



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Case study of the strategies of planned change used in the implementation of the ANISA Model of Education in the Suffield, Connecticut public schools.

Item Type	Dissertation (Open Access)
Authors	Lincoln, Richard Thomas
DOI	10.7275/11191700
Download date	2025-07-03 23:19:06
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/13640

CASE STUDY OF THE STRATEGIES OF PLANNED CHANGE
USED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANISA MODEL OF EDUCATION
IN THE SUFFIELD, CONNECTICUT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Dissertation Presented

By

RICHARD THOMAS LINCOLN

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1978

EDUCATION

CASE STUDY OF THE STRATEGIES OF PLANNED CHANGE
USED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANISA MODEL OF EDUCATION
IN THE SUFFIELD, CONNECTICUT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Dissertation Presented

By

RICHARD THOMAS LINCOLN

Approved as to style and content by:

Kenneth H. Blanchard

Kenneth H. Blanchard, Chairperson of Committee

Frederic E. Finch

Frederic E. Finch, Member

Donald T. Streets

Donald T. Streets, Member

Drace J. Erving for

Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

This work is dedicated with gratitude and love
to my friend, Henry Paar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks go out to many:

to my mother and father who, by example, taught me intellectual curiosity and the pursuit of knowledge. And to my mother, again, for her typing of many drafts of the various chapters,

to my children who gave up time with me on weekends and vacations while I wrote,

to my support group - Leila Zeller, Mary Bain, Peg St. German, Len and Judy Borsari, Shiela Malloy, Mary Bohn, Sylvia Carter, Nancy Perry, Barbara Miller, Liz Mavis - who kept cheering me on,

to the members of my dissertation committee - Fred Finch, Ken Blanchard, and Don Steets - who provided the confidence and support I needed to "get through",

to my colleagues - Eileen Oleksak, Irene Hartley, and George Bondra - who read the several drafts and provided valuable help,

to Malcolm Evans without whose support ANISA, Suffield would not have been possible,

to Vesta Glowacki whose courageous leadership in our early childhood program helped show me the way, and

last, but not least, to Lillian Kuchachik who worked so long in typing and re-typing the various drafts of the dissertation; only the typist and I really know what hard work this

all is.

And to all who have helped me through the years - and they are many - I say thank you, too.

ABSTRACT

CASE STUDY OF THE STRATEGIES OF PLANNED CHANGE
USED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANISA MODEL OF EDUCATION
IN THE SUFFIELD, CONNECTICUT, PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SEPTEMBER 1978

Richard T. Lincoln, B.S., University of Massachusetts
M.Ed., Springfield College
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Kenneth H. Blanchard

This dissertation is a case study of the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education in the Suffield, Connecticut public schools. Havelock's (1973) six stage model of planned change is used as a framework for describing the process of problem solving and innovation which occurred prior to and during this implementation.

Anisa is an exciting new model of education which has only been developed within the last fourteen years. Its authors, Dr. Daniel C. Jordan and his associate Dr. Donald T. Streets, are on the faculty of the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts. ANISA has appeal to many educators because it is a comprehensive educational model which includes a theory of development, a theory of curriculum, a theory of pedagogy, a theory of administration, and a theory of evaluation - all based on a philosophy of Man. Because the model rests on the universal processes of growth

and development, it has cross-cultural applicability and addresses directly the problem of how to achieve equal educational opportunity.

Suffield, a small rural-residential town in north central Connecticut, is one of two public school systems in the United States to have implemented the Anisa Model. In Suffield, the implementation process began in 1973 in two independent nursery schools and the public kindergarten. The implementation was funded under a three-year Title III federal/state grant in the amount of \$205,000. The time period covered by this case study is from September 1973 to June 1976.

The purpose of the case study is to provide an historical record of the process of planned change used during the implementation of the Anisa Model in Suffield. Such documentation makes it possible for others contemplating adopting the Anisa Model to know and understand the procedures and strategies used during the implementation. The case study will also have value to social scientists as they study the process of planned change. This case study is the actual accounting of the processes of planned change used to implement an innovation in a public school.

The dissertation is divided into six chapters.

Chapter I is an introduction to the case study.

Chapter II is a selective review of the relevant literature. This chapter includes a brief overview of planned

organization change, often referred to as organization development (OD), followed by a discussion of organization development within schools. Next, various models and theories of organization development are presented followed by the definition of OD and stages of planned change used throughout the case study. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the work of Nancy Rambusch, the only other researcher who has written about implementation of the Anisa Model.

Chapter III presents a detailed description of the methodology and procedures used in researching, reporting, and analyzing the case study. The chapter begins with a rationale for the use of the case study as an appropriate research method followed by a discussion of the perspective and format of the case study. The chapter concludes with a short history of the town of Suffield and its school system followed by a description of the Title III Anisa Project.

In Chapter IV, Havelock's (1973) first four stages of planned change are used as a framework for describing the problem solving process which occurred prior to the implementation. These stages are: Stage I, Relationship; Stage II, Diagnosis; Stage III, Acquiring Relevant Resources; Stage IV, Choosing the Solution.

Chapter V describes the last two stages of the Anisa change effort: Stage V, Gaining Acceptance; and Stage VI, Stabilization and Self Renewal.

In Chapter VI, the successes and failures of the strategies of planned change are assessed. Recommendations based upon this analysis are then made to the change team in Suffield who is attempting to extend the Anisa Model into third grade and beyond, to Suffield's Early Childhood Program, and to other educators who may be contemplating the implementation of the Anisa Model in their school districts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE	i
APPROVAL	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
Chapter	
I. RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE DISSERTATION	1
Introduction	
Rationale for the Study	
The Purpose of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Methodology	
Significance of the Study	
Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation	
II. SELECTIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Planned Organization Development	
Theories and Models of Change	
Other Research on Implementation of the Anisa Model	
III. METHADODOLOGY	35
Introduction	
The Case Study Method	
Perspective	
Format	
Research Site	
The ANISA Project	
Analysis of the Case Study	

Chapter	Page
IV. PREPARING FOR CHANGE	55
Stage I: Relationship	
Stage II: Diagnosis	
Stage III: Acquiring Relevant Resources	
Stage IV: Choosing the Solution	
V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANISA MODEL IN SUFFIELD	111
Stage V: Gaining Acceptance	
Year I (1973-1974)	
Year II (1974-1975)	
Year III (1975-1976)	
Stage VI: Stabilization and Self Renewal	
VI. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	204
Introduction	
Analysis	
Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	238
APPENDIX	
Appendix A:	
Appendix B:	

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
4.1 Relative Position of Members of the Change Team on a Scale of 1-10 from Outside to Inside at the Beginning of the Change Effort	69
4.2 Analysis/Summary, Reaction Sheet Responses, Jordan Presentation - Afternoon of November 28, 1972, on a Scale from -3 to 3	106
5.1 Number and Percent using a Seven Point Likert Scale of Staff Responding to the Pre-Service Education Questionnaire, Summer 1973	124
5.2 Number and Percent of Staff Responding to the In-Service Education Questionnaire for 1973-1974, Based on a Seven Point Likert Scale	129

C H A P T E R 1

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE DISSERTATION

Introduction

This dissertation is a case study of the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education in the Suffield, Connecticut public schools. Havelock's (1973) six-stage model of planned change is used as a framework for describing the process of problem solving and innovation which occurred prior to and during this implementation. ANISA is a new comprehensive educational model. Suffield is one of two school districts in the United States where this model has been implemented. It is probable that other school districts will consider adopting the Anisa Model of Education in the near future. This case study will be helpful to their administrators as they contemplate that decision.

All too often the decision to implement an innovation within a school district, or within any organization for that matter, is made at a high administrative level and passed down with little thought given to the processes of planned change needed to successfully install the innovation. At this point in time there is significant evidence within the field of organizational psychology and organizational development to indicate that such an approach is folly. Imperfect as it is, a "science" of planned organizational change has evolved during the past 50 years, and with increasing

rapidity, within the last 10 to 15.

With increasing precision the agents of change within organizations are able to predict and control the direction and speed of change by manipulating the structural, technological and person/process elements that make up those organizations. This case study is an illustration of a small Connecticut school system's attempt to remain contemporary through planned organization development.

The remainder of this chapter will describe the rationale and purpose for the case study. Following this certain terms pertinent to the study will be defined and methods and procedures used in the study will be discussed briefly. The significance of the study and limitations will then be described. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the manner in which the remainder of the dissertation will be organized.

Rationale for the Study

ANISA is a new educational model. It has only been developed within the last fourteen years and fielded within the last five. Its authors, Dr. Daniel C. Jordan, and his associate, Dr. Donald T. Streets, are on the faculty at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. With the assistance of federal and state funds, implementation of the Anisa Model began in 1973 at two public school sites; Hampden, Maine, and Suffield, Connecticut. Two small pilot projects were also

started in Headstart centers; Fall River, Massachusetts, and Kansas City, Missouri. Implementation of the model in these various sites represents the first effort to apply Anisa theory in practice. In Suffield, the implementation process began (1973-1974) in two independent nursery schools and the public school kindergarten. The second year of implementation (1974-75) included grades one and two as well. The third year (1975-1976) was one of consolidation of the gains made during the change process and preparation for the evolution of ANISA into grades three, four, five and beyond.

The Anisa Model of Education should appeal to many educators because it includes a theory of development, a theory of curriculum, a theory of pedagogy, a theory of administration, and a theory of evaluation - all based on a philosophy of Man. Because the model rests on the universal processes of growth and development, it has cross-cultural applicability and addresses directly the problem of how to achieve equal educational opportunity.

Since the model is new to education generally, and only recently fielded, there is a limited Anisa "literature". In most instances where a school administrator is contemplating the implementation of an innovation, they can go to the literature and find out how others have coped with the innovation, either its content or its process. While there is much in

writing concerning the content of ANISA there is nothing in the literature concerning the process of implementing the model. The exception to this statement is the work of Nancy Rambusch which will be commented on in the second chapter, review of the literature.

This case study will make it possible for any administrator contemplating implementing the innovation to see how one school district has approached the problem. Because the case study uses the generic six-stage model of change described by Havelock (1973) the steps involved are clear to anyone. While the situation from one school district to another will vary in size and particulars, those school administrators reading this case study will find much in common.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study is to provide an historical record of the process of planned change used during the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education in Suffield. This documentation will make it possible for others to know and understand the procedures and strategies which were used. Through analysis in Chapter VI the reader will understand the successes and failures of the procedures and strategies employed. The study will address the specific questions:

1. What strategies of planned change were employed during the implementation?
2. What has been the role of leadership?

3. What are the successes and failures of these strategies of planned change?
4. What suggestions can be made to others as they implement this new model of education in their school districts?

Definition of Terms

To provide for clarity and ease in reading this case study the following definition of terms, as used in this study, is provided.

Anisa Model of Education

The word ANISA refers to an ancient symbol meaning "tree of life." It represents the concept of continuous growth and fruition in the context of shelter and protection. This dynamic image reflects the philosophical assumptions about the Nature of Man which undergirds this unique educational model. Man is believed to be an organism at the apex of creation, who is endowed with an infinitude of potentialities and that creativity--the capacity to translate potentiality into actuality--defines man's essential reality. The central purpose of education is to facilitate the fullest development of the potentialities of each individual.

The term ANISA refers to the Anisa Model of Education. Further definition of the Model can be found in Appendix A.

Strategy

Strategy is defined here as "a means of causing an advocated innovation to become successfully (i.e., durably) installed in an on-going educational system" (Miles, 1964, p. 18). There is a large array of strategies which may be used in any change process. Selecting the appropriate strategies to be used to implement the innovation is largely defined by an analysis of the system(s) by the change agent(s) prior to and during the change process.

Planned Change

Planned Change is used interchangeably with the words - planned innovation. It is essentially a "change or innovation which comes about through a deliberate process which is intended to make both acceptance by and benefit to the people who are changed more likely" (Havelock, 1973, p. 5)." An innovation can be thought of as any change which represents something new to the people being changed.

Stages

Most change agents organize their work and their thinking around innovations in terms of specific projects in which they are involved; projects which have a defined beginning and end, and a sequential history. This sequence is often broken down into "stages". The descriptive history of the implementation found in Chapter IV and V and the analysis

of the case study found in Chapter VI will incorporate the six stages of change described by Havelock (1973).

Methodology

A brief description of the methods and procedures used in the case study is included here. A more detailed examination of the methodology will be found in Chapter III. The method for describing, analyzing, and evaluating this case study will involve the following:

1. A description of the process of problem solving and innovating used to implement the Anisa Model. Havelock's six-stage model of change described in The Change Agent's Guide to Innovations in Education will be used as a framework (1973).
2. A detailed accounting of the strategies of planned change used to move towards acceptance and adoption of the Anisa Model by the widest possible number of staff within the Suffield Public Schools.
3. An analysis of the implementation in order to assess the successes and failures of the strategies of planned change employed.
4. Personal comments based upon participatory observation and perusal of records, resources, and materials prepared for the implementation.

5. Research into the literature on change.
6. Discussions with key administrators and primary teaching staff.

Significance of the Study

This case study will have value to social scientists as they study the process of planned change, to educators contemplating implementation of the Anisa Model, and to administrators of the public schools as they contemplate the future of ANISA in Suffield.

This study is the actual accounting of the processes of planned change used to implement an innovation in a public school. Such case studies are helpful in the development of that body of knowledge deemed critical to the successful implementation of innovations in general. Chin and Benne write:

As attempts are made to introduce these new thing technologies into school situations, the change problem shifts to the human problems of dealing with resistance, anxieties, threats to morale, conflicts, disrupted interpersonal communications, and so on, which prospective changes in patterns of practice evoke in the people affected by the change. So the change agent, even though focally and initially concerned with modifications in the thing technology of education, finds himself in

need of more adequate knowledge of human behavior, individual and social, and in need of developed people technologies, based on behavioral knowledge, for dealing effectively with the human aspects of deliberate change (1969, p. 33).

It has been the slow gradual process of recording "people" data in case studies such as this which permitted Havelock and his associates to review over 1,000 studies of innovation and knowledge utilization in education and other fields while preparing the text for The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. This case study will, in a similar way, provide data to future researchers.

Since ANISA had not been implemented prior to 1973, there is no literature available on the process of planned change used by others as they have implemented this model. This study will be helpful in setting out whatever change problems there may be that are unique to this new educational model. At first glance it would seem that implementing an innovation as broad and far reaching as ANISA would be fraught with complications. Teachers are not simply asked to try out a new system of handwriting, rather they are asked to develop a whole new sense of the reality of Man and cope with a new conceptualization of curricula and teaching. The administration is asked to reorganize itself based upon a new purpose as determined by Anisa principles. The suspicion is that the problems associated with such a broad sweeping innovation

are numerous. Analysis of the planned process of change will be helpful in deciphering the facts and should help future change agents as they strategize implementation of the Anisa Model in their local districts should they decide to proceed with the ANISA innovation.

This case study will also be valuable to the administration and staff of the Suffield Public Schools and the resource team at the University of Massachusetts as they contemplate the future of ANISA in Suffield. It will provide the feedback necessary for successfully capping-off the implementation at the Early Childhood level and provide strong footing for the further evolution of the model throughout the school system.

Delimitations

This study does not deal with the question of adequacy of ANISA except peripherally as it affects or complicates the strategies of planned change used to implement the model in Suffield. Nor does this study compare the Anisa Model of Education to any other educational model. The reader is referred to materials which address these questions that have been prepared by Dr. Joan Bissell and her associates of Harvard University School of Education at the request of the Suffield Board of Education (see Bibliography).

A second delimitation of this study is that it is a case study of the implementation of the Anisa Model at one site.

Caution is needed when generalizing these results. If, however, there is a pattern which emerges that is characteristic of any attempt to implement an innovation, then, that is useful to document.

A third delimitation is that objectivity cannot be assured. The case study is reported by a person who was on sabbatical leave at the University of Massachusetts (1972-1973) at the time the decision was made to adopt ANISA. This person, the author, upon return to Suffield became the Director of this federal/state funded project. The reporting is made from a vantage point which is not temporarily detached from the situation. The pros and cons of the internal change agent are discussed within context in Chapter IV.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II provides a selective review of the literature as it relates to organization development, theories and models of change, and other research on implementation of the Anisa Model.

Chapter III provides a detailed description of the methods and procedures used in the case study.

Chapter IV contains a description of the innovation using Havelock's (1973) first four stages of change: relationship, diagnosis, acquiring relevant resources, choosing the

solution.

Chapter V contains a description of the innovation relevant to Havelock's (1973) last two stages; gaining acceptance, stabilization and self renewal.

Chapter VI presents an analysis of the successes and failure of the implementation process used in Suffield and recommendations to other educators who may contemplate implementing the Anisa Model in their school systems.

C H A P T E R I I

SELECTIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is a selective review of the literature relevant to the case study presented in this dissertation. The literature review includes a brief overview of planned organization change, often referred to as organization development (OD), followed by a discussion of organization development within schools. Next, various models and theories of organization development are presented followed by the definition of OD and the stages of planned change used throughout this case study. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the work of Nancy Rambusch, the only other researcher who has written about implementation of the Anisa Model of Education.

Planned Organization Development

The thrust of contemporary history can be characterized by a related set of words: change, turmoil, restlessness, alienation, confusion, and so on. Almost as much has happened in the past 50 years as happened in the 50,000 years preceding. There have been approximately 800 life times of 62 years each in the past 50,000 years. Of these 800 life times, some 650 were spent in the caves (Toffler, 1970, pp. 3-4). Of these 800 lifetimes, one, two at the most, have been spent with blood transfusions, air conditioning, instantaneous com-

munications, travel into outer space, laser technology, the transistor and the computer. All of which is to say that rapid change is upon all Mankind. If he is to have some say over his future man will have to learn to guide this rapid change, not just witness it. If man can learn to control and direct change he can guide these forces into constructive efforts which will enhance "the good life" rather than destroy it. There is an emerging body of concepts, tools, and techniques which can be used to enhance man's ability to control the direction and quality of change. These concepts and techniques are referred to as organization development or OD.

OD borrows from a number of disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, psychology, and economics. Although it is rooted deeply in the behavioral sciences, organization development has evolved not out of behavioral science theory but primarily as a response to the growing need to improve organizational effectiveness.

Tracing the historical roots of OD will help place this case study in perspective. Early organizational activities centered around the time and motion studies of Frederick Taylor during the first three decades of this century. This movement, referred to as "scientific management", had as its primary focus production output at the lower levels of an organization. During the 20's and 30's the trend started by

Taylor was replaced by the human relations movement initiated by Elton Mayo (1945, p.23). Mayo and his contemporaries argued that in addition to finding better technological methods to improve output, it was beneficial for management to look into human affairs as well. They claimed that the real power centers within an organization were the interpersonal relations that developed within the working units. For them the study of human relations was the most important consideration for management.

Douglas McGregor, working with Union Carbide in 1957, is considered to be one of the first behavioral scientists to talk systematically about and to implement an organizational development program. His approach was to try to apply some of the values and insights of laboratory training to total organizations. Other names associated with these early efforts are Herbert Shepard and Robert Blake, who, in collaboration with the Employee Relations Department of the Esso Company, launched a program of laboratory training (sensitivity training) in the Company's various refineries.

Laboratory training essentially emerged around 1946, largely through a growing recognition by Leland Bradford, Ronald Lippitt, Kenneth Benne, and others, that human relations training which focused on the feelings and concerns of the participants was frequently a much more powerful and viable form of education than the lecture method. Some of

the theoretical constructs and insights from which these laboratory training pioneers drew stemmed from the earlier research by Ronald Lippett and Kurt Lewin. The term "T-Group" emerged in 1949 as a shortened label for "Basic Skill Training Group". This term was used to identify the program which began to emerge in the newly formed National Training Laboratory in group development (now the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science). The T-Group was a major strategy used in OD during its early days. It is, of course, still in use.

From 1959 on the movement labeled OD began spreading across various companies; IBM, Aerojet, Pacific Finance, etcetera. In 1961 McGregor showed managers and other OD specialists a new vision of man in the organization. His set of assumptions, labeled "theory Y" pictured man as inherently curious and capable of growth, of being trustworthy, and of taking initiative. During the middle and late 1960's, OD techniques spread more widely because of economic support from companies interested in functional improvement.

OD In Schools

OD first appeared in schools when the Seattle system first used T-groups during the mid 1950's. It was not, however, until 1961 that the National Training Laboratories specifically designed for educators. The first systematic efforts to carry out OD in the schools was begun by Miles in

1963. His was a three year project on organizational development in schools. The interventions tested included data feedback, problem-solving workshops, and the training of teams through process consultations.

Beginning in the fall of 1965, a group of university based specialists and researchers carried out the first large scale OD project. It was labeled COPED. Through a consortium, a number of colleges and universities collaborated on the conceptualization, planning, and initiation of a well-studied effort to bring about self-renewing processes in twenty-three school districts. COPED did not produce any studies of the input of organization change efforts because funding was terminated during the first year of active OD intervention. It was, however, successful in producing clearer conceptualization and strategies for OD in schools, research instruments appropriate and useful for assessing school organizations, and a great amount of practical experience for both university personnel interested in the study of OD in schools and a growing case of school and university based OD practitioners. In 1967 three educational OD projects began which took an intensive approach to the training of individuals as such; Everett Rogers in Los Angeles, a project in Brevard County, Florida, and a project in East Williston, New York.

Currently the most active centers doing research and

development in OD in schools, according to Schmuck and Miles (1971), are: the Program on Strategies of Organizational Change of the center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon, and two other centers, each with a professional staff of fifteen to twenty members; the Educational Change Team at the School of Education, University of Michigan and the Program in Humanistic Education at the University of New York at Albany.

Schmuck and Miles (1971) indicate that very little formal research has been accomplished on OD's processes and effects; "the literature that reports systematic evaluative data of OD interventions in school districts is sparse and largely descriptive and speculative (p. 231)." The need for rigorous research on OD in the schools continues.

OD is still very much in process. Havelock (1975) suggests that it may be premature to describe OD as a "science." " In reality, knowledge utilization is at best a crude art occupying the individual attention of only a small scattering of scholars in three or four centers of learning (p. 1)." Both Friedlander (1976) and Burke (1976) refer to the field as in its "adolescence" - gangly, searching for self-identity and self concept, and sometimes overly autonomous if not rebellious, rather than more settled and adult. Schmuck and Miles (1971) state, "If OD in schools is going to mature and blossom, the need is great for more adequate research; clearer theory; sharper descriptions of techniques;

the use of more models, types of schools and populations; and the development of teams of OD specialists within school districts that are linked regionally. If these needs can be worked on promptly and vigorously, we are optimistic about the part OD can play in humanizing and rebuilding the American School (p. 238)."

Theories and Models of Change

Choosing a particular model of change is no easy task. A variety of conceptual schemes for threading together the constituent elements of a human system are proposed in the literature. Most of the models do not speak to the same issues. In fact they all vary in degree of abstractness, relate to change problems at different levels and from different perspectives, cover different variables and have varying degrees of completeness. From these schemes the practitioner must find one or a combination of several which "make sense" to him. The practitioner then uses this schema in dealing with the forces for and expected resistances to change.

Following are some of the models of change which are found in the literature. An attempt has been made to include models which cover the various dimensions of planned organization change.

Chin and Benne (Bennis, Benne, and Chin, 1976) describe three types or groups of changes: (a) the rational-empirical

(b) the normative-re-educative and (c) the power-coercive. While their essay was prepared for the second (1969) edition of the Bennis, Benne, and Chin classic, The Planning of Change, the article is retained in the third edition (1976). Following is a brief summary of their three types or groups. The authors infer that all forms of planned change are some variant of these three.

Empirical-rational strategies are based on the assumption that people are rational and that they will follow a rational self-interest once truth (knowledge) is revealed to them and their self-interest is demonstrated. A variety of specific strategies are included in this group: basic research and dissemination of knowledge through general education (thus banishing ignorance and superstition); personnel selection and replacement (getting the right people in the right positions); the employment of systems analysts as staff consultants (focussing away from the individual and his or her role and focussing on the system and its difficulties with the result that planned change is viewed as a wide-angle problem); applied research and linkage systems for diffusion of research results; the projection of utopias (inventing and designing the shape of the future by extropolating what we know in the present); and perceptual and conceptual reorganization through the clarification of language (for example, through general semantics).

Normative-re-educative strategies are built upon the assumption that men are inherently active; in quest of impulse and need satisfaction. In these strategies the relation between man and his environment is essentially transactional. Man, the organism, does not passively await given stimuli from his environment in order to respond but rather initiates actions in search of need satisfaction. Patterns of action and practice are supported by sociocultural norms and by commitments on the part of individuals to these norms. Change in a pattern of practice or action, according to this view, will occur only as the persons involved are brought to change their normative orientations to old patterns and develop commitments to new ones. Change in normative orientations involves change in attitudes, values, skills, and significant relationships, not just changes in knowledge, information, or intellectual rationales for action and practice.

Normative re-educative approaches to effecting change bring direct intervention's by change agents (interventions based on a consciously worked out theory of change and changing) into the life of the client system, be that system a person, a small group, an organization, or a community. A variety of specific strategies are included in this group including improving the problem solving capabilities of a system and releasing and fostering growth in the persons who make up

the system to be changed.

Power-coercive approaches are based upon the application of power in some form, political or otherwise. The influence process involved is basically that of compliance of those with less power to the plans, directions, and leadership of those with greater power. Often the power to be applied is legitimate power or authority. Some of the strategies of the power-coercive group employ moral economic, and/or political power such as strategies of non-violence, the use of political institutions to achieve change and change through the recomposition and manipulation of power elites.

Chin and Benne (1976) include an excellent diagram of these three types or groups and provide illustrations for each (pp. 44-45). The type of change plan used in the Suffield implementation of ANISA falls into the normative re-educative group.

Chester and Lohman (1971, p. 193) define a Power-conflict Model of OD. It is based on three premisses or assumptions. The first premise is that schools as social organizations are strain-and-conflict producing systems, that is, legitimate but competing and sometimes incompatible interests are endemic in the current structure of the school organization. Recognizing the need for legitimacy of pluralism, with the inevitable conflict that attends it, necessitates OD

strategies which use conflict in an overt and constructive manner.

The second assumption is that members of a school district - students, teachers, and administration - occupy roles and structure and operate with professional and organizational money and procedures which keep them separate, and work against formal (even informal) interaction and the development of cross-cutting ties of common interest, values, or feeling.

The third assumption is that all of the legitimate power, authority, and expertise in schools (and much of the informal power) presently resides in the hands of board, administration, and some teachers in the school. A sizeable proportion of the total school district, therefore, has no formal access and little informal access to power, influence, or control. The Power conflict Model overtly addresses the distribution of power in the system by helping participants become aware of the nature of power in the system and by helping participants become aware of the nature of power inequities, and the feeling and behavior which such inequities engender in people. It focuses directly on strategies for power equalization. The Power-conflict Model explicitly recognizes and legitimatizes pluralistic or multiple goals and the goal and value conflicts which follow. Chester and Tohman acknowledge that decision making by consensus is often

not possible because of incompatible differences. The Power-conflict Model assures that differences are inevitable and that processes (such as voting or coercion) which include dialogue and negotiations and which enable decisions to be made in the face of strong opposition are at times necessary. The acknowledgement of such goal differences reinforces the moral or philosophical position that all relevant parties need to be actively involved in goal setting. The techniques of the OD specialists in the Power-conflict Model is to: provide training to help participants (non-power holders) develop the necessary personal and organizational skills to operate effectively in new structures; preparation for self-advocacy; preparation for collaborative problem solving; preparation to identify, develop, organize and prosecute their own special interests; training for value-homogeneous groups (the grouping of individuals from various parts of the organization who share a common set of values or goals).

In conclusion Chesler and Lohman write, "OD is centrally a matter of clarifying and strengthening expressions of conflicting interests of diverse groups, and of radical redistribution of decision-making prerogatives so that low-power groups can have more influence over an organization's fate (p. 185)." The Power-conflict Model was rejected by the Suffield change team. The conditions in Suffield called for

evaluation, not revolution.

Shashkin, Morris, and Horst (1973) present five models of social and organizational change. In their discussion of these models they emphasize communication, the generation and flow of information, as, perhaps, the single most critical factor in any theory of social organization and interaction. Although all five models differ significantly from each other, some of the models actually are far more similar than different. Whether similarities amongst these five models is due to a common bias resulting from the commonalities in training that individuals receive in the social services or actually reflect a common reality is not clear.

Research, development, and diffusion model. This model is hard to identify with any one researcher or group of researchers. It's a model in which information is transferred from one person to another when the "sender" transmits a "message" over some "medium" to a particular "receiver". This model is focused on new information gained through research. There are certain assumptions undergirding this model: (a) scientists generate new knowledge (data) needed by users via a complex, rational process of research and development, (b) users are passive consumers; if the new knowledge or innovation is presented over the "right" channel of communication, in an appropriate way, at the proper time, then the user will accept it, (c) the entire process of research, development,

and diffusion consists of a rational sequence of coordinated activities, if the sequence is correctly rationally followed and coordinated, acceptance of innovations (new data) by users will necessarily occur. This model has been criticized by Havelock et al (1969) as "over-rational, over idealized, excessively research-oriented, and inadequately user-oriented (pp. 11-17)". Shaskin, Morris and Horst (1973, p. 512) feels there needs to be more scientific research evaluating the effectiveness of this model.

Social interaction and diffusion model. This model stems from: (a) rural sociology, investigation the process by which farmers adopted technological studies, studies on how physicians adopted new drugs, and studies on noting behavior, (b) Lewin (1947a, 1947b) and his associated on changing food habits. There are several assumptions that undergird this model: (a) data exists and have been generated by persons other than the (potential) users (b) there exists a natural process of data flow via personal influence on users by key persons called "opinion leaders" or " gatekeepers" (c) this natural process can be used by a change agent to introduce new information into a social system.

Havelock (1968) has criticized this approach because the target of change is seen as the individual, thus ignoring the work of Lewin (1947a, 1947b) and others and does not deal adequately with the problems of change in organized social

systems. Havelock (1968) also feels that this model, like the R D & D model, leaves the user or user system as the passive consumer, rather than as taking active role in the dissemination and use process.

Intervention theory and method. This model has recently been developed by Argyris (1970) based on research and practice in organization change since the early 50's. This model concentrated on internal changes in an organization. Basically, Argyris argues that organizational problems are not solved because the people in the system do not know how to (a) generate problem-relevant data, (b) use the data to obtain solution alternatives and make decisions, and (c) communicate a shared commitment to the decisions. These are the three primary tasks of the interventionist. As the interventionist models these actions, in the context of real and relevant problems, the client system learns to use and eventually internalize the information flow process that Argyris believes is so critical for organization effectiveness. The creation of specific change is not Argyris objective, it is, rather change to the client system in a major and basic way. Shaskin, Morris, and Horst (1973) feel much research evidence is needed before Argyris' model can be accepted by behavioral scientists, especially including comparative studies of similar and different organizations.

Action Research. This model derives from the work of

Lewin (1947a, 1947b, 1948) and is a major factor in Lippett's (1958) planned change model. The action research model differs from the planned change model in that it is primarily a process model focused on the development of the action research process within the client system. Essentially the model emphasizes the link between research and action. Data gathering, analysis, and diagnosis (research phases) lead to action-planning and action-implementation (action), the results of which are carefully evaluated research. This evaluation provides data for further diagnosis and action. Thus, a continuous cycle of research and action provides a general model for problem solving and change.

Several assumptions undergird this model: (a) Research (data gathering and analysis) is an action intervention in a client system and is a basis for diagnosing problems and planning and implementing changes, research data are also collected after changes are made in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the change and to serve as a basis for planning and taking further action), action research is a continuous process of research and action, inextricably linked, (b) the client learns this process by applying it with the assistance of a change agent/researcher, to real, specific problems, (c) in the context of the action research process, knowledge is gained relevant to more general social and organizational problems.

Planned change. This model was developed by Lippitt, Watson, and Westly (1958) when these authors integrated knowledge derived from such diverse fields as psychoanalysis, sociology, and social activism into a comprehensive model of change in social systems. This knowledge was integrated across system levels, from "individual" through "community". It is a model of planned change which is applicable to social systems in general. It is an expansion of Lewin's (1947a) three-stage model of change (unfreezing-moving-freezing) into seven phases (establishing a need for change; establishing a change relationship between client and change agent, data collection and diagnosis; action planning; action implementation; generalization and stabilization of change; termination of the change relationship).

Several assumptions undergird this model: (a) data exists within the client system or can be provided (linked into the system from the outside) by the change agent, (b) data must be directly translated into action steps which generate further data (data generation, diagnosis, action planning, and action implementation are elements of a sequential and continuous process of change), (c) mechanism and commitments can be developed to stabilize (support) the changes which have been made.

The change team in Suffield adopted as its model of change a synthesis of action research and planned change.

This combination is best described by Havelock (1973) in his Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. He refers to it as a Problem-solving Model (pp. 155-158). Havelock defines planned change as "change or innovation which comes about by a deliberate process which is intended to make both acceptance by and benefit to the people who are changed more likely (p. 5)." Havelock uses a six stage model of change to describe the stage of the change process (pp. 13-15).

a. Stage I: Relationship. The first thing the successful change agent needs to develop is a viable relationship with the client system or a solid base within it. A secure and reasonably well-delineated helping role is an essential place from which to start.

b. Stage II: Diagnosis. Once established in the client system, the change agent must turn to the problem at hand. He must find out if the client is aware of his own needs and if the client has been able to articulate his needs as problem statements.

c. Stage III: Acquiring Relevant Resources. With a well-defined problem, the client system needs to be able to identify and obtain resources relevant to solutions.

d. Stage IV: Choosing the Solution. With a defined problem and a lot of relevant information, the client needs to be able to derive implications, generate a range of

alternatives, and settle upon a potential solution. Even a good solution needs adaptation and needs to be reshaped to fit the special characteristics of the client.

e. Stage V: Gaining Acceptance. After a solution has been developed and adopted, it needs to be moved toward acceptance and adoption by the widest possible number in the client system. By describing, discussing, and demonstrating, the change team helps the client to gain awareness, develop interest, evaluate, try out, and finally adopt the innovation. In doing so they rely on many channels and make maximum use of natural leadership and informal communication.

f. Stage VI: Stabilization and Self-renewal. Finally the client needs to develop an internal capability to maintain the innovation and to continue appropriate use without outside help. The change agent encourages members of the client system to be their own change agents and to begin to work on other problems in a similar way. As this self-renewal capacity begins to build, it allows the gradual termination of the relationship so that the change agent can move on to other projects, other problems, and other clients.

It is these six-stages of change presented by Havelock that will be reiterated and expanded in the next four chapters as the author describes the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education in Suffield.

Other Research on Implementation
of the Anisa Model

The only other researcher who has written about the implementation of the Anisa Model is Nancy Rambusch, founder of the American Montessori Society and doctoral student at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts from 1972 to 1977. Dr. Rambusch has written of her experiences as site co-ordinator for the installation of the Anisa Model at the Earl C. McGraw elementary school (K-3) in Hampden, Maine, 1973-1974. These writings are found in two places; a six page article entitled "Fielding the Anisa Model" in The Constructive Triangle (1975), a publication of the American Montessori Society, and in her doctoral dissertation (1977). The 1975 article is a precursor to the ANISA section of her doctoral dissertation.

Dr. Rambusch's dissertation (1977) is the presentation of her experience as change agent during four field efforts; three Montessori and one ANISA. Dr. Rambusch's accounting of the change process encountered during the installation of ANISA in Maine differs from the present dissertation in several respects.

First, in her dissertation Dr. Rambusch writes from the perspective of the outside change agent. She was a member of the University of Massachusetts Anisa faculty who was employed by the Hampden, Maine, school district to install the

Anisa Model. Her dissertation records some of the difficulties encountered when entering a school district from the outside to install an educational innovation that has been handed down to a teaching staff from "on high". The case study recorded in the present dissertation is written from the perspective of an internal change agent. As will be shown in the following chapters, the problems encountered are quite different.

Second, Dr. Rambusch saw her efforts in Maine as the "diffusion" phase of a research, development, and diffusion process. She writes, "The ANISA model represents an example of the grand research, development and diffusion design familiar in agriculture and industry, which is committed to large scale research prior to fielding, and which aims at a mass audience (p. 116)." Rambusch considered the Anisa Model "fully articulated in its essentials prior to diffusion (p. 131)." Rambusch uses Donald Schon's (1971) center-periphery model of diffusion to discuss the installation. The present dissertation considers the ANISA implementation from the perspective of a planned change model of organization development and uses Havelock's six stage model of change for the presentation.

Third, in Maine Dr. Rambusch was integrally involved with teaching teachers how to implement the Anisa Model in the classroom. She writes, "What was not fully articulated,

prior to diffusion of the ANISA Model was what I choose to call Metapedagogy, the teaching of the teaching (1977, p. 131)." In another place she writes, "The most important skill I brought to the Anisa team and to McGraw was an ability to do anything with the children practically that was discussed theoretically (1975, p. 62)." In the present dissertation the "teaching of teachers" constitutes only one strategy of a number used during the problem solving and innovating process. While staff training was an important part of the design it was not the direct responsibility of the change agent or change team.

Fourth, Dr. Rambusch's writings are concerned with only one year of the change process and, in Havelock's terms, only with Stage V:, Installation phase. The present dissertation is concerned with the entire change process over a three year period.

All of this is not to demean in any way Dr. Rambusch's contribution, it is merely to make distinctions between her work and the present dissertation. I think anyone contemplating implementing the Anisa Model will benefit by reading the work of both researchers.

C H A P T E R I I I

METHADODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed description of the methadology and procedures used in researching, reporting, and analyzing this case study of planned change. The chapter begins with a rationale for the use of the case study as an appropriate research method followed by a discussion of the perspective and format used in the case study. In order to provide the reader with an understanding of the setting in which the case study takes place a short history of the town of Suffield and its school system follows. After a description of the Anisa Project, the chapter concludes with a description of the procedure used in analyzing the case study.

The Case Study Method

Different authors have used slightly different methods for classifying educational research. Fox (1969) divides educational research into the following categories:

Historical

Survey

Descriptive

Comparative

Evaluative

Experimental

Sax (1969) divides educational research into:

Descriptive

Case Study

Sample

Correlational Studies

Developmental Studies

Cross-cultural Studies

Experimental

Van Dalen (1966) divides educational research into three research categories: Historical, Descriptive, and Experimental. He sub-divides the descriptive category into the following convenient but arbitrarily selected categories: (a) Survey Studies, (b) Interrelationship Studies, and (c) Developmental Studies. Under the second, Interrelationship Studies, he includes the case study method. In addition to Interrelationship Studies, Van Dalen includes causal-comparative and correlational studies in this category.

The case study approach has a somewhat unique position within research. It has some characteristics of an historical approach in the sense that it deals with past data and also some characteristics of a descriptive study in that it uses much data to describe a particular situation. The case study method is most usually categorized as descriptive

research.

The case study method has been in use over a long period of time. Business administration (Towl, 1969; Willings, 1968), child psychology (Piaget being a prime example), medicine since the days of Socrates, anthropology (Margaret Mead amongst others), numerous studies in social psychology and sociology (Street Corner Society, Elmstown Youth) are but some examples.

In the case study method, a researcher makes an intensive investigation of a social unit - a person, family, group, social institution, or community. The researcher gathers pertinent data about the present status, past experiences, and environmental forces that contribute to the individuality and behavior of the unit. After analyzing the sequences and interrelationship of factors, the researcher constructs a comprehensive, integrated picture of the social unit as it functions in society. Since the case study method is qualitative rather than quantitative, the researcher must guard against permitting personal biases and standards to influence his or her interpretation. Facts must be reported as precisely and objectively as possible and judgements must be suspended until adequate evidence supports a conclusion.

Sarason (1971, p. 15) cautions that the attempt to gain perspective on the structural characteristics of the school culture, particularly as they have bearing on the process

and problems of change, runs headlong into the problem that the observer is not neutral. By virtue of the fact that the observer is himself part of a structure - be it in the school culture or in one outside of it - his perception and thinking are in various ways incomplete, selective, and distorted.

Another caution is that a case study is most usually a sample of one. This means that the researcher must be cautious in generalizing his or her results to the same or similar populations. In spite of these cautions, the method has great value. According to Bogdan (1972), Sarason (1971), and Schatzman and Strauss (1973), the case study method may be one of the few tools available to researchers dealing with complex, multiple-variable situations.

Walton (1972) offers some of the relative advantages of the case study:

- (a) The case study is a vehicle for the inductive development of new theory.
- (b) The case study often shows the need for modification of the existing theory used to explain events.
- (c) The case study can attend to aspects of a change program which other methodologies cannot, namely processes of change and of change interventions.
- (d) The case study has the potential advantage for

appreciating the role of personal styles (preferences, strengths, weaknesses and biases) of the actions in a system of planned changes even if the role of these factors does not appear sufficiently systematic to generalize and incorporate in a theory of intervention.

- (e) The case study helps take the mystery out of the behavioral scientist's role in change programs (pp. 73-78).

Some argue that there is little difference between the case study method and what a reflective person does in his or her daily living. Not so writes Bogdan (1972, p. 4). They are similar in that both are looking for understanding, but the researcher carries out his activities in organizational settings in which he has no direct personal interest. That is, his career status, friendships (past and future), and self-definition are not directly intertwined with the setting he is studying. The reflective person, on the other hand, is intimately tied in his daily life to the settings he participates in and thus is less able to liberate himself from his personal biases. In addition, the researcher can devote full time to carrying out his observations while in the setting, whereas, the reflective person participating in his daily life has many constraints on his time. In most situations

in which the reflective person is involved he or she has to perform tasks with a certain degree of competence, which takes his or her time and energy. Another difference is that the researcher is more systematic in his or her observations than the reflective person in daily life. The researcher keeps detailed notes, recording what he has observed in the field soon after an observation session is over. The researcher is trained in the craft of observation and analysis. He or she has become familiar with the problems of observation and has developed certain skills and techniques to help themselves. He or she also developed a unique perspective in which the research act and the role of the observer dominate their interests while in the field.

In this case study of the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education, the author does not fulfill Bogdan's criteria for participant observer outlined in the previous paragraph. In many ways the author is more reflective than scientific. This dissertation, therefore, may be more historical than descriptive, more reflective than objective and analytical. As Nancy Rambusch (1977) has put it so aptly, it is more the case of "an observant participant" than a "participant observer".

Sarason (1971, p. 2) while not making a direct plea for case study as a research methodology does indicate that what one learns via the helping relationship is difficult, if not

impossible to learn by other means. He finds that much of the literature which describes the culture of the school was written by people who were not in a working or service relationship to the school setting. While he does not conclude that what one learns about the school culture via the helping relationship is superior to what one learns in other ways, it is different, and the nature of the difference fills in and rounds out the emerging picture.

Sarason (1971) feels there is a general lack of knowledge of the natural history of the change process within the school culture. He comes to the conclusion that an adequate description of the modal process of change in the school culture is, unfortunately, unavailable. He writes, "What is at issue is the absence of formulated and testable theories of how the school works, the conditions where it changes, and the processes whereby the changes occur (p.9)". It is my hope that the present case study will contribute to the natural history of the change process as it occurs within schools.

Schmuck and Miles (1971) point out that most OD practitioners are not researchers: they do not systematically evaluate the outcomes of interventions except in informal ways. Most OD consultants collect information from clients in the manner of an "artisan clinician". That is to say, as a competent consultant, the OD trainee collects data about his

intervention in order to become alert to the responses and needs of his clients. He makes use of such information in designing future training sessions and may feed some of the data back as part of the training design. However, OD trainers seldom collect data to test their theory of organizational change, to evaluate outcomes after their intervention, or to compare what occurs in a OD influenced school with other schools receiving different inputs.

In 1967 Warren Bennis, then Associate Editor of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, introduced a new section of the Journal which he called "Case Studies of Behavioral Science Intervention." In 1968, Bennis wrote a plea to the membership for submission of better quality. He wrote:

How I wish our Case Studies section would capture and chronicle the detailed processes of the changes we seek and often observe. Instead, what we often receive from our contributors is a fairly static, dull description of a company followed by the use of a series of T Groups going through a monotonous progression from "stranger" groups to "family" groups, followed inevitably by another static and dull description of how peoples' attitudes changed. Very few of the Case Studies seem to provide that marvelous sense of a Tolstoy novel, where to know

Anna Karenina is to know all women. Or the rare precision of an Eriksonian specimen such as Luther, or now, Gandhi. Freud built the main outlines of psychoanalytic theory from five brilliant "cases". Darwin's discovery of evolution was one brilliantly described "grand tour". Our research methodology textbooks do not discuss the process of selecting the right specimen, the right case, the right period. It is a gift, perhaps, that goes beyond science, which is after all the bureaucratization of imagination. I wish our cases in the future would provide more possibilities for generalization (p. 230).

I hope that this case study not only contributes to the general literature on change, but also the particular process of change involved in the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education.

Perspective

This case study is written from the perspective of an internal change agent. The author was Project Director of the three-year federal-state funded Title III project whose goal it was to install the Anisa Model of Education in the Suffield Public Schools, K-3. The advantages and disadvantages of an internal change agent are discussed in context in

Chapter IV. The author was employed half-time as Project Director and half-time as Director of Pupil Services in Suffield. He was a member of the school system before, during, and after the formal installation. As Project Director, the author had overall responsibility for the installation. Because of his relationship to the Project, the author had a first-hand, immediate, day to day knowledge of the implementation process-its successes, its failures, its problems. Furthermore, the author was charged with solving these problems or at least seeing that they got solved, thus had an intimate knowledge of the processes of change both formal and informal.

This dissertation was written upon conclusion of the Anisa Project to serve the purpose of recording the process of planned change used during the implementation for future researchers, the Suffield Staff, and others who may contemplate implementing the Anisa Model.

In order to write the case study the author had to reconstruct the implementation year by year. The author was able to reconstruct this process through a variety of methods:

- a. The author kept a detailed appointment calendar throughout the Project.
- b. The author conducted an interview with members of the change team and other key staff (such as the kindergarten teachers).
- c. Detailed minutes were kept of each Steering

Committee meeting. The author was Chairperson of the Steering Committee during the three years of the Project.

- d. The author attended most policy meetings held regarding the Project. He kept detailed notes.
- e. The author participated in the writing of each annual Project proposal. These proposals were a detailed map of the plan for implementation. As such they are a valuable resource for reconstructing the change process.
- f. Dr. Bissell, Harvard researcher submitted an annual report of her work in Suffield. Her reports provide valuable information for the case study.
- g. Mr. Bondra conducted an annual year-end report of his evaluation for the State Department of Education. These reports are very helpful.

Format

In spite of the authors integral involvement in the actual installation of the model, objectivity is attempted by reporting the case study in a standardized format using the third person (Chapter IV and V) and then analyzing the case study using the same format (Chapter VI). Havelock's six stages of planned change described at the end of Chapter

II are used to provide this structure. Chapter IV of this dissertation can be thought of as the factors leading up to the implementation (Stages I-IV), and Chapter V as the actual implementation (Stages V and VI). Chapter IV begins with a description of the nature of the client and client system and the role of change agent and change team. Next, background essential to an understanding of why the Anisa Model of Education was chosen by the Suffield educational team is presented. In Chapter V issues concerning acceptance by individuals and the group are discussed. No attempt to analyze the success or failures of the change strategies is made, that is left to the chapter VI of the dissertation. Chapter V concludes with a description of the events which helped to institutionalize the Anisa Model in Suffield.

Research Site

The setting for this case study is a small rural-residential town in north central Connecticut. Suffield, first settled in 1670, was the eighteenth town to be established along the Connecticut River. Originally a part of Massachusetts, it was annexed to Connecticut in 1749. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the town had a variety of manufacturing and commercial enterprises, including ship building, iron works, earthen ware, tanning, cotton and paper mills, furniture and cigar making. Suffield had grown

tobacco from its earliest days but around 1800 tobacco farming began to play a more and more prominent part in the town's economy. In 1810 the first cigar making factory in the United States was established and from 1850 on agriculture dominated. Suffield and the Connecticut Valley soon became world renowned for producing a fine shade-grown broadleaf tobacco which made an excellent outer wrapper on a cigar.

Suffield is large geographically. Included within its boundaries are 43.1 square miles of land and over one hundred miles of roads. Ninety-five percent of the children travel to school by bus. The town's population in 1970 was nine thousand seven hundred people, two thousand three hundred of whom were school age children. Because the town is bordered on the north by the Massachusetts' state line, many townspeople are oriented towards the Bay State. In fact, people in the western part of town (West Suffield) can travel to Southwick, Massachusetts quicker and easier than they can get to Suffield center and thus find it more convenient to do their shopping and banking there. The eastern part of town is more built up, the western part is more rural in character. As will be discussed in the text, this east-west split plays a significant role in the town's government and effects dynamics within the school system as well.

The town is rural-residential. Located on the by-way approximately 15 miles equi-distant between the metropolitan

centers of Springfield, Massachusetts, and the capitol city of Hartford, Connecticut, Suffield offers to its residents the advantages of country living and the cultural opportunities of nearby cities. There is little or no industry and, except for a small portion of the town bordering on industrialized Windsor Locks, none is wanted. The people who have lived in Suffield for generations and newcomers alike are attracted to the town because of the historic old houses surrounding the town green and the rural-open quality of the landscape. To this day the town retains its colonial charm and beauty.

The town has had a slow, stable pattern of growth. This has not been true of some other nearby communities which experienced a building boom during the 50's and 60's. Suffield's slow rate of growth has been due, in part, to restrictive zoning, the high value of land for farming, a lack of a sewer network, and the will of the town. Because much of the land is clay in nature (and thus poor for the percolation of septic tank water) it is not feasible to build housing developments without also installing expensive sewerage systems. This picture, however, is changing. Due to the technological perfection of the "homogenized tobacco leaf" there has been a serious decline in the demand for Suffield's shade-grown tobacco. The result has been that the important agricultural base to the community has been upset and land

previously committed to farming has now become available for residential development. In the next ten years Suffield may find itself facing a more rapid growth pattern.

The town's populace is composed of a large number of farm owner/workers, business owner/managers, professionals, retired persons, and a politically powerful aristocracy. The factory-worker middle class is almost non-existent. The largest ethnic group is of Polish descent and there is a two to three percent Negro population deriving from the days of the underground railroad.

Because of little industry, tax revenues are based almost entirely upon the value of residential property and farm land. The town is politically conservative for the most part and there are few funds for excesses of frills. The town makes education its number one public concern. The school budget accounted for sixty percent of the town expenditure during 1974.

The Public Schools

Suffield has had one-room school houses or their counterpart since 1701. However, it has only been since 1939 that a grade 1-12 school system has been intact. In that year a junior-senior high school was built to house a grade 7-12 program (the present McAlister Middle School). Up until then students attended high school at Suffield Academy, Agawam (Massachusetts), or Enfield, Connecticut at town expense.

The school board has been and remains relatively stable. It is still an honor to be a member of the Board of Education and many prominent members of the community have had their hand in the development of the present educational system. Members usually remain on the Board for several terms thus providing continuity of Board policy.

The administration of the schools has also been fairly stable. There have been only five school superintendents during the past fifty years:

Royce D. McAlister	1927 - 1956
William Farris	1956 - 1961
Hugh Watson	1961 - 1966
Jack Green	1966 - 1969
Malcolm Evans	1969 - 1977

During 1976 a staff of approximately one hundred and forty professionals served 2,300 students in five school buildings:

Spaulding School	- Grades K and 3, 4, 5
Bridge Street School	- Grades 1 and 2
West Suffield School	- Grades 1 and 2
McAlister Middle School	- Grades 6, 7, 8
High School	- Grades 9, 10, 11, 12

The original part of Spaulding School was built in 1953 with an addition in 1962. The building is primarily devoted to programs for later childhood; grades three, four, and five.

Due to a shortage of space in Bridge and West Schools, the town's kindergarten program is, also, housed in this building.

Bridge Street School, which lies near the commercial center of the town, was built in 1924. It contains nine classrooms and serves six and seven year old children (Grades 1 and 2).

West Suffield School, built in 1934, lies in the western part of town. Its six classrooms also serve six and seven year old students (Grades 1 and 2).

McAlister Middle School, built in 1939 as the town's original junior-senior high school, was converted to grades six, seven, and eight in 1965, and renovated as a "middle school" in 1974.

The high school, built in 1965, was expanded and updated in 1974. It serves students in grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve. Approximately thirty percent of its graduates go on to a four year college, another thirty percent go on to some other type of post-secondary schooling, and the remaining forty percent go directly to employment or military service.

Administratively, the schools are organized under a principal at each of four levels:

Early Childhood Education Program; Grades K-1-2;

350 students

Later Childhood Education Program; Grades 3-4-5;

550 students

Early Adolescence Education Program; Grades 6-7-8;
580 students

Later Adolescence Education Program; Grades 9-10-11-12;
820 students

In addition to the four principals mentioned above, there is a Superintendent of Schools and a Director of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education.

The Nursery Schools

There are two independent pre-schools in town--the Suffield Cooperative Nursery and the Calvary Nursery. The Suffield Cooperative Nursery School is a parent-run program for approximately 16 three-year olds and 36 four-year olds. Quarters are rented in the Congregational Church. The Calvary Nursery School is sponsored by the Calvary Episcopal Church and provides a day care program as well. It serves approximately 21 three-year olds, 31 four-year olds, and 32 children in day care.

The Anisa Project

The Anisa Project described in this case study took place over three years (1973-1976). The project was made possible through a Title III grant from the Connecticut State Department of Education. A total of \$212,000 was allocated over the three years for the Project. The purpose of the Project, as articulated in the proposal, is as

follows:

- A. The application of the ANISA Model to early childhood education in Suffield.
- B. The application of a process model of planned change demonstrated how the innovation will be accomplished (Lincoln, 1973, p. 6).

Title III funds are made available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which is a comprehensive education law passed by the Federal government to aid elementary and secondary schools. Over the last few years, it has provided to education more than one billion dollars annually. President Lyndon B. Johnson said, upon signing the bill, "I believe deeply that no law I have signed or will sign means more to the future of America" (Piltz and Murphy, 1965, p.5). With this Act, the United States Office of Education changed from being a passive advisory agency to active involvement in the development of new thrusts in American education.

Title III of this Act provides for exemplary experimental elementary and secondary programs. Through this Act venture capital was made available to Suffield to implement the Anisa Model of Education.

In order to obtain Title III funds it is necessary to write a project proposal and submit it to the State Department of Education. Each yearly proposal is a statement of need and proposed plan for meeting that need. As such the

yearly proposals become a map or plan of action for the Project. The reader seriously contemplating implementing the Anisa Model may find these proposals helpful (Lincoln, 1973, 1974, 1975).

Analysis of the Case Study

Chapter VI is remarkable because it is reported in the first person. It is the author's candid, hopefully informed, opinion of the events that took place during the three years of the Project. Using Havelock's six stage model of change, the author comments on each stage. Concluding the chapter, the author makes recommendations to the change team in Suf-field who is attempting to extend the Anisa Model into third grade and beyond, to those in the early childhood program who are concerned with stabilization of the Model, and lastly to other educators who may contemplate implementing the Anisa Model in their school systems.

CHAPTER IV
PREPARING FOR CHANGE

Introduction

The decision to implement the Anisa Model of Education in Suffield has its roots deep in the history of the town and the evolution of its school system. For Suffield, Havelock's (1973) six-stages of change trailed over many years. While the focus of this case study is on the strategies of planned change used to implement the solution (Stages V and VI), the various factors which played a part in the process of arriving at the solution (Stages I through IV) are important to an understanding of the implementation strategies selected. In fact, as will be demonstrated, the procedures used in arriving at a potential solution are inextricably tied to and part of the implementation strategies themselves.

In this chapter Havelock's first four stages are used as a framework for describing the problem solving process which occurred prior to the implementation. During Stage I, Relationship, the change team, the client system and the pros and cons of an internal change team are discussed. During Stage II, Diagnosis, the problems facing Suffield are presented along with selected relevant history. During Stage III, Acquiring Relevant Resources, the steps undertaken by Suffield to search out alternative solutions to its problems are des-

cribed. The chapter ends with Stage IV, Choosing the Solution; a rationale for choosing the Anisa Model.

The overall period of this case study is from September, 1969, the time of Dr. Evans' arrival, to the spring of 1976. Stages I through IV extend from the fall of 1969 to the spring of 1973, and Stages V and VI extend from the summer of 1973 to the spring of 1976.

Stage I: Relationship

Havelock (1973) writes in the Guide:

This is where any innovation or change effort should begin. A strong creative relationship can carry a change program through the most difficult obstacles. While innovation is generally difficult, it can become impossible if there is a bad relationship between the change agent and his (or her) client. (p. 43)

This need for a strong relationship exists whether or not the change agents (those facilitating change) are from inside the system contemplating change, outside the system, or a combination of both. This relationship is critical to any change effort because change is focused on the behavior of people. How and why people change is very complex, but it almost always includes change in attitude as well as change in knowledge. It is this critical attitude factor which

is in jeopardy if the relationship between the change agents and the system to be changed is not of the highest regard.

Besides exploring the quality of the relationship, Havelock (1973) asks some very helpful questions about this first stage: He asks that we be specific as to who is the client or client system. What are the parameters of the system? Who are its formal and informal leaders? And who is the change agent? Is there more than one change agent? Is there a change agent team? Do members of the team come from inside the system, outside the system, or are they a combination of both?

Who is the Client?

Havelock uses the word "client" to refer to the people who the change agent is trying to help. The client might be an individual or a group of individuals working on a common task. In the latter instance, the client is referred to as a "client system".

During the Suffield change effort individual clients included the classroom teacher or specialist, the teacher aide, the parent volunteer, the parent, the administrator, and the Board of Education or individual community member. The largest client system referred to in the case study is the town of Suffield itself, whose common goal it is to provide a system of education. The smallest client system referred to is each of the two nursery schools.

Although the change effort included the entire town of Suffield, the focus was upon the following five sub-systems:

1. The Suffield Cooperative Nursery School at the Congregational Church.
2. The Calvary Nursery School at the Episcopal Church.
3. The Kindergarten at Spaulding School.
4. The Bridge Street School (grades 1 and 2).
5. The West Suffield School (grades 1 and 2).

As will be demonstrated in Stage V, the focus of the change effort varied from time to time during the same year, and from year to year there was a major refocusing of the change effort. However, the principal client throughout all efforts and all levels was the person with a hands-on relationship to the children - in most cases the classroom teacher.

As previously mentioned the decision to implement the Anisa Model of Education has its roots in the evolution of Suffield's educational system. This is clearly demonstrated when examining the historical relationship between the various private kindergarten programs and the public kindergarten.

Public Kindergarten

Public kindergarten did not occur in Suffield until 10 years ago (1966-1967) when they were mandated by the state. Before that time, there had been for many years privately run kindergarten programs which for the most part were located in the Sunday school facilities of various local churches. One such kindergarten was particularly important to the development of the public school program - the Suffield Cooperative Kindergarten at the West Suffield Congregational Church.

The Suffield Cooperative Kindergarten was founded in 1957 by a group of Suffield parents. It's first director, Mrs. Harriet Bruce, served in that capacity for three years. Prior to her appointment as Director, Mrs. Bruce had been teaching-principal for five years at Suffield's old (now closed) South School and before then Director of Early Childhood Education for New Hampshire. Following Mrs. Bruce as Director was Mrs. Irene Hartley who guided the program for the next two years (1960-1962).

In 1965 Mr. Jack Green, the then Superintendent of Schools, began to assemble staff for the new public kindergarten which was to open the following fall. Mrs. Hartley and Mrs. Bruce were hired as two of the first three teachers. They, along with Dr. Harriet B. Nash, State of Connecticut Consultant in Early Childhood Education, plus others formed a Kindergarten Planning Committee. Much preparation

proceeded the opening. The attention of the reader is drawn to the ongoing relationship between Dr. Nash, Mrs. Bruce, and Mrs. Hartley. It was this same Dr. Nash who had consulted with Mrs. Bruce and Mrs. Hartley when they directed the Cooperative Kindergarten. And the reader will note that in later stages these same three educators participated in the Early Childhood Education Study Committee, Project SEED, and finally in Project ANISA.

With the opening of the public school program, the Suffield Cooperative Kindergarten closed. As previously agreed upon, all equipment and materials owned by the Cooperative Kindergarten were donated to the public school system. It was the end of a long pioneering effort by many to establish a public school kindergarten program in Suffield. It also marked the beginning of stabilization and, ultimately with ANISA, integration of an important aspect of Suffield's educational system.

Calvary Nursery School

The Calvary Nursery School was founded in September of 1964 at Calvary Episcopal Church by the pastor of the Church at that time, Mr. Wayne Opel. The need for a nursery school was apparent since the other privately operated pre-schools were for kindergarten age (5 year old) children. Calvary Church was in the process of adding a church-school wing and Mr. Opel thought that a nursery school program to be held

during the week for 3 and 4 year olds would be a fitting community use of the new facility.

Mrs. Sandy Billings was the school's first teacher-director. Because the addition to the church was still in the formative stages of architecture Mrs. Billings and Mr. Opel were able to design a suitable nursery school space. They were also able to purchase furniture and materials from the privately run Little Yankee Kindergarten at the Congregational Church because its teacher-director was about to retire and close the school. Calvary's program was designed to help children develop healthy attitudes and habits through a succession of experiences, to find ways to cope with feelings and emotions, to satisfy curiosity, to learn to get along with his or her peers and adults, and to value his or her own individual worth. It was a program designed to maximize affective and personal-social growth. While reading readiness was inherent in the activities of the program and much intellectual growth occurred, cognitive/academic development per se was not emphasized. It was rather a program that fostered the child's creativity and expressive abilities.

In 1971 Calvary Nursery School added a day-care program for the parents of children who worked. In some instances, children who spent their morning at the Co-op Nursery School spent their afternoons in the day-care program at Calvary.

In other instances children who attended the half-day public kindergarten spent the other half day at Calvary. In still other instances, public school children went to Calvary for the period of time when public school was over (about 3:00) until they could be picked up by their parents as they returned from work (about 5:00 or so).

In September of 1973 Mrs. Billings left Calvary to become Director of a laboratory nursery school at a nearby college. Mrs. Kruk, who had been a teacher at Calvary became the new teacher-director thus providing a smooth transition.

In 1972 the Board of Directors of the Calvary Nursery School made the decision to join the ANISA project. They found the philosophy and theory compatible with their thinking. "What ANISA did for Calvary", explained Mrs. Billings during our interview, "was to put into writing much of what we were already doing". With the addition of the Anisa Model of Education, Calvary had the structure needed to expand to a larger enrollment and an educational model that the new teacher-director found compatible with her own educational philosophy.

During the summer of 1973, Mrs. Kruk and her assistant Miss Biggerstaff, joined others from Suffield at the Anisa Summer Training Program at UMass. It should be noted that Mrs. Eileen Oleksak, Principal/Director of the Early Childhood Program, became a member of Calvary Nursery School's

Board of Directors in 1970 and thus participated in the Board's decision to go with the Anisa Model. Mrs. Billings was also a member of the Board of the nursery school and remained so for three years after her retirement thus further assuring continuity of commitment and support for ANISA.

Suffield Cooperative Nursery School

The present Cooperative Nursery School was founded in 1970 when two Suffield Academy wives, Joy Waldeman and Judy Beams, felt the need for a particular nursery school program within reasonable driving distance of Suffield center and decided that the kind of nursery school experience they wanted for their children was not available. Putting in \$500.00 each and renting space in the Congregational Church they hired a teacher, organized parents of three and four year old children, and opened the Cooperative Nursery School. The school's general philosophy was that children at age 3 and 4 were not too young to deal with letters and numbers and that what was needed was the proper materials, the proper structure, a rich environment, and warm supportive adults. The school's program emphasized academic skills such as pre-reading skills, language comprehension and production, understanding of numerical concepts, and the like.

The school's first head-teacher was Mrs. Gay, a woman whose children also attended the school. Mrs. Gay was

British trained and was with the school two years. Mrs. Barbara Dowd, the school's present head-teacher followed Mrs. Gay. Mrs. Dowd found in the Anisa Model a philosophy of education that was compatible with her personal philosophy and that of the school. She was most enthusiastic about joining the Anisa Project. During the summer of 1973 Mrs. Dowd and her co-teacher Mrs. Dieli attended the Anisa Summer Training Program at Amherst.

Who is the Change Agent?

This question might indicate to the reader that in any change effort there is one and only one change agent and that he or she is a constant over time. That is not the usual case. More often, several different people are instrumental in bringing about a successful change effort. For example, in Suffield many teachers were concerned about the lack of a coherent educational model in the early childhood program and they verbalized their concerns. Other staff members actively pursued solutions to this problem and brought new information back to Suffield hoping to change the system. Others, because of their positions of formal authority, were able to become more directly involved in leading a change process. Stage II will explain these influences in further detail.

For the most part the Suffield change process was guided by a four member change team which consisted of the Superintendent of Schools, the Director/Principal of Early Childhood

Education, the Director of the Cooperative Special Services Center, and the Director of Pupil Services. The leadership of this team shifted during the six stages of change; the Superintendent of Schools led the change effort from Stage I through Stage IV, and the Project Director led the change effort through Stages V and VI.

The change effort began with the Superintendent calling together the other three to discuss "problems" at the Early Childhood level. At the beginning these three subordinates acted as advisors to the Superintendent. As time passed, and as the group matured, they functioned more and more as a decision making team. By the time the Project Director began leading the team in 1973 all members were essentially equal in power. This did not negate the fact that the change agent team which included the superintendent was also advisory to the superintendent. He, as chief executive, was advisory to the Board of Education; the Board holding final authority.

Inside Versus Outside Agent.

Havelock (1973) spends some time discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the "inside change agent" versus "outside change agent". Some advantages of the inside change agent which he cites are:

- . He or she knows the system; knows where the power lies, where the strategic leverage

- points are; knows how to identify the gatekeepers, the opinion leaders and the innovators.
- . He or she speaks the language, literally and figuratively; knows the special ways in which members discuss things and refer to things; has the accent, tone, the style.
 - . He or she knows the commonly held beliefs, attitudes and behavior of the client system.
 - . He or she identifies with the system's needs and operations.
 - . He or she is a familiar figure; a known quantity. As such, he or she does not pose the threat of the new and unfamiliar. (p. 50)

The inside change agent has disadvantages, such as:

- . The inside change agent may lack perspective or may be unable to see the client system as a whole.
- . The inside change agent may not have the special knowledge or skills relevant to the innovation. He or she may not have had enough outside training or experience to be a true "expert".
- . The inside change agent may not have an adequate power base. His or her plans may be confronted by superiors or competing peers.
- . The inside change agent may have to live down his

or her past failures.

- . The inside change agent may not have the independence of movement so often required to be an effective change agent. The obligations of membership may severely limit the time and energy that he or she can invest in their new role.
- . The inside change agent usually faces the difficult task of redefining their on-going relationship with other members of the system. He or she must be able to change the expectations that his or her associates have about how they will behave and how they will relate. (p. 51)

Some advantages of the outside change agent are:

- . The outside change agent has a fresh start. He or she is not burdened by negative stereotypes.
- . The outside change agent is in a position to have perspective; he or she can look at the client system objectively.
- . The outside change agent is independent of the power structure in the client system. He or she has the option of pulling out if and when he or she deems it necessary. He or she is not compelled to identify with any particular faction and is not threatened and inhibited by superior authority.

- . An outside change agent is in a position to bring in something new. As an outsider the change agent is likely to have had the opportunity to gain expertise beyond that which the client system already possesses. (p. 52)

But, the outside change agent has disadvantages, such as:

- . The outside change agent is a stranger. As such, he or she is a potential threat, and issues of trust must necessarily be worked through.
 - . The outsider may lack the knowledge of the insider. He or she may lack understanding of the system, its language, its norms, its values.
 - . The outside change agent may not care enough.
 - . The system's pain may not be the agent's pain.
- (p. 52, 53)

When all the pros and cons are tallied, Havelock (1973) concludes that neither one nor the other seems clearly superior. For Suffield the best solution was a change team which combined the best of both. While the members of the change team were all technically "insiders", that is, all employed by the Suffield Board of Education, the term is used relatively. If you think of a continuity from outside to inside, at the beginning of the change effort the

At Bedford, Mr. Bondra conducted local experimental and action research projects with grants from state and federal sources in excess of one million dollars. Mr. Bondra holds a B.S. from Clark University. He is presently a doctoral student at the University of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Eileen Oleksak, Principal of Early Childhood Education, has been a teacher of a one-room school house, and a principal in Gray, Maine and Milton, Massachusetts. Mrs. Oleksak received her Bachelor's and Master's degree in Education from Boston University, and has taken graduate work at Colorado College of Education and the University of Massachusetts. She was for many years an educational consultant for the Houghton Mifflin Company. Just prior to coming to Suffield, Mrs. Oleksak was an Assistant Professor of Elementary Education at Westfield State College. Mrs. Oleksak's special interests in education are Child Development, Staff Development and Learning Competency.

The author, Mr. Lincoln, Director of Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services, has been a seventh grade teacher, a guidance counselor and a school psychologist. He holds a B.S. from the University of Massachusetts, an M. Ed. from Springfield College in Guidance and Counseling, and a C.A.G.S. in Psychology from Boston University. He is presently completing his studies toward an Ed. D. from the University of Massachusetts. He has a special interest in

educational philosophy, developmental psychology, and organizational development.

Dr. Evans and Mrs. Oleksak who were new to Suffield at the beginning of this innovation could clearly see faults that those of us who had been on the scene for five or six years could not see. Also, Dr. Evans, from his view as superintendent could see the functioning or dysfunctioning of a kindergarten through grade twelve educational program. By virtue of the power of the superintendency, Dr. Evans was the one person able to bring a team together in a concerted effort to define and find solutions to problems. Dr. Evans brought to the team the experiences he had had working with prestigious programs in other states.

Mrs. Oleksak, who had traveled back and forth across the eastern part of the United States for eight years as an educational consultant for one of America's oldest and well-known publishers, was well aware of what good education looked like. She was also in a position of first hand knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of Suffield's early childhood program and faculty. She was painfully aware of the administrative difficulties engendered by an educational program located at three geographically different sites.

Mr. Lincoln brought to the team four years' experience working at the elementary level in Suffield. Since Mr. Bondra was not employed by the Suffield School System per se, and both Dr. Evans and Mrs. Oleksak were new to Suffield in the fall of 1969, Mr. Lincoln brought to the team considerable first hand knowledge about the inner workings of Suffield's educational system. Mr. Lincoln was also ego-involved in finding a solution to the primary level hodge-podge, a problem he had been dealing with for four years as Elementary Guidance Consultant. Mr. Lincoln also brought to the team the experiences he had had just a year or two before in founding an independent elementary school in Springfield, Massachusetts; a school patterned on the British Integrated Day (open classroom) theory of education.

Both Dr. Evans and Mr. Bondra had had experience in dealing with federal/state grants. Mr. Bondra had a background in systems theory and action research which came to play a significant part in the team's conceptualizations. He also possessed process skills which kept the team going when they got bogged down in detail and side issues. It was Mr. Bondra's fine sense of what the Title III committee would be looking for in a proposal which made it possible for the team to write with such assertiveness. Mr. Bondra and Mr. Lincoln had an interest in and knowledge about

group process. Mr. Lincoln was in the middle of a two year graduate students professional development program at the National Training Laboratories (NTL) and Mr. Bondra, by virtue of his association with Goodwin Watson and others at Columbia, knew a great deal about organizational development and the social psychology of innovation and change.

The change team functioned well together. They were all motivated to see the problems in early childhood solved. The extra time needed to search for state/federal funds and the large amount of time needed to write a proposal were freely given. The team more or less held a similar philosophical point of view towards education and all were developmentally based in their educational and child psychology.

Stage II: Diagnosis

Once the relationship between the change agent and the client is established, the next step is to study and understand the current situation within the system in which change is contemplated. This is often referred to in organizational development as the diagnostic stage.

Diagnosis is essentially a description of the client's problem. Diagnosis includes the essential details of symptoms, history, and possible causes. The object of the diagnosis is to articulate and define the problem.

Past is Prologue

For all practical purposes, modern educational program in Suffield began twenty years ago with the superintendency of Dr. Farris, successor to the 29 year administration of Mr. McAlister. From 1956 on, many "best practices" from contemporary American Education were incorporated into the Suffield educational system. A longitudinal record of the school system's progress can be had by reading the "Report of the Superintendent of Schools" found in the town's Annual Report. A review of these reports over the past twenty years indicates the following innovations have been attempted:

- . team teaching
- . "modern" mathematics
- . continuous progress concept of curriculum organization
- . "in-service workshops for teachers" as part of the on-going educational program
- . differentiated staffing (including the addition of teacher aides)
- . independent study for high school students
- . kindergarten
- . flexible individualized instruction programs
- . special education programs for children with learning disabilities and other special needs.

Unfortunately during this same time period little attention was paid to an organizational design that provided for the vertical and horizontal coordination and integration of these curricula innovation. Some gain was made during Dr. Watson's administration (1961-1966) when the concept of system-wide Directors was developed and an attempt was made to develop curriculum guides for various subject areas. The result of these efforts was a few outstanding developmentally based and internally coordinated K-12 programs. But the quality from program to program varied from outstanding to poor and too much depended upon the personality, style and motivation of the individual program Director.

At the primary level it was especially difficult to find common themes amongst faculty and programs. For example, children entering kindergarten may or may not have attended nursery school and, if they had, would have had a quite different experience depending on which of the two nursery schools they had attended. From nursery school the children entered the double-session kindergarten with its three self-contained classrooms isolated in the Spaulding School building under the supervision of the principal for Grades 3-4-5. The outstanding kindergarten faculty had little to do with either nursery school or either Grade 1-2 program. There was no animosity, just a lack of an organizational structure which provided for communication and coor-

dination. From this common kindergarten experience the children moved to Grade 1 in either the Bridge Street School or the West Suffield School. At Bridge Street the classes were self-contained and traditional for the most part. ^{West} Suffield School was trending toward multiaging and "open education".

Prior to 1969 the entire elementary program K-5 was under the administration of a single principal; three buildings, nearly fifty professional staff, and one thousand students. Mr. Green, prior to leaving in 1968 divided this task by hiring Mrs. Eileen Oleksak to be the principal of the West Suffield and Bridge Street Schools. This re-organization provided for a principal whose sole occupation it was to coordinate the Grade 1-2 program in each of the primary schools. This still left kindergarten under the administration of the principal of the Spaulding School.

When Dr. Evans came to town in 1969 he found a small school system rapidly moving towards the twenty-first century with a little-of-this and a little-of-that but not a great deal of any one thing to hold it together except a well-trained staff who was devoted to children and who liked each other. This administrative arrangement was not chaotic, or for that matter, very different from most other small Connecticut towns, but it could hardly be called a "system

of education".

Centralized School Concept

There is considerable evidence that during Mr. Green's administration, he and the Board of Education spent time and energy grappling with the questions of "where are we headed?" and "what do we need to get there?" In 1967 Mr. Green wrote a memo to the Board of Education entitled "A Preliminary Report on Long-Range Goals" and in January, 1968, "Proposed Master Plan, Facility Objectives (Tentative)" and "Proposed Master Plan, Curriculum Objective (Tentative)". In August, 1968, Mr. Green and Board member Mr. Richard K. Upham, co-authored a document entitled Education for Suffield: A Master Plan for the Development of the Suffield Public Schools. This report again dealt with curriculum and facilities. The report ended up endorsing a centralized school district by stating, "As far as curriculum is concerned, all emphatically agreed that in order to facilitate continuous progress, efficient use of specialized personnel, teacher planning, etc., a centralized school district would be far superior to a neighborhood school plan". (p. 6) The arguments presented in the report to support this point of view are substantial.

At the Early Childhood level, a "centralized school district" meant a new school. Mr. Sernatinger, Chairman of the Board of Education, spoke thus in Show and Tell, the

Board of Education's newsletter to all town citizens:

As a result of these studies, the Board of Education recommends: 1) that during the 1971-1975 period a construction program be initiated to provide a new elementary school near Spaulding School for pupils in kindergarten through second grade, and 2) that the West Suffield and Bridge Street Schools be closed and that the West Suffield School be used by the school administrative staff and Cooperative Special Services Center. This would provide additional space for teaching stations in the Spaulding, McAlister and the High School. The Bridge Street School would revert to the town...This particular construction program was selected because it emphasizes early childhood education. Concentration of our efforts on this age group may provide solutions to many of our education problems in succeeding years. The closing of the small older elementary schools will allow all of the kindergarten through second grade pupils to participate in this more flexible facility with the individualized program now under development.

(p. 1, 2)

The Board of Education and Dr. Evans presented the proposal for the new elementary school to the voters at a

Town Meeting in May of 1971. It was rejected. The idea has never been re-presented to the town but, as will be pointed out in Chapter VI of this dissertation, an early childhood education program housed in three buildings (kindergarten in one, programs for six and seven year olds in two others) is less than ideal and continues as an important educational problem.

Early Childhood Education Study Committee

One of Dr. Evan's first administrative moves after his arrival in Suffield was to create a Curriculum Council composed of representatives of the K-12 teacher staff, the superintendent, and the principals of the four levels. The task of the Council is to receive and review new ideas for curriculum change. If the Council feels the idea worthy, an appropriate study committee is appointed. It is the task of this study committee to make recommendations back to the Council.

As Elementary Guidance Consultant in Suffield from 1966-1969 the author was acutely aware of the potential for trauma inherent in the way our early childhood program was structured and administered. On November 5, 1970 the author sent to Mr. Richard Roy, Chairperson of the Curriculum Council, a memorandum regarding Early Childhood Education. It read as follows:

Pupil Services
Suffield Public Schools
Suffield, Connecticut

DATE: November 5, 1970

TO: Richard Roy, Chairman, Curriculum Council

FROM: Richard T. Lincoln, Director of Pupil
Services

RE: Early Childhood Education in Suffield

Whereas, it is more and more clear through research in early childhood development that experiences (or the lack thereof) critically effect a child's mental ability and his readiness for a later more formal school program;

Whereas, it is clear through research there is a dearth of adequate early childhood education and day-care facilities throughout this country;

Whereas, the federal government has a national interest in the welfare of its children and the determinants of a child's ability to succeed to "the good life;"

Whereas, it is readily recognized that a child's working to his highest potential is a social and economic goal of this country, state, and town;

Whereas, it is predictable that more federal monies will become available for domestic programs with a limited Viet Nam commitment;

Whereas, the federal government has through its various publications made it clear that they will be encouraging states and towns to get into the early childhood education (currently preschool) business;

Whereas, the state law already makes mandatory special education programs for pre-school children who have "impaired hearing" and for "those whose learning disabilities are such that their 'educational potential will be irreparably diminished without special education at an early age.'" Preschool is defined as a child who will have attained the age of three years before January 1, of the school year;

Whereas, the town of Suffield is fortunate in having two private nursery schools and three public kindergartens whose expressed task is early childhood education;

Whereas, the Board of Education is now contemplating a school building program which would include new primary level facilities;

Therefore, it is proposed that the Curriculum Council appoint a sub-committee on early childhood education whose task it would be to:

- a.) Study and develop a hypothetical public school early childhood education program which would receive children at two years, nine months the earliest,
- b.) extrapolate the building requirements anticipated by such a program,
- c.) develop an interim plan for co-operation and co-ordination between the existing private and public school special education preschool programs, kindergarten, and grade one.

It is suggested that such a committee include:

- a.) one Suffield Public School Administrator;
- b.) one representative of Grade one;
- c.) one representative of Kindergarten;
- d.) one representative from each private nursery school in town;
- e.) two interested lay people;
- f.) one Board of Education member.

After reviewing the proposal, the Curriculum Council appointed an Early Childhood Study Committee. The Committee's composition was not as suggested in the memo, however. The study committee contained no school administrator, no Board of Education member, no nursery school member, and no interested lay person. It was essentially composed of staff from the Kindergarten and Grade 1.

On May 5, 1971 the Early Childhood Study Committee produced a report which met only one of the three mandates given to it by the Council: that of extrapolating the building requirements for an anticipated hypothetical early childhood education program. The study committee did not come up with an exact early childhood model, but they did point the way. It is important to note the following from that report:

- . The Committee made a study of early childhood education trends current at that time.

- . Dr. Harriet Nash, from the State of Connecticut, Department of Education, served as Consultant to the Committee.
- . The Committee had a chance to get out of Suffield and see what was going on in early childhood education in other parts of New England.
- . The report includes a statement of Philosophy.

Each child should be helped to realize his individual potential intellectually, emotionally, socially and physically. In support of this, we affirm the following:

We Believe

1. Children learn best when happy and in a pleasant educational setting.
2. Children learn in various ways: visual, auditory, tactile, etc.
3. Children learn at different rates.
4. Education is centered in the learner.
5. Children have an innate desire to learn (natural curiosity).
6. Parents, teachers, other adults, and pupils, as well as the environment, can diminish or enhance this desire to learn.
7. Learning for the joy of learning can be its own reward for children.

8. Young children can make critical choices, select options and assume responsibilities and should have the opportunity to do so.
9. There are certain peak periods in a child's life when he is most receptive to the acquisition of knowledge.
10. It is important to develop a child's ability to think and to verbalize ideas, questions, and feelings throughout each day.
11. Reading success is dependent upon fine listening ability and organized auditory skills. A developmental program should precede a standard reading readiness program.
12. Physical movement and involvement is an essential ingredient to early learning and adequate space is essential to initiate and maintain this movement.
13. Coordination of mind and body adds a dimension to the process of learning integration.
14. Early successes and experiences are crucial to the development of self esteem and self worth. Success is so important in any human being's life.
15. How children feel about themselves and their talents and abilities is positively related to their accomplishments and their successes.

16. We must genuinely respect children in order to generate attitudes of respect from them.

(p. 2, 3)

- . Part III of the report made a strong argument for a developmentally based early childhood program.
- . Their description of the proposed Early Childhood Facility included such ideas as:
 1. individual programming
 2. multiaged grouping
 3. open plan arrangement; a group of large open areas with few, if any, fixed walls.
 4. team teaching
 5. one leader would represent the teams and be responsible for cross movement
 6. differentiated staffing; three professionals, four paraprofessionals, and volunteers
 7. movement
 8. large and small group activity
 9. experimentation with a wide range of materials.

"In one corner a boy might be curled up with a book; in another, a small group of youngsters would be concentrating on a science project; while several might have earphones in place listening to tape recordings." (p. 6)
 10. "The teacher would be a guide, an observer, and

a valuable resource person as well as a leader of groups' activities when the need arises." (p. 6)

11. "Air conditioning and carpeted floors are essential features and the importance of adequate space as well as accoustical and lighting conditions in architectural planning is stressed. (p. 6)

12. team planning

13. movement exploration and the performing arts

. The Committee's report included "Suggestions for a Theoretical Model: Childhood Learning Center" Some ideas from this report follows:

1. to aid each child in developing intellectually, socially, emotionally and physically
2. The intellect is not fixed or rigid.
3. sensory, motor and perceptual experiences
4. positive self image, relates to peers and adults positively with trust
5. The teacher should start where the learner is.
6. Teachers should change their role to knowledgeable observers of children who skillfully supply the right resource materials for individuals at the prime moment of need.
7. Teachers should become for children the model

through which life and beauty are viewed as exciting and good.

8. Parents should be informed and treated as partners. (pp. 9-16)

To the best of my knowledge nothing further came directly from the Committee on Early Childhood Education's preliminary report. This is not to say it did not have its influence, it did, as will become clear as the discussion of this case study proceeds.

Flexible Scheduling

Another thrust occurring in the school system at about the same time (1969-1971) was the result of the machinations of the new principal for Grades 1 and 2, Mrs. Oleksak. During the first and second year of her administration Mrs. Oleksak was seeking organizational structures which permitted more individualized instruction and more affective learning. At the state reading conference in Connecticut in 1969-1970, Mrs. Oleksak had the good fortune to hear a presentation by Miss Helen C. Martin, Principal of the Driscoll School in Wilton, Connecticut. Miss Martin was selling well organized "open classroom", a model which permitted individualization of instruction. Mrs. Oleksak, with the support of Dr. Evans, made arrangements so that all 14 Grade 1 and 2 teachers visited the Wilton program. These visits were inspirational to the Suffield staff and provided a model of organization

which permitted flexible grouping. To this end Mrs. Oleksak conducted a three-day workshop for her staff during the summer of 1971. In addition, Miss Martin made a presentation to the entire K-12 faculty during an early-release-day program in 1971-1972.

The results of these efforts were that the Bridge Street and West Suffield staffs under Mrs. Oleksak's leadership began to break down the rigid lockstep homogeneous-grouping organizational structure and move towards a more flexible continuous progress design.

Project SEED

At the same time that the Board of Education was proposing a new building to the voters and the Early Childhood Education Sub-Committee of the Curriculum Council was hypothesizing the type of educational program which might go into such a building were it to be approved, and at the same time that Mrs. Oleksak and her Grade 1-2 faculty were examining flexible grouping patterns, Dr. Evans set up a Planning Committee to develop a Title III proposal in the area of early childhood education.

On February 10, 1971, Dr. Evans sent to Washington a preliminary proposal for a project entitled: Suffield's Early Education Design-Project SEED. The architectural team for this proposal included: Mr. George Bondra, Dr. Malcolm D. Evans, Mr. Richard T. Lincoln, and Mrs. Eileen Oleksak.

The "Abstract" from Project SEED reads as follows:

Project SEED proposes to develop a theoretical model of education for children ages 3-7. It proposes to redesign the present educational program for all children ages 5-7 and for handicapped pre-school children. Local faculty will be trained to implement the new program. A new school will be specifically designed based upon the educational model. This new Suffield school will become a field demonstration site for Harvard University's Early Childhood Education Center... The project has five major components: development of a theoretical program to implement this model, staff education, program demonstration, evaluation of program, and change strategies.

(p. 7, 8)

The Title III preliminary proposal was rejected by Washington thus the need for a formal proposal was never manifest. None-the-less some good resulted from this effort because:

- . For the first time Mr. Bondra, Dr. Evans, Mr. Lincoln and Mrs. Oleksak began working as a team.
- . The team had its first experience at proposal writing.
- . Dr. Evans assumed leadership in grappling with the primary level hodge-podge problem.
- . The Planning Team got a chance to shake out ideas and

get in-puts from such a notable as Dr. Robert Anderson of Harvard University.

- . A variety of local organizations were asked to cooperate on a single idea; the Curriculum Council, the Administrative Council, the Board of Education, the Capitol Region Education Council, and the Selectmen's Executive Committee for the Town of Suffield.
- . The Planning Team became aware of the fact that there was no single model of education available which met the particular need of Suffield:

Of the four primary models reviewed by Mrs. Mayer, no single model was suitable. A decision was reached to finally adopt aspects of the verbal-cognitive and child-development as models within which the broad framework of Suffield's early education design would evolve. (pp. 9-10)

- . The Planning Committee began thinking in terms of:
 - a. a collaborative relationship with Harvard
 - b. lack of clear educational design and inappropriate program as major problems (in Suffield)
 - c. local awareness of the very real problem of lack of coherent design
 - d. local recognition of the problem of discontinuity by the Suffield Board of Education as is evidenced by their mandate to the Superintendent

to provide articulation between grades and subjects within each segment. The kindergarten reflected frustration and anxiety as pupils from diverse backgrounds are brought together for their first public school experience. Children might enter from a nursery school experience in a Montessori school, a traditional child-development nursery school, or from an activity-centered nursery school. Absence of clear goals, tension due to diverse expectations, and absence of a theoretical framework made it difficult for the kindergartens to function effectively.

- e. rebuilding the Suffield Schools from the bottom up.
- f. developing a theoretical model of education for children ages 3-7
- g. implementing an educational program using a consistent theoretical framework and techniques
- h. providing a teacher training program consistent with the theoretical framework
- i. evaluating the relative effectiveness of the program and the processes of planned change.

It seems then, that there were many efforts afoot to grapple with the problems facing the Suffield school system--

to provide articulation between grades and subjects within each segment. The kindergarten reflected frustration and anxiety as pupils from diverse backgrounds are brought together for their first public school experience. Children might enter from a nursery school experience in a Montessori school, a traditional child-development nursery school, or from an activity-centered nursery school. Absence of clear goals, tension due to diverse expectations, and absence of a theoretical framework made it difficult for the kindergartens to function effectively.

- e. rebuilding the Suffield Schools from the bottom up.
- f. developing a theoretical model of education for children ages 3-7
- g. implementing an educational program using a consistent theoretical framework and techniques
- h. providing a teacher training program consistent with the theoretical framework
- i. evaluating the relative effectiveness of the program and the processes of planned change.

It seems then, that there were many efforts afoot to grapple with the problems facing the Suffield school system--

building needs, organizational structure, curriculum matters, and educational philosophy and purpose. These several thrusts identified provided the base for further investigation into early childhood education models as an answer to the acute need in Suffield for an educational framework upon which to hang "best practice". As it turned out, the Anisa Model of Education became more than just an educational frame for Suffield's early childhood educational program, it became a comprehensive planning model for the entire school system.

Diagnosis

In this section the diagnostic inventory suggested by Havelock (1973) is used to diagnose the early childhood program. As the reader will remember, the early childhood program includes five subsystems: the Cooperative Nursery School, the Calvary Nursery School, the public Kindergarten, the Bridge Street School, and the West Suffield School. The nursery schools while not technically part of the public school system are considered so for purposes of this case study. Havelock's diagnostic inventory suggests several relevant questions to be asked when attempting to diagnose a system's functioning. They are:

1. What are the goals?
2. Is there adequate structure for achieving these goals?

3. Is there openness in communication?
4. Does the system have the necessary capacities?

In answering the questions posed, the strengths and weaknesses of each of the subsystems is indicated. At the end of each question there is a summary in the form of problem statements.

What are the Goals of the System?

As can be seen by having read the previous section, the kindergarten faculty had by 1972 made good headway towards defining their goals and purpose. Although the kindergarten program was relatively new to Suffield (1966), two of its three teachers in 1972 were "founding mothers". These two had worked hard during that five year period to incorporate "best practice" into their program. As stated previously, they were alone for the most part in this struggle.

Calvary Nursery School in 1972 was a program in transition. The school was in the process of changing from one teacher-director to another and it was an opportune moment for innovation. There was a need for a more structured educational program in order to accommodate the increased number of children anticipated by the advent of a day-care program. The philosophy of education of the incoming teacher-director was sympathetic to the Anisa Model. In 1972, both the out-

going head-teacher and the principal/director of the public school's Early Childhood Program, were members of the nursery school's Board. They, and the rest of the Board, were delighted by the Anisa Model and anxious to be included in the Project. In a manner of speaking, all signals were "go" for Calvary's involvement; they were seeking a new direction and in ANISA they found a compatible statement of educational philosophy and goals.

At the Cooperative Nursery School there was a similar openness to the Model. From the outset their educational goals were in the cognitive/academic area and a structure which facilitated the same. ANISA articulated a good many of their thoughts and ideas in a comprehensive coherent educational model. Voila! The head-teacher, Mrs. Dowd, her teaching colleague, Mrs. Dieli, and the parents of the children were all enthusiastic about joining the Anisa Project.

The West Suffield School was at this time well on its way towards a more flexible approach to education. A strength within the faculty and administration was a willingness to look outside for new ways to individualize their instructional program. There was recognition that a more flexible organizational structure would be needed if West Suffield was to escape the limitations imposed on program by a graded structure and self contained classrooms. The teachers them-

selves were looking for an educational model that provided for a more individualized instructional program (not necessarily a different structure) that maximized the potential of the faculty and brought new educational materials into the program. As previously stated, all grade 1-2 faculty had visited the Wilton School System and observed its open education model. One of the West Suffield teachers had been trained in open education under Dr. Vincent Rogers at the University of Connecticut and was active in leading the West Suffield program in that direction; the faculty was already on its way to multiage grouping even at this early point. West Suffield was not, however, looking for a new model of education per se. Even if it was not articulated on paper, they had a model and were not unhappy with it. Thus, their search was not of the same intensity or direction as kindergarten, Co-op, or Calvary.

The Bridge Street School in 1972 was quite traditional. There were no stated program goals nor was there any drive to develop them. Each teacher felt under pressure to teach the academics since the parents of the children seemed oriented in that direction. A few teachers were open to innovation, but most were content with what they had and were looking for very little new. This was understandable since the Bridge Street School served the more conservative and wealthy center of town and held a fine reputation in the

community.

In summary, then:

- a. The Kindergarten, Cooperative Nursery School, and Calvary Nursery School were open to and looking for a model of education which reflected their educational ambitions.
- b. West Suffield School was well on its way toward an open education model and happy with this pursuit.
- c. Bridge Street School was traditional and not searching for new options.

Is There Adequate Structure for Achieving These Goals?

It can be inferred from the documents just cited that Suffield had been trying to define its educational goals for sometime. The results of these efforts provided clearer statements of educational goals in some parts of the system than in others. For example, it seems that kindergarten was quite clear as to what it wished to accomplish educationally with children, whereas Bridge Street School's educational goals were much more diffuse and certainly less well defined. The question of adequate structure for achieving educational goals can not be answered in the case where the subsystem is not clear just what its intended educational goals are. I think, however, the question is relevant in two aspects regardless of the status of stated goals - one is physical

structure (plant), and the other is administrative structure (coordination and leadership).

The physical plant at the kindergarten site was adequate. Compared with whatever might be available at either Bridge or West, it was more than adequate, it was good. The physical plants at Cooperative and Calvary were also adequate, in fact, also quite good. The drawback in their particular case was the fact that they shared space with the Sunday Schools of their respective churches and thus of necessity had a put-up, take-down type of operation. Anyone who had taught under those conditions will understand the limitations it imposes on program.

The physical plant at West Suffield was warm, friendly, overcrowded and inadequate for its program. At Bridge Street School the physical plant was cold, decrepit, not overcrowded, but certainly inadequate for contemporary education. And, there was no room at either Bridge or West for inclusion of a kindergarten program - an overriding problem. No matter how it was strategized, there was no way to get the five year olds (kindergarten) onto the same site as the sixes and sevens.

As was explained in the last section, prior to the advent of the ANISA innovation no coordinating structures between the Cooperative Nursery School and the Calvary Nursery School existed. There was no bad feeling between the two, just little opportunity to get together to share ideas

and "talk" program. There was, however, some contact between the kindergarten and each of the nursery schools especially in the spring around the transfer of children to the public schools. As the reader will remember, until 1973 the principal of grades 1 and 2 did not direct the kindergarten. The result was poor coordination. In 1972 the programs at Bridge and West were being coordinated by the Principal Director of Early Childhood Education but the staffs themselves saw little reason to get together to discuss educational goals.

In summary then:

- a. The physical plants at Cooperative, Calvary, and kindergarten were adequate; in fact quite good.
- b. The physical plants at Bridge and West were inadequate.
- c. There was little coordinating force across the five subsystems.
- d. There was no room at Bridge and West for kindergarten program.

Is There Openness in Communications?

The inhibitions to communication derived mostly from the geographical isolation of the various subsystems of the early childhood program, and the fact that there were no administrative structures to facilitate communications other-

wise. Even between the two programs under the early childhood principals' direct control, there was very limited discourse. Attempts to hold joint faculty meetings had ended in failure. It seemed that the two small schools had little to say to each other; in fact, it often seemed they were competitive.

Within programs, communications varied from excellent to poor. Since each of the nursery schools had only two persons on staff, it can be assumed their internal communication was good. At West and Kindergarten the teachers were attempting to bring about program synthesis. At Bridge Street the faculty, while friendly and cordial to each other, did not get together on such essential items as educational goals and curriculum, rather conferred more on such issues as recess, cafeteria, assemblies and for adult social occasions. By and large, each teacher at Bridge Street was, when the classroom door closed, teaching in their own unique interpretation of a traditional early childhood program.

As for receptivity to new ideas, it has been stated that West was well on its way toward "open education", and that Kindergarten, Cooperative, and Calvary were in search of a model of educational compatible with their expressed or implied educational philosophy.

In summary, then:

- a. The problem was to facilitate communications

between the five subsystems and to help them to see that they all had a common goal; that of educating young children.

- b. Bridge Street School had the unique problem of not seeing anything wrong with their educational program as it was and being rather conservative when approaching new ideas.

Do They Have the Necessary Capacities?

It is clear in retrospect that had Project SEED been funded, Suffield would have been over its head. The development of an educational model is a colossal task, as is well documented by the agony of the extremely competent University of Massachusetts' Anisa Staff. Even with all their expertise, they are at times overcome by the breadth of the task. It is clear that Suffield did not have the resources necessary to solve their own problems. Suffield did not have a skilled curriculum development staff, it did not have the money nor expertise to retrain its own staff, nor did it have the facilities needed for contemporary educational programs.

Recapitulation of Problems as Seen in 1972

The major problems facing the Early Childhood Program in Suffield then, were:

1. Lack of organizational structures to facilitate

communication between the five sites.

2. Lack of adequate physical plants at Bridge Street and West Suffield.
3. Geographic isolation of kindergarten.
4. Lack of a common administrative structure for grades K, 1, 2.
5. No impulse to change on the part of the Bridge Street faculty.
6. Lack of a common educational model between the N, K, Bridge and West staffs.
7. A lack of sufficient resources within Suffield to solve all of its problems.

Stage III: Acquiring Relevant Resources

This is, essentially, the stage in which the change agent and the client system scan the field of education looking for alternative solutions to the problems uncovered during the diagnostic stage. The usual procedure is to go to books and periodicals, people of knowledge in the field, and information retrieval systems such as clearing houses, document centers, data banks, and information services and ask, "What's new and available"?

For Suffield the acquisition of resources took two forms:

1. As previously mentioned, a major effort was made in 1970-1971 to write a proposal for a

federally funded early childhood project entitled Project SEED. This aborted effort was described in some detail in Stage II of this chapter.

2. The second effort took place in the fall of 1972 when a delegation of Suffield educators traveled to the state department of education making an inquiry about an educational model called ANISA. They had already learned during their SEED experience and conferencing at Harvard with Dr. Robert Anderson that there were no appropriate educational models available to serve Suffield's unique needs.

During the fall of 1972, Dr. Roger Richards, State Title III Director, called Dr. Evans and told him that one of the state consultants in early childhood education had come across an educational model in which Dr. Richards thought Dr. Evans would be interested. Dr. Richards was aware of Suffield's Project SEED proposal.

On September 29, 1972, Dr. Evans, Mrs. Oleksak and Mr. Bondra met with four State Department of Education consultants: Dr. Roger Richards, Dr. Harriet Nash, Mrs. Marjorie Maynard and Mrs. Jean Rustici (the last three were consultants in early childhood). Mrs. Rustici discussed a presentation on the Anisa Model of Education she had heard given by Dr. Daniel C. Jordan, Professor of Education and

Director of the Center for the Study of Human Potential at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The Suffield team liked what they heard and asked Dr. Richards to arrange a contact between Suffield representatives and Dr. Jordan.

On October 10, 1972, Mr. George Bondra, Director of the Cooperative Special School Center, Mrs. Eileen Oleksak, Principal of Grades 1 and 2, Mr. Edwin Humphrey, Principal of Grade K, 3-5, Dr. Malcolm Evans, Superintendent of Schools, and Mr. Richard Lincoln, Director of Pupil Services (who was by then on sabbatical leave at the University of Massachusetts) met with Dr. Daniel C. Jordan and his associate Dr. Donald T. Streets.

Stage IV: Choosing the Solution

According to Havelock (1973), it is during this stage that the change team and the client system settle upon a potential solution. This is not an easy process since no one solution is "exactly" right. Ultimately it is a matter of trade-offs amongst many relevant factors. After the meeting with Drs. Jordan and Streets, the change agent team in Suffield was quite convinced no educational model "fit" Suffield better than the Anisa Model appeared to at first hand. They were impressed with what they had heard.

In the usual instance of considering the adaption of an educational model one arranges an on-site visit to a location

where the model is in action, or one delves into the research on the model. In the case of ANISA this was not possible.

Prior to the summer of 1973 the model had never been implemented. Nor was there a published text on the model or a body of research. This is not to infer that nothing had been done. Over thirteen years of research, planning and experimentation had been invested by Dr. Jordan and his associates in the development of the Model. During that time experimental work, teacher training activities and collection of data from the field were combined with efforts to develop the theoretical framework of the model. During 1971 the New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE) granted \$242,000 to Dr. Jordan and the Center of the Study of Human Potential at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst to initiate a model of Teacher preparation based on the Anisa Model.

While this activity was in progress Dr. Jordan and his associate Dr. Streets wrote a manuscript (1972) entitled Releasing the Potentialities of the Child: A New Perspective on Child-rearing, Day Care and Early Childhood Education. It was never published because the model underwent major revision just after the manuscript was written and thus the manuscript was outdated before being published. It is nonetheless a significant work and any reader seriously contemplating implementation of the Anisa Model might read the

manuscript for its historical significance as well as its informational value. There were other publications in lieu of a text which did help the Suffield change agent team. One such early writing was found in World Order (1972). The article was entitled "The Anisa Model, a new educational system for developing human potential." Interestingly enough this 1972 article mentions nine rather than five fundamentally different but interrelated categories of potentialities. (Some future doctoral student might well spend his or her time writing a descriptive history of the evolution of the Model itself. I think, personally, it is quite fascinating.) In case the reader is wondering which potentialities have dropped out (or rather been subsumed under some of the present five area of psychological potentiality) they are: Moral Development, Development of Creativity and Aesthetic Sensitivity, Spiritual Development, and Language Development.

October 25, 1972 is a memorable day for all of the people in Suffield who had the opportunity to meet and hear Dr. Jordan talk about ANISA for the first time. As he began talking about the previous nine years of development, the beautiful "tree of life" metaphor, master teachers, differentiated staffing, learning competence, releasing potential, individualized instruction, developmentally based teaching, nutrition and biological potentiality, symbol systems, en-

vironments and much more, the Suffield educators became ecstatic. Here was the rational, coherent, comprehensive, research-based education model for which they were searching. The change agent team explored with Dr. Jordan and Dr. Streets their readiness to enter into a collaborative relationship with Suffield. They were willing. The next step was to find out if the Anisa Model of Education would be acceptable in Suffield to the private and public school faculty, other administrators, and the parents and community.

On November 28, 1972 at 1:45 P.M. at the Bridge Street School, Drs. Jordan and Streets made a presentation to a wide variety of Suffield educators: five administrators, (including the Superintendent of Schools and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools), 31 K-3 classroom teachers, eight Curriculum Council representatives, two PTO members, three parents, three newspaper reporters, and 13 others including specialists (art, music, physical education, speech and hearing, social work, psychological, reading, guidance counselors) and five classroom teachers from the high school. A survey of the reaction of this audience to Dr. Jordan's presentation is given in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

Analysis/Summary
 Reaction Sheet Responses
 Jordan Presentation - Afternoon November 28, 1972
 On A Scale From -3 To +3*

I. What was your general reaction to the ideas presented by Dan Jordan?

	0	+1	+2	+3
K-3 teachers (N = 31)	3%	16%	26%	55%
Administrators (N = 5)			20%	80%
Curriculum Council (N = 8)			12%	88%
PTO Member (N = 2)			50%	50%
Citizen (N = 3)			33%	67%
Other (N = 13)			39%	61%

II. To what degree would you be interested in knowing more about the Anisa Model?

	0	+1	+2	+3
K-3 teachers (N = 31)	3%	23%	6%	68%
Administrators (N = 5)			20%	80%
Curriculum Council (N = 8)			12%	88%
PTO Member (N = 2)			50%	50%
Citizen (N = 3)				100%
Other		8%	8%	84%

TABLE 4.2 Continued

III. How appropriate would the Anisa Model as you understand it be for implementation in Suffield?

	0	+1	+2	+3
K-3 teachers (N = 31)	19%	16%	19%	46%
Administrators (N = 5)			20%	80%
Curriculum Council (N = 8)	12.5%	12.5%		75%
PTO Member (N = 2)			50%	50%
Citizen (N = 3)			67%	33%
Other (N = 13)			39%	61%

*Note: No negative responses - all responses from 0 (no opinion) to + 3 (very favorable)

Analysis of the data indicated that most people felt favorable towards Dr. Jordan's ideas and wanted to know more about the Anisa Model. The general feeling was that ANISA might be appropriate for implementation in Suffield.

That same evening of November 28, 1972, Dr. Jordan and Dr. Streets made a similar presentation to the First Selectman, Finance Board Chairman, Citizens Advisory Committee, Board of Education, the Director of the Capitol Regional Education Council and teachers from the school system who had missed the presentation in the afternoon. The general questioning from the audience was in the area of, "Was the model experimental?" "Was Suffield being used as a guinea pig?"

Reservations seemed easily satisfied and once more there was general approval and acceptance given to the Model.

On December 14, 1972, after Dr. Jordan's presentation to the faculty and citizens of Suffield and prior to writing the Title III proposal, Dr. Evans, Mrs. Oleksak and Mr. Bondra traveled to Harvard University to once more talk with Dr. Anderson regarding Suffield's interest in having Dr. Anderson evaluate Suffield's adaptation of the Anisa Model. Dr. Anderson was grateful (even excited) about being made aware of the Anisa Model. Dr. Anderson indicated his willingness, along with his graduate assistant Joan Bissell, to be "friendly critic" but felt that the primary task of evaluation should be left with the University of Massachusetts and Mr. Bondra, Research Coordinator and on-site evaluator. Rochelle Mayer, who had done previous work on model comparison for Suffield at Dr. Anderson's request, had completed her work at Harvard and left. Dr. Anderson himself expected to leave soon. He felt, however, that Dr. Bissell was quite capable of handling Suffield's request in his stead. Dr. Anderson reiterated his interest in Suffield and said he'd be glad to help relate our research to the profession during the dissemination phase. This is how Suffield's two year relationship to Dr. Bissell came about.

On January 16, 1973, Dr. Evans requested of the Board of Education the following:

- . Endorse further exploration of the Anisa Model and preparation of one or more proposals seeking funds to be used in the education of interested faculty and initial implementation of the model. Such proposals to be developed with the advice of a citizen-Board-faculty committee and to be formally approved by the Board prior to submission to state, federal or private agencies.
- . Also authorize the superintendent to inform Dr. Daniel C. Jordan, Director of the Center for the Study of Human Potential, UMass, that based upon its present understanding of the Anisa Model, the Board is interested in having the Suffield Public Schools be designated as an Anisa school system and authorize Dr. Jordan to so indicate in any proposals or plans he submits to appropriate funding agencies. The Board would expect to be advised of the inclusion of the Suffield Schools in any of Dr. Jordan's plans or proposals concerning broad scale implementation of the Anisa Model. The Board further states that identification of Suffield with ANISA does not commit the Board to financial involvement without specific Board

action.

On January 23, 1973, after much vigorous discussion, the Board of Education approved that Dr. Evans, "file on behalf of the Suffield Board of Education with the Connecticut State Department, a proposal for funds under Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, to implement a project now known as Project Anisa-Suffield". With this vote of the Board the project was officially under way.

During December and January there were numerous strategy meetings between the Suffield team and the UMass team, the Suffield team and the teachers, and the Suffield team and the Curriculum Council. The question was asked over and over again, "Shall we proceed?" "Do you support the innovation?" Again and again the answer (with considered wisdom) was, "Yes!"

On February 1, 1973, a 119 page Title III proposal was transmitted to the Commissioner, State Department of Education, Connecticut. Project Anisa - Suffield proposed to demonstrate the following:

- A. The application of the Anisa Model to early childhood education in Suffield.
- B. The application of a process model of planned change demonstrating how the innovation will be accomplished.

C H A P T E R V
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANISA MODEL IN SUFFIELD

Introduction

This chapter describes the last two stages of the Anisa change effort; Stage V, Gaining Acceptance and Stage VI, Stabilization and Self Renewal. For the convenience of the reader, Stage V is divided into three parts - Year I, Year II and Year III. Each of these years is divided into two parts - acceptance of the innovation by individuals and acceptance of the innovation by groups.

Stage V: Gaining Acceptance

It is during the fifth stage that intentions are transformed into actions and the applicability of the innovation is tested. Will the innovation work? Does it solve all or at least part of the problem? Does it create new problems?

Year I (1973-1974)

The Title III Initial Application to the Commissioner of Education was submitted to Hartford on February 1, 1973. During that spring there were numerous phone calls from Dr. Evans to Dr. Richards, State Title III Director, tracing the path of the application through the bureaucracy. As the proposal passed from one state-level review committee

to another, Suffield became more encouraged and more excited. But still, it was no sure bet that the application would be approved ultimately. Meanwhile the staffs of the nurseries and kindergarten plus others became rather anxious regarding summer plans; June 25 was right around the corner. The school administration encouraged patience. As time passed beyond the first week of June, both the Suffield administration and faculty became frantic. It was so late. What would Suffield do as an alternative? How would they solve their problems if the project was not funded? Should the administration tell the staff to go ahead with other summer plans?

And at the center for the Study of Human Potential at the University of Massachusetts things were little better. They too had to make plans. They too had commitments and obligations. They knew they had three other groups coming to summer school but the Suffield group, and the dollars they represented, meant a great deal to the success of their summer school program.

On June 17, 1973, five days before public school was out for the summer and eight days before summer school was to begin, Dr. Evans received word from Dr. Richards that Project ANISA-Suffield had been funded. You can imagine the relief felt by all to know, at last, what was going to happen. For 1973-1974 the project was funded at the \$57,740.00

level with an expectation that all things being equal, the project would be funded for the following two years as well.

The target population for the first year of the Project was the children and the teachers, aides, volunteers, parents, specialists and administrators of the two nursery schools and kindergarten. A staff or parent volunteer was considered a client and was the object of intensive change strategies if they had a direct hands-on relationship to a child in nursery school or kindergarten. All others involved with the change process that first year were considered secondary clients.

Acceptance by Individuals of the Innovation

Rarely does anyone fully accept and adopt an innovation upon first hearing about it. People reach the decision to adopt an idea or innovation by a very complex process. When the innovation is a comprehensive model of education, the process is all the more involved. The process by which an innovation is adopted by individuals has been broken down into phases by researchers and summarized by Havelock (1973). These six phases in the adoption process have concomitant activities on the part of the change agent who is facilitating the adoption of the innovation. These phases are summarized briefly below:

COORDINATION OF CHANGE AGENT ACTIVITIES
WITH THE CLIENT'S ADOPTION ACTIVITIES

THE ADOPTION PROCESS
BY INDIVIDUALS

1. Awareness. The individual is exposed to the innovation and thus becomes 'aware' of it.
2. Interest. During this stage the client is actively seeking further information about the innovation.

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE
CHANGE AGENT

1. Awareness. The change agent wants to develop a clear and positive image of the innovation. The agent wants to instill a curiosity, a motivation to seek more information.
2. Interest. The change agent encourages the individual to seek out facts and become actively involved. The agent encourages group discussion as an opportunity to air doubts and mold positive attitudes about the innovation. Group discussion can be useful in supporting individual risk taking.

3. Evaluation. This is a period of 'mental trial'; a necessary preliminary to 'behavioral trial'. At this stage the individual decides whether or not it is worth the effort to try it out.
4. Trial. The individual uses the innovations on a small scale in order to find out how it will actually work in the client's own situation. An alternative is to use the innovation on a temporary or probationary basis before moving on
3. Evaluation. At this stage the change agent should attempt to provide information which will enable the client to envision the innovation applied to his or her own situation. One way of doing this is to demonstrate the innovation in the client's home environment under conditions that are natural to the client.
4. Trial. Further demonstration and encouragement will be needed in order to support the trial. The individual will need training in order to fulfill his or her new role. Failure at this stage is very real and the change agent will need to pro-

to true adoption.

vide maximum support and encouragement. The agent will want to help the client evaluate the trial.

5. Adoption. The results of the trial are weighed and considered and on the basis of this post-trial evaluation, the decision is made to adopt (or reject) the innovation.

5. Adoption. Even after this client has made the decision to adopt, he or she, may experience difficulty in carrying out the innovation and the change agent must be prepared to provide further training and encouragement.

6. Integration. This is when use of the innovation becomes routine.

6. Integration. Practice sessions, reminders, news-letters, follow-up conferences, observations and feed-back, all will be helpful in further integrating the innovation into the

everyday activities
of the client.

In the implementation of any innovation there will be a variation among individuals as to the point at which they are in their acceptance of the innovation. Some individuals will be only 'aware' and mildly 'interested', while others will have 'tried' the innovation and be convinced of its worth to the extent that they will have 'adopted' it. Since the clients will be at different points of acceptance so too will the activities of the change agent will need to vary accordingly. For example, some staff will be receiving information regarding philosophy while others will have someone working with them in the classroom demonstrating the hands-on application of an Anisa specification. (It is noted that the six phase process described by Havelock very neatly parallels the ANISA definition of learning competence -- differentiation, integration, and generalization.)

For purposes of organizing the descriptive history of the first year of the implementation, this portion of the case study is organized according to these six phases.

Awareness

For the Suffield faculty initial awareness of the Anisa Model of Education took place at the Bridge Street Schools on November 28, 1972. Approximately 65 people were present including almost all nursery through Grade 5 faculty. In

February of 1973, Dr. Evans sent to each faculty member a two-page summary of the Anisa Model. In April, Dr. Jordan addressed the entire faculty once again. In May, a newsletter sent out by Dr. Evans indicated that he was very supportive of the staff taking a close hard look at the Anisa Model. In that newsletter he told the faculty that the Title III proposal had been written, would in all likelihood be funded, and that selected primary and secondary clients should plan on attending summer school.

The faculty was impressed with the Model. No one who has had the opportunity to hear Dr. Jordan can doubt his sincerity and brilliance. He is charismatic to the point that more than once during the three years of the Anisa Project the question was raised, "Is it the Model that's so great, or is it Dan Jordan?" If the purpose of an awareness session is to arouse interest and peak curiosity, then the presentations by Dr. Jordan were eminently successful. The reaction of the faculty to Dr. Jordan's November presentation has already been cited. The majority of faculty were clearly interested in ANISA and wanted to know more.

Interest and Evaluation

The next two phases of adoption occurred during the 1973 six-week summer training program offered at the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts, about 35 miles

away from Suffield. The summer school was under the direction of Dr. Jordan and a team of 19 specialists from the Center for the Development of Human Potential at the School of Education. A laboratory school involving children ages 3-10 was provided for a hands-on experience.

When the change agent team first contemplated implementation of the Anisa Model it was thought that it would take three years to install nursery through Grade VIII; first year N-2, second year, 3-5, and third year, 6-8. Upon further exploration with Drs. Jordan and Streets, this design was thought to be unrealistic and was modified to: first year, N and K, second year, Grade 1, and third year, Grade 2. The final design turned out to be first year, N and K; second year, Grade 1 and 2; third year, consolidation and preservice with the third grade.

The summer school was designed to give the primary clients a six-weeks summer school experience and to those who were secondary clients (those who needed to be "aware" of ANISA but were not expected to implement it immediately) a one week experience. Forty-one Suffield staff members were presented the Anisa philosophy and theory for one week. Seventeen of this number were primary clients who continued to participate in summer school for an additional five weeks. The summer school day was from 9:00 - 4:00 daily and involved application of ANISA techniques with children. Each staff

member was paid per diem plus travel and those professional staff who wished to receive six graduate semester hours credit as well.

During the first week participants received a detailed presentation by Dr. Jordan on the Philosophical Basis of the Anisa Model, the Anisa Theory of Development, the Anisa Theory of Curriculum and the Anisa Theory of Teaching. On Thursday of the first week, participants were introduced to the laboratory school and had a chance to view children from the observation booth. On Friday of the first week, participants began working with the specification on Attention and a prototypical experience related to that specification. The UMass staff modeled the prototypical experience and the "student" repeated it. These sessions were video-taped and later critiqued by all staff and students. It was an excellent technique for helping the Suffield staff understand and become facile in using the ANISA specifications.

The remainder of the summer training experience consisted of more lectures, explanation of other specifications, demonstrations, hands-on experiences and video-taped critiques. In terms of Havelock's phases, the individual teachers became actively involved in seeking more information about the innovation. During the explanations and demonstrations of specifications the individuals had an opportunity for 'mental trial' prior to 'behavioral trial'. The laboratory school provided an excellent opportunity for real teaching exper-

iences that were maximally supportive and minimally threatening. During the critique sessions there was ample opportunity to share doubts and reservations. The opportunity for immediate feed back provided for positive growth on the part of the participants.

There is something about a new experience that brings people together. So it was at UMass, that summer. For many Suffield staff this was the first opportunity they had to get to know one another. The reader will remember that prior to 1973, the kindergarten teachers were assigned to the principal of grades 3, 4, 5. The leisure of summer and the catalytic action of a new adventure, provided an excellent opportunity for Mrs. Oleksak and the kindergarten teachers to talk with each other. It also afforded each of the two nursery schools the opportunity to work together. The three sites began to develop a common identify with "early childhood education." All of the participants were students in a new adventure and they felt warm and supportive towards each other in their common efforts to understand the Model and translate it into practice.

During the last week of the summer training program the action moved from UMass to Suffield. The learning experience for the Suffield participants was to create an ANISA environment by arranging their teaching spaces (classrooms). Key to this learning was Dr. Nancy Rambusch, founder of the

American Montessori Society and co-director of the summer laboratory school. Dr. Rambusch helped each teaching team (kindergarten, Calvary, and Co-op) take a critical look at their teaching space. While others observed, she helped each team take apart and reassemble their learning environment according to Anisa principles.

There is an axiom in ANISA that states "purpose generates structure." This was never more true than after Dr. Rambusch helped over-haul the kindergarten space. From separate self-contained over-crowded triplicate classrooms, Dr. Rambusch helped the kindergarten faculty create a quiet spacious three room suite. At the Calvary Nursery School the space was completely reorganized (structured) according to purpose and with teaching platforms and new carpeting added. At Co-op the space was reorganized into learning centers which included a 'soft' corner, and new curtains and carpeting were added. My description does not do justice to the revolution that actually occurred at all three sites. The teachers put their hearts and souls into the effort to transform their classrooms into warm cheery learning environments with the appropriate auditory and visual shelter, working spaces and walking spaces, calm light coloring, and carpeted platforms and floors. It was during this last week of the summer program that the participants had a real opportunity to envision the innovation applied to her

individual situation. (The reader is referred to the pictures in Appendix A.)

A Pre-Service Education Program Questionnaire was constructed by Mr. Bondra to evaluate the affective reaction of the staff to the summer training program. It was administered at the end of the full six weeks. Data were obtained from 14 staff who attended for six weeks, three staff members who failed to check weeks attended, and one respondent participated for the first week only.

Table 5.1 shows that 67% of the staff felt the total summer program was satisfactory (+3). The great majority of the staff indicated a greater cognitive understanding of the Anisa Philosophy; the staff showed that 78% strongly agreed (+3) with the philosophy, with the remaining 22% giving a +2 rating. While there was very strong agreement with ANISA theory, the staff did not believe as strongly that they would be able to translate that theory into practice. It was nevertheless notable that 69% gave a +2 to +3 rating, only 6% were neutral (0) with no staff giving a negative rating. This high degree of confidence may be related to the staff involvement and learnings which, using an intrinsic reinforcement system, was judged by the majority (89%) to be in the superior range.

Table 5.1

Number and Percent Using a Seven Point Likert Scale of Staff Responding To The Pre-Service Education Questionnaire, Summer 1973

1. Generally speaking, how do you feel the summer program as a whole has been?

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very			(N = 18)			Very
Unsatisfactory					Satisfactory	
					33%	67%

2. How much cognitive (intellectual knowledge) change did you experience in your understanding of the ANISA model?

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very			(N = 18)			Very
Little						Much
					44%	56%

3. To what degree are you in agreement with the ANISA philosophy?

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Strongly			(N = 18)			Strongly
Disagree						Agree
					22%	78%

4. How adequately do you believe you will be able to implement the ANISA theory with its applied techniques in Suffield?

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very			6%	25%	63%	6%
Inadequately						Very
						Adequately

5. Using an intrinsic reward system, i.e., your own evaluation of your involvement and learnings this summer, indicate the qualitative grade you would give yourself.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very				11%	72%	17%
Poor						Very
						Superior

Table 5.1 Continued

6. Using the criterion of effort, i.e., prepared lectures, materials, demonstrations, readings, etc., rate the degree to which the ANISA staff performed its duties.

	-3	-2	-1	0	5%	28%	67%
Low Effort				(N = 18)	+1	+2	+3 High Effort

7. Using the criterion of effect, i.e., the effectiveness of the above efforts in developing your cognitive, affective and volitional competencies, rate the degree to which the staff was effective.

	-3	-2	-1	0	11%	39%	50%
Highly Ineffective				(N = 18)	+1	+2	+3 Highly Effective

8. Using the criterion of adequacy, i.e., the adequacy of the summer program in preparing you to understand and implement the ANISA model, rate the degree to which the summer program was adequate.

	-3	-2	-1	0	5%	17%	50%	28%
Very Inadequate				(N = 18)	+1	+2	+3 Very Adequate	

9. Using the criterion of efficiency, i.e., the efficiency with which the summer program operated, rate the degree to which the staff was efficient.

	-3	-2	-1	0	5%	28%	67%
Highly Inefficient				(N = 18)	+1	+2	+3 Highly Efficient

10. Using the criterion of process, i.e., the processes - not substantive matters - used during the summer program, rate the degree to which staff use appropriate ANISA type processes.

	-3	-2	-1	0	29%	18%	53%
Highly Inappropriate Processes				(N = 17)	+1	+2	+3 Highly Appropriate Processes

Trial

In order to facilitate trial and adoption the Project also provided an in-service training program for the Suffield staff. Throughout the school year ANISA specialists came to Suffield from UMass and to conduct workshops and engage in other teaching activities. The goal of the in-service program was to interact with the Suffield staff in a manner that facilitated their internalization of ANISA principles. This meant relating the teacher's classroom behavior to the theoretical and philosophical foundations of the Anisa Model. As an understanding of these principles occurred, the Suffield staff would more easily master the process of arranging environments and guiding the interaction of children. Organizing this in-service program was no mean task since many many people were involved. For example, the kindergarten team at Spaulding School by itself consisted of three teachers, three aides, and 16 parent volunteers.

Dr. Magdaline Carney acted as Suffield's primary trainer and co-ordinator of the in-service program. It was she who brought together the efforts of the ten UMass Anisa staff specialists who provided on-site consultation to teachers, modeled ANISA techniques with children, and provided expert knowledge in particular areas, e.g., perception, cognition, nutrition, etc. This team provided the equivalent of 144 days of on-site training at the three

target sites (Calvary, Co-op and Kindergarten).

An early September after-school session with all three sites present, for example, was devoted to the following broad goals for the accomplishment of the in-service training:

- (a) to realize that implementation as process is evolutionary - all processes cannot unfold immediately;
- (b) to insure that a purpose underlies every activity and that the process of differentiation, integration and generalization remain in clear focus at all times;
- (c) to begin diagnostic assessment of children, using available tools and techniques;
- (d) to re-arrange aspects of the environment to fit the evolving needs of children and their learning experiences;
- (e) to prescribe new learnings experiences based upon the diagnostic assessments.

A weakness to the in-service program was that, due to time constraints, feedback to teachers was not always adequate. It was often necessary to conduct feedback sessions during lunch breaks or the teachers' regularly scheduled planning hour. An attempt to correct this limitation was made during the second year of the Project.

consultation and training was provided on the basis of emerging problems and concerns. Considerable flexibility was shown with consultation adapted to the needs at the different sites. Attempts were made to insert specifications into a flowing program. That is, each site had an on-going content curriculum to which a balance of the process curriculum was begun. On-site schedules were adhered to beginning September 10, 11, 12, 26, 27, 28; as well as October 10, 11, 12, 24, 25 and 26. The first two visits were used specifically to help consolidate the information gained during the summer training program; to see that ground rules and daily routines were consolidated. In addition, during October, there were three evening sessions, one at each site, for parent-volunteers, curriculum specialists, teachers, and aides. October 26 was designated as a day long aesthetic workshop. And the year went along pretty much in that fashion.

An In-Service Education Program Questionnaire using a Likert rating scale and written responses was developed by Mr. Bondra to evaluate the attitude of the staff who participated in the in-service program. The questionnaire was administered at the end of the school year. Data was obtained from six key staff members - two nursery school teachers, two kindergarten teachers and two administrators. Table 5.2 presents the data.

Table 5.2

Number and Percent of Staff Responding
To The In-Service Education Questionnaire
For 1973-74, Based on a Seven Point Likert Scale

1. Generally, how do you feel the in-service program as a whole has been?

-3	-2	-1	0	57%	43%	+3
				+1	+2	
Very						Very
Unsatisfactory						Satisfactory

2. Using the criterion of effort, i.e., materials demonstrations, time available, specifications, etc., rate the degree to which the ANISA staff performed its responsibilities.

-3	-2	-1	0	43%	14%	43%
				+1	+2	+3
Low						High
Effort						Effort

3. Using the criterion of effect, i.e., the effectiveness of the above efforts in helping you become an ANISA teacher, rate the degree to which the staff was effective.

-3	-2	-1	0	29%	57%	14%
				+1	+2	+3
Highly						Highly
Ineffective						Effective

4. Using the criterion of adequacy, i.e., how adequate was the in-service program in preparing you to implement the ANISA model, rate the degree to which the in-service program was adequate.

-3	-2	17%	0	50%	33%	+3
		-1		+1	+2	

Table 5.2 Continued

5. Using the criterion of efficiency, i.e., the efficiency with which the in-service program was conducted, rate the degree to which the staff was efficient.

		14%		57%	29%	
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Highly Inefficient						Highly Efficient

6. Using the criterion of process, i.e., the "how" not the "content", rate the degree to which the staff used processes consistent with ANISA theory.

		14%		43%		43%
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

7. As a result of having participated in the full Pre- and In-Service ANISA Programs, indicate the degree to which you, in your own judgement, have been effective in putting into practice ANISA concepts.

				29%	71%	
-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Very Ineffective						Very Effective

By inspection, the data in Table 5.2 indicates that the staff attitude towards the program generally ranged from moderate to very positive. There were only two negative quantitative responses.

The Pre-and In-Service Programs should be looked at as a totality. One without the other, is inadequate. Considered in this perspective, the 1973-74 teacher training program could in general be considered as adequate. It was adequate in reaching its primary target population; the nursery and kindergarten staffs. The program was able to build on staff training begun during the summer and the on-site con-

sultation dealing with emerging problems in the real situation was very supportive to staff.

Adoption and Integration

Each member of the early childhood faculty with a hands-on relationship to nursery or kindergarten children was expected by the administration to try the Anisa Model in their classrooms. There was an additional expectation; they would also adopt the innovation. This posture was not unrealistic since the nursery schools and kindergarten teachers had indicated, through their response to questionnaires and by direct personal comment, a high commitment to making the Anisa Model work in their classrooms. By the time June 1974 came around Anisa Model was well on its way towards total integration into the education life of the nurseries and kindergarten of Suffield.

Harvard Evaluation

The reader will remember that the Suffield Public Schools employed as "friendly" critic a team of evaluators from Harvard University headed by Dr. Joan Bissell, Dr. Robert Anderson's protege. This evaluation team assessed the Anisa Model and its implementation for the first and second year of the project. Against the author's protests funding for a third was not requested in the third year proposal.

The primary purpose of the evaluation undertaken by Dr.

Bissell and her colleagues during the first year was to analyze ANISA as an approach to early childhood education in the context of other contemporary practices being implemented in the nation. The analysis was made in terms of educational goals, methods and curriculum, children's classrooms experiences, organizational and staffing patterns, and cost.

The evaluation was carried out using several procedures; materials developed by ANISA were reviewed and analyzed, on-site observations were made of ANISA classrooms in Suffield, teachers in ANISA classrooms were interviewed, and ANISA in-service trainings activities were observed.

The final report of Dr. Bissell (1974) and her colleagues is quite positive regarding adoption of the Anisa Model during the first year. They write in May of 1974:

In conclusion, we consider the implementation of ANISA in Suffield to be proceeding very well. Major strengths in ANISA lie in the rich theory which underlies the approach, in the challenging experiences provided to children in ANISA classrooms and in the successful organizational and staffing patterns which have been created as the model has been implemented. It appears that Suffield teachers, children and parents have found the approach both consistent with their educational orientation and capable of generating exciting new

classroom experiences. The teachers feel that ANISA has given them the support and encouragement needed to develop good learning situations. As part of the implementation of ANISA, Suffield administrators have been able to experiment, to provide for a great deal of teacher input into educational decision-making and to provide essential administrative support and encouragement for ANISA. In sum, the implementation of ANISA appears to have been successful during the first year. (p. 24)

Acceptance of the Group of the Innovation

The reader may remember that it was the expressed purpose of the Title III Project to demonstrate 1) the application of the Anisa Model to early childhood education in Suffield, and 2) the application of the process model of planned change demonstrating how the innovation will be accomplished. In a manner of speaking the first goal, that of applying the Model to early childhood education, was focused on the knowledge change of individuals; i.e. the Pre-Service Education Program at UMass and the In-Service Program back in Suffield for the primary clients. The second goal, application of the process of planned change, was focused upon attitude change of groups; i.e. individual teaching teams, administrators, Citizens Advisory Groups, Steering Committees

etcetera.

The Project ANISA, Suffield proposal (1973) states:

Another problem area of concern - related but seldom treated as an entity - is the process of program implementation. Many innovative programs, as the literature shows, may actuate individual, group, and institutional behaviors which prevent evaluation and adoption of the program on its own merits. The skeletons of innovations which collapsed due to inadequate attention to the totality of change processes litter the educational scene. This is documented by Title III experience, Ford Foundation studies, etcetera.

(p. 5)

For Suffield a process model of planned change which would support the innovation, allow for modification, and provide continual renewal of the system included (a) the use of a process leadership style consistent with the Anisa Model, (b) development of new organizational structures (Steering Committee, teaching teams), and (c) staff development in those organizational processes by which people accomplish their own and organizational goals (communication, problem solving, and decision making skills). It is the discussion of these various process strategies which concern the next section of this case study.

Process Leadership

From the beginning the Suffield change agent team was committed to a process leadership style. Within the four-member change agent team Mr. Bondra and Mr. Lincoln were considered experts on this aspect of the model's implementation. Mr. Bondra had been a graduate student at Columbia University under Goodwin Watson and Kenneth Herrold and Mr. Lincoln was working at the University of Massachusetts under Kenneth Blanchard. In addition, Mr. Lincoln was enrolled in the two-year Graduate Students' Professional Development Program (GSPDP) at the National Training Labs (NTL). While the other two members of the change team had less formal education in organizational development and group dynamics, they were equally committed to a participatory model of administration, especially in light of the process nature of the Anisa Model.

At the time the change agent team was writing the 1973 Title III proposal, the Anisa Theory of Administration had not yet been fully articulated by Drs. Jordan and Streets. The reader will remember that the Anisa Model had not been fielded prior to 1973 and many aspects of the Model were still in evolution even though the basic philosophical principles upon which the model rested were not. It was therefore necessary for the change agent team to develop an interim theory of administration based upon their own

ideas and those of others who they felt were compatible with ANISA: As it turned out, the Anisa Theory of Administration which unfolded in the fall of 1974 was quite compatible with Dr. Blanchard's theory of leadership. Process leadership allows for group participation in goal setting, problem solving, and decision making. In this process the group is encouraged to become aware of the problem, accept responsibility for the problem, deal with the problem in a least-sized group, and steer by the consequences of their decision. An effective leader adopts his or her leader behavior to meet the needs of the group, the task, and the particular situation. Success and effectiveness depend upon the personality and expectation of the leader, characteristics of the followers, and other situational variables. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) refer to this as the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

Innovators, Resistors, and Leaders

As previously mentioned, the steps taken in the process of getting ready for change (Stages I through IV) are as important to the overall change effort as are the steps used in the actual implementation of the change. The process leadership style used by the change agent team from the beginning paid attention to the resistors of change as well as the innovators and leaders.

Three types of people play a roll in generating group acceptance of an idea; (a) the innovators, (b) the resisters, and (c) the leaders (both formal and informal). Innovators are notable because they are intelligent, traveled and depend on outside sources for information. They are usually receptive to influence by outside change agents. At home, they may be viewed as "odd balls" or mavericks. When these people have a commitment to a new idea they can be relied upon to stand up and be counted. Resistors are defenders of the social system the way it is. They lend equilibrium and stability to a social system usually asking the 'hard' questions about an innovation. Leaders are certain influential people who are held in high esteem by the majority of their fellow man. They are usually not the first people to try out new ideas because they need to maintain their standing with the followers. They listen to both the innovators and to resisters so that they can better size up a developing situation. They watch the innovations to see how the idea works, and they watch the resisters to test the social risks of adopting the idea. Indeed in many cases they are eager to observe these changes because their continuance in power rests upon their ability to judge innovations. As Havelock (1973) says, "They want to be champions of the innovation whose time has come (p. 120)."

According to Havelock (1973) there are four steps to group acceptance of an innovation:

1. First, the change agent team introduces the innovation to a core group of "innovators." The change agent team tries to get these persons to try out the innovation, to become sophisticated in its use and to demonstrate it to others.
2. Second, the change agent team begins working with some of the concerned citizens who are potential but not - yet vocal resisters, answering their questions and showing them by demonstration that the innovation does not violate established values and does not threaten the survival of the system as they know it.
3. Third, the change agent team brings the innovation to the attention of the leaders of the group, allowing them to observe live demonstrations by the innovators and sounding out the reactions of potential resisters.
4. Fourth, the change agent team allows the leaders to lead the way to acceptance by the rest of the system. If possible, the change team tries to get the leaders to publicly commit

themselves and organize themselves into supporting committees. (p. 122)

The Suffield change agent team that traveled to Hartford to meet with Dr. Richards and others from the State Department of Education that day in the fall of 1972 were people who were both leaders and innovators. All four members of the team were open to change and all four were in positions of formal powers. In a manner of speaking, Havelock's first step, that of introducing the innovation to a core group of innovators, occurred during that visit. The team's first impressions were later reinforced when this same group met with Drs. Jordan and Streets at the University of Massachusetts.

The change agent team quite appropriately anticipated Suffield's not-yet-vocal-resistors by presenting Dr. Jordan to the staff and community at several afternoon and evening meetings prior to the decision to write the Title III grant. At the conclusion of the second public meeting there was rather high agreement by the community's leaders that ANISA did not violate the values of the Suffield Public Schools nor did the Anisa Model appear to threaten the survival of Suffield's educational system. In fact, it appeared to most as if the innovation would enhance the future development.

By the early involvement of the teachers of the two nursery schools in the group acceptance process (they were

invited to attend Dr. Jordan's presentations and to participate in the Title III project) an important segment of Suffield's educational community became part of the ANISA leadership.

Implementation of an innovation is not unlike the game of Tug 'O War, in which one group tries to pull another group across a line. In a sense, resisters, once won become, in the eyes of others, innovators and sometimes leaders. It should be noted that there was little or no resistance on the part of the primary clients that first year. As will be seen when discussing the second year of the implementation this same statement was not true for the staffs at Bridge and West. During the second and third year the nursery and kindergarten staffs acted as important peer leaders in pulling others in the school system "across the line."

It occurred to the change agent team even as they were writing the first year Title III proposal that, in addition to a process leadership approach, there would be a need for new organizational structures to accompany the implementation of the Anisa Model. In January of 1973 they thought those additional structures might be: a Steering Committee, a parent's advisory committee, a public relations committee, and an advisory committee formed from the Early Childhood Sub-Committee of the Curriculum Council. They also felt there would be a need for an Early Education Team composed

of the three kindergarten teachers, the teachers from the Calvary and Cooperative nursery schools, the Project Director, and the Early Childhood principal. As it turned out, some of these new structures failed to materialize or were otherwise absorbed one into another.

The Steering Committee

The change agent team had the major responsibility for getting Project ANISA, Suffield off the ground. It was this team who met with Dr. Richards and the Connecticut State Department of Education folks, met with Drs. Jordan and Streets and arranged for their visits to Suffield, wrote the Title III proposal and made the arrangements for summer school. Once the proposal was approved and funded (July 1, 1973) the author took over as Project Director and relieved the change agent team of much of the detail for which they had previously been responsible. By the fall of 1973 it was apparent to the Director and the change agent team that there was a need to involve others more directly in the problem solving/decision making process. The new organizational structure developed for that purpose was called the Anisa Steering Committee.

From November 1973 to June of 1974 this Steering Committee met 12 times. The first meeting was held on November 8, 1973, at 12:00 noon at the office of the Project Director which was, at that time, in Suffield's Town Hall.

Following are the minutes taken at that first meeting. They are transcribed in toto and will give the reader the process flavor involved.

Present were: Dr. Evans, Mrs. Oleksak, Mrs. Hartley, Mr. Bondra, Mr. Lincoln, Mrs. Kruk, Mrs. Dowd, Mrs. Kelco, Mrs. Rudzik, Miss Carney

A. Introduction. Mr. Lincoln identified the above people in the following manner:

1. Dr. Evans, Superintendent of Schools
2. Mrs. Oleksak, Principal of Elementary Schools
3. Mrs. Hartley, representing Spaulding Kindergarten
4. Mrs. Dowd, representing Cooperate Nursery School
5. Mrs. Kruk, representing Calvary Nursery School
6. Mrs. Kelco from West Suffield and
7. Mrs. Rudzik from Bridge Street as representatives of the schools where, hopefully, the Project-ANISA, Suffield will next be introduced
8. Miss Carney, consultant from UMass
9. Mr. Bondra, evaluator and researcher as well as process observer
10. Mr. Lincoln, director of the project, coordinator of sites, and the one who will rewrite Title III project for refunding of Anisa for another year.

B. Focus on Functions of the Steering Committee. What will the committee be asked to do and what are its responsibilities?

It is an advisory and recommending role on how best to proceed with implementation of Project-ANISA in Suffield.

Mr. Bondra, Dr. Evans, Mrs. Oleksak, and Mr. Lincoln wrote the request for the original grant; worked with Dr. Richards, Title III Director; set up bookkeeping; set up sites. Now responsibilities should move from these four people to a team.

Dr. Evans is the receiver of funds, controlled by people. Mr. Bondra will be responsible for research for innovative program. If the program should not be acceptable, the Steering Committee will call it

to a halt. Or, it will facilitate the program, be responsible for how it moves forward. Make recommendations to Dr. Evans and to the Board.

Grant awarded as three year innovative field testing of the Anisa model.

Dr. Evans requested Mr. Bondra to speak on operations research.

Two goals: A. Implementation of Anisa Model
B. Process used to do it.

How?

Organization of several groups one of which is the Steering Committee. Evaluation mandated by federal government. Steering Committee looks at consequences immediately. Is a feed back process so policy can be recommended.

Steering Committee set up to be recommending body based upon input of various operations. Steering Committee role is primarily one of recommending. As we operate daily, we set up mechanism.

Dr. Evans spoke of the necessity of all to participate in a venture of this type. Have been many innovations in American education that have collapsed. Some were good, but process was wrong. Anisa model will stand or fall on itself--not because of failure of all to be involved.

Mrs. Dowd feels her views are limited and, therefore, all views should be thoroughly discussed during Steering Committee meeting. Mr. Lincoln feels that we should "hash around" the in-service program as one of the Steering Committee's functions.

Mrs. Oleksak feels that the West and Bridge representatives on the Steering Committee should be disseminators of information to colleagues who have any apprehension. Mrs. Kelco feels it most important that information be disseminated by them. Mrs. Rudzik feels that there is much apprehension among her colleagues. Mr. Lincoln felt that fear of elementary teachers was very practical. Mrs. Rudzik felt Mr. Lincoln's meeting did much to dispel fear.

Mrs. Hartley foresees that this feeling of fear will

exist throughout the system as the Project-ANISA rolls up through the system. Mrs. Hartley stated that she is as excited today about the Anisa program as she was the day she left UMass last summer. Happy to say that the Kindergarten is outgrowing some of the anguish of the past months, but excitement remains.

Dr. Evans brought up the point that under the grant everybody is co-equal--public and non-public sections of Anisa program. Federal funding means sharing--in-service training, video tapes, etc. Specialists are on the Board of Education payroll but the spirit and intent of the grant is that these specialists share by meeting and giving suggestions to non-public Anisa institutions--within a fair time limit.

Mrs. Hartley feels Kindergarten can help with some of the seemingly insurmountable problems as the project rolls up into the lower grades--ex. time problem.

Mr. Lincoln spoke of the need which exists to try to facilitate communications between staff of the three sites. If one has a planning time problem, then the Steering Committee should be dealing with that problem.

Next year we must anticipate degree of time required for planning and degree of time for in-service.

PUT ON AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING--Sharing must be discussed. Planning time for present and future. In-service time for present and future.

Mrs. Oleksak's contribution to planning time was that the teacher is the master who diagnoses, prescribes, and evaluates. Others can become the technicians. Dr. Evans feels that, in part, this is already going on in Suffield school system.

Mr. Lincoln raised the question as to what Miss Carney feels that she can do on the Steering Committee.

- a. Hear problems
- b. Give suggestions

- c. She stressed that the committee must shy away from policy making.
- d. Will be happy to be here and will readjust her program to accomodate Steering Committee meetings.

Mr. Lincoln addressed himself to the question as to whether the people there assembled wanted to participate in the Steering Committee and see where it moves. What time is the Steering Committee to meet and what kind of time can the people give? He would like a standing meeting every other week--subject to change if one every week was needed or less frequently if a meeting every other week is too often.

Mrs. Kruk suggested that it would be better to make definite time such as the first and third Thursdays of the month rather than every 2 weeks.

Mr. Lincoln stated that once decided upon, a definite schedule would be mailed out.

Dr. Evans brought up the point that if something seemed to be developing into a problem, the committee should convene the group the next Thursday coming up.

Mr. Bondra stated that he would like to be a member of the committee. He feels that initially there will be a need for more meetings until all members understand each other. To start, a weekly meeting would be necessary and then could go to twice a month meeting. It is needed in order to learn the overall views of the members and the members are in need of much information. Mr. Bondra reminded those present that if they assumed the responsibilities of a member of the Steering Committee, it would take a great deal from them.

Mr. Oleksak felt that people should have the chance to say that they could not accept membership on the committee.

Mr. Lincoln stated that there must be a representative from each site even if it meant buying time to cover the members absence from the classroom to attend the meetings.

Miss Carney remarked that it takes a long time to know each of the members of a committee. She believes that there is nothing to equal frank, loving consultation. She feels that all problems should be put on the table openly--never feel hesitant to do so.

Mr. Lincoln suggested that we have Steering Committee meetings at a time when Miss Carney was in town.

Discussion as to time of day for meeting ensued. Mr. Lincoln suggested time for next meeting be set--Wednesday, November 28, at 12:--1:30.

First on agenda next time should be drawing calendar and getting firm dates.

Dr. Evans felt that 20 days is a long time between meetings and if anything should come up that wobbled the model, a meeting should be called. It was agreed that November 28 was too distant for the next meeting. It was decided that the next meeting should be Thursday, November 15, from 12:00-1:20.

Mrs. Hartley objected to that particular time because it is the period when the Kindergarten children flow and move from area to area.

Mr. Lincoln asked if there were any closing statements and Miss Carney asked for information regarding next week's in-service program and placement of 3 staff members who are to be in town.

Mr. Lincoln requested that in-service problem be put on agenda of next meeting.

Mr. Bondra repeated that the most critical decision each person has to make after today's meeting is to decide whether they wanted to participate and assume the responsibilities of being a member of the Steering Committee. If they do not so choose, they must so state at the next meeting.

Mrs. Kelco was of the opinion that such a decision would in part be determined by the hour of the meeting in relation to their class work.

Mr. Bondra said this group must be organized and that items which individuals desire to have on the agenda must be put on.

Meeting adjourned at 1:10 P.M. at which time some members went into small group meetings.

These notes of that first meeting are remarkable in several respects. The reader will note that all the members made a verbal contribution of some kind during the meeting. Two members went so far as to mention fear and apprehension amongst the teaching staff about ANISA. Mr. Bondra acted as a process facilitator. Mr. Lincoln acted as Chairperson. During this first meeting the task of the Steering Committee was appropriately identified and the role of its members properly clarified. The conversation suggests that the roll-up of ANISA was still quite tentative at that time. It was implied that the Steering Committee had the power to recommend the halting of the innovation if and when they should make that decision. For the first time (but not the last) discussion began about the amount of curriculum planning time required by the Model. This issue was to come up over and over again as the nursery and kindergarten staff spent what seemed to be an inordinate amount of time planning their classroom activities. Another issue that was to reoccur throughout the first year was the quality and quantity of in-service. Dr. Carney's participation in the Steering Committee was critical to open communications between the field site and UMass. Unfortunately Dr. Carney had too many jobs to do and as the year progressed found it necessary to miss more and more meetings.

It is fair to say that the Steering Committee made rather good progress for a first meeting. While the Steering Committee did not replace the four-member change agent team, more and more decisions were left to the Project Director and the Steering Committee. Since the Steering Committee included all of the change agent team members this was not inappropriate. Within the Steering Committee itself the four members acted as leaders with the Project Director also being chairperson of the Steering Committee. The Superintendent of Schools seemed comfortable with this arrangement and often reminded the author that he was Project Director and that he had the authority and responsibility for the project's implementation. When there was a specific administrative task to accomplish the four-member change agent team got together to accomplish it, for example, writing the second year Title III continuation grant.

Members of the Steering Committee felt their presence at meetings was important and only rarely was a member absent. It is fair to say that the Steering Committee functioned in a rather egalitarian fashion. As the year went along the group matured taking on fundamental and often emotional issues. Several problems emerged during the year which were never successfully handled by the Steering Committee or the Board of Education. For example negotiating the intricacies of the In-service program continued to be a problem through-

out the life of the project; more will be said of this in Chapter VI. Also, the issue of getting the five year olds onto the same site as the six and sevens, though discussed, was never resolved. The record keeping system and its computerization continued to elude the Steering Committee, staff and the administration even though considerable Steering Committee time was devoted to this issue.

For those who are interested and to illustrate the continuity of agenda, a summary of the notes of the second meeting follows:

Project-ANISA, Suffield
Box 126
Suffield, Connecticut, 06078

DATE: November 15, 1973 - 12:00-1:20 P.M.

RE: Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting of Project-ANISA, Suffield

1. Members in attendance: Mrs. Hartley, Miss Carney, Mrs. Oleksak, Mr. Bondra, Mr. Lincoln, Mrs. Kruk, Mrs. Dowd, Mrs. Kelco, and Mrs. Rudzik.
Members absent: Dr. Evans
2. Minutes approved of meeting on November 8, 1973.
3. Discussion of the need to set up a process for visitation to the various Anisa sites.
4. Discussion of the operation of the Steering Committee. This issue needs further discussion: i.e. chairmanship, method for developing the agenda, responsibilities of the Committee.
5. Discussion of meeting times. The group decided that afternoon rather than noon was best. Miss Biggerstaff of Calvary will sit in for Mrs. Kruk. Next meeting was set for Wednesday, November 28, from 2:30-5:00 P.M.

6. Discussion of in-service schedule. Held for further discussion.
7. Handed out sheets of reference on Piaget.
8. Discussion of Anisa records. Mrs. Oleksak wants scope and sequence chart--step by step development. Observers need to know what they are looking for. There followed a discussion on how to measure progress, how to record growth, how to evaluate growth, how child is transferred from one grade to another and from one school system to another without grades. Suggestion: A sequence chart be provided giving information in five areas. "This child has experienced thus and so in psychomotor area" and so on down through the five areas. Suggestion: A three symbol code be devised . . . ready to move, stay, back. If once the kindergarten gets a profile set up, it should be applicable to the nursery school. Records should be one continuous record in the five areas. Mr. Bondra: Since this group is trying to deal with problem, Mrs. Hartley should bring in profile as far as it has gone. Kindergarten profile can be refined to apply for future grades.
9. Discussion of future agenda
10. Meeting adjourned at 1:20 P.M.

As the year went along, the group dealt with other relevant issues:

- . The use of public school specialists in the nursery schools. This issue was resolved by stating that specialists (music, physical education, art, reading, etc.) were available as consultants to the teaching staff of the nursery schools on a request basis, but were not available for direct services to children. If a child was thought to be handicapped then referral for evaluation to the Director of Pupil Services was appropriate.

- . Early admission of children to kindergarten. Since ANISA was a child development model it made sense to let children progress as they were ready. The Board Policy stated a child had to be 5 by January 1 for admission to kindergarten. The Steering Committee asked for and got a policy change which allowed early admission. A similar policy had to evolve so that children who were ready mid-year for a Grade I experience could transfer from the kindergarten site to either Bridge or West.
- . A Day Care Center at the High school. There was some discussion about a day care center at the high school for ten or twelve children. The high school building could not meet state standards and the idea was dropped. It should be noted that one of the reasons the Anisa Model was given such high support by the State Department of Education was that it was an early childhood model that bridged nursery and grades K-1-2.
- . Harvard Evaluation. The Steering Committee spent a good portion of two meetings reviewing the reports by Dr. Bissell and her colleagues.
- . Open classroom. There was a need to continue

curriculum development throughout the rest of the school system even while ANISA was being implemented in the nursery schools and kindergarten. Everyone was anxious to develop curricula which was compatible with ANISA. But who was to say? By all measures the Anisa Model of Education at this time was in dynamic evolution and many areas (reading and language, the affective) were still in process. The issue of the compatibility of the open classroom approach (which was in vogue 1968-1976) with ANISA was much discussed. The reader will remember that the West Suffield staff was trending in the direction of the open classroom and did not feel any great desire to go in the direction of ANISA. Also several teachers at Spaulding School were moving in that same direction and wanted some word from the Steering Committee endorsing that approach. This question came up early in the implementation process for on December 12, 1973 the Steering Committee passed the following resolution. "We see no problem transitioning from open education to ANISA and if a teacher wants to use it (open classroom) we see nothing against it." This motion legitimi-

zed the efforts at West and Spaulding and relieved considerable staff anxiety.

- . Multiaging of 5, 6 and 7 on the same site. Throughout the year the Steering Committee grappled with this question. Many designs were explored and a sub-committee was set up to deal with the question. The committee was unable to come up with any acceptable solution and the question remained unanswered at year's end. Kindergarten would remain at Spaulding and grades one and two would remain at Bridge and West. For the next year at least the 5 year olds would remain geographically isolated from the 6 and 7's.

Organizational Structures Antieipated But Not Developed

It was anticipated that there would be an Early Childhood Team composed of the Project Director, the Principal of Early Childhood Education, the three kindergarten teachers, and the nursery school teachers. The group did try to meet on one occasion but the logistics were impossible. Since the Kindergarten teachers taught two sessions, they were not available until after 3:00 daily. In addition they were operating the kindergarten as a suite so of necessity had to engage in team planning at the close of each day. That moved the time for an Early Childhood Team meeting beyond 4:00 P.M.

The nursery schools were basically morning programs with the teachers leaving shortly after noon or at the latest, in early afternoon. A meeting held from 4:00 to 5:00 P.M. meant that the nursery school teachers had to return to work and that the kindergarten teachers had to extend their day. In addition there seemed to be little purpose. The Steering Committee and its representative form seem to provide the necessary platform for communication and problem solving.

The development of advisory councils (from the Curriculum Council and from the parents) never took place. In the instance of the Sub-committee on Early Childhood from the Curriculum Council, such an advisory committee seemed unnecessary since many members of the Curriculum Council were already members of the Steering Committee. In the instance of a Parent's or Citizen's Advisory Committee there was much discussion. The Director who was already committed to death was dragging his heels in going about the development of such a committee. There is no doubt that one was needed and would have been helpful to the implementation. The matter was discussed at Steering Committee and it looked at several points, as if one would be founded. However, fact is, none was, and, in Chapter VI, this will be noted as a weakness in the implementation. A Public Relations Committee was never discussed. Had a Parents' Advisory Committee been formed it might well have served as a public

relations committee as well.

Staff Development

During 1973-1974 very little was done to enhance the staff's abilities to work in groups (communications, group process, problem solving). Mr. Bondra on several occasions acted as process consultant for the group with whom he was involved, but, by and large, the effort and its consequent influence was minimal. The Director modeled process leadership for the group each time the Steering Committee met. It was the mode to call for the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and to encourage all members to participate. As will be demonstrated, in Year II measures were taken to correct these deficiencies in staff development.

Year II (1974-1975)

During the winter of 1974 the change agent team began to deal with the question of continuing Project ANISA Suffield into its second year. They were encouraged by Dr. Roger Richards, State of Connecticut Title III Director, who felt that the over all purpose of Title III was to demonstrate in the field key innovations in education. Dr. Richards felt that ANISA was such a thrust. The Connecticut State Department of Education was looking for a demonstration of best practice in early childhood and Dr. Richards was pleased with the apparent happy marriage between the private nursery

schools and the public kindergarten. He wished to see the demonstration extended to include Suffield's entire early childhood program N-K-1-2, and beyond, if that was the wish of the Suffield staff and Board.

Both the Superintendent of Schools and the Principal/Director of Early Childhood Education were also anxious to see the Model extended into Grades 1 and 2. During the year they had seen good things happen in terms of staff and students and they wanted to offer these same good things to the rest of the school system. Further discussion with the nursery and kindergarten staffs encouraged the administration to proceed with the second year grant.

In late winter of 1974 the change agent team began the footwork needed to write the continuation grant. There was a need to learn from the mistakes of their first year. The change agent team and the Steering Committee were determined to develop a pre-service (summer school) and an in-service program which more closely reflected teacher needs. To this end the Project Director conducted a needs assessment with the staffs of the Cooperative and Calvary Nursery Schools and Dr. Carney. Similarly, Mr. Humphrey and Mrs. Oleksak interviewed their own staffs. Using this gathered data, the team sat down and wrote the Second Year Continued Application to the Commissioner of Education, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut to Support An Innovative Project Under Provision of Title III of the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL89-10) (Lincoln, 1974). This document which was submitted to the Commissioner May 1, 1974, reflected the hopes and wishes of The University of Massachusetts and the administration and staff of Suffield Schools. The two broad goals of the Project remained the same; 1) to demonstrate the application of the Anisa Model to early childhood education in Suffield, and 2) the application of a process model of planned change demonstrating how the innovation will be accomplished.

The target population during the second year of the Project was the Bridge-West teaching staffs, their aides, and their specialists (art, music, physical education, etc.). These were the new hands-on people who would be teaching children with one year of ANISA under their belt. While the kindergarten and nursery school staffs remained important, for purposes of change strategies, these new hands-on folks were the focus of attention. The goal of the Project was to provide maximal support to these new people while reinforcing previous learnings in the nursery and kindergarten staffs, and providing introduction of ANISA to teachers in Grade III, IV, and V. The reader will remember that the decision was made to introduce ANISA to Grades 1 and 2 simultaneously based on the fact that it was impossible to have a primary school with half of the staff and students on the Anisa Model and half of the staff and students on a traditional (or other)

model.

Acceptance by Individuals of the Innovation

Once again the six phases of acceptance by individuals as summarized by Havelock (1973) will be used to organize the descriptive history of the second year of implementation. These six phases are: Awareness, Interest, Evaluation, Trial, Adoption, Integration.

Awareness

It is fair to say that by September of 1974 the entire school system and most of the town of Suffield was 'aware' of the Anisa Model. For the Grade 3, 4, and 5 staff at Spaulding the first week of summer school served as an intensive awareness session. Since three distinct populations (teacher/aide/specialist) attended the 1974-75 summer school, it was necessary to differentiate the summer school program in order to meet the needs of these different participants. For the Spaulding staff the goal was maximal development of the participant's ability to know, understand, and articulate the fundamentals of the philosophical and theoretical foundation of the Anisa Model. Judging by the reaction of the 24 Spaulding staff who attended the one week 'Awareness' session, the program was a success.

Interest and Evaluation

Since the faculties at Bridge and West had already been

'aware' of ANISA during the first week of the previous summer school, the second year four-week summer session served the purpose of providing further information about the Anisa Model and an opportunity for 'mental' trial prior to the implementing the innovation in their classrooms in the fall.

The summer school program was changed from the previous year in three significant respects; one, it was shortened from a six weeks program to four; two, it was held in Suffield rather than in Amherst; and three, the Suffield staff assumed more responsibility for the management of the summer school and their own training. Despite hard work on everyone's part, the summer school did not measure up to its own expectations or, by comparison, with the quality of the first summer school. This was true for several reasons.

Due to the travel factor and a shortage of space at UMass the decision was made to hold the summer school program in Suffield. It was thought that it was easier for a few UMass faculty to travel to Suffield than for 40 or 50 Suffield participants to travel to Amherst. This was true, but the trade off was that the unfreezing effect of the translocation from Suffield to Amherst never occurred within the Suffield faculty. Nor did the same comraderie develop between participants that had been facilitated the previous summer by the 45 minute drive to and from Amherst and lunches eaten together.

Moreover, the UMass faculty, because it did travel, had to spend time and energy on transportation rather than the summer school itself.

The major responsibility for organization and administration of the summer school shifted from Dr. Jordan and his team to Suffield. Dr. Carney's only role was to coordinate the lectures. Mr. Lincoln was to take care of administrative detail, Mrs. Oleksak was to organize and manage the 20 student laboratory school, and Mr. Humphrey was to run the video cameras for the critique of the teachers' hands-on experience with children. This organizational structure while theoretically adequate was inefficient and often disorganized.

Also, the laboratory school never quite served the purposes for which it was intended. The University site was adapted to handling student observers by virtue of one-way mirrors and microphones. The Bridge Street site on the other hand had no such conveniences, and was in fact only an ordinary classroom. Also, because of the heat, the teachers were receiving their lectures in the airconditioned high school while the lab school was in the non-airconditioned (hot) Bridge Street School. This set up provided little motivation for staff to spend long periods of time engaging in hands-on experiences with children. And, because the summer school was held in Suffield it was far too easy for Mr. Lincoln, Mrs. Oleksak, and Mr. Humphrey to get caught up in their other

administrative summer duties (hiring new staff, ordering supplies, preparing for the fall). The coordination of lectures seemed to go well and was a major strength of the pre-service program. Dr. Jordan was used in only a limited way during the second summer school and his presence was missed by those who had also attended the first summer school. None-the-less Mr. Bondra found in his survey of the participants that the professional staff felt the summer school program was moderately successful. Based upon an objective questionnaire using a seven point Likert scale, the staff judged the summer program to be highly successful; an average scaled rating score of 5.2 was obtained.

Trial

Whereas the kindergarten and nursery school teachers by the end of summer school were enthusiastic about the trial and adoption phase of the implementation, the teachers in Grade I and II were much more cool and considered in their approach. Some staff were disillusioned as to just what was the Anisa Model of Education. A few were looking for cookbook approaches and were frustrated by the lack of 'canned' anisa-type materials to accompany the Model. Other staff were looking forward to retirement and just wanted to 'fade away'. In only one or two instances was there a high commitment to trying the innovation. The Superintendent and the change agent team grappled with this resistance. Through the use of staff

development techniques and a good in-service program they felt the nay-sayers would eventually be overcome. For the moment, the administration asked only that the teaching staff try the ANISA approach in any manner that they found comfortable. And so, - try it they did - with reservation.

During the school year Dr. Jordan and his team provided a total of 36 days on-site in-service training for the Calvary and Cooperative Nursery staffs and the full Early Childhood Education Staff of 16 teachers. In addition, 14 specialists were provided two full days of in-service at the University of Massachusetts and two full days on-site. Based on participant observation, testimonial reports, interviews, and questionnaires, the global effect of the in-service program was moderately positive. Staff reaction to the fall in-service program were essentially negative as documented by a questionnaire given at the end of the sessions. Improved program planning through the intervention of the Process Observer (Mrs. Bohn) resulted in a significant improvement. The results of the questionnaire during the spring in-service sessions for the teaching staffs resulted in a rating of 4.3 on a five point Likert scale -- most effective. The training sessions for the specialists were shown to be consistently positive throughout. Try as they might, the University of Massachusetts' staff could not provide technical assistance to the classroom

teacher to the degree deemed necessary by them. This was noted and adjusted for in the third year continuation grant.

During the first year of the implementation it was noted that while the pre-service and in-service programs were adequate for the classroom teachers and their aides, the specialists needed something different. And even within the the specialist group there was variety - teaching personnel such as music and art specialists and support personnel such as psychologists and reading consultants. An attempt was made the second year to modify the in-service program to meet these diverse needs. To this end four meetings were held between the UMass staff and 14 Suffield specialists (Learning Disabilities, Reading, Media, Guidance, Speech, Health, Art, Music, Nutrition, Physical Education, Psychology, Social Work). Two of the meetings were held in Amherst and two were held in Suffield. Topics covered included: Classification of the Role of the Specialist in the Anisa Model, Integrating the Differentiated Staff, Planning-time and the Scheduling of Specialist. Only when the discussion got down to real problems within the Suffield Public Schools did the work sessions seem to meet the staff's needs. In spite of this new effort at supporting the specialists, the groups needs proved too diverse for inclusion in a single program and some personnel felt frustrated by their in-service experience. In summary, these four meetings while not helping to clairfy the needs of

some specialists (health or social worker for example) did meet the needs of others and did help to build a sense of inclusion and cohesion within the specialist staff themselves.

Adoption and Integration

By the end of the 1974-1975 school year the nurseries and kindergarten were well on their way toward intergrating the Anisa Model in other classrooms. For Grades 1 and 2 this level of enthusiasm was some distance in the future.

Acceptance of the Group of the Innovation

It was noted by the change agent team and the Steering Committee that in order to more effectively implement the Anisa Model during the second year they would need to strengthen the process aspects of the Project. By spring of 1974 the change agent team and the Steering Committee were aware that the honeymoon was over. Whereas the nursery and kindergarten teachers had enthusiastically endorsed the Anisa Model, the Bridge and West faculties were much more hesitant and reserved. The Steering Committee notes of the spring of 1974 reflect an increased anxiety on the part of the Bridge and West representatives about the impending summer school and the next school year. In order to overcome some of this anxiety the second year continuation grant provided for an Effective Leader Program and a Process Consultation Program.

Effective Leadership Program. The goals for this program were to:

1. Teach the administrator and staff the environmental factors which impinge upon effective leadership.
2. Teach the administrators and staff how to assess these factors.
3. Teach the administrators how to select (and use) the appropriate leadership style.
4. Help the administrator understand their own leadership style.
5. Expand the principals repertoire of styles of leadership.

During the 1974 pre-service summer school Dr. Kenneth Blanchard, Director of the Center for Leadership and Administration at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, made a two-day presentation to approximately 57 Suffield staff. During these workshops Dr. Blanchard explained his Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. This learning experience was enthusiastically received by the Suffield Staff; not only is the Life Cycle Theory dynamite, so is Dr. Blanchard--the two are an unbeatable combination. These two days were rated very high by the staff. This leadership program permitted open discussion between staff about appropriate leadership style, high relationship--low relationship, Quadrant I, II, etc., and the maturity of the group. The reader will remem-

ber that prior to the fall of 1974, Dr. Jordan had not yet fully articulated the Anisa Theory of Administration. Dr. Blanchard's presentation filled an important theoretical void in the process aspects of implementing the Anisa Model.

On September 24, 1974, a rather historic meeting took place at the University of Massachusetts between the ANISA specialists (Drs. Jordan, Streets, and Carney), Dr. Blanchard and Mrs. Bohn, and Suffield administrators (Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Bondra, Dr. Evans, Mr. Humphrey, and Mrs. Oleksak). The goal of the meeting was to generate a set of fundamental administrative principles which derive from the Anisa Model of Education. The notes which follow are not quotes, but rather this writer's interpretation of what was expressed that day. They may give the reader in a short time some flavor of the Anisa Theory of Administration.

1. Administration of an Anisa educational system serves the actualization of the potentialities of human beings.
 - a. The universe is characterized by change.
 - b. Once you are talking about change you are talking about process.
 - c. Once you are talking about process you are talking about potentiality.
 - d. Man is composed of an infinitude of potentiality.
 - e. It is the purpose and function of human beings to express all those potentialities at an optimum rate.
2. Management arises out of imminence.
 - a. Man has a phenomenal capacity to accumulate traces of his past and build up, therefore,

a resource which we call experience that he can call on.

3. Leadership arises out of transcendence.
 - a. Man has the capacity to use accumulated experience to negotiate the present with an eye towards the future.
 - b. Looking to what you might want to become.
4. It is necessary for an administrator to be available to his/her followers in order to reinforce positively those behaviors which support the goals of the educational system, mainly the release of human potential.
5. Change takes time.
6. Purpose generates structure. If staffing patterns (structure) do not serve purpose, then you will generate an administrative problem (demoralization and frustration).
7. One of the chief functions of leadership is to articulate the vision about where you are going. In some cases it is not clear what the final end-state is (that is really the case in education), but the direction can always be indicated. Even if you do not know what the final end-state may look like in very clear concrete terms at least you have a sense of what the direction ought to be.
8. Authority is legitimized power. The person who is making a decision has to have the knowledge that the decision pre-supposes.
9. Poor timing leads to inefficiency and ultimately undermines authority.
10. Shared decision making means that you should get input from those who will be affected by decisions (not just information, but feelings, too).
11. An element of good administration is that you cannot organize only on concrete rewards. People must feel their lives are infused with meaning and then, potentialities are unleashed.

Two months later, November 19, 1974, Dr. Jordan was the keynote speaker at the statewide conference of the Connecticut Council of School Executives. The subject of the conference was: Futuristic Educational Administration and Leadership. Dr. Jordan's speech was entitled "Re-definition of Leadership and It's Implications for Educational Administration". During his talk Dr. Jordan further developed the relationship between the ANISA Theory of Administration and the ANISA Philosophy, and the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, (the nature of reality inheres in the process of becoming); in ANISA terms, translating potentiality into actuality.

It is difficult to express in writing the problems the Suffield change agent team was having digesting so much so fast. The change agent team was implementing a model they held for the most part in theory in their heads. The reader will remember that this unique educational model had never been fielded prior to September 1973. In addition, it is fair to say, that the change agent team, in spite of great enthusiasm and drive, understood only the surface of the model. Only gradually were they becoming aware of the enormous implications the Model held both for Suffield and for all of education. Certainly talking face to face with Dr. Jordan and others on the implications for the model to administration and hearing Dr. Jordan further expand on these

points during his Connecticut presentation put the Suffield change team further in touch with the degree of change which was necessary to bring Suffield's administration into conformance with the Model.

In March of 1975 Dr. Penelope Walker presented her doctoral dissertation on The Administration for the ANISA Model, The Release of the Collective Potential. The reader is referred to this document, especially Chapter III entitled, "A Theory of Administration for the Anisa Model".

Process Consultation

Both Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Bondra had been attempting to fill the role of process consultant for the project. The needs, however, were greater than either of these two staff had the time or the skills to fulfill. What appeared to be needed was some neutral outside person who could help the teams accomplish their own goals and those of their organization. This consultant was to facilitate the needs of the teachers, share observations with the groups, help the groups share their own observations, and teach them to diagnose their process. At the outset this was to be accomplished through team building, the development of group process skills, communication skills, problem solving and decision making skills, and where appropriate leadership training.

The project director asked Dr. Blanchard if he knew of a graduate student facile in group process and consultation

who would be willing to work in Suffield on a part-time basis for the school year 1974-1975. Dr. Blanchard recommended Dr. Mary Bohn, a graduate student of his.

At the outset it was agreed between Dr. Bohn, Mrs. Oleksak, and Mr. Lincoln that Dr. Bohn would work directly with Mrs. Oleksak and her team including the Director only where necessary. It was further agreed that the substance of her work would be confidential; between Dr. Bohn and the teams and between Dr. Bohn and Mrs. Oleksak. Caution was needed so that the teams did not see Dr. Bohn as the agent of administration.

In the role of Process Consultant Dr. Bohn attempted to facilitate effective working teams in five separate task groups in the Early Childhood Program in the Suffield Public Schools. As Process Consultant in these five groups her overall goal was to facilitate team development within the whole Early Childhood staff including the principal, teachers, aides and secretaries. In negotiating the role of the Process Consultant each group identified problems with which they hoped she could assist. In general these goals were centered around enhancing the working relationships within the teams and between the team leaders; integrating the secretaries and aides into the staffs and assisting the staffs in understanding and being more perceptive about group process. By enhancing each individual's process skills, style

of leadership and group member participation, it was hoped that improved staff and team meetings would result.

The activities Dr. Bohn was involved in as Process Consultant were:

1. Process Observing five groups (Team I & II Bridge Street, West, Kindergarten, and the ANISA Steering Committee) and giving feedback to the leaders and group members on their process (Communication, leadership, decision-making, problem-solving, roles people play in groups, etc.).
2. Re-organization of the Bridge Street Staff Meetings using teachers as leaders on a rotating basis.
3. Individual leadership training for the teachers at Bridge Street School prior to their conducting staff meetings.
4. Workshop training in group process skills for ANISA Steering Committee. Informal training to all teams as situation arises in their groups as well as modeling by Process Consultant of group process skills.
5. Training in Force-Field Analysis Problem-Solving techniques to Kindergarten teachers using data gathered from their own group. Follow-up on action plans.

6. Improving task group efficiency in the teams by teaching agenda building, setting priorities and a time frame for completion of tasks.
7. Facilitating the development of a model in-service program involving teachers in the planning, preparation, presentation and leadership of the program with the University of Massachusetts ANISA staff serving as resource.
8. Training for entire Early Childhood staff in problem-solving skills - brainstorming, prioritizing, evaluating solutions and action plans.
9. Individual counseling with teachers and administrators about concerns and problems relating to their team or school.
10. Teaching and modeling the use of positive feedback.
11. Modeling good human relations skills - sensitivity to needs of individuals - listening, caring and sharing.

On a Group Rating Effectiveness instrument scaled from 1-10 the Bridge Street Staff Meetings improved from an average of 3.6 in the fall to 7.9 in the spring according to the evaluations of teachers and principal. The leadership program was well received with each teacher assuming the role of leader and demonstrating their ability to conduct the staff meeting with a high degree of effectiveness.

The use of process observer in the ANISA staff meetings and the training of the staff in group process helped the group such that eventually they developed skills in processing their own meetings with little assistance from the Consultant.

The model in-service program which was developed by the Consultant and the teachers received the highest evaluation by the teachers of any in-service program during the Project.

All of the staff were taught group process skills. They practiced process skills in communication, leadership, decision-making, and the problem-solving processes that occur in groups. As a result all of the team expressed their feeling of improved group effectiveness.

The fact that the administration and staff felt the need and usefulness of a Process Consultant in the implementation of ANISA by requesting that a person be hired in the same capacity the following year, spoke to the success of the Process Consultant Program.

Steering Committee

This group continued to be the major vehicle for communication between all sites and their respective staff. While representatives to the Steering Committee did not consider themselves obliged to poll their teams before voting, all were in close communication with their teams and it was felt by most that the Steering Committee was a microcosm of

the five implementation sites. With the addition of Mrs. Bohn as Process Consultant, the Steering Committee became more and more efficient in terms of task and more explicit in terms of feelings. All of this was judged to be helpful to the overall implementation of the Model.

During the school year the Steering Committee continued to address the following issues:

- . In-service. This one issue seemed to dominate each Steering Committee meeting the entire year. The group could never quite decide whether the responsibility for organizing the in-service program was the task of the entire Steering Committee or whether it should be delegated to a sub-committee. For good or bad it was both. In some instances a sub-committee worked on the problem and in some cases the entire Steering Committee worked on the problem. The dominance of the in-service on the Steering Committee agenda was a reflection of the controversy within Bridge and West over the purpose and quality of the in-service program. The essence seemed to be that the staff wanted less theory and more practical application. The Suffield staff to a large degree was less than charmed by the quality of teaching experience the UMass staff

brought to Suffield. This was especially true in the area of reading. The good part of the controversy was that the Suffield staff began to take credit for knowing more than they thought. Also, they took more and more responsibility for their own development. During this growth process the Steering Committee served as an important vehicle for the expression of feelings.

- . Dr. Bissell's Evaluation. The Steering Committee helped organize Dr. Bissell's presentations to the Bridge Street and West staffs as well as Dr. Bissell's presentation to the Board of Education and the community. While the staff had difficulty accepting some of Dr. Bissell's opinions, by and large the staff found the evaluation helpful. So much so, that they asked that the evaluation continue for a third year (which it did not, for other reasons, one of which was that Dr. Bissell moved to the West Coast).
- . Specialist Meeting at UMass. There was a carry over to the Steering Committee of some of the results of the discussions between the Suffield specialists and the UMass staff. This was especially true in the areas of 'integrating-the

specialist staff' within the ANISA program and the use of specialists in providing 'planning time' for the classroom teaching staff. Ideas were generated which were eventually incorporated into the third year continuation grant.

- . The Third Year Continuation Grant. The Steering Committee was the focus of the needs assessment of the staff in regards to the third year. Using the representatives from Nursery, Bridge, West, Kindergarten, and Spaulding, a list of wishes were drawn up. All of this was helpful to change agent team as they began writing the continuation grant.
- . Nutrition Policy. Mrs. Oleksak, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Bondra, and Mrs. Welch, Director of Cafeterias for Suffield, formed a sub-committee to develop a nutritional policy. After several meetings and much work the sub-committee presented to the Steering Committee a substantial document detailing the five goals of the nutrition program. (These goals are listed in the third year Title III proposal.)
- . Strengths and Weakness of ANISA. The formal agendas of the Steering Committee were not al-

ways strictly adhered to. One way of overcoming resistance is to allow people to express their doubts and negative feelings. Again, with the able assistance of a process consultant many fears and reservations were expressed. The overall feeling was that the ANISA philosophy was great, but pulling it off in the classroom was something else. Often it appeared that we were being too self critical--expecting too much, too soon.

- . Multiaging. There is a thrust in the Anisa Model to group children developmentally where appropriate. At West multiaging (mixing 6's and 7's) had already begun prior to ANISA and at Bridge Street School the staff was experimenting with multiaging. But one serious problem remained--all the five year olds were on one site (Spaulding) and there were no 4's or 6's to developmentally group with. So, the problem was, -how do we get 5's, 6's, and 7's on the same sites. The answer was, after such agony - we don't. The most the administrative team could come up with was to encourage the early introduction of 4's into kindergarten when appropriate and the physical transference of

of advanced 5's to Bridge or West as soon as they seemed ready.

- . Record Keeping. There was a need to develop an efficient and accurate schema for measuring children's developmental growth in the five areas of psychological potentiality and areas of biological potentiality; all part of the diagnostic-prescriptive process. There was discussion and some planning for computer involvement but along the way that fizzled and, although there was much discussion, not much got done in the development of a record keeping system except that which the teachers in Nursery and kindergarten developed on their own. It was a case of too much to do and not enough money or staff to do it.
- . Community Advisory Committee. While the Second Year Continued Application (1974) mentions the need for a Community Advisory Committee this issue was never brought up at Steering Committee and no such group was ever formed (p. 22). Such a committee might have been helpful because there continued to be community and Board discussion regarding the pros and cons of ANISA.

Year III (1975-1976)

It is not clear from the record whether or not the question was ever asked, "Shall Suffield write a third year continuation grant?" By the time spring of 1975 came around it was understood by all that Suffield was into a three-year Title III project, like it or not. And, while there were problems, most liked it. The major decision for the third year grant was - will ANISA roll-up to include all of the Spaulding School (Grades 3, 4, and 5) as it had at Bridge and West, or would it roll-up one year at a time? Would it roll-up at all or would the third year of ANISA only be one of consolidation at the early childhood level?

Even as the grant was written the answers to these questions were not clear. As it turned out, it was to be a combination; one of consolidating ANISA in the Early Childhood Program and 'some' roll-up into grade III.

The Third Year Continued Application (1975) was submitted to the Commissioner of Education May 1, 1975. The grant called for the expenditure of \$66,827.00 bringing the total Federal cost of the three-year project to \$206,000. The third year of the project maintained the same two goals found in the first and second year grant; 1) to demonstrate the application of the Anisa Model in Suffield, and 2) to demonstrate a process model of planned change showing how the ANISA innovation was to be accomplished. The reader is referred to the

Third Year Continued Application (1975) itself for further details.

Acceptance by Individuals of Innovation

Continued use of the six phases of adoption outlined by Havelock (1973) will continue to provide the structure for the descriptive history of the third year. Again the emphasis will be on the process aspects of the innovation rather than those of content. The reader will note upon reading the Title III grants themselves that many content aspects of the implementation have been excluded from this case study. This is intentional since their inclusion would not contribute to the purposes of this dissertation.

Awareness. The nine day Anisa Summer School held at Suffield High School the third summer served as an awareness session for only three people. These people were new staff two of whom were new nursery school teachers and one who was a high school art teacher who had been reassigned to work at the primary level. All other staff who attended had had at least one week of prior introduction and in most cases had had three or more weeks of previous training.

Interest and Evaluation. A total of 23 staff were paid to attend the Summer School Program. Staff were asked to participate on the following priority basis:

Priority I - Nursery, Bridge, West or Kindergarten
teachers or aides who were new or had had

minimal training.

Priority II - Classroom teachers and specialists at
Grades 1, 2, 3.

Priority III- Classroom teachers and specialists of
Grade 4.

Priority IV - Classroom teachers and specialists of
Grade 5.

This list will give the reader a sense of the goals of the third year of the project; reinforce ANISA nursery through Grade 2, first and extend into Grade 3, second. The breakdown of the list of those who actually attended Summer School is as follows:

- 2 Nursery School Staff (new)
- 3 Bridge-West Staff
- 4 Third grade Staff
- 2 Fourth grade Staff
- 4 Fifth grade Staff
- 5 Specialists
- 3 Teacher Aides from Bridge-West

It is significant that by the end of the 1975 Summer School approximately 95% of the nursery through Grade Five staff had had three or more weeks of intensive ANISA pre-service training plus one or two years of in-service. It is fair to say that all had had a chance to examine the Model in detail and evaluate its applicability to their own situa-

tion. Some were very enthused, some were not. In almost all instances, however, no one had a dispute with the ANISA Philosophy, only its application.

The third year summer school was different from the previous summer schools in several respects. For one thing there was no laboratory school. It's not clear in looking back over the materials exactly why this was so - perhaps it was the shortness of the program itself (only 9 days in length), or perhaps it was the difficulty in setting up and operating a laboratory school in Suffield. Or perhaps it was our poor lab school facilities. Or perhaps it's as simple as no one felt the need. In any case, none was available to teachers.

Another difference was the prominence of Dr. Jordan in the summer school. Most of the major lectures were given by Dr. Jordan and video-taped for future use by Mr. Humphrey. Many felt that Dr. Jordan's explanation of the Anisa Model provided a perspective that no other UMass staff held. Many who had been to the first and second summer school felt the second pre-service program was lacking in this regard. The change agent team set out to rectify the situation the third year. Since it was clear that Federal financing of Project ANISA was coming to a close it was desirable to have Dr. Jordan's lectures on video-tape. The Anisa Curriculum Specialist would now have at her disposal over 22 hours of Dr.

Jordan on tape telling about the Anisa Model of Education. In addition, Dr. Carney had copies made for the UMass ANISA library for dissemination to others.

During the third summer, in addition to the lectures on the Philosophical Foundation of Anisa Model, there were lectures on Memory, Organization of the Self in the Environment, Principles of Good Planning, and a two day workshop on the Development of Psycho-motor Competence. While there were twenty-three staff paid to attend summer school numerous others joined the group for lectures in which they had particular interest. All in all the third summer school was considered successful by the participants as measured by a questionnaire administered at the end of the nine days.

Trial. For two years both the UMass faculty and the Suffield staff had felt the need for a local Anisa staff developer. Through joint funding between the Title III Project and the Suffield Board of Education, Mrs. Irene Hartley was released from her kindergarten duties to spend full time training with Dr. Carney. She was to become Suffield's on-site Anisa Curriculum Specialist. At the theory level, it was this thrust which would allow the phasing-out of Suffield's close relationship to UMass while maintaining the innovation and the capacity for self-renewal. It was intended that the Curriculum Specialist would become Suffield's primary on-going local resource person. It was planned that the Curriculum Specialist would spend approximately 50% of her time working

directly with teachers in their classroom settings - a need that had been too long unfulfilled. It was also planned that the Curriculum Specialist would coordinate and correlate the in-service training. About 25% of her time was to be spent working with Dr. Carney for linkage between Anisa theory and practice. The balance of the Specialist's time was to be spent working with the teaching teams, specialists, and volunteers. Meeting with parents concerning curriculum problems was an additional duty.

It was the provision of the Anisa Curriculum Specialist which saved the day as far as institutionalizing the Anisa Model at the Early Childhood Level in Suffield. More will be said for this later.

Most of the In-service Program during 1975-1976 year concerned itself with new ANISA specifications - Attention, Goal Setting, Auditory Perception, Transitivity, Space-time Perception, Figure-Ground, and Affective Processes. These specifications were much needed and well received. It was, however, once more the problem of translating theory into practice. For this purpose the Anisa Curriculum Specialist was of great help. By virtue of knowing the system, the Curriculum Specialist could help teachers translate UMass ANISA jargon into local practice. It was a happy arrangement.

Adoption and Integration. For the kindergarten and nursery schools this was the third year of ANISA. The staff

remained loyal and enthusiastic. However, they continued to need support. UMass and the Suffield Anisa Curriculum Specialists helped fill this need. Because Mrs. Hartley had been a kindergarten teacher as well as a founder of the ANISA movement, her new position allowed her to further translate theory into practice for her nursery and kindergarten colleagues. They were well on their way towards integration and generalization of the Model.

For the Bridge Street and West Staffs there continued to be resistance. For Bridge it was a tough year. There was passive resistance and disillusionment. More will be said of this in the next section of this case study. At West, there was slow progress towards the development of internal leadership and further adoption of the innovation. At the Spaulding School there was no clear cut roll-up. For a multitude of reasons the innovation was not enthusiastically endorsed by the leadership. More will be said of this during analysis in Chapter VI. In summary then, the third year of implementation had its problems, some were technical, some were attitudinal, many were both.

Acceptance by the Group of Innovation

For the 1975-76 year there were no novel programs in the area of process. The Steering Committee continued to be the major organization of communication and decision making for the Project. And the Process Consultant and Leadership Pro-

gram continued.

Steering Committee. During 1975-1976 the Committee met together 11 times. These meetings were usually held at the Bridge Street School where the Project Director, Principal/Director of Early Childhood, and the Anisa Curriculum Specialist all shared an office. The atmosphere was pleasant, cooperative and the membership loyal. Dr. Sylvia Carter, Mrs. Bohn's replacement, acted as Process Observer and helped the Steering Committee further develop their process skills. The Steering Committee for the most part were now old friends and had developed a mature working relationship. With few exceptions most had been members of the Committee for two or more years. With the addition of Mrs. Hartley as Anisa Curriculum Specialist the Committee's direct involvement in planning the in-service program seemed to lessen - at least, that issue does not seem to dominate in the Steering Committee notes to the same degree it did the second year. It's also possible that the in-service program was meeting teacher needs better and was thus less controversial during the third year. What did dominate the Steering Committee was the future of ANISA within the Suffield Public Schools. From the first Steering Committee meeting in the fall it became evident that getting the Board to institutionalize the Anisa Model by endorsing it in Board Policy was going to be a problem. The change agent team feared that if the Model was not codi-

fied into Board Policy before federal funding was dropped, it would soon go the way of most innovations. There were several reasons why the Board was resistant to endorsing ANISA. For one thing the Board actually knew very little about the program. Within the Board there were only two members who actually had children in the program; one a long term member, one a new member. The long term Board member did not like the ANISA program and was quite vocal about it; the new member liked ANISA but was shy (at first) about expressing her approval.

A second factor of resistance relates to a peculiarity of Suffield. In Suffield the Board members are the ones to whom citizens complain about the schools. And in Suffield the Board members feel they have to do something about a citizen's complaint. And, as is true of humanity as a whole, one complaint carries the weight of 20 satisfied customers. A few (less than 5% by our estimate) parents did not like the Anisa Model. The Board was concerned about these few parents and asked the Anisa administration to report to them on the issue of parent dissatisfaction. Appendix B is the response sent to the Board by the Project Director as part of the overall strategy of trying to get the Board to approve in policy the Anisa Model. There were other strategies which will become clear as this case study proceeds.

Another reason the Board was resistant to endorsing

ANISA was because they did not hold the administration (Superintendent, Project Director, nor Early Childhood Principal/Director) in high esteem. The reasons for this were multifactored but its overall effect was to taint what they touched and the Anisa Project was very much touched and, thereby, very much tainted. The Board, however, trusted teachers. A resultant strategy was to arrange a meeting between the Board and the hands-on people.

Dr. Sylvia Carter helped design the meeting paying attention to communications and group process issues. On February 9, 1976, Dr. Evans sent out the following invitation:

Suffield Board of Education
Suffield, Connecticut

February 9, 1976

Mr. Richard Lincoln
57 Woolworth Street
Longmeadow, Massachusetts, 01106

Dear Mr. Lincoln:

An ANISA Experience!

What is it? It's an opportunity for the Board of Education and folks who have had a direct relationship to the Anisa Model of Education to get together and share. This letter invites you to join members of the Board and me on Thursday evening, February 19, at 7:30 P.M. at the Bridge Street School Cafeteria for an ANISA dialogue.

It is my plan to meet in small groups and share the experiences you have been having during the last three years as we have been implementing the ANISA model for purposes of planning and policy develop-

ment in all of our schools. I will also recommend maintaining what we have implemented and extending implementation to the extent resources are made available.

Your experiences shared frankly with Board members and your colleagues will help Board members better understand what the ANISA model can do for children and how it affects the life and work of faculty involved in implementation.

I cordially invite you to join us. Please write, stop by, or call Mrs. Falkowski, my secretary, (668-7347) by the close of school on Tuesday, February 17, 1976, and let her know if it is possible for you to join us.

Sincerely yours,

Malcolm D. Evans
Superintendent of Schools

MDE:cf

Eight out of nine Board members accepted the invitation as did a total of 12 teachers, 6 specialists, and 3 aides. A small-group design provided for direct communication between two Board members, a teacher at each of the three sites, an aide, and a specialist; there were five such groups. As part of the strategy the administration (Mr. Bondra, Dr. Evans, Mrs. Cleksak, and Mr. Lincoln) were not included in the groups. The event was a huge success and acclaimed by all. The teachers and the Steering Committee had made their point - they endorsed the Anisa Model and told it to the Board loud and clear.

The second strategy for influencing the Board to endorse

ANISA was for Dr. Evans to prepare a policy statement entitled "Adoption of the Anisa Model of Education as a Basis for Planning and Policy in the Suffield Public School".

It was hoped that such a paper would point out to the Board the pluses from such an endorsement. The Superintendent asked the Steering Committee to review and comment upon this paper. The entire February 19, 1976, Steering Committee meeting was devoted to this purpose. The message to the Superintendent from the Steering Committee and indeed the entire Project was -- we are behind you, we want the Board to endorse this Model, get out there and fight!

In the last section of this Chapter, Stage VI, a rather historic (for ANISA) Board meeting will be described.

During the 1975-1976 School Year the Steering Committee dealt with a second issue relative to the future of ANISA, and that was the future of the Steering Committee. At its meeting on May 10, 1976 the Steering Committee voted "continuance of the Steering Committee as an organic vehicle to encourage communications with all groups". A rotating chairperson among administrators was suggested and Mr. Humphrey was selected chairperson for the 1976-1977 school year. The Steering Committee dealt with other important issues throughout the school year.

- . Trip to Maine. A major event, at least in terms of internal leadership within the ANISA staff,

occurred when Mr. Humphrey, Mrs. Hartley, Mrs. Wilson (a third grade classroom teacher) and Mrs. Glowacki (Bridge Street) made a two day visit to the site of the only other implementation of the Anisa Model; Hampden, Maine. This visit gave the Anisa leadership a huge boost in self confidence - they were pretty competent and they were making rather good headway in implementing the Model.

- . UMass staff. During the year it was thought that the ANISA program at UMass might move to the west coast. This caused great alarm in Suffield because few felt ready to separate so forcefully from the "land of our forefathers". The anxiety was lessened when a vote was taken by the Steering Committee to maintain contact no matter where they moved to - it was just a matter of a plane ticket.
- . K-1-2 on the same site. Once more this issue was raised. A subcommittee was appointed but never reported out. To the best of my knowledge nothing was done with the issue further. To this date it remains a problem.
- . Visitors. Over 150 people visited the Anisa Program during the school year. Unfortunately Mrs. Hartley and Mrs. Cleksak bore the weight

of guiding these visitors through out school. This task took them away from other equally important duties.

- . Slide-tape presentation. A twenty minute slide-tape presentation was made for use by Suffield staff when introducing the Anisa Model to parents. It was considered by all to be quite effective. It was written by a local newspaper writer and was explicitly written with as little jargon as possible.
- . Roll-up or extension of ANISA. Dr. Evans at the November 12, 1976 meeting expressed his feelings that roll-up of ANISA in the same manner as in Grades N-K-1 and 2 was not going to be possible due to finances. He felt the principles and practices could be extended through Grade 8 with the Anisa Philosophy being carried throughout the school system. What this did in effect was switch the words from 'roll-up' to 'extension'. What it meant in reality will be discussed in Chapter VI.
- . Representation of the Specialists on the Steering Committee. Each of the two previous years the Steering Committee dealt with the question of who will represent the specialists. The

third year was no different. Word was received by the Steering Committee that the specialists wanted a representative. Word was sent out to the specialists to send a representative. Word was received from the specialists that no one wanted to be a representative but they would like to be invited to meetings when an issue related to them was on the agenda. This seemed to satisfy the specialists.

- . Trip to Atlantic City. Mrs. Oleksak, Dr. Evans, and Mrs. Hartley traveled to Atlantic City to make a presentation on ANISA at a national convention of school administrators. The presentation itself was well received by a disappointingly small group. The secondary pay off, however, was great. First three key ANISA folks had a chance to share thoughts and ideas for two days. Second, the three had a chance to talk with Dr. Robert Anderson formerly of Harvard and now of the University in Texas who was also attending the convention. The reader will remember Dr. Anderson had been a friend of Suffield's 'friendly critic'. Dr. Anderson was very encouraging to the Suffield team and may have been the critical item in causing Dr. Evans to

have more courage in facing the Board with the question of endorsing the Model.

Effective Leadership Program. As part of the on-going leadership training program, Dr. Frederick Finch, Professor of Management, School of Business Administration, University of Massachusetts agreed to conduct a day-long workshop in Suffield with all of the Suffield Administration. Dr. Sylvia Carter joined Dr. Finch in this workshop. Dr. Finch assisted Suffield's Administrative team in reviewing its decision making process (authoritative decisions, participative decisions, delegative decisions), and by means of simulation helped teach the administrators decision theory. Dr. Finch dealt with performance variables and issues of ability and motivation in working with and through others. Dr. Finch and Dr. Carter were very well received by the staff and much of what was learned had carry over into the following school year. Unfortunately, Dr. Evans was unable to attend these meetings. The Director did review with Dr. Evans the materials that were distributed by Dr. Finch.

Process Consultation. Dr. Sylvia Carter replaced Dr. Bohn as Process Consultant for the 1975-1976 school year. Her overall task was to assist in the implementation of the Anisa Model by working with key individuals, teams, and groups. Mostly Dr. Carter worked directly with hands-on people, when asked. During the school year she held meetings

as follows:

- Meetings with individuals,
- Director - 8 meetings
 - Principal/Director of Early Childhood - 8 meetings
 - Bridge Street Teachers (individually) - 15 meetings
 - Bridge Street Specialists (individually) - 3 meetings
 - Bridge Street Secretary - 2 meetings
 - Anisa Curriculum Specialist - 4 meetings
 - Principal/Director of Later Childhood - 1 meeting
 - Bridge Street Aides - 2 meetings
- Meetings with Groups,
- Calvary Nursery School - 1 meeting
 - Kindergarten Staff - 1 meeting
 - Bridge Street Faculty - 8 meetings
 - Steering Committee - 5 meetings
 - In-service Day Meetings - 1 meeting
 - West Suffield Staff - 1 meeting
 - SEA Committee Meetings - 1 meeting
 - Meeting with Superintendent and Project Director - 1 meeting

The major emphasis was placed on the Bridge Street fac-

ulty. Time was spent preparing faculty members to chair meetings, assisting faculty members to organize meetings, and teaching faculty members strategies of problem solving. The results of Dr. Carter's work were:

1. Re-institution of rotating chairperson at faculty meetings.
2. Bridge Street teachers initiated, organized, and set in motion a Suffield Education Association Committee composed of teachers from four schools to support an attempt to obtain planning time for elementary teachers.
3. Establishment of communications networks by the Bridge teachers to other schools as well as to the SEA.

A secondary emphasis of Dr. Carter was placed on process observation of individual administrative and faculty members in their meetings with feedback from the consultant afterward.

Stage VI: Stabilization and Self Renewal

During this stage the successful withdrawal of support of the change agent team from the client system is very much dependent on the strategies employed during the preceding five stages. If the client has been involved collaboratively in the change process, the clients will be well trained in

helping themselves. If the efforts of the change agent team have been successful the client will have developed the capacity to carry on alone. This is the process of stabilization and termination. Ultimately the criteria for the successful implementation of an innovation lies in the answer to the questions: "Does the innovation remain after the change agent has withdrawn?" "Can the system generate its own self renewal?"

Havelock (1973) writes:

The key word in securing continuance (of an innovation) is "internalization". Where possible, the change agent should lead the client toward self-help and responsibility with maintenance of the innovation. There are at least six important considerations in securing continuance. These are:

1. Continuing Reward
 2. Practice and Routinization
 3. Standard Integration into the system.
 4. Continuing Evaluation
 5. Providing for Continuous Maintenance
 6. Continuing Adaptation Capability
- (p. 134)

Continuing Reward. The ANISA staff, both teachers and administration, need to feel that continuing the innovation pays off in one way or another. The continued support and approval of others is important to further internalization of the Model. This requires follow-up by those who instituted the change in the first place and hold the power to reward and reinforce.

For Suffield the major reinforcers at the Early Childhood level are continued support from the Principal/Director, continued support from the Anisa Curriculum Specialist and continued in-service training. During the spring of 1976 the Anisa Curriculum Specialist was maintained in the budget as a half-time position. This was an extremely valuable consideration in terms of ANISA's future. With the dropping away of federal funds what was needed was assurance that the staff would continue to be guided in using ANISA and assurance that continuing to use the Anisa Model of Education was held in high esteem by the administration. It is a tribute to Dr. Evans' continued support of ANISA that this budget item was maintained in the face of severe pressure to cut the budget for 1976-1977. It was planned that the Anisa Curriculum Specialist would continue to work with teachers (at their request) hands-on in the classroom, that she would take on the responsibility for training new staff during 1976-1977, and that she would maintain contact with UMass through Dr. Carney on an informal basis.

Practice and Routinization. Ideally the Anisa innovation will become a routine part of everyday life for the classroom teachers, aides, and specialists. In order to enhance the internalization of the Model during the three year project there were pre-service programs each summer and in-service workshops during the school year. The teachers were encour-

aged by the Principal/Director of Early Childhood to move towards integration of the Anisa Model in their classroom. Mrs. Oleksak never waived from her conviction that ANISA was right for Suffield and right for her program. When she hired new staff it was always with the understanding that ANISA was a way of life for Suffield. Due to retirement, Mrs. Oleksak had opportunity to hire three (out of 12) new staff at the Grade 1-2 level during the three years of the Project. By the end of the Project most of the Grade 1-2 staff had been thoroughly indoctrinated into ANISA and with only one or two exceptions all were well on the way towards integrating the Anisa Model in their classrooms. As previously stated, at the kindergarten and nursery school level the integration and generalization of the Anisa Model occurred early in the implementation. The staff participated willingly in the on-going summer schools and in-service programs, always eager for new information on ANISA.

Structural Integration into the System. It was this issue that occupied most of the energy of the change team, the Steering Committee, and the Anisa Curriculum Specialist during the third and last year of the Project. Mrs. Hartley spent many many hours helping the Superintendent work out his proposed policy statement to the Board and she carefully explained the Anisa Model so that Dr. Evans' reservations were set aside. All knew that it was up to Dr. Evans to

carry the ball and all had an investment in supporting a strong fearless leader. On May 14, 1976, six weeks before the Project was to terminate the Board of Education addressed the question of institutionalizing ANISA. Almost 75% of the Anisa faculty, all of administration, and many many pro-ANISA parents showed up at the Board meeting at which the question was to be discussed. Dr. Evans presented his paper. The discussion went on and on, -- and on. The Board seemed unable to come to closure. The teachers spoke in favor, the Anisa Curriculum Specialist spoke in favor, the administration spoke in favor, parents spoke in favor. The Board seemed reticent. Finally one parent asked the Board, "How do you feel about ANISA"? The Board chairman then polled each member of the Board asking them to express their views. When it was all over, the Board passed the following resolution:

The Suffield Board of Education will:

- . Maintain and reinforce, within limits of resources available, the implementation of the Anisa Model in kindergarten, grade one and two.
- . Extend the basic elements of the Anisa Model through grades three, four and five. Implementation will be one year at a time. Staff training, at least at a

minimal orientation level, must be provided for each grade level. The principal for Later Childhood education will be responsible for implementation within his school.

- . Recognize that in three years ANISA trained children will reach the middle school. The principal of the Middle School should be involved in advance planning, perhaps by working with the Later Childhood principal.

Our strategies had worked! The Board had institutionalized the Model at the K-1-2 level. That was our goal. That the Board voted to extend the Model into grades 3, 4, and 5 was a bonus.

While the three year project was in process there were attempts along the way to institutionalize parts of the Model.

- . The record keeping system for Grade K-2 took on the flavor of ANISA. Children were measured developmentally in the area of perception and psychomotor. Teachers began to see the affective and volitional development of a child as important as the cognitive. Report cards to parents began to reflect these other areas of psychological potentiality.
- . The ANISA snack program became part and parcel of the nurseries and kindergarten. Good nutri-

tion both at home and in school was much discussed. Twinkies became a no no. Good nutrition was stressed in the curriculum and the children's cafeterias were re-organized to reflect ANISA principles.

- . The teacher evaluation process was conducted by Mrs. Oleksak in terms of ANISA principles and goals.
- . The Administration began to talk in terms of purpose generating structure and function. Much thought was given to planning time, on-going in-service and integrating the differentiated staff.

Continuing Evaluation. According to Havelock there should be some provision for reinspection and re-evaluation of the innovation over time. Aside from review by the Anisa Curriculum Specialist and the Principal/Director of Early Childhood no explicit provision was made in this direction.

Providing for Continuing Maintenance. While the Steering Committee expressed strong support for continued liaison with UMass, there was established no formal relationship for the 1976-1977 year.

Continuing Adaptability Capability. A sophisticated school system will accept an innovation only so long as it benefits the system more than competing innovations. Hope-

fully the Suffield system will retain the flexibility and freedom to discontinue ANISA when something better comes along. At issue in Suffield will be whether or not the innovation faded away because of failure to nurture it, its failure to meet Suffield's needs, or Suffield's need for something different. Only time will answer this question.

C H A P T E R V I
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter I will assess the successes and failures of the strategies of planned change used by the change team to implement the Anisa Model of Education in Suffield. From this analysis I will make recommendations to the change team in Suffield who is attempting to extend the Anisa Model into third grade and beyond, I will make recommendations regarding further stabilization of the Model in the Early Childhood Program, and lastly, I will make recommendations to other educators who may contemplate implementing the Anisa Model in their school systems.

The six stages of planned change outlined by Havelock (1973) will be used as a structure for the analysis.

STAGE I: Relationship

The Change Agent

A strong positive relationship between a change agent and his or her client undergirds any successful change effort. Many of the issues mentioned by Havelock (1973) which typically effect the initial encounter between the change agent and his or her client were of no account in Suffield due to the fact that the change team was composed of people from inside the school system. All of the change team members were known to the staff prior to the innovation and were seen not as strangers, but as friends who

knew and cared for the school system.

In my opinion an outside change agent or change team would not have been successful in Suffield. My reasoning is that the school system and the community itself is far too conservative and ethnocentric to trust outsiders to come in and innovate. Secondly, had an outside change team been employed I think they would have had great difficulty maintaining a flexible change plan. I think it was the combined knowledge of the inside change team about the internal workings of the Suffield School system, its staff and its Board which allowed some of the success realized by the change effort. All of this is not to say that the team could not have used more outside expertise in the diagnostic and resource acquisition stages of the change effort.

The change team itself was a powerful group of people; in addition to the power of knowledge, they held significant personal power and considerable position power. The change team included the superintendent of schools and the principal of the program in which the innovation was contemplated. The team also included persons knowledgeable about organizational development, group dynamics, research and evaluation, and the writing of federal grants. Some members of the change team were old and trusted friends of their clients. Not only did the change team include these

powerful people, it had included them right from the beginning. In fact it was this team who had initiated the problem solving process which culminated in Project ANISA, Suffield.

The change team worked together effectively. It was fortunate that they had the opportunity to work together on Project SEED. That experience acted as a "shake down cruise" for Project ANISA. Because many of the power issues that naturally occur in groups had already been worked out by the time the team began to write the first year proposal, the team was able to concentrate their time and energy to the task itself.

A project of this dimension needed a full-time or at minimum a half-time director; a change team alone could not have done the job. During the actual implementation of the Model (Stages V and VI) Mr. Lincoln was appointed half-time director of the Project and began assuming the responsibility for many of the day to day decisions. Because the Director had at one time been a guidance consultant at the elementary level it was necessary to re-define his relationship within the system making it clear that he, as Project Director, was now in a new and different role. This redefinition was accomplished rather easily by virtue of the fact that the Director coordinated the participation of Suffield's staff in the first summer school at UMass.

Because the Director had been a resident graduate student at UMass and had taken courses in ANISA he was seen as knowledgeable by the Suffield staff. He was also seen as helpful by the UMass training team because of his familiarity with Suffield's personnel. In addition, the Director was bursar to the staff for travel and per diem pay. This further established and defined his new role to all concerned. I think the fact that the Project Director was a familiar friend to the staff helped establish trust and credibility for the entire change effort.

The change team included more than just four members. Early in the implementation the team shared its' leadership and management responsibilities with a steering committee and others. Buttressing this expanded change team were various experts such as the UMass ANISA faculty (Jordan, Streets, Carney, Kalinowski, Rambusch, and many others), the UMass Center for Leadership and Administration faculty (Blanchard, Finch, Bohn and Carter), the UMass Research and Evaluation staff (Hambleton, Algina and others), and the Harvard evaluation team (Anderson, Bissell, French, Hazelkorn and others). I believe that this arrangement provided a significant expertise to the Project as a whole. In addition these experts were able to influence directly the implementation process. One conclusion that can be drawn from this case study is that shared power is a key ingredient

on the effective implementation of an innovation.

Another feature which I think contributed to the success of the Project was the concept of decision making by the least-sized group. Under this concept decisions are made by as few people as are necessary to make an effective decision. For example, many day to day decisions were made by the Project Director alone, other decisions were made by the four member change team, still others by the change team expanded into a Steering Committee plus consultants. This parsimony of effort and flexibility made for sound and effective decisions. I believe that the success of the Project can be, in part, attributed to the fact that we structured a change team with the ability to ebb and flow as problems changed.

The Client

From the beginning the change team included their clients in the change effort. This was critical to the over all success of the Project. As may be clear from Chapters IV and V of the case study, the nursery and kindergarten staffs and the Early Childhood Principal were integrally involved in the problem solving process. At almost every point the kindergarten staff was consulted as to their thinking and feelings. Even after the change team had made a rather firm decision to go with ANISA, they left the final decision up to the kindergarten staff. Had

they said no, it would have been no. I can remember clearly sitting in Dr. Evans' office in the spring of 1973 with Mrs. Oleksak, Dr. Evans and Mrs. Hartley. Dr. Evans asked, "Well, Mrs. Hartley, what do you say, shall we go with ANISA?" And she replied, hesitantly and knowledgeably, "Yes". It was good process. There was no way we could have or would have wanted to impose an innovation of this magnitude on the school system without including those effected in the decision.

STAGE II: Diagnosis

In many ways the decision to implement the Anisa Model of Education was inevitable. Many and various forces were predicting that ANISA or its facsimile would eventually find its way to Suffield. The kindergarten faculty was looking for a comprehensive educational model and had already described what its theoretical facility looked like. Dr. Richard was looking for a demonstration site for an early childhood education model that included nursery schools. Both the Suffield Cooperative Nursery School and the Calvary Nursery School were in transition and looking for an appropriate educational model. The administration was open to innovation and change and looking for new solutions to its education problems. And, there was abundant talent within the Suffield staff. All of these factors were favorable towards the adoption of

ANISA or some similar model.

What was not so favorable was the fact that UMass was not as ready to field the Anisa Model as Suffield would have liked them to be. One of the weaknesses of the implementation that shows up time and again was that the Anisa Model was still immature and needed significantly more research and development activity prior to being fielded. These facts were known to Suffield from the beginning. The UMass ANISA staff was clear that the Model was still in development and that if Suffield wanted ANISA it took the model as it was, not as Suffield and UMass might have wanted it to be.

In Chapter IV it was noted that in 1969 the Board of Education suggested that a centralized early childhood school be built adjacent to the present Spaulding School. Had this event taken place consonant with or just preceeding the implementation of ANISA it would have been to the change team's great advantage. It would have had the effect of dissolving the boundaries between Bridge, West and Kindergarten with ANISA providing the necessary overarching theory. However, that did not occur. The fact that we were trying to implement a single model in a K-1-2 faculty that was geographically separate significantly complexified the task of the change team.

While the Suffield change team did a masterful job of diagnosing problems in nursery and kindergarten, they did a less than masterful job of diagnosis in Bridge and West. Had we conducted a better diagnosis the team might have anticipated some of the problems that eventually surfaced. For one thing, they would have discovered that Bridge Street School was indifferent to its problems, in fact would not recognize they had any. They would have found out there was a long history of fear and avoidance of change or innovation of any sort. They would have found that for the most part what leadership there was was the sort that resisted outside attempts to change the system. At West they would have realized that the faculty was already committed to a particular model of education (Open Education) and that they would have to accommodate ANISA to the model if ANISA was to be accepted. They would also have discovered that the West faculty was a closed system that was not looking for volunteered help from the "outside". While a better diagnosis would not have changed the situation, it would have allowed the change team to single out various incapacities and pathologies as targets for the change effort.

Had I the opportunity to do it over again, I would treat Bridge and West as two entirely separate sites and would conduct a separate diagnostic assessment on each. No doubt the result would be a unique change plan for each of

these two sites. Due to the resistance by each of these faculties to the ANISA implementation the change team was forced into differentiating these two programs anyhow. The team would have been better off had they differentiated right from the beginning. I also think it would have been a good idea to diagnose the readiness-for-innovation of each individual involved in the change program. I will speak to this point further when I analyze Stage V.

While the change team did conduct a force field analysis of sorts, it would have been more effective and more efficient if we had constructed the analysis in the more structured tradition of driving forces, restraining forces, etcetera.

From the beginning, the change team was determined that implementation of the Anisa Model would not fail due to inconsideration of the issues involved in the process of change. The reader will remember that the second goal of the Project was to demonstrate a process model of planned change. The seven phases of planned change articulated by Lippett (1958) were used by the change team for the initial diagnosis of the situation in Suffield. In addition to Lippett, the second and third year Title III proposals were based on a contemporary needs assessment and the results of action research conducted during the prior year of the Project. Because we were a federally funded project we

were forced into being very specific. Even if this were not the case I would most certainly advise any system contemplating implementation of ANISA (or any other innovation) to write out a similar plan or proposal. For Suffield these proposals served the very useful purpose of acting as a blueprint for the implementation. They were of incalculable assistance to the Project Director as he initiated the various subprograms (pre-service, in-service, leadership, etcetera) and managed the day to day activities. Any school system contemplating adopting ANISA had best conduct a thorough diagnosis of the situation in their particular school district before taking any steps to innovate. From this diagnosis they should be able to lay out a very specific blueprint of their plan for change. Plans can be changed, indeed they will most certainly be modified. But implementing the Anisa Model "shooting from the hip", as it were, would be at best chaotic, at worst a disaster and possibly a tragedy since such an event might well turn off staff to future innovation.

The poor physical plants at Bridge and West were another issue relative to diagnosis. While there was a moderate infusion of money to carpet and paint these facilities it was never clearly stated in the change plan how limiting these crowded outdated plants were to the ANISA program. The ANISA program had been (and is) seriously curtailed by the lack of appropriate space in which to

operate--for example there can be no full time media center at West because the space must be shared with the Learning Disabilities Specialist. At Bridge Street there is no gymnasium and the media center is stuck on one end of the cafeteria. The next major break through in the implementation of the Anisa Model of Education in Suffield will come in the form of a new K-1-2 school. Then, and only then, will Suffield's Early Childhood Program take on the words, "excellent"! Not only will a new plant solve the difficulties of space, it will solve the problem of the 5's being separate from the 6's and 7's and it will solve the problem of communication and management that now so badly fractures the K-1-2 faculty and provides much pain to the administration.

STAGE III: Resource Acquisition

Resources come in many forms: they may be available as print materials, people, or products. For the Suffield implementation of ANISA, the major resources used were people resources; knowledge that the change agent team held, knowledge of the UMass faculty, and knowledge of the Harvard faculty. We were fortunate to have had ready access to such excellence. Within the team there was knowledge about organizational development, leadership, management, early childhood education, curriculum, reading, grant writing, research, group dynamics, etcetera. Within the UMass staff there was knowledge about ANISA, pedagogy, administration, research and

evaluation, curriculum development, child development, philosophy, etcetera. Within the Harvard staff there was explicit knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of various educational models, best practice in education, research and evaluation, model development, etcetera. The change team knew how to use these various resources.

As said previously the change team could have done a better job with diagnosis. I think going to the literature on change or at least asking for consultation in this area might have helped us consider Bridge and West differently. The change team might also have devised better strategies in the change plan for the building situation or at least the separation of the 5's from the 6's and 7's.

In researching the education model question, Suffield's change team never really used books or periodicals nor information services. In retrospect I would think there was no real need to, I think the people resources requisitioned were quite adequate. What we needed was more of them.

A serious limitation for Suffield as regards information about ANISA was the fact that ANISA had not been fielded prior to 1973. In usual circumstances one can travel to a site where an innovation is already in existence and see it in action, talk with people, check impressions. In our case this was not possible. Nor was there a written body of research regarding ANISA. In retrospect, Suffield was

hanging a great deal on the spoken word of ANISA'S creators, Drs. Jordan and Streets. That we were suspicious is attested to by the fact that we asked Dr. Bissell in her "friendly critic" evaluation to tell us whether or not ANISA met the criteria of a unique educational model. It did. Dr. Bissell was keenly aware of the difficulties Suffield was having implementing an educational model that was not yet complete. She and her colleagues shared this opinion with Suffield on several occasions. Dr. Bissell could not however, come up with an alternate educational model that better suited Suffield's needs. Dr. Bissell did suggest that we become more eclectic and draw from various models. To Suffield this was return to the hodge-podge. What Suffield did do, however, was encourage the UMass ANISA staff to incorporate what they found valuable in other models under the rubric of ANISA.

STAGE IV: Choosing the Solution

While looking for an early childhood education model for Suffield only one expert was consulted, Dr. Robert Anderson of Harvard. In retrospect, it might have been wise to have consulted other experts as well. The Suffield team did not; that may have been an error. Suffield certainly entered into a high risk adventure when they latched onto a model such as ANISA which was at such a low level of research and development and had not yet been fielded. Yet, the Anisa Model fit. Suffield especially liked the quality of the UMass

staff and their ready accessibility. In order to off-set the immaturity of the model Suffield might have used better implementation strategies during Stage V. I will say more regarding these implementation strategies when I discuss this stage next. It should be added that during the past four years ANISA has become a robust adolescent and is now well onto its way to becoming a mature young adult.

In Suffield's case diagnosis, resource acquisition and choosing the solution are not easily distinguished; one stage seems to lead to the other with not a lot of clear alternative from which to choose. In Suffield it appears to be the case of a hand looking for a glove and, in the case of UMass, a glove looking for a hand. All things considered, the match has been a good one. One advantage of an immature model is its flexibility. Suffield was able to adapt ANISA rather easily to its specific needs. Because of its flexibility ANISA became OUR model and the team no longer considered it the exclusive property of the University of Massachusetts. I think ANISA'S authors intended it that way; Dr. Carney certainly encouraged this feeling.

While Suffield entered into the first year of the implementation as if it were to be a pilot test, there was much prejudice (necessarily) that Suffield was going to spend three years implementing ANISA N-K-I-2, or N through Grade 3 or 4, or 5 or all three. What effect this prejudice

had upon the reversability of implementing the model I don't know. I certainly would not advocate anyone entering into an implementation of this dimension with reservation and hesitancy. It took the drive, energy and conviction of the entire team to implement the model. In my opinion anything less would not have worked. It should be stated that there were times during that first and second year when I had my questions. And there were times when the other members of the change team had theirs. Fortunately, it never happened that all four members were questioning the Project at the same time; when one team member was "down", three were "up"-- an advantage perhaps to a change team over a single change agent.

STAGE V: Gaining Acceptance

Implementing the Anisa Model of Education in the nursery school and kindergarten was relatively easy and quite successful. This was due for the most part to the fact that the nursery and kindergarten staffs plus the administration had participated actively in choosing ANISA as the solution to their many problems.

Acceptance by Individuals

The change plan or proposal was well thought out. Dividing the proposal into content areas and process areas allowed me as Director to know where to focus in bringing about change. For example, most of the acceptance by indi-

viduals of the Model resulted from the knowledge the staff acquired at summer school and during the following inservice program.

The first summer school was a roaring success. I think it would have been valuable to have had all of the summer school programs at UMass for reasons previously cited - the unfreezing effect, comradarie, the excellence of the lab school facilities, consideration of the UMass staff's energy and time in traveling, etcetera. Paying school staff to go to summer school is a great statement. It says, "We value you". "We value what you know". "We value you to the extent that we want to educate you in the summer when you are not harassed and worn out by the day to day activities of teaching". Being able to pay personnel to attend summer school was an important factor in the success of the Project.

Having the UMass staff come to Suffield the last week of that first summer school in order to re-arrange the Suffield environment was the cherry on top of the cake; a brilliant plan on the part of UMass. And Dr. Nancy Rambusch was just perfect. It is regretful she was not invited to do the same thing at Bridge and West. It is still not too late. There were many many problems in trying to tailor ANISA information and process to Suffield. For one thing, the time needed to adapt a new educational model was grossly underestimated by the change team. It is to their credit that they quickly

adjusted to this reality and slowed the implementation down. The change team also underestimated the complexity of the model. It is a difficult model to understand, albeit, a satisfying one once understood.

Often the in-service program did not fit the needs of many who were exposed to it; the needs were too varied. Many Suffield staff were looking for recipes. And the UMass staff was inexperienced in consultation and terribly over-worked. Many were graduate students who were in a doctoral program within the School of Education. In addition to their doctoral studies several were acting as consultants to two or three field sites. These consultants were under great stress. But we all kept communicating and meeting and working our way through problems. Things did smooth-out and the in-service program slowly over time seemed to more and more meet the needs of the staff. As stated previously, I think it would have been valuable to graph each individual client along a six-phase scale of individual acceptance (awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, adoption, and integration). This graph would have allowed us to deal with each hands-on staff member as if they were the only object of the change effort - which they were - rather than aiming at the center of a group (the center of West say, or the center of one of the nursery schools).

The lack of a full-time UMass ANISA staff person in Suffield weakened the in-service program. A full-time consultant was sorely needed and would have been money well spent within a project of this dimension. As teachers began to evaluate how they felt about ANISA and began to try the idea in the classroom they needed someone to be at their elbow demonstrating the innovation and helping them to see its applicability in their particular setting. Plotting each staff member's growth along a scale of the six-phases of adoption would have facilitated this kind of support and given it direction. One of the goals in any change program is to prevent failure; a full time UMass ANISA staff member in Suffield would greatly have enhanced the potential for success during trial. It would have also allowed those "negative feelings" and the "hard questions" on a one to one basis. This criticism should not infer that Dr. Carney did not try, for she most certainly did. Whatever successes have been realized in this part of the implementation are most certainly to be shared with Dr. Carney and her fellow UMass helpers. What was needed was more of her services. Whatever has been said for the trial phase is equally true for the phases of adoption and integration as well. The teachers needed time to ask questions, see the specifications modeled, make a personal commitment, and discuss their doubts about the innovation.

Suffield's early approach to the staff and community regarding ANISA had many strengths. The team was wise in including all of the K-12 faculty, the PTO's, the two nursery schools and the news media. They were wise to include the governmental structures (Board of Selectmen, Citizens' Advisory Council, the Board of Education). I think we could have done more with parents, and perhaps such groups as the Lions, Rotary, League of Women Voters, and JC's. We did include the secretarial, custodial, and cafeteria workers initially, but did not follow-up on these groups as well as we might have.

Acceptance by the Group

Two members of the change team were students of organizational development and clinical psychology; the Project Director and the Research Coordinator. With this background, the change team was able to strategize the processes of planned change paying attention to organizational and human factors. Had the Suffield team tried to implement ANISA by merely influencing teachers' knowledge, the change plan would have failed. In order to effect real change, it is necessary to effect teachers' attitudes and feelings as well.

During the first year it was the process leadership style of the Director during Steering Committee meetings and that of the change agent team within the staff that pro-

vided for process considerations. During the first year there was no Process Consultant nor a Leadership Program. That was an error. Both should have been provided as early in the Project as possible. It was fortunate that the nurseries and kindergarten were amenable to change that first year for had there been resistance, we would have probably lacked adequate resources to handle it.

According to Havelock (1973) three type of people play a significant role in generating group acceptance of an innovation; innovators, resistors, and leaders. It would have been a good idea to have indexed each staff person according to each of these categories. I think I did categorize people in my mind but putting it down on paper would have allowed me to do a force-field analysis on each person and strategize how to win their acceptance of the innovation. Again, as in the case of the six-phase scale of individual acceptance of an innovation, it would mean dealing with each staff person as an entity in and of themselves; a good strategy I think. Although the team did not categorize people per se, it was their practice to concentrate their efforts on supporting those faculty who they thought were innovative and open to change. From this core group they hoped to influence the behavior and attitudes of other staff within the various teams.

During the first year of the Project the Steering Com-

mittee was the most important part of the team's strategy towards group acceptance of the innovation. By including representatives from all five sites it was hoped they would begin to make a commitment to the Model. The Steering Committee was also forum for gripes and doubts about the Anisa Model. The Steering Committee provided for quick feed-back to the UMass staff, the Research Coordinator, the Project Director, and the administration (the Superintendent and the Principal). It also provided for continuous needs assessment and feed-back into the change plan. The Steering Committee was a critical factor in the success of the Project. That a parents advisory group was never developed for ANISA is to the discredit of the Project Director. It was a hang up. Somehow I never saw the value of it. In retrospect, I do. The change plan did not strategize parents and the Board of Education very well. A Parents Advisory Committee would have helped by including a parent from each site, a Board of Education member, the Director of each nursery school, the Early Childhood Principal and the Project Director. It could have been an excellent vehicle for communication and advice.

The Leadership Program presented by Dr. Blanchard during summer school the second year of the Project should have been offered the first and third year as well. This program provided to the staff and administration a common language for discussing leadership. In addition it provided to adminis-

tration a paradigm which included both high and low structure. Dr. Blanchard's Life Cycle Theory of Leadership provided a valuable bridge from ANISA theory to the practical.

The Process Consultation program was of inestimable value to the implementation of the Anisa Model. The results of the consultants' work was most obvious at Bridge Street School where a radical change occurred during the second and third year of the Project and the year after. It should be stated that both Dr. Bohn and Dr. Carter were extremely able consultants. Each in their turn dealt with some very sticky issues and it's to their credit that the implementation went as well as it did.

STAGE VI: Stabilization

From the beginning the change team had its eye on stabilization and continuity of the ANISA innovation once federal monies were withdrawn. For this reason, the change team wrote the grant application paying equal attention to process and content. The change team wanted the client system to own ANISA and thus have a vested interest in the innovation's survival. The change team realized it had only three years in which to accomplish this task. The change team was aware that the literature on change suggests that five years is a more realistic estimate of the amount of time needed to implement an educational innovation

(Weikart, 1972). For the change team this short time allowance meant that the change plan had to be accurate (no major steps could be left out), be concentrated and include the broadest number of people. In retrospect, I think the change plan was just that.

The principle factors insuring the continuity of ANISA after the Spring of 1976 were a well trained early childhood faculty, provision for continuing pre-service and in-service training by virtue of a half-time Anisa Curriculum Specialist, a Board of Education Policy that institutionalized ANISA as Suffield's Early Childhood Education Model, and a Principal who was well trained in ANISA and convinced of its educational value.

With the establishment of a singular model of education in both nursery schools, kindergarden, and both primary schools, a self-feeding system was created. The upper level's expected the lower levels to send them children trained in the Anisa Model, and the lower levels expected the upper levels to follow through on an educational system they had begun. The trick for the change team was to establish ways for the system to continue to communicate and continue to self perpetuate. The Anisa Curriculum Specialist, the Early Childhood Principal, the pre and in-service programs, and the Steering Committee all helped in that effort. In addition, the staff and administration were trained in problem solving and communications skills. These qualities plus

continued updating of the staff appeared to insure Suffield's continued evolution into an ANISA system of education.

A weakness in Suffield's effort to maintain the innovation is its connection or avenue to its roots; the ANISA staff and body of knowledge located at the University of Massachusetts. ANISA is formulated on a model that provides for continuous updating of educational practice based upon research and new knowledge. The funnel for this knowledge was the UMass ANISA staff. For the school year 1976-1977 (the year following the Project) the follow-through from UMass to Suffield and vice versa was left informal. This meant that the development of new specifications, updating and consultation, and participation of UMass in Suffield's in-service program was left up to whimsy rather than to plan. Our experiences during that year showed that this approach is not successful.

A second weakness in the plans for stabilization and continuity of the Model was in the area of on-going evaluation. According to Havelock (1973), some provision needs to be made for re-inspection and re-evaluation of any innovation. No such follow-up plans were made for ANISA. In fact the whole evaluation effort of the Project became more suspect with each passing year.

While most educators know better, the simple fact is that they do not, as a whole, either create or use evalua-

tion very well. Mr George Bondra, Research Coordinator for the Project, set up an excellent research methodology for the three years of the Project. It included a goal evaluation model emphasizing operating research within a general systems theory.

The quality of the ANISA program was evaluated in terms of defined goals and objectives. The methodology included a combination of approaches to data collection; i.e., counting, description, and the ripple effects. The methodology also included an analysis of effort, effect, efficiency, adequacy, and process. Integral to this research methodology was an evaluative study of selective out-comes of the ANISA program directed by Dr. Ron Hambleton, Director of the Laboratory of Psychometrical and Evaluative Research, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The study focussed on evaluation of the physical and human environments and several of the process goals that underlie learning competence (classification, conservation, seriation, attention, figure-ground, cooperation, and inflection). The Hambleton work was begun the first year of the Project, and concluded the second. Much of the work was original (both the research itself and instrumentation) and constitutes an important piece of the research on the Anisa Model of Education. To the best of my knowledge the research has not been continued, nor has there been further development of these

instruments for measuring the effects of ANISA on the learning competence of children.

Another part of the evaluation effort which did not continue beyond the second year of the Project was Dr. Bissell's efforts to analyze ANISA as an approach to early childhood education in the context of other contemporary practices being implemented in the United States and an assessment of the degree to which ANISA, as implemented in Suffield, was consistent with Suffield's espoused educational goals. The latter took the form of a rating of ANISA as implemented in Suffield on such dimensions as "individualization," "teacher as facilitator," "fostering higher achievement," "self appreciation," "appropriateness of classrooms" (Bissell, 1975). This particular type of evaluation was helpful in reporting objectively to administration and staff their progress in implementing their educational goals. The report provided by Dr. Bissell and her colleagues not only contained objective data, it also included recommendations for Model implementation at each site and recommendations concerning procedures for choosing educational products to supplement the Anisa Model--materials consistent with Suffield's educational goals. It is sad that this piece of evaluation was not continued at least into the third year.

The only piece of evaluation that remains is some pre and post testing of ANISA children on reading using standardized tests. There are no longer ways for evaluating whether or not ANISA is achieving that which it purports to achieve nor are there any mechanisms for evaluating whether or not ANISA continues to help Suffield solve its early childhood problems.

Whether or not Suffield will maintain its self renewing capacity is a serious question. Since the inception of Anisa, 1972-1973, the Suffield School System has become involuted and self-centered. No longer is the Superintendent and Board encouraging creativity and innovation. No longer are the staff encouraged to take professional days to visit other school systems and see what is happening that's new and interesting. It may be that a change in America has come about; sometimes it feels like that. The great heyday of innovation and adventure in American education seems to be over, temporarily. The country is in financial crisis and this seems to have frightened everyone. The climate now seems to be, - lay low, be quiet, wait to see what's going to happen, don't rock the boat. And so it is that Suffield has entered a quiet non-innovative period. It will not last, times change, new problems arise, new solutions must be sought. Systems do not have a choice about change; they either adapt or become archaic and dysfunctional. We will see which of these directions Suffield chooses.

RecommendationsTo Those In The Early Childhood ProgramIn the area of leadership and management.

1. There should be an annual plan of activities for each school year based upon the successes and failures of the previous years and a contemporary needs assessment.
2. The principal and others in position of formal power should continue to model democratic leadership.
3. The Steering Committee, Curriculum Specialist and Early Childhood Principal should continue to implement the Anisa Theory of Administration (see Dr. Walker's dissertation).
4. There should be further attempts to integrate the differentiated staff. The role of the specialist in the Early Childhood Program should be re-examined.
5. The Steering Committee should continue to have representatives from K, Bridge and West. (This would, of course, change once a new early childhood facility is built).
6. The Steering Committee should continue as a major decision making body. The new superintendent should be encouraged to become part of this group.

7. A parents' advisory group for Early Childhood might be considered.
8. There should be close communications between the staffs of VEAP, the two nursery schools, Kindergarten, Bridge, and West.

In the area of individual and group acceptance of the innovation.

1. Continue to reward present staff for attempting to follow-through with the innovation by helping teachers and others in the classroom with the hands on application of the model.
2. A newsletter to staff should be considered - a monthly update of implementation activities.
3. Dr. Rambush should be invited to meet with the staffs of Bridge and West to look at their learning/teaching environments. She might also take a second look at the Kindergarten environment.
4. Maintain a written contract with the UMass ANISA staff for services (i.e. so many training days, new specifications, on-site visits, evaluation, etcetera).
5. Continue the in-service training program for new and experienced staff. The new staff might join other Suffield staff at UMass for a paid summer school experience.

6. Individuals members attempting to adopt the Anisa Model should be evaluated on the six-phase scale of individual acceptance of an innovation and on the readiness-for-innovation scale (innovator, resistor, leader).

In the area of evaluation and research.

1. Strong support should be given to maintaining Mr. Bondra evaluation process.
2. Some consideration should be given to using Dr. Bissell's evaluation scales to see what progress is being made towards achieving Suffield process goals of education.
3. UMass should be encouraged to continue Dr. Hambleton's research effort.
4. The staff should be asked whether or not they still support the Anisa Model of Education; if not, what else might be suggested.

Other.

1. Efforts to further codify ANISA into Board policy should be made (for example, there needs to be a Board policy on nutrition).
2. A yearly (minimum) presentation on ANISA should be made to the Board.
3. The Early Childhood principal and ANISA Curriculum Specialist should try to make presentation to

various clubs and organizations in the community.

To Those Extending Anisa Into The Third Grade And Beyond

In the area of leadership and management.

1. An annual plan should be developed for each school year. Such a plan should be the product of a needs assessment (faculty, parents, students, administration) and an analysis of the successes and failures of the previous plan.
2. While a plan is a necessity it must remain flexible.
3. There should be an internal change team for the Spaulding School with the Principal as its' primary leader and the Anisa Curriculum Specialist as its' primary consultant. Generally speaking the leadership should be shared. The internal change team should elect a representative to the steering committee. The internal change team should consist of people who are naturally respected and liked by their colleagues. (Informal leaders).
4. Consultants as needed (process, leadership, content).

In the area of individual and group acceptance of the innovation.

1. A pre-service and in-service program is critical to the implementation. Consideration should be given to training new staff at UMass in the summer time.
2. Each individual attempting the innovation should be plotted on the six-stage scale of adoption by individuals of an innovation. Some index should also be made as to whether the individual is an innovator, resistor, or leader.
3. A Process Consultant should work with the individual teachers, teaching teams, and the faculty as a whole on group dynamics, communications skills, leadership, and problem solving skills.
4. Include secretaries, custodians, and cafeteria personnel.

In the area of evaluation and research.

Mr. Bondra or someone else, in conjunction with UMass, should set up a research and evaluation design. The Principal should act as coordinator of this evaluation effort using consultants where appropriate. Such consultants should be budgeted appropriately.

Other.

Dr. Nancy Rambusch should be invited to consult with the faculty on arranging their learning-teaching space.

To Those Who May Contemplate Implementing Anisa in Their School Districts.

1. Buy a copy of Havelock's The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education (1973). Read it from page 3 to page 146, twice.
2. Conduct a thorough diagnosis of your particular situation. Bring in whatever consultants are needed in order to make this diagnosis as effective as possible.
3. From the diagnosis decide what type of educational model you are interested in. Talk with people, read, conduct a search of the literature, visit places where the models you are interested in have been implemented. In the case of ANISA, come to Suffield, go to Hampden, Maine.
4. Make a group decision.
5. Read this dissertation in detail, especially Chapters IV and V.
6. Develop a plan for implementation in your system paying attention to the process as well as the content of the ANISA.

7. Set up a rigorous evaluation design for your plan.
8. Make firm contracts with the UMass ANISA staff.
9. An overall goal of the implementation plan should be to develop self reliance in implementing the Anisa Model of Education.
10. Good luck.

S E L E C T E D
B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Books

- Argyris, C. Intervention theory and method. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.
- Beckhard, R. Organization development: strategies and models. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Bennis, W. G. A typology of change process. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), The planning of change: readings in the applied behavioral sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
- Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. The planning of change (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., Chin, R., & Corey, K. E. The planning of change (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.
- Blake, R., & Mouton, J. S. Strategies for consultation. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, R. Chin, & K. E. Corey (Eds.), The planning of change (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976, 48-68.
- Bogdan, R. Participant observation in organization settings. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1972.
- Chesler, M. A., Lohman, J. E. Changing schools through student advocacy. In R. A. Schmuck & M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971, 185-212.
- Chin, R., & Benne, K. D. General strategies for effecting change in human systems. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), The planning of change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Fox, D. J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- French, W. L., & Bell, C. H. Jr. Organization development. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

- Giacquinta, J. B. The process of organizational change in schools. In F. N. Kerlinger (Ed.), Review of research in education. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, a publication of the American Educational Research Association, 1973, 178-208.
- Golembiewski, R. T. Renewing organizations: the laboratory approach to planned change. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, 1972.
- Goodson, M. R., & Hagstrom, W. O. Using teams of change agents. In R. A. Schmuck & M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971, 155-184.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Berstein, M. An attempt to implement a major educational innovation: a sociological inquiry. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences, Harvard University, 1968.
- Havelock, R. G. Dissemination and translation roles. In T. L. Eidell & J. M. Kitchell (Eds.), Knowledge production and utilization in educational administration. Eugene, Ore.: University Council for Educational Administration and Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.
- Havelock, R. G. Planning for innovation through the dissemination and utilization of knowledge. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Havelock, R. G. The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
- Havelock, R. G. Planning for innovation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, 1975.
- Havelock, R. G., Guskin, A. E., Frohman, M. A., Havelock, M., Hill, M., & Huber, J. Planning for innovation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1969.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. Management of organizational behavior: utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

- Lewin, K. Quasi-stationary social equilibria and the problem of permanent change. In The planning of change: readings in the applied behavioral sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
- Lewin, K. Group decision and social change. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1947.
(b)
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. The dynamics of planned change. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958.
- Lippitt, G. L. Organizational renewal. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Lombard, G. F. Clerical research and research reports in human relations. In K. R. Andrews (Ed.), The case method of teaching human relations and administration. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Margulies, N., & Raia, A. P. Organizational development: values, process, and technology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Mayo, E. The social problems of an industrial civilization. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1945.
- McGregor, D. M. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Miles, M. B. Innovation in education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Sarason, S. B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Sax, G. Empirical foundations of educational research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. L. Field research: strategies for a natural sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Schmuck, A., & Miles, B. (Eds.). Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971.
- Schon, D. A. Beyond the stable state. New York: Norton, 1971.

- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Towl, A. R. To study administration by cases. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1969.
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding education research, revised edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Willings, R. How to use the case study in training for decision making. London: Business Publications Limited, 1968.

Journal Articles

- Bennis, W. G. The case study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1968, 4, 226-231.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Implementation of educational innovation. The Educational Forum, 1976, XL, 345-370.
- Browne, P. J., Colton, C. C., & Golembiewski, R. T. Marginality and the O D practitioner. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977, 13, 493.
- Burke, W. Organization development in transition. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1976, 12, 22-43.
- Friedlander, F. O D reaches adolescence. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1976, 12, 7-21.
- Lewin, K. Resolving social conflict. New York: Harper's, 1948.
- Lewin, K. Frontiers in group dynamics. Human Relations, 1947, 1, 5-42. (a)
- Piltz, A., & Murphy, J. New education act. The Instructor, June, 1965.
- Rambusch, N. Fielding the ANISA model. The Constructive Triangle, 1975, 2 (2), 57-63.
- Ready, R. K. The case study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1968.
- Sashkin, M., Morris, W. C., & Horst, L. A comparison of social and organizational change models: information

flow and data use processes. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 510-526.

Walton, R. E. Advantages and attributes of the case study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, 8, 72-78.

Other Sources

Bissell, J. S. Evaluation of Project - ANISA, Suffield, Progress Report. Harvard University Graduate School of Education, March, 1974.

Bissell, J. S. An Evaluation of ANISA in Suffield, 1974-75. Harvard Graduate School of Education, Laboratory of Human Development, February, 1975.

Bondra, G. Annual Evaluation Report for July 1, 1973-June 30, 1974, to the Commissioner of Education, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to Support a Demonstration Project under Provisions of Title III of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965 (PL 89-10), August 20, 1974.

Lincoln, R. T. Initial Application to the Commissioner of Education, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut, to Support an Innovative Project Under Provision of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), February 1, 1973.

Lincoln, R. T. Second Year Continued Application to the Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Connecticut, to Support an Innovative Project Under Provision of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), May 1, 1974.

Lincoln, R. T. Third Year Continued Application to the Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Connecticut, to Support an Innovative Project Under Provisions of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), May 1, 1975.

Rambusch, N. Intuitive and intentional change agency. Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1977.

Walker, P. G. The administration of the ANISA model, the release of a collective potential. Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1975.

Weikart, D. P. Planned variation from the perspective of a model sponsor. Paper presented at Brookings Institution Panel on Social Experimentation, Washington, D. C., December, 1972.

The Anisa Model

A
Comprehensive
Plan for
Educational
Renewal



Copyright 1975 by ANISA

All rights reserved

Cover: A child completes an exercise in seriation—a kind of thinking essential to understanding mathematics. In this picture the boy is ordering cylinders on the basis of decreasing diameter. The child also demonstrates his attentional powers. Like seriation, how to pay attention—how to concentrate—is taught as part of the Anisa curriculum.

Photographs of activities at the McGraw School in Hampden, Maine, including the cover, were taken by Philomena Baker. David Walker took the photographs of staff at the implementation sites in Suffield, Connecticut. Pattabi Raman photographed scenes outside of the school settings.



Anisa comes from a root word that refers to a flowering and fragrant plant or tree. It has been used to represent the "Tree of Life," an ancient symbol which connotes the qualities of beauty, grace, nurturance, shelter, and cycles of fruition. The Anisa logogram was designed to illustrate these qualities and to suggest their significance for an organismic conception of education.

Education is the guidance of the individual towards a comprehension of the art of life; and by the art of life I mean the most complete achievement of varied activity expressing the potentialities of that living creature in the face of its actual environment. This completeness of achievement involves an artistic sense, subordinating the lower to the higher possibilities of the indivisible personality. Science, art, religion, morality, take their rise from this sense of values within the structure of being. Each individual embodies an adventure of existence. The art of life is the guidance of this adventure.

Aims of Education, p. 39.

The Anisa Model is a blueprint for a new educational system that brings joy to learning without losing sight of the need for self-discipline and hard work. Underlying this new system is a philosophy about life and the wonders of the universe, and a theory of education that connects the two. To ensure the coherence, depth, and comprehensiveness of the philosophical and theoretical foundations of the Model, we have drawn heavily on the works of the great philosopher, logician, and mathematician, Alfred North Whitehead, from whose writings selected statements appear throughout this publication.

The purpose of this brochure is to disseminate basic information about the Model as part of a systematic effort to broaden the base of interest and support for a new phase of research and development.

Daniel C. Jordan
Director, ANISA Project

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Aims of Education, page 14.

Table of Contents

What Can Anisa Do for Children?
3

What Can Anisa Do for Teachers?
6

How Can Anisa Help Parents?
9

How Can Anisa Help the
Community?
11

What Makes Anisa Different from
Other Educational Systems?
13

Equalizing Educational Opportunity
21

How Has the Anisa Model Been
Developed?
22

How Do Other Educators View the
Anisa Model?
23

What Can Anisa Do for Children?

The opportunity to become a competent learner is one of the greatest gifts a child can receive. It is a great gift because learning competence enables a child to take full advantage of all other opportunities life may bring. And if life seems to bring few opportunities and many problems, a competent learner need not despair because he can work through problems and knows how to create opportunities for himself and others.

How can we give this gift to our children?

To transform schools and homes into places where children will develop into competent learners requires a comprehensive plan for educational renewal. The Anisa Model is such a plan. It is a scientifically-based educational system that fosters each child's natural love of learning and helps him to become a confident and productive human being. If a child loves to learn, it stands to reason that he will be attracted to learning opportunities, and will therefore enjoy taking on responsibilities that require new learning. Problems and the challenge of finding their solutions will interest him. With this attitude toward learning he will continue to develop and grow throughout his life.

The first thing that a teacher has to do when he enters the classroom is to make his class glad to be there.

Science and Philosophy, pages 179-80

The solution which I am urging, is to eradicate the fatal disconnection of subjects which kills the vitality of our modern curriculum. There is only one subject-matter for education, and that is Life in all its manifestations.

Aims of Education, pages 6-7

An effective and competent learner knows *how to learn*. Yet, how to learn is itself something that has to be learned, but it is rarely taught in schools. A traditional curriculum emphasizes *what* to learn, rather than *how* to learn; what to see or hear, not how to see and listen; what to think, rather than how to think; what to feel, but not how to feel; what to strive for, rather than how to strive. The Anisa curriculum emphasizes the "hows" of learning.

Adding the "hows" to the "whats" of the traditional curriculum makes the Anisa Model comprehensive and ensures the development of the whole child, rather than just that part of him concerned with the memorization of facts. Although memorizing different kinds of information is certainly important, learning includes far more than that. In schools based on the Model, five other kinds of learning concerned with the "hows" are given high priority. The part of the curriculum designed to develop learning competence is organized around these five types.

1. Learning how to move and gain maximum control over the voluntary muscles. This form of learning is essential to many important human activities such as riding a bicycle, playing the violin, writing, or performing surgery. The expert use of tools and the operation of machinery depend on this kind of learning.

2. Learning how to perceive. Development of the senses—seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching—is important to all other forms of learning. Through proper training, children can increase their efficiency in processing in-



Stitchery helps development of fine motor coordination which is an important preparation for handwriting.

Hand-eye coordination and visual discrimination exercises can begin early in the life of a child. The Anisa Model includes a training program for parents which enables them to carry out at home a full educational program for their babies.



Learning to coordinate, control and direct the movement of muscles is the basis for many other kinds of learning, including how to read and write. Balance and posture are essential aspects of poise and important in the development of confidence.



Observation is a cognitive-perceptual process essential to the scientific method. These children are observing distinguishing characteristics of the hamster in order to vote on a name for him at a later time.



Nursery school children operate a grocery store which provides a setting for classification of goods and calculating costs. Learning the names of products is a part of the process. A parent volunteer guides the interaction.



formation taken in through the senses and can learn to make use of it to the best advantage.

3. Learning how to think clearly. There are many kinds of thinking emphasized in the Model, especially problem-solving through the use of logical reasoning. Problem solving is given emphasis because no child can gain independence nor can he secure the best kind of employment as an adult if he cannot identify and solve problems.

4. Learning how to exercise the will. This form of learning produces self-discipline and the ability to concentrate or pay attention. It includes learning how to set goals, how to initiate action to accomplish them, and how to persevere in the face of obstacles until they are achieved. Without this kind of learning, a child cannot become a productive, self-reliant, self-directed adult.

5. Learning how to feel and respond emotionally to any situation appropriately. To become fully human, a child must learn how to love and how to be loved; how to

cope with sadness and disappointment; how to manage anxiety; how to control anger or jealousy. His emotions need to be organized so that he likes the things that further his development and dislikes things that do not. For example, learning to love justice and honesty and to dislike injustice and dishonesty will enable him to be a morally responsible person who keeps out of trouble and attracts friends who will meet his social needs in a beneficial way. When emotions are organized the other way around, the child feels that injustice and dishonesty are acceptable. The stage is then set for delinquency, crime and disrespect for legitimate authority. The Anisa Model therefore does not leave the emotional and moral development of the child up to chance, but treats it as an obligation of high priority. To do otherwise is to deprive the child of a promising future and a decent life.



Complex skills such as speaking, reading, writing and mathematical reasoning, all of which are given central importance in the Anisa Model, involve the five kinds of learning mentioned above. Concentrating first on the "hows" of learning enables each child to achieve the prerequisites to these skills as soon as possible, but in his own time. In this way children who are ready for learning the skills are not held back and those not yet ready can still proceed at their own pace without being made to feel that they have failed.

In summary, Anisa can serve children by providing a comprehensive educational experience that will enable them to develop their potentialities fully and at an optimum rate.

The process of self-creation is the transformation of the potential into the actual, and the fact of such transformation includes the immediacy of self-enjoyment.

Modes of Thought, page 151

To make the sounds that letters represent is an engaging activity for children in pre-reading learning experiences.

An education which does not begin by evoking initiative and end by encouraging it must be wrong. For its whole aim is the production of active wisdom.

Aims of Education, page 27

What Can Anisa Do for Teachers?

We are discovering that in schools you cannot do without genius, genius of character, genius of insight, and genius of intellectual enthusiasm. Authorities who want successful schools must see to it that the conditions in the teaching profession are those in which genius can thrive.

Science and Philosophy, p. 180

The most important factor in giving a child an opportunity to become a competent learner is a teacher who knows how to nurture a love for learning and who can teach all of the "hows" of learning. The Anisa Model incorporates a plan for the systematic and thorough training of teachers in this new approach. With such training teachers also become more effective learners and are better models for their students. Anisa teachers gain their greatest satisfaction from watching each child become an independent and competent learner, rather than from covering so many pages of a textbook by a certain time. The curriculum of the Anisa Model clearly specifies the education objectives that lead to learning competence and outlines the principles that must guide the actions of the teachers and children if the objectives are to be met. Both the educational objectives and the means of achieving them have been formulated on the basis of an analysis of a vast amount of scientific



The Anisa Model is functionally defined by specifications which insure its replication, evaluation, and refinement. Anisa staff members Dr. Lois Abeles and Dr. Magdalene Carney, both teacher trainers, examine the content of an Anisa Specification in the Volitional domain prior to its introduction in the field.

This student is able to concentrate fully on his reading because the arrangement of the physical environment of the classroom and the observance of ground rules permits the child to proceed at his own pace uninterrupted by others.



The environment within which the mind is working must be carefully selected. It must, of course, be chosen to suit the child's stage of growth and must be adapted to individual needs. In a sense it is an imposition from without but in a deeper sense it answers to the call of life within the child.

Aims of Education, pages 32-33

The demonstration of a principle of teaching is recorded on videotape to be viewed and discussed by teachers as part of the Anisa teacher training program.



Teacher trainers, Dr. Nancy M. Rambusch and Dr. Susan Theroux, prepare for videotape a demonstration which teaches the concept of number through the manipulation of concrete objects. The Anisa system emphasizes that planning time for teachers is essential to providing high quality educational experiences for children.

There can be no mental development without interest. Interest is the *sine qua non* for attention and apprehension. You may endeavor to excite interest by means of birch rods, or you may coax it by the incitement of pleasurable activity. But without interest there will be no progress.

Aims of Education, page 31

research about how children learn and develop. The research has been condensed, organized, and presented in the form of principles of teaching and learning which can be understood and used. By applying these principles, the Anisa teacher is relieved of many discipline problems and most of the difficulties of classroom management. Equipped with such knowledge and principles, teachers are not bound to specific places, materials, equipment, or lesson plans. Instead, they are free to concentrate on the diagnosis of each child's needs and the prescription of educational experiences which meet those needs, and they can create settings appropriate to each prescribed experience where every child can work alone or in small groups at his own pace, giving expression to his own interests and preferences.

Anisa can also help teachers by upgrading the profession through excellence of training and high certification standards. Since we believe that teachers themselves must be

competent, enthusiastic, and knowledgeable learners so that they can model the learning process effectively, teacher preparation programs based on the Anisa Model are rigorous and demanding. They are also individualized so teachers can progress through the training at their own pace. The emphasis is not on memorizing what is in a variety of textbooks about teaching but on knowing the Model's specific educational objectives and understanding the principles necessary to help children achieve them. How to teach in the new way is accomplished by teaching day after day under careful supervision and by learning how to evaluate every act of teaching. Because Anisa teachers know how to evaluate their own teaching, they are able to improve continually their services to the children and the profession.

The Anisa approach to certification is straightforward. A student who goes through a training program and is not able to teach effectively is counselled into some other occupation and is not given teaching credentials. In traditional systems it is possible for students to receive "straight A's" in course work and become certified even though they are incompetent as teachers, whereas others might receive lower grades but be extremely effective in working with children. To be certified in the Anisa system, a teacher must have superior knowledge of the

subjects to be taught and must know how to work with children so that they become competent learners. Certification and re-certification depend on demonstration of teaching competence and knowledge of subject matter and not simply on the accumulation of course credits.

How Can Anisa Help Parents?

Because of the critical nature of pre-natal development and the first five years of life, the Anisa Model includes a program to assist parents in nutritional planning before conception, during pregnancy, and after birth. Good nutrition is essential if children are to develop strong minds and bodies and since the health of parents affects the well-being of their children, it is also important for them to acquire and maintain excellent physical health.

Just as the nutrition and health of the parents affect the development of the child's body, so do the learning environment and emotional atmosphere of the home affect the development of the child's character. It is vital that such qualities as love, order, honesty, trust, happiness, discipline, respect, and justice pervade the life of the family. These qualities have a strong influence on a child's ability to learn because they determine what he believes about himself and how he will regard the world and interact with it.

Recognizing that parents are the most influential educators of children, the Anisa Model provides a way to unite parents and the school into a single system of support for the growth and development of the child. It incorporates a home-based educational program which begins at birth and continues through the elementary school years. When a child enters school, the active par-



Since nutrition is the key factor in the maintenance of good health and the ability to learn, emphasis is placed on this aspect of human development at all ages.



Nutrition plays a very important role in helping a child become a competent learner. Dr. Pattabi Raman, Anisa member whose professional preparation is in two fields, biochemistry and developmental psychology, helps to prepare parents in the home-based training program.



Parents are the first teachers. The Anisa system encourages a continuation of parent involvement with children in the school environment. A parent volunteer engages a small group of children in an exercise that teaches them the nature of symmetrical patterning and how to create sequences using colored beads.



The Anisa program begins for children right after they are born. It therefore has a well-defined, home-based curriculum for parents and children in which the role of the father is stressed.

participation of parents in his education continues. In this way, discontinuities between the experience of home and school are avoided and the transition into the formal educational setting is smooth and easy.

Experience has shown that parents who have an organized approach to rearing children based on knowledge of human development, who take the need for good nutrition and exercise seriously, and who can create the proper learning environment in their homes will have a successful and happy family life. They enjoy child rearing, feel confident in coping with troubles and difficulties, and develop a wholesome relationship with their children that lasts throughout their lives.

How Can Anisa Help the Community?



The children gathered and classified a variety of edible items, priced them, and set up a small grocery store. During this experience, they strengthened their understanding of classification and its practical application, how to evaluate foods in monetary terms, and how to run a small business.

The aim of education is the marriage of thought and action—that actions should be controlled by thoughts and that thoughts should issue in action.

Science and Philosophy, 180

The strongest possible foundation for the security and advancement of future generations is established when a community provides an educational system that enables its children to become competent learners. In such a community, the energies of its citizens will always be devoted to improving the quality of life for everyone.

Crime, delinquency, mental illness, drug addiction, alcoholism,

unemployment and poverty are among the most serious problems facing any community. While no school system can be expected to solve these problems by itself, it has the obligation to assume a major role in dealing with them. The Anisa Model has been designed to help prevent these problems from arising. When they do occur, however, it also provides the means for dealing effectively with them in collaboration with home and community agencies.

Crime, delinquency, and mental illness have their roots in frustration, anger, anxiety, and failure—all of which cause the student to strike out against society or to withdraw

into a fantasy world where no one can reach him. One of the most common sources of frustration and failure for many children is a school that neither fits them nor serves their needs. Children kept in such a situation have their love of learning destroyed and come to hate school, teachers, and school administrators. They have no chance to develop good work habits and important qualities like dependability, responsibility, and respect for legitimate authority. Instead, they feel rejected, unwanted, and mistreated. They have little confidence in themselves and not much hope for a better future. Under these circumstances, they have no

alternative to dropping out. The same problems that lead to dropping out make finding and keeping a job unlikely. Unemployment and poverty follow. If no help is forthcoming, crime, mental illness, drug addiction, and alcoholism are almost inevitable. These problems also guarantee the instability of marriage and home life. When the new generation is born into such conditions, the cycle will repeat itself. The Anisa Model functions as an effective intervention in the cycle by addressing the root causes of these social problems.

While it is important to find a remedy for its most serious problems, a community needs more than that. It also requires an enlightened citizenry, willing and able to participate in self-government so that the affairs of the community can be managed to the benefit of all. Children in Anisa schools are trained from the earliest years in the skills of group decision-making—skills which are essential to the effective operation of government on all levels. They are also taught the nature of justice and the function of law in the maintenance of social order.

In our view, it is foolhardy to continue believing that social problems will go away if we give them short-term, superficial treatment. Nothing short of a systemic transformation of the basic social institutions which

These children are being briefed about the voting process in connection with naming their hamster. The timing of this event coincided with the National elections.



create and sustain the problems will work. For this reason, we believe that the comprehensive educational program represented by the Anisa Model can, over time, make a significant contribution to the stability of community life and help it bring into being a better future for everyone.

What Makes Anisa Different from Other Educational Systems?

The failing of ideals is sad evidence of the defeat of human endeavor. In the schools of antiquity philosophers aspired to impart wisdom, in modern colleges our humbler aim is to teach subjects. The drop from the divine wisdom, which was the goal of the ancients, to textbook knowledge of subjects, which is achieved by the moderns, marks an educational failure, sustained through the ages.

Aims of Education, page 29

Many features of the Model that make it different from other educational systems have already been discussed. These combined with other distinctive features presented in the following paragraphs support the claim that the Anisa Model is the most comprehensive plan for educational renewal in existence today.

An Explicit Philosophical Base. Anisa is based on a philosophy that recognizes man as a spiritual as well as a physical being whose capacity for development is limitless. By spiritual we mean that man has a consciousness that makes him aware of unknowns, such as his own future, which he has to approach on faith. Faith is the ability to deal with unknowns by making assumptions, developing plans, and formulating ideals all of which can guide action in the face of the unknowns. Man is unique not because he reacts to physical forces but because he is

Your character is developed according to your faith. This is the primary religious truth from which no one can escape.

Religion in the Making, page 15

responsive to assumptions, ideals, plans, aspirations, hopes, and a sense of purpose which he himself can create. Furthermore, he is endowed with the capacity for articulate speech and the ability to make use of symbols to record and communicate information. Such attributes make him different from animals; they give him the power to take an active part in forming his own character thereby determining his own destiny.

The character of a child is shaped by his experiences and the way he interprets them. Those who are with children most of the time, such as parents and teachers, have an awesome responsibility to make certain that the experiences they provide are developmentally sound and that they are interpreted by the children in ways that support further growth. Out of these experiences emerge the attitudes, values, ideals, and beliefs that make up the child's character. The Anisa Model stipulates the kinds of experiences required to form ideals that will influence the development of those values, attitudes, and beliefs which, in turn, will sustain continuing growth and development. A child without ideals

You won't get interested in what you are doing unless you have some ideals before you—some hopes for the betterment of human society, some joy at making others happy, some courage in facing the obstacles to progress. Such ideals bear essentially upon your school work. Ideals which are not backed by exact knowledge are mere fluffy emotion, and often lead to disastrous action.

Science and Philosophy, page 181.

has no sense of future and nothing to strive for. Without a sense of values he has no standards to apply in making judgments. Without belief or faith in his ability to cope with life's problems and seize opportunities when they appear, he will have little confidence and take no initiative in planning his life.

The Anisa Model thus holds that if education is to counter the social ills which have brought us to the point of crisis in many communities, it must be based on a philosophy that regards man as a noble creation capable of continual development.

An Emphasis on Moral Development. The Anisa Model provides for the moral instruction of children so that when they become adults they will help maintain order and unity in society while making constructive efforts to change it to improve the quality of life for everyone. Because cooperation is the basis for democratic activity, learning how to work effectively in groups



Moral competence, in large measure, depends upon children learning how to appreciate diversity in the human family and treat each other fairly. The Anisa curriculum for moral development rests firmly on the principle of the oneness of mankind.

The moral code is the behavior patterns which in the environment for which it is designed will promote the evolution of that environment towards its proper perfection.

Adventures of Ideas, page 292

is stressed. The Model upholds the principle of the oneness of mankind and the equality of men and women and it affirms the necessity for racial and ethnic diversity within the classroom and the community. Its curriculum acquaints children with the damaging nature of prejudice and how to detect and rid themselves of it.

A Central Role for the Arts. Creativity is the ability to explore possibilities

and arrive at a different order or combination of things to produce something new. The arts provide the most natural means by which children can explore a rich variety of possibilities and develop their capacity for creativity and inventiveness. In addition, music, dance, theatre arts, poetry, and the visual and plastic arts are the greatest resources for developing learning competence, particularly in the young child.

The arts are also important for other reasons. They are indispensable in helping the child to understand order and the nature of beauty. Without a sense of beauty, a child is deprived of a

You cannot, without loss, ignore in the life of the spirit so great a factor as art. Our aesthetic emotions provide us with vivid apprehensions of value. If you maim these, you weaken the force of the whole system of spiritual apprehensions. The claim for freedom in education carries with it the corollary that the development of the whole personality must be attended to.

Aims of Education, page 40

dimension of meaning in his life necessary to the full development of his potentialities.

A High Priority for Science. Children who are not educated in the sciences will not be equipped to participate fully in a modern, in-

Activities in the visual arts strengthen the child's ability to translate three-dimensional objects into two-dimensional representations and to appreciate principles of form, such as contrast, balance, pattern, proportion, and unity.



History shows us that an efflorescence of art is the first activity of nations on the road to civilization. Yet in the face of this plain fact, we practically shut out art from the main work of the population. Can we wonder for that such an education, involving and defeating cravings, leads to failure and discontent?
Aims in Education, page 40



The arts are at the core of the Anisa curriculum not only because they help a child to appreciate beauty, but because they are the natural means for developing all other potentialities of the child. Musical activities improve auditory acuity and promote the development of hand-eye coordination in conjunction with the auditory memory of patterns and rhythms.

Art activities develop the child's ability to understand part-whole relationships and the nature of form and pattern.
Dr. Aino Jarvesoo, art theorist and specialist in aesthetic education, provides a demonstration for the Anisa staff.



Measurement is a cognitive process which also implicates perception. Children cooperatively measure corn using the same basic container. On another level this task can extend to conservation—a form of thinking important for mathematical reasoning.



No man of science wants merely to know. He acquires knowledge to appease his passion for discovery. He does not discover in order to know, he knows in order to discover. The pleasure which art and science can give to toil is the enjoyment which arises from successfully directed intention.

Aims of Education, page 48.

dustrialized and technological society. The Anisa Model introduces at an early age the basic principles of scientific thought: causation, hypothesis formation and testing, logical thinking, measurement, and mathematical reasoning. Science not only plays an essential role in guaranteeing our survival and improving the quality of life through technology, it also provides a rational basis for living and prevents faith from degenerating into superstition. Adults who have not been trained in the fundamentals of scientific thought can easily become victims of their own superstitions. Lacking a well-trained mind, they can be manipulated by others and easily persuaded to become involved in affairs that lead to financial and personal difficulties.

Guaranteeing Success and Avoiding Failure. The formation of ideals and sound values, the appreciation of beauty, freedom from superstition, and the development of good character are all undermined by injustice.



This exercise requires the child to record a mathematical operation performed by manipulating concrete objects and to represent the operation using numbers and symbols for addition and subtraction.

In this exercise staff member, Mr. Geoffrey Marks, tests the child's understanding of class inclusion, a way of thinking prerequisite to comprehending addition and subtraction. He asks, "Are there more red flowers or more flowers?" To answer the question, the child must be able to apprehend the relationship of the parts to the whole.



Perhaps one of the most subtle but pervasive forms of injustice in the life of a child is setting him up for failure in school, making him believe it is his fault, and then punishing him for it. How can this injustice be avoided?

The successful accomplishment of any learning task depends upon certain prerequisites. If a teacher sets a learning task for a child when he has not yet mastered its prerequisites, his failure is almost guaranteed. Many children are locked in school systems that perpetuate their failure. Their confidence as learners is destroyed and they come to hate learning in school. A child who hates learning suffers from a very serious disability. His feelings and attitudes work against him. Things are made worse by blaming him for failures he can do little about. The consequent frustration, guilt, and anxiety—all too common in our schools today—make life miserable for millions of children. Such misery is a prelude to more serious difficulties and troubles.

In the Anisa system, creating the conditions for success while avoiding failure is a central feature. This is done by finding out what each child knows and what he can do so that learning experiences that match his developmental needs can be provided. Children educated in this way are highly motivated to learn and do not become lazy; in-

stead, they develop an industrious attitude towards work that insures steady employment.

Individualizing Instruction and Learning. Because children develop in different ways at their own rates, the school that wants its students to succeed must treat them as individuals. Children have different strengths that need building on and different weaknesses that need attention. The learning experiences each child has must fit his particular needs. Moreover, children work at different paces. In traditional systems, this is often disregarded. For example, an entire class is frequently required to begin a task at a specific time and to stop working on it at a specific time. Some children finish within the time allotted and gain a sense of accomplishment. Others do not finish in time and are therefore frustrated because they did not finish their task. Yet, many slow workers are more thorough and in the long run may be building a more solid foundation for future learning. If their efforts to work thoroughly are undermined by the continual frustration of not being able to finish, they may become indifferent to learning opportunities and grow to dislike school. The Anisa Model individualizes instruction so that each child can have whatever experiences he needs, when he needs them, for as long as

he needs them. This nurtures his love of learning and keeps him confident in his ability to learn.

Flexible Grouping. Age is one of the most misleading criteria for grouping children for instructional purposes. If science has established anything certain about the nature of human beings, it is that they grow and develop at different rates, both physically and mentally. For example, some children are ready to learn to read at age four. Others are not ready until age seven. Yet, both groups of children are normal. To expect every child to read at age 6 (first grade) is unjustifiable and a

The "soft" corner provides a quiet, cozy area for children to enjoy books, alone or with a friend. Because the environment is comfortable the children are engrossed and attentive to their experience.





An Anisa classroom for young children accommodates a wide range of developmental levels by having available a variety of manipulable materials for pre-reading, pre-math, and pre-writing learning experiences as well as materials for fine-motor coordination. A music center complements the arts program.

Children working in small groups of 2 or 3 can become actively involved in learning and develop social skills at the same time.

A five-year old demonstrates to another child an exercise in one-to-one correspondence which requires placing geometric shapes with holes on the correct set of pegs. The Anisa Model advocates children teaching other children. It helps a child consolidate what he has learned, gives him confidence, and teaches cooperation.

An eight-year-old child is instructing a five-year-old child in a sorting and matching exercise which is prerequisite to understanding multiplication. The Anisa math curriculum is based on research which demonstrates that manipulation of concrete objects accompanied by questions concerning quantitative relationships is a better approach to teaching math than one which depends primarily on pencil and paper work with numbers.



It is a primary principle of the Anisa approach to teaching that older children should assume responsibility to help teach younger children.





An Anisa teacher gives a child direct feedback on her progress while engaged in the process of completing a pre-reading task. This is far more effective than using letter grades.

good many children suffer because of it. In the Anisa system, children are grouped according to their developmental level rather than age. In this way children can work in groups where they have the right amount of challenge. This approach creates interest, avoids failure, and gives them a sense of accomplishment out of which confidence grows. It is important to note that a child who reads well may be very undeveloped when it comes to math or social skills. Thus a child cannot be assigned to the same group for all things. The formation of groups must remain flexible so that the needs of all children who make up the group are served.

Children Teaching Children. Experience has shown that learning is consolidated by teaching others. In the Anisa system all children consolidate their own learning by teaching other children for a certain amount of time each day. On these occasions children are grouped so that the more experienced children help those with less experience.

Grading and Evaluation of Performance. In most school systems, grades are not a measure of a child's own progress based on his own efforts. They are partly determined by what other children do. For example, a "B" usually means the child is doing better than most of the

others; a "D" means he is doing worse. A grading system of this kind is unjust for the child who starts behind and has farther to go. Such a child may receive a "C" or "D" and yet work three times as hard and make twice as much progress as another who receives an "A" but makes little progress. A grading system that ignores how much effort is put forth and how much progress is made is undesirable because it is unjust and discouraging. Other types of grading systems may use "S" for satisfactory and "U" for unsatisfactory. This approach is not very useful because it doesn't convey enough information on which to base action for improving performance.

The curriculum of the Anisa Model solves the problem by selecting for each child specific objectives suitable for his developmental level. He is then given feedback regularly on how he is progressing toward those objectives. The feedback is not given just in terms of "good" or "bad," determined by a comparison with how others are doing, but in the form of a detailed appraisal of progress with an explanation of why the progress is good or why it is not. This kind of evaluation enables the child to know what he needs to do to improve. In the Anisa system, teachers do not ask children to do things over without giving them help and

making certain they understand how and why they need to be done over. Useless busy work is avoided and every required task has meaning and purpose. This approach to evaluating performance enables a child to appreciate high quality work and eventually to demand it of himself.

The only avenue towards wisdom is by freedom in the presence of knowledge. But the only avenue towards knowledge is by discipline in the acquirement of ordered fact. Freedom and discipline are the two essentials of education.

Aims of Education, page 30

Equalizing Educational Opportunity

The number of children who can be productively involved in a learning experience depends on the nature of that experience. In the learning experience shown—a musical game which involves identification of body parts—many children can participate. The arrangement of the physical environment facilitates the task for teachers and children alike.



Many educators and parents believe that the central problem facing education is how to equalize educational opportunity. Although progress has been made, no real solution is possible if educators continue to believe that equality means making things the same for every child. Equalizing educational opportunity means providing experiences to meet the needs of each child and this necessarily means that they will be different for different children. What is opportune for Johnny is not necessarily right for Josué; what Susie requires may not be good for Michelle. The Anisa Model goes to the heart of the problem and solves it by providing

the means for individualizing instruction—diagnosing the child's developmental needs and prescribing experiences that meet them in ways that take into account the child's cultural background. This ensures the maximum possible progress for every child and thus equalizes opportunity for educational advancement.

Implicit in the idea of equal opportunity is the equality of educational outcome. Under the individualized program of the Anisa Model, there will be considerable variability in achievement levels among individuals within a given ethnic or racial group, but no differences between the average performances

of different racial or ethnic groups. It is in the latter sense that equality of educational outcome is a necessary and legitimate expectation of a democratic society. To achieve it is to make justice a hallmark of the educational system.

The Anisa Model regards justice in the educational system as the primary guarantor of each child's opportunity to become a competent learner. Ultimately, this great gift must become a common right of all children.

How Has the Anisa Model Been Developed?

Over fifteen years of research, planning, and experimentation were invested in the completion of the first phase of development of the Anisa Model. During this time experimental work, teacher training activities, and collection of data from the field were combined with efforts to develop the theoretical framework of the Model. Grants of over \$300,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity supported early experimental endeavors carried out under the auspices of the Institute for Research in Human Behavior at Indiana State University. In 1969, a \$50,000 grant from the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education to the Center for the Study of Human Potential, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, was used to study compensatory education (primarily Title I ESEA programs) in the Commonwealth. This study demonstrated that if the educationally "disadvantaged" are to be effectively served, instruction must be individualized by concentrating on the development of the processes underlying learning competence. A \$76,000 training and technical assistance grant from the Office of Child Development, Region I, put staff members of the Center in touch with the needs and problems of Headstart children, their parents and program staffs. Such experiences in the field were an impor-

tant inductive influence on the development of the Anisa Model.

The most productive period in the formal development of the Model began in 1971 when the New England Program in Teacher Education, Durham, New Hampshire, granted \$242,000 to the Center for the Study of Human Potential to complete the conceptualization of the Anisa Model and to initiate the development of a teacher preparation program based on it. A team of scholars comprised of faculty and graduate students was assembled to formalize and extend the philosophical basis of the Model and to derive deductively from this basis a coherent body of theory concerning development, teaching, curriculum, administration and evaluation. These deductive formulations have been inductively validated to the fullest extent possible by the empirical findings and promising theory accumulated by anthropological, sociological, psychological and biological sciences as they pertain to the growth and development of human beings.

Implementation of the Model in selected sites began in 1973 with the assistance of grants from Title III ESEA funds through two school districts, one in Hampden, Maine and the other in Suffield, Connecticut. Funds were also received from the Office of Child Development for a small pilot project in two Head-

start centers in Kansas City, Missouri. Other implementation efforts have been supported by private sources for private day care and child development centers.

Implementation of the Model in these various sites represents the first effort to apply the Anisa theory in practice and initiates a new and more extensive phase of development which will be devoted to full implementation of the Model, teacher preparation, research, program evaluation, and refinement of the Model.

Updating and refining the Anisa Model is possible through a computerized information storage and retrieval system. A part of that system is inspected by Dr. Daniel C. Jordan, Director of the Anisa Project, and Dr. Donald T. Streets, Associate Director.



How Do Other Educators View the Anisa Model?

Over the last ten years, presentations on the Anisa Model have been made to audiences totalling over 50,000 people. National and regional conferences that have featured presentations on the Model have been sponsored by such organizations as the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Association for the Education of Children International, the American Educational Research Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, State Associations for Children Under Six, and the American Montessori Society. Numerous presentations have also been made at conferences, institutes, and workshops sponsored by state and local educational agencies, school boards, and private institutions. The reaction of those attending has been extremely positive. The following statements reflect the views of educators who have observed the development of the Anisa Model or have sponsored and participated in its implementation.

We believe that Dr. Daniel C. Jordan and his colleagues have developed a philosophy and a theory of education which are unique and remarkable in their potential and promise. The Anisa Model provides a comprehensive synthesis of knowledge about human development, learning and teaching which has been

notably absent in American education. I wish to firmly state that the community, the State Board, the administrative staff, and faculty have a commitment to try to develop and implement the Anisa Model of education because it provides for us, and we think ultimately for a large segment of the nation, the only truly comprehensive plan of education which we have seen.
Malcolm D. Evans, Ph.D.
*Superintendent of Schools
Suffield, Connecticut*

My staff and I are delighted to participate in the implementation of the Anisa Model. The response to the training has been accepted with great enthusiasm. The Model has a sound scientific base, is extremely comprehensive, and creates a great deal of excitement among teachers.
Willard Hillier
*Principal of the McGraw School
Hampden, Maine*

I am very positive about your work with the Anisa Model. It is, in my opinion, the most fully developed, fully comprehensive model in existence today. Your outline for the future of Anisa is a very positive, but ambitious, undertaking.
C. Ray Williams, Ph.D.
*Former Executive Director
The Child Development Associate Consortium
Washington, D.C.*

The Board of Directors of S.A.D. No. 22 and I are very pleased and proud to have the Earl C. McGraw School serve as a pilot school for the implementation of the Anisa Model.

Our two-year association with the Anisa Project staff has convinced us beyond any doubt that the Model is extremely well researched, is based on sound psychological principles, is very comprehensive in scope, and that it is structured such that it can be implemented in any school system that is interested in the improvement of education for its young people.

The teachers at the McGraw School are enthusiastic and excited about Anisa, and they are appreciative of the intensive and practical in-service training that they have received from the Anisa central staff in helping to translate theory into classroom practice.

John W. Skehan
*Superintendent of Schools
Maine School Administrative
District No. 22
Hampden, Maine*

The New England Program in Teacher Education has supported the development of the Anisa Model for the last four years. We have provided financial, personnel, and dissemination resources to this research effort. We believe that the Anisa Model holds great potential

for teachers who seek to maintain and develop the highest standards of quality for instruction. We are particularly impressed by the interrelations of learning domains and the specificity of prescriptions for teaching articulated by the model.

Careful step-by-step thorough analysis and review of information about learning and teaching is the style of research and development of Anisa. Teachers and educators we have worked with are impressed by the insight and practicality of the resulting integration of knowledge in a targeted, coherent, demonstrable, instructional program. The pilot tests of aspects of the model demonstrate the potential impact of the model.

Roland Goddu, Ph.D.
*Director, The New England Program in Teacher Education
Durham, New Hampshire*

I know of no well-researched, comprehensive educational model that has the potential for productive change that Anisa possesses. During my two plus years as the NEPTE project monitor, I developed a respect for the Model as conceptualized, researched, and finally piloted. In short, I became a project advocate as well as a project monitor. The Anisa project has my strongest possible support in its efforts to expand to additional grade levels and additional schools.

Leroy O. Nisbett
*Director, School Facilities
Department of Educational and
Cultural Studies, State of Maine*

Even though we knew last year how great Anisa was in helping us to train our teachers, it was not until this year that we began to fully realize its lasting power as a model and that we could continue to apply the theory in new ways again and again.

The strength of the Anisa training program lies in its comprehensive theoretical base as a framework for understanding what you're doing. There is nothing that gives teachers a greater sense of power and confidence than being armed with a comprehensive theory as a guide to

practice. We think it is the most exciting thing we have seen or experienced for training teachers. It's the best thing we've ever found. You can't compare it with other programs because it's much greater in scope and the information is so much better organized.

While we were doing many things right before we received training in Anisa, we now know why they were right. Furthermore, we now see education and teaching in a much broader context. And that's important.

Norma Busch, Director
*Kansas City Head Start Program
Kansas City, Missouri*

In the Anisa Model there is a unique blend of theories of teaching, learning, and curriculum. The integration of these theories makes possible a comprehensive teacher preparation program where the emphasis on using theory to guide practice provides the framework for evaluating the effectiveness of practice thereby testing the adequacy of the theory. Such evaluation and testing are the means by which the preparation of teachers can be improved and the quality of education upgraded. For these reasons, I believe the Anisa Model to be one of the most promising developments in contemporary American education.

William E. Engbretson, President
*Governors State University
Park Forest South, Illinois*

I believe that the Anisa project represents the most promising comprehensive model of education ever constructed. Thus, I predict that it will provide the framework within which educators can begin to understand previously unfathomed dynamics in the processes of teaching, learning, and human development.

Richard J. Clark, Jr., Ph.D.
*Assistant Dean for Teacher Education
School of Education
University of Massachusetts*

Anisa has brought many changes in my thinking as well as changes in my approach to teaching.

Ground rules have simplified the

management of children. Our rooms are low-keyed usually, and quieter. Children are able to attend and are learning independently. They approach activities with purpose and are eager to work. We are teaching on a more individual basis and it seems to be a more efficient, exciting way to learn.

The children are respectful and polite to one another, share willingly and resolve their differences in a friendly manner.

They handle responsibility well and appear to be ahead, academically, of the group last year.

Barbara Dowd, Teacher
Suffield Cooperative Nursery School

Following are comments written by parents of children attending kindergarten classes based on the Anisa Model in Suffield, Connecticut. The comments are from parents who have worked as volunteers in the classroom for over 40 hours.

"I am pleased by the lack of confusion. It is good that the child is able to pick his activities. There is a loving feeling between teachers and children."

"There isn't any fighting between the children and they show a lot of patience when it comes to waiting for a turn. There is such a variety of activities for the children."

"I like the freedom children have to choose activities which interest them. It pleases me to see the interaction with all kindergarten children. The many types of snacks pleases me too. I see the respect that children have for each other and their growth toward independence."

"I like the idea of having a purpose behind an activity, which I find in Anisa, rather than the space-filling 'artsy-craftsy' things I've seen in other kindergarten programs."

"I have been pleased by the absence of clutter on walls and shelves, the quiet atmosphere, the absence of busy work, the emphasis on making a choice, and a greater variety of activities available to the children."

Acknowledgements

The development of the Anisa Model and its implementation could not have been possible without the cooperative efforts of large numbers of people and institutions. We are grateful to the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, where much of the development of the Model has taken place; to Mr. Charlotte Ryan, Chairman of the NEPTE Board, and Dr. Roland Goddu, Director of the New England Program in Teacher Education, which provided generous financial assistance; to Mr. Leroy O. Nisbett, who has served as project monitor on behalf of NEPTE and who was instrumental in making arrangements for the implementation of the Model; to the Board of Directors of School Administrative District No. 22, Mr. John W. Skehan, Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Willard Hillier, Principal of the McGraw School, and the teachers, children, and parents participating in the project in Hampden, Maine; to the Board of Education in Suffield, Connecticut, Dr. Malcolm Evans, Superintendent of Schools, Mrs. Eileen Oleksak, Director of Early Education, Mr. Richard T. Lincoln, Director of the Anisa Project in Suffield, Mr. George Bondra, Director of Cooperative Special Services, and teachers, children, and parents participating in the Anisa programs in the public schools and cooperative nurseries; to the St. John's Child Care and Development Center, Fall River, Massachusetts, and Father Harold Wilson, Director, Sister Kathleen Harrington, Educational Director, and the teachers, children, and parents associated with the Center; to Miss Norma Busch, Mrs. Phyllis Jones, and teachers, children, and parents who have participated in the Headstart programs in Kansas City, Missouri, where the Anisa Model was piloted; to

Dr. Nancy McCormick Rambusch whose wealth of practical experience was generously shared as the Model entered its implementation phase; to Dr. Ronald Hambleton, Director of the Laboratory for Psychometric and Evaluative Research, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, his staff, and students for their efforts to develop evaluation instruments and measure the progress of Anisa in the field sites; to the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education who provided a grant to study compensatory education programs throughout the Commonwealth; to Board Members of the American National Institutes for Social Advancement, under whose auspices initial efforts to develop the Model were undertaken; to Seals and Crofts and Mrs. Marcia Day, director of Day Artists' Management, and to the many other individuals who have made financial contributions to the project; and finally, to staff members and former students and faculty of the Center for the Study of Human Potential who have contributed to the development of the Model and its implementation.

Persons interested in more detailed
information about the Anisa Model
may write to:

Center for the Study of
Human Potential
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01002

Project-ANISA, Suffield
Suffield Public Schools
Suffield, Connecticut

APPENDIX B

May 18, 1976

Dear Board Member:

The administrative and teaching staff recognizes that the Anisa Model of Education does not satisfy the needs of some Suffield parents. We also recognize the Anisa Model is unable to meet all the individual needs of some children. We feel there is not one, but a variety of reasons why this is so.

Parents:

1. Some parents do not agree with the philosophical assumption about the nature of man which undergirds the Anisa Model.
2. Some parents do not see children as developmental in nature, but rather age graded.
3. Some parents do not value the affective, volitional, perceptual, psychomotor, and cognitive aspects of a child, equally.
4. Some parents feel they want their child taught in an authoritarian style.
5. Some parents find the Anisa teaching style too controlling. They want their children in an unstructured classroom where the child has great freedom to initiate his own activities.
6. Some parents feel that traditional education is

plenty good enough and why all the hullabaloo.

Teacher/Child:

7. Some teachers still subscribe to a cognitively-oriented curricula and a traditional style of teaching.
8. Some teachers have difficulty looking at children developmentally due to prior training. The Anisa in-service program has been helping change this.
9. Some staff are having difficulty with educational diagnosis and prescription and thus do not, or cannot, meet the needs of some children.
10. Some teachers by constitution believe that orderly arrangement of the teaching environment is not necessary to cognitive growth, i.e., do not accept the model in all aspects.
11. Some children move into our school system from prior experiences that have been quite different.
12. Some children have trouble adjusting to Anisa due to highly atypical learning patterns or social-emotional problems. These children would, no doubt, have difficulty under any education-model geared to normal children. They need a special class placement but because one is unavailable are left in the normal classroom.
13. The learning style of some children is not com-

patible with the teaching style they are subjected to.

14. The peak period of learning for some children is out of synchronization with the school day.

If you have questions regarding these above sentences, please write them down and Mrs. Hartley, Mr. Lincoln, Mrs. Oleksak, and Dr. Evans will respond to them on Tuesday night.

