: courses, practice teaching, and any other field work and independent study. In some cases this will include giving attention to some administrative functions as well; most typically---admissions, advising, evaluation, placement. It is quite possible, however, for a designer to take a significantly broader view of program impact and deal with many other avenues through which a program affects participants. For example, he may consider how a program affects living conditions, how a program affects who participants have contact with outside the program, and how a program affects the physical habits of participants. Some would call these indirect effects of the program "the informal curriculum". As we pointed out in the discussion of the admissions process, these effects, whether they are intended or not, may be at least as significant as the formal curriculum.

In order to have the broadest view of program processes we will consider the processes to be what happens to participants and resources over time. The critical aspect of process is the change that takes
place in participants, or in educational terms, the learning that occurs. It is useful then to look at the choices of process in terms of a designer's assumptions about learning. We will use as our umbrella definition of learning a change in behavior which leaves open the likelihood of further change. It is necessary to distinguish changes that promote learning from changes that lead toward the dead ends of madness. The dead ends can be thought of as being two poles: a catatonic state where the stimulation one receives is greatly reduced, or a frenzy where one is indiscriminately open to stimulation without being able to integrate it. 

Within the umbrella definition we will consider two contrasting views of learning and the choices of process that eminate from them. First we will consider a Skinnerian view and then a wholistic view. Skinner’s well known S-R mode has as its essence three steps:

1. Stimulus - a phenomenon is encountered.
2. Response - the learner reacts.
3. Stimulus - after the learner reacts, he receives another stimulus which influences whether he reacts that way again.

Following this model a teacher will choose stimuli so as to shape response in a given direction. As an initial stimulus he may pose a question or a problem to be solved or a model to be imitated. Then he channels the learner's response into an observable form. Then he selects a second stimulus which will reinforce or extinguish the response. This stimulus may be giving a correct answer, repeating the model, or commenting on the relationship between the learner's response and the desired response. If the teacher wishes to condition the learner or
change him in a lasting way, he will usually need to repeat the three steps many times using a variety of forms.

This is the approach that is presupposed by the word program as it is used in programmed instruction or computer programming. This view of the learning process can be extended in a general way to provide a framework for the design of teacher education programs. It leads one to view a program linearly. Participants are input. The program's goals are output. The narrow goals of participant competence are divided into specific measurable goals (behavioral objectives). The processes are the means of acquiring each behavior. An example of this programmed approach is the University of Massachusetts Model Elementary Teacher Education Program (METEP), one of many so-called "competency-based" programs funded under the Educational Professions Development Act. This program divides teaching into a series of skills. They include, for example, introducing a lesson, expressing empathy, and eliciting third order questions. Each skill is measured by a set of performance criteria. A student may choose from a variety of processes as means for acquiring each skill. The choice includes programmed learning modes and also more typical uses of readings, films, discussions, and practice teaching.

Many programs including METEP use processes that are direct expressions of the programmed approach. Two that are particularly worth

attention are microteaching\textsuperscript{12} and interaction analysis.\textsuperscript{13} These processes monitor behavior in relation to observable goals and feedback observations to the learner. Microteaching is a simplified teaching context: a teacher meeting with three to five students for five to fifteen minutes. The interaction is video-taped and then viewed and evaluated by the teacher with a critic teacher. The programmed approach would use microteaching for practicing or demonstrating a specific teaching skill. The learner may practice the same skill over again until he achieves adequate results. Interaction analysis refers to an observer's categorizing behavior through use of some standard rating sheet. It is most often used in a classroom or a microteaching setting to determine to what extent a class is teacher centered or how wide class participation is.

The value of the programmed approach is that it provides people with an objective picture of changes in their behavior and of the effects of their behavior. This dispels the learner's illusions about himself; it tells him specifically that he has accomplished something or that he has yet to learn something. Many see this approach as the key to improving teacher education. It is seen as scientifically putting the focus on learning and exposing the traditions and rituals in teacher education that do not promote learning. For example, it challenges a program that apprentices pre-service teachers to master teachers to identify criteria by which the teachers' masterfulness can be validated and by which their effect on students can be validated. It brings into question any processes which give the designer less control, where outcomes are less visible,

\textsuperscript{12} See Dwight Allen and Kevin Ryan, Microteaching, (Reading, Pa.: Addison-Wesley, 1969).

\textsuperscript{13} See, for example, James Reed Campbell and Cyrus W. Barnes, "Interaction Analysis---A Breakthrough?" Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1969.
where the designer is less able to predict or evaluate the effect of what he does.

To respond to this challenge it is necessary to go back to consider the limitations of the S-R Model of learning. Many would hold that Skinner oversimplifies the nature of learning. The part of learning that can be called growth in understanding, as opposed to acquisition of skills and techniques, is not easily treated as an individual event or as a series of individual events. It is not easily seen as totally emanating from external stimuli.

The specific limits of the programmed view can be highlighted by looking at some of the weaknesses of the METEP program. Problems occur when it comes time to choose processes for teaching the more complex of their objectives. Attainment of the skill of diagnosing was identified as a particularly difficult area by the chief designer of the program, James Cooper. Diagnosing means knowing when to apply which other skill. In the METEP curriculum this requires seeing the skills that have been learned in isolation and out of context in relationship to each other and in a real teaching situation. Having simplified the teaching act by addressing it piece by piece, it brings one suddenly without any preparation to the task of understanding the sum. A different kind of problem is raised in designing processes for promoting the skill of expressing empathy. A designer cannot ultimately make a person feel empathy. Empathy is internal. If a person is feeling empathy, it may be useful for a designer to call attention to the value of expressing it and suggest means of doing so. If one does not feel it, the learning to show it becomes a sham. This in any case would seem to be true if
empathy is treated as merely a skill to be acquired and measured.

METEP's processes for acquiring the ability to elicit third order questions brings to light a profound problem. A third order question is a question about the meaning or value of something (second order questions are about cause and effect connections, first order questions are about what exists). To ask a third order question one must be able to step back from any specific context to evaluate it in terms of a larger and independent frame of reference. It requires taking a conscious responsibility for one's own experience. This may be no problem as long as it is just the children taught by METEP students who are to ask the questions. But if students in the METEP curriculum are expected to be able to ask third order questions, they would seem to be as ill-prepared to do this as they are to diagnose. They have been required to accept external prescriptions for teaching and external evaluations of their own work. They have experienced teaching primarily in contrived and narrow contexts. They have been led as far as possible from taking responsibility for their own learning.

Beyond the S-R model is a wholistic view of learning. Learning can be seen as interaction with an environment, or in gestalt terms, interaction with a field. It need not be seen as a series of discreet events. Stimulation need not be seen as having an external origin. Learning can be seen as having affective and spiritual aspects as well as a cognitive aspect. We have considered this to be the nature of learning in the liberal arts, in the learning of ideas and in the growth of understanding. However, the wholistic approach may also be a useful way of looking at the acquisition of skills. Even the performance of physical skills is
subject to a wide range of influence. For example, the best way to become better at shooting a basketball into a basket may be instruction by a Zen master, meditation, or love. Effective performance involves more than observable and conscious factors. Perfection is not simply a matter of practicing the skill. Great athletes whose life's work is performance in basketball are unable to shoot consistently as accurately as an average college player during a hot streak on a good day.

The variety of processes that emanate from a wholistic view are less simplistic and more complex to describe than the programmed processes. We can continue to categorize influences on learning as stimuli and as reinforcing and extinguishing forces. However, we will recognize that these influences are often internal and not observable. A memory may be a stimulus. A moment of reflection may act to reinforce or extinguish. And one's own goals may overshadow any external designs. The designer with a wholistic approach then will give added attention to the admission processes. The processes that follow will be determined as much by what the participants bring to the program as what the designer plans. As we have indicated the participants' influence on each other can be very significant. Peer group norms are the most powerful mechanism of reinforcement in many programs.

The designer with a wholistic approach will not be manipulating discreet stimuli and reinforcement. Instead he will address external factors by shaping a context which participants can respond to in a number of ways. The context stimulates and reinforces in a general way by increasing the accessibility of some resources and processes and making others more remote. It also directly or indirectly models ways
of behaving, influencing what processes are used and how. Most programs
go beyond this and simply state requirements for how much time partici-
pants give to various activities. However, for the sake of seeing the
range of processes, it is worth picturing the kind of unstructured pro-
gram which most contrasts with the programmed approach.

The general processes under consideration for a given university-
based program may include participants' interaction with a faculty, with
a body of literature, with each other, and as practice teachers in sec-
secondary schools. If the context is one where faculty have lots of free
time, are easy to find, and make themselves approachable participants,
will be influenced to interact with faculty. If the context isolates
participants from faculty, from libraries and other resources, and limits
practice teaching opportunities, participants will be influenced to inter-
act with each other. The program offers models of how the context is to
be used. The individual faculty members, master teachers, and super-
visors of practice teaching will express an approach to teaching and
learning. Participants will have a tendency to teach themselves and
others the way they are being taught. The program as a whole expresses
an approach to human and institutional relations. The staff, the setting,
and the processes of admission, evaluation, and of general decision
making convey a model of how to behave. For example, it may promote
a competitive model or a supportive model, a highly academic model or
an anti-intellectual model. A designer is apt to be most conscious of
expressing a model during the admissions process as he states his ex-
pectations for the program. If a designer is not deliberately offering
a model, the already existing models contained in the setting and among
the participants will take effect. A designer can choose to emphasize a single coherent and consistent model for the sake of having maximum control. Or he may deliberately cultivate a variety of models in order to establish ferment and dissonance. A designer may wish to focus on the question of what can be added to what participants have already done or would be doing anyway. He may choose to support the deepening and integration of what is already possessed or to introduce new broadening stimulation.

It remains to be considered how a designer decides which process to choose. A designer using a wholistic approach does not have a behavioral model of a standardized output. If he did have a model person, he might proceed by studying how the person got to be that way and try to recreate those processes. But there is also no standardized input. And the process is not intended to be standardized. Therefore there is no way to get the kind of exact validation of what works that is possible when one can hold all the variables but one constant.

Resources

Resources in education usually can be translated into time. Money is usually used to acquire people's time or an article in which human time has been invested. Resources for a teacher education program include people, means to people (books, media), and facilities and settings. Often designers see the resources and participants as defining the real limits of a program. The designer's goals and conception of the learning process are seen as determining only what can be done within those limits. Being resource-rich may for a designer mean having the authority to choose
resources rather than being committed to using existing ones. It may also be viewed in terms of the per student cost of a program.

The people resources of a program include participants and staff. They may be chosen for their competence as teachers for each other, using the kinds of competence we discussed under goals. When we think of people as resources, we probably first think of people with knowledge competence. People with human relations competence can most easily be thought of as functioning in an advising or support group role. People with competence in institutional relations are resourceful at getting additional resources. People who are staff may be associated with all of these functions. The distinctive function of the staff is to take special responsibility for the organization and leadership of a program. Usually the staff (I include the designer) initiates the program and continues with it after any group of participants leave. They typically play the major role in evaluating the program and participants and in general decision-making. The staff can be truly regarded as a resource if participants are better off for having the staff perform these functions. The staff may be a resource either by reason of being especially competent people or simply by being willing to take over functions that participants would otherwise have to perform for themselves. The danger here is of underestimating the participants' competence and the value of their performing most of the program functions.

Vicarious and abstract experiences with people are accessible through printed matter, television, radio, film, tape, records and other media. The knowledge of the most knowledgeable people is chiefly available through books. Buckminster Fuller, George Leonard and others have predicted that
the most knowledgeable people and the best teachers will become generally available to learners through television, whenever possible in live, two way, connections. 14

The setting and facilities of a program may be conceived narrowly as being those that are fully identified with or contained within the program. They may extend to a larger institution or community some of whose resource are used by the program. Traditionally a university setting is designed to enable people to retreat from the demands of relationships with the larger society. However, a designer can take the view that the setting is the whole society. A designer can see his job as choosing which of the world's interactions he should emphasize.

If a designer no longer pictures the program as self-contained, then the boundaries are almost unlimited. Everything that participants have time to experience can become part of the program. The becoming part of continues, of course, to require that there be a center or common point in the program.
