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ABSTRACT

IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS IN OPEN SPACE FACILITIES

An Investigation of an "Integrated Day" In-Service Training Approach at the Secondary School Level for Teachers, Administrators, and Other School Personnel Moving Into Open Space Facilities

(May 1980)

Jerome Clark, B.S., Indiana Central College; M.Ed., Bowie State College; Ed.D., University of Massachusetts/Amherst

Directed by: Professor R. Mason Bunker

This study recounts the expressed inservice needs of a secondary school in northwest Washington, D.C., as they prepared to move from a very old traditional style building into their new open space facility.

An explanation of how agencies and individuals outside of the Washington, D.C. Public School system were contracted to provide the inservice for the case school is detailed. The problems projected for this kind of intervention is outlined and plans for resolving those problems are presented.

Purpose and Objectives

A comprehensive review of the literature on open education shows the historical development of this concept. The writer uses five major questions to guide his review of the literature. They are: (1) What is open education? (2) What is the role of the teacher in the open classroom? (3) What are the goals of open education for students? (4) What is the state of open education at the secondary school level? (5) What considerations, as a result of the conclusions drawn from the literature, need to be addressed to assure effective inservice programming at the secondary school level?
Based upon the review of the literature and personal experience, this writer presents four considerations that must be addressed for effective inservice teacher education. The four considerations are:

1. In order for inservice programs to have optimum effectiveness they must be designed with an understanding of the kinds of changes our outcomes and goals that may reasonably be expected from the inservice effort.

2. Administrative leadership is needed to assure effective planning and implementation.

3. The inservice participant must be actively involved in the basic design of the inservice program including implementation and evaluation.

4. Some evaluation design for gathering feedback must be built into the inservice component.

This study describes an approach to inservice teacher education and its application at a secondary school level.

This study is guided by the following questions:

1. What is the proposed approach to inservice teacher education?

2. How is it applied at a secondary school level?

3. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants?

4. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshops objectives?

5. What are the implications of this approach to future inservice training projects?
6. What effect did this approach have on teachers?

These questions are investigated with specific evaluative measurements and implications for further study is drawn from the data.

**Methods of Inquiry**

Data were obtained through a number of formal and informal instruments.

The data were analyzed in hopes of finding some real answers to the posed questions. Frequency of responses was the methodology used for data tabulation. These frequencies are often represented as percentages.

**Conclusions and Implications**

The findings indicate that the participants had a sense of accomplishment at the end of the two-year project. The inservice facilitators were viewed as competent, receptive, and exemplary in expousing the ideas and concepts of open education. Finally, this writer concludes that:

1. The proposed approach to inservice education was an effective alternative at the secondary school level.

2. The approach was viewed by the participants as one with much practical and realistic value.

3. Workshop objectives can be realized utilizing an approach which provides the participants with opportunities for shared decision-making, active learning, and skills acquisition.
On the basis of the data and the conclusions drawn from these data, suggestions are made for further study. Since there is little empirical data available in the area of open space/open education in-service training for secondary school personnel, further studies will have to be made and more literature will have to be reviewed to complete the picture of the impact this approach had on inservice training at the secondary school level.
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CHAPTER I

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND BACKGROUND

Open education is an approach to educating children ... not a style of architecture. Open education is based on faith in a child's ability to act independently and his ability to assume responsibility for his behavior. Open education views learning as a continuous process within the total life environment.

Greenery, Issue No. 19, October, 1972.

Introduction

A new Shaw Junior High School opened September 1977. It was the first secondary school in the District of Columbia constructed in the open space format. Open space dictates a new kind of structure in planning for learning and teaching. Open space is the structural design of the new Shaw facility, and open education is the approach to learning and teaching that is being utilized by the professional staff. Students and teachers, in order to function constructively and develop academic programs within such space, must plan and conceive of their daily functioning in new ways. Some of the developmental changes which this open space requires include:

1. An option for planning which includes a group of students learning together over a longer span of time during the day, and pursuing subject matter in
a different format from the previous forty minutes of segmented instruction once utilized by the school.

2. The implication of different time and group arrangements for study in that teaching and learning may proceed in an interdisciplinary fashion. For example, computation skills in mathematics integrated with collecting and analyzing of scientific data; and the learning objectives for science and math being interchangeable in terms of skills and specific in terms of the content for each subject. This means that continuous curriculum development and modification occurs in order to promote interdisciplinary teaching.

3. Non-teaching personnel such as engineers, custodians, cafeteria workers, aides, counselors, media specialists, and office staff functioning in different relationships to students and one another in an open space school. There is more interaction, people see more of each other and have the opportunity to perceive more directly some of the needs of students in putting together learning and teaching. The implications of this are that any inservice training should have involved all of the relevant personnel.

4. A wider range is encompassed in the new school since sixth-grade students are enrolled and other students will service as student-teacher assistants. This cross-age representation in the student and teaching corps means the development of new adaptive attitudes in relationships to multi-age groupings.
5. Measurement of achievement of individual students, of competence and success of teachers, and of the achievement of the general objectives of the program is more difficult since the proposed purposes of the new school included aims to increase the tolerance and respect for values which are different from one's own; to explore one's own value system; and to develop decision-making techniques and assist students to use them (ARE Proposal, 1974). Each of these variables was difficult to measure by existing evaluative techniques currently used at the secondary school level.

Shaw was the first open space secondary facility of its kind in Washington. A major need in the new open space facility was to plan for an inservice training program which had to be developed in order to implement and evaluate programs which grow out of open space and open education as adapted to the new physical plant of Shaw Junior High School.

The school administration, in an attempt to make sure the teaching personnel of Shaw would be prepared to function adequately in the new open space structure, contracted the job of inservice training to the "Advisory and Learning Exchange," (a teacher center which operates within the Associates for Renewal in Education, Inc., a non-profit organization) who, in turn, selected the "Integrated Day" program co-director of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst as inservice coordinator. This study describes that inservice approach.
In the following sections we examine these questions:

. What do we know about inservice training and staff development?

. What could be the nature of inservice training?

What Do We Know About Inservice Training and Staff Development?

Harris, et al (1969) contend that inservice teacher education is potentially one of the most important and effective means of helping teachers acquire current professional information and learn alternative teaching strategies. Darland (1970) states that traditional inservice programs often have been ineffective in spite of substantial investments of time, funds, and consultant services. He acknowledges that one of the major reasons for the ineffectiveness is that although teachers are in favor of inservice programs, the content of these programs is usually prescribed by high-level administrators. Lawrence (1974) emphasizes the fact that inservice education too often takes place on the teacher's own time and frequently at his or her own expense. As a result of some inservice programs, teachers receive credit for salary increases, graduate and advanced degrees, and/or higher levels of certification. However, if the programs are not based on teacher need, little progress is made in the improvement of teaching or overall school programs.

Tyler (1971) reports that in many instances, teachers have found inservice programs threatening, confusing, or irrelevant. Teachers who are threatened by inservice programs may feel that
their approaches or techniques have been wrong and that their skills are inadequate. He believes this may cause some teachers to fear trying new teaching strategies because of past failures. Lawrence (1974) supports this by stating that teachers become uneasy about what they are doing, yet do not know what they might do differently. Confusion may result when information is presented without practical suggestions for implementation.

Replogle (1950) states that the problem of irrelevancy is intensified when consultants come to an inservice situation and attempt to impose upon teachers a particular method or methods for teaching. The literature thus far indicates that much time, money, and people resources have been invested in inservice programs. The impact of these programs have been limited in terms of effectiveness due to improper planning, design, and implementation.

The ultimate dilemma according to Darland (1970), occurs when those who plan and implement the inservice program are not held accountable for its results. This absence of accountability may lead to an absence of evaluation and to a perpetuation of certain failure for future inservice programs.

Edelfelt (1974) concluded that inservice education has been the neglected stepchild of teacher training. He feels that most resources and efforts have gone to preservice preparation. Many school districts have tried to justify this neglect by pointing to the transient nature of the teaching profession. Why, they ask, put money and effort into inservice components when after a few years, a large percentage
of those persons participating in the programs will be working in a different capacity within and, oftentimes, outside of the system.

This researcher would answer by pointing out that the current economic state of the country and the declining population growth rate has stabilized the teaching profession. Many school districts across the nation are indicating a hiring freeze on new teaching positions. This means that inservice programs are being conducted for the experienced teacher and must therefore take into account the stated educational needs of this group.

Edelfelt (1974) concludes that the declining number of persons in university and college teacher-preparation programs has necessitated the shift of emphasis from preservice education to inservice. He also points to the stabilized teaching patterns over the past few years as a rationale for increased inservice offerings.

What variables appear important in changing traditional inservice procedures? The question of the content versus the process of inservice teacher training and implications of the important problems in this area deserve much consideration. Harris et al (1969) make the statement that:

In an organization such as a school, where members aspire to professional autonomy and status, personnel development is seen as everybody's job. Members may feel a responsibility to meet their own needs either individually or in small voluntary groups. To the extent that this is true, programs prescribed by authority are likely to be seen as irrelevant, coercive and demeaning. These assertions, reflecting the familiar experiences of teachers and principals, help account for the low state of inservice education and lead to a groan response when inservice is mentioned. The resolution of these two needs... organizational and personal... is a major challenge to leadership personnel in designing inservice education programs. (p. 28)
Ringness (1968) has indicated that some teachers feel they have too little voice in determining on what inservice programs should focus. He says they are not convinced of the value of certain kinds of programs, and that they resent being required to attend certain meetings. Furthermore, it seems they also resent the extra time required when such meetings are after school hours. Teachers believe, he reports, that much of what is offered by such programs is unrealistic, and that more specific help, directed to more selected groups, would be more valuable than what is usually presented to everybody. His findings are supported in an earlier study by Replogle (1950) who found that teachers were dissatisfied with the method of inservice programming common at that time, and that they wanted professional aid in these specific areas:

1. Improving teaching methods and techniques;
2. Utilizing principles of group dynamics;
3. Locating community resources;
4. Providing for individual differences;
5. Handling pupil behavior and discipline cases;
6. Meeting the needs of atypical pupils;
7. Enabling teachers to evaluate their own teaching competence;
8. Caring for the needs of the emotionally maladjusted;
9. Relating the ongoing class activities to the problems, concerns, and tensions of the pupils;
10. Using current teaching situations to make more understandable the contemporary social realities;
11. Making better use of visual aids;
12. Locating and making available expert resources and personnel, as special problems arise;
13. Identifying the possibilities of the current classroom activity to enable pupils better to understand democratic values, loyalties and beliefs;
14. Constructing teaching units on problems and topics not found in basic textbooks. (p. 15)

Although Replogle's study was conducted over 25 years ago, teachers are still requesting aid in the same professional areas, due to what they consider inadequate and irrelevant inservice programming. Waynant (1971) emphasizes that relevant and effective inservice programs can be established if they are built around teacher strengths and concerns. She goes on to observe that all too often the administrator, supervisor, or consultant have looked for what is wrong rather than what is right with teachers in their classroom performance thereby conducting inservice programs around teacher deficiencies. Brighton (1970) agrees when he observes that it is little wonder that inservice programs founded on a threatening base have met with little enthusiasm. He stresses that seldom have administrators aimed at helping the teachers to succeed, to improve their performance, or to advance their profession.

The literature above indicates that a great deal of frustration is being felt by the target group of inservice training—the teachers. They often feel hopeless in terms of the time and energy they have
invested. The research leaves us with a number of conclusions:

1. Inservice education too often takes place on the teachers own time and frequently at their own expense (Lawrence, 1974).

2. Teachers have found programs threatening, confusing, or irrelevant. Teachers feel their techniques have been wrong and that their skills are inadequate (Tyler, 1971).

3. Traditional inservice programs often have been ineffective in spite of substantial investments of time, funds, and consultant services (Darland, 1970).

4. Relevant and effective inservice programs must be built around teacher strengths and concerns (Waynant, 1971).

This study describes and examines an approach to inservice teacher education which was designed as a positive response to some of the negative implications of current inservice approaches found in the literature and research.

What Could be the Nature of Inservice Training?

In any inservice training program, we must consider the needs of teachers, taking into account their unique qualities. Tyler projected in 1971 that inservice education of the future would not be seen as shaping teachers, but rather, would be viewed as aiding, supporting, and encouraging each teachers' development of teaching capabilities that they value and seek to enhance. He went on to predict that inservice training in the future would deal with real problems and
that the training programs would build in feedback so that as
teachers work on problems a basis for correction and revision is
available. Since the early 1970's little has been done in inservice to
make Tyler's predictions become fact (Edelfelt, 1975).

Among the questions to be examined are: Who will determine
what the real problems are, and who will provide the necessary
feedback? Bush (1971) seems to have found part of the answer. He
believes that teachers ought to be the ones who take the initiative in
determining real problems. He is convinced that teachers should
select the kinds of help for these problems from a wide array of
interesting and available alternatives. Bush goes on to suggest that
teachers may well need the help of an impartial outsider to enable
them to make diagnoses and to analyze situations.

Any improvement in inservice training must find viable ways
for teachers to keep abreast of the changing times and to extract
benefit from the new knowledge that research uncovers. Russell
(1975), addressing himself to this statement, provides what he considers
to be the six major objectives of future inservice teacher preparation
programs:

1. To foster the professional development of teachers;
2. To aid in problem identification and needs assessment;
3. To develop approaches to problem solution;
4. To disseminate new ideas, practices, or programs;
5. To disseminate research results;
6. To communicate administrative and management considera-
tions, such as procedures and regulations emanating from local, state, and national levels.

The report by Tyler (1971) tends to indicate that if inservice programs are to be "successful" then they should upgrade the effectiveness and efficiency of teachers and other educators, orient and prepare staff members prior to introducing improved or innovative practices, and upgrade the total climate in an educational institution by improving the morale of staff members as well as students. The approach to inservice training which will be described in this study, has as its goal the actualization of the above statements. This research field tests the approach using the Shaw Junior High School as a case to study and examines the data collected in terms of the stated research questions, report findings, and state implications for the specific site and for inservice in general.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to describe an approach to inservice teacher education and to examine its application at a secondary school level. The inservice approach was developed by the staff of the "Integrated Day Program" at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, School of Education.

The study also documents the existing beliefs and apprehensions towards open education held by the professional personnel of the case school, as well as toward decision-making, and children's learning prior to their involvement in the extensive inservice workshops.
This study further attempts to document the transition of these participants from more "traditional" teaching styles, philosophies, and settings toward more "open ways" of working together as reflected by the integrated day/open education philosophy. This study is guided by the following questions:

1. What is the proposed approach to inservice teacher education?
2. How is it applied at a secondary school level?
3. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants? (In other words, does the approach provide the administration and staff with sound and realistic knowledge of what the open space/open education theory entails?)
4. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?
5. What are the implications of this approach to future inservice training projects?
6. What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?
   a. Did the workshop provide activities for classrooms?
   b. Were these activities used by the teachers?
   c. Did teachers change their perceptions of their role?
   d. Did attitudes toward open education change?
   e. Was there an allowance for shared decision-making?
   f. Was there an opportunity for skills acquisition?

These questions are investigated with specific evaluative measurements described briefly in this Chapter and in more detail in
Chapter III. Implications for further study are drawn from these data.

Definition of Terms

1. Open Education: is an approach to education that is open to change, to new ideas, to curriculum, to scheduling, to use of space, to honest expressions of feeling between teacher and pupil and between pupil and pupil, and open to children's participation in significant decision-making in the classroom.

2. Open Space: is the construction design of a school facility in which the visual and accoustical separation between teacher stations is limited or eliminated.

3. Open Classroom: an environment rich with materials, ideas to explore, and things to use. It offers diverse opportunities. Activities are available to stimulate interest and extend learnings. Management procedures are flexible. The daily schedule is less rigid, and children are given broad latitude relative to the scheduling of their work pursuits. There is much evidence of children's work. There is evidence of active learning, shared decision-making, and skills acquisition present in the classroom.

4. Openness: The degree to which the classroom reflects the characteristics of an open education approach. These questions are usually asked and reflected upon when
determining openness:

- Does all knowledge emanate from a teacher talking from the front of the class to a group of children?
- Who besides the teacher can help children learn?
- What materials and activities besides the approved texts can be used in teaching?
- Does learning take place when the teacher presents information, or does learning require that the learner engage positively in an activity selected to ensure that learning?
- Does trust between teacher and pupil facilitate training?
- Can children take an active role in their own learning?

5. Informal Education: is the attempt to move away from the rigid timetable, the formally prescribed lessons and assignments, and the traditional directing role of the teacher.

6. Inservice Education: Broadly defined is all the activities aimed at the improvement of professional staff members.

7. Staff Development: is concerned with the personal, role, and institutional dimensions of the educational system. The emphasis is upon those attitudes, competencies, and knowledges that enhance learning, program effectiveness, and professional and non-professional adequacy.
Significance of the Study

The literature in the area of open space/open education inservice training for secondary school personnel is incomplete. This study contributes to our knowledge in this area by describing an approach to inservice and its application in a real setting. This is the first open space secondary facility in the greater Washington, D.C. metropolitan area; it is also only one of a handful of such facilities in the United States. The proposed inservice model has been tested at the elementary level with some success (Schumer, 1974; Welles, 1976); however, this study is the first comprehensive attempt to implement the model at the secondary level. Therefore, the data gathered and information derived from this study can be a reference point for other school systems throughout the nation that are considering open space secondary school construction and a more open approach to working with learners.

The study is also significant in that the researcher believes this "open" approach is applicable not only to teacher and administrators in open space facilities, but for anyone involved with the teacher/learner process. Two recent studies building off the same approach have been completed. For more information see the unpublished dissertations of Merrita Hruska (1975) and R. Michael Mayo (1977) at the University of Massachusetts Library/Amherst. For example, the inservice approach described in this study could help change the current methods of initiating staff renewal programs and could serve as a viable alternative to current inservice activities.
Methodology

The present study examines that body of literature and research which focuses on open education/integrated day approach, current inservice and staff development practices, and special professional development needs of staff at the secondary school level. The researcher describes an approach to inservice teacher training. The Shaw Junior High School of Washington, D.C. is used as a case to examine the application of the approach. The researcher examines relevant documents such as the "Shaw Proposal for Inservice" (1973), the "Advisory and Learning Exchange Proposal for Shaw Inservice" (1974), and program materials developed for use in the inservice program. Further, he describes in detail the approach as it was applied during the inservice program.

The major emphasis in this research focusses on the approach to inservice. Thus, data collected from interviews, a questionnaire, and participant reports are used to gain evidence that the approach was consistent with the conclusions drawn about staff development set out earlier in this chapter (p. 9).

The researcher further examines the research questions listed (p. 12) earlier by using Shaw as the case. Data for analysis was collected by administering both formal and informal instruments. Primary use of these data was formative in nature; that is, data were collected during the first Workshop (A) for use in planning Workshop (B). Among the formal instruments used were:
1. **Teacher Concerns Checklist:** This instrument was developed by Francis F. Fuller and Gary D. Borich (1974) at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, Austin. The instrument lists 56 teacher concerns and allows the teacher to check the magnitude of his/her concern for each item.

2. **Assumptions About Children's Learning:** This instrument was developed by Roland S. Barth (1972) and is valuable as an instrument used to get information about the assumptions held by persons moving towards open education.

3. **Who Decides Questionnaire:** This instrument first used by Bernice J. Wolfson and Shirlyn Nash (1965) and adapted by Bunker (1974) asks 49 questions related to who makes what decisions in the classroom. The offered responses are:
   (a) student, (b) class, (c) teacher, and (d) other.
   This instrument reflects on the teacher's perception regarding decision-making in the classroom.

The researcher collected and analyzed the data and drew conclusions from which implications for Shaw and for the broader educational profession were made. Other instruments (described later in Chapter III) looked at informal data which focussed on consistency between articulated beliefs about staff development and participant perceptions of ways in which the staff acted during the inservice workshops.
Limitations of the Study

There is little empirical data in the area of open space/open education inservice training for secondary school personnel. The possibility of replicating this study is currently bleak since there are only a limited number of secondary open space structures in operation.

The participatory group used for this study was small in number and all came from the same junior high school. The investigator was not only the recorder, but also a participant/observer throughout the study. The writer is a proponent of the integrated day/open education philosophy and acted as a co-instructor during the inservice workshops. Since all of the participants were from the same school and were part of a very new concept in secondary school construction and operations, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other secondary facilities.

The evaluation will be both formative and summative in nature, which is appropriate to the development of an approach, and will not include tests of significance. There will be no attempt made by this writer to offer supportive data on the reliability or validity of the research instruments.

The data will be formative for the staff. There will be no pre-testing or post-testing of control groups; nor will there be any systematic comparison of the participants in the first summer's workshop (Workshop A) with those participants in the second summer's workshop (Workshop B).
The data presented will be limited to Workshop A except when references are made to Bunker's Summary of Evaluations (1975) which provides data from Workshop B. The analysis of the data from Workshop A was used by the workshop leaders and the staff of Shaw to plan Workshop B.

Organization of the Dissertation

This study is developed in five chapters. Chapter I has included: background and statement of the problem; questions the study seeks to answer; purpose of the study; methodology and design of the study; and a definition of terms.

Chapter II reviews the literature on open education, open space schools operating at the secondary level, and inservice education. Five major questions arising from this review comprises the theoretical framework of this dissertation.

Chapter III describes the procedures involved in the study. The researcher proposes an inservice plan built on the research and literature on effective inservice teacher education and designed for needs of open space schools.

Chapter IV focuses on a case study of the application of the inservice approach, analyzes the data, and reports the findings of the study. Data are interpreted and the questions posed in Chapter I are examined and discussed.

Chapter V summarizes the study, draws conclusions from the findings, relates the findings to the existing research, and discusses
implications for further research by referring to the related literature and the application of these results to future studies. The implications are developed specifically for the personnel of Shaw School and beyond that to all who are actively involved in inservice education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Notwithstanding a change here and a change there, our educational system particularly at the post-elementary levels, is largely conventional, traditional, and parochial. How do we convert theory into practice, talk into action? Open education in its various forms holds some promise, but it may remain another academic exercise unless a vanguard of stalwart educators can pick up the signals and put it into play. (Bell, 1974, p. 332)

In this chapter the author reviews the literature on open education, open space schools operating at the secondary level, and inservice education. Five major questions arising from this review comprises the theoretical framework of this chapter:

1. What is open education?
2. What is the role of the teacher in the open classroom?
3. What are the goals of open education for students?
4. What is the state of open education at the secondary school level?
5. What considerations, as a result of the conclusions drawn from the literature, need to be addressed to assure effective inservice programming at the secondary school level?

The following section will describe beliefs about learning which grew out of open education theory. These beliefs support the practices
of an integrated day approach to inservice teacher education.

**What is open education?** During the decade of the 1960's, Britain with its informal (open) approach to education was seen as "the" model by some educational communities of Europe and the United States. A statement from the Plowden Report (Plowden, 1967) indicating that the child is the agent in his/her own learning motivated a large number of American educators to go to Britain to learn first hand the mechanics and theory of this open education approach.

The information from these travels was disseminated through a variety of media sources; however, the ideas seem to have reached the most receptive audience through articles in journals, magazines, newspapers, and books. Critics, such as Illich, Silberman, Reich, Holt, Dennison, Kozol, and Postman began to sound the alarm on the hopelessness of what then were the current educational practices in the United States. Although much of their criticism was harsh, it was indeed perceptive. Concurrently, Lillian Weber, Joseph Featherstone, Charles Silberman, and small numbers of educators across the country began to share their enthusiasm for open education; indeed their writings led many others to establish open education in American classrooms.

Whenever an attempt is made to establish the rationale for open education writers invariably return to Rathbone's (1971) research which establishes as a rationale these six subheadings:
1. **How children learn.** It is an active process and direct experience is central.

2. **A view of knowledge.** Knowledge becomes real only when it is personalized. The idea of covering a certain amount of the school curriculum is rejected.

3. **A perspective on schooling.** School represents the larger world and open education begins with needs and concerns of the individual child. The setting and attaining of goals which will include the learning of facts and knowledge are encouraged, but the emphasis is on learning how to learn—to develop independence, self-reliance, trust, and responsibility.

4. **The teacher’s role.** The teacher is primarily a facilitator and resource person. He must diagnose individual needs and provide a rich environment for learning to take place.

5. **The psychological-emotional climate.** The classroom is a place of trust and openness. The expression of feeling is encouraged and accepted and as a result mutual respect and toleration are increased.

6. **The moral context.** The child has rights, obligations, is free to choose, and is to be treated with kindness and respect. The teacher has the responsibility to make issues clear in any study and to help the child accept his or her responsibility. (p. 24)

Open education has been characterized as a classroom environment in which there is minimum teaching to the class as a whole, in
which provision is made for children to pursue individual interests and to be actively involved with materials, and as a place in which children are trusted to direct many aspects of their own learnings (Stephens, 1974).

Howes (1974) relates that the open classroom offers children a quality of human living in their learning as they experience their surroundings, explore their world, and grow in power to feel, think, and act in independent responsible ways. A "doing" place is the way one writer describes an open classroom (Smith, 1974). It is a place where a number of activities and opportunities for students is provided.

Definitions of open education have varied widely. Since the theory of open education is a fairly new phenomenon it will have to be tested over a long period of time before a definition evolves that is acceptable to the broader educational community. However, Bussis and Chittenden (1970) sought to develop a schematic design that could serve as an evaluation tool for describing classroom environments. They viewed the open classroom as being both child centered and teacher-centered. In order to characterize such a classroom it was necessary to consider both the child's and the teacher's contributions to decisions regarding learning. Thus, they developed a two-dimensional design which portrays open education as requiring high input from both teacher and child, and indicates in a general sense where other kinds of classroom approaches would be located. (See Figure 1)
Double Classification Scheme Based on Extent to which (1) the Individual Teacher and (2) the Individual Child is an Active Contributor to Decisions Regarding the Content and Process of Learning.

![Double Classification Scheme Diagram]

The teachers in the two left-hand quadrants are reported to assume little responsibility for significant curricular and instructional decisions. In the "programmed instruction" quadrant textbook specifications and programmed materials determine the course of the child's educational activity. In the "laissez-faire" quadrant the child presumably makes the decisions concerning his/her learning.

Teachers in both right-hand quadrants assume much greater responsibility for decision-making. Teachers in the lower right-hand quadrant are said to be active in organizing and examining curriculum, determining student progress to decide on next steps, but base these decisions on a rather limited range of information about students. This information is generally preassessed by teachers as being important and children are not given an opportunity to have input into their own learning. Open education teachers, however, base their decision-making on information they gain from the children's own decisions and choices about learning. Decisions center around what to do and how to do it, purposes of activities, meanings to be derived for interaction with subject matter, and selection of materials.

The Double Classification Scheme, such as this, attempts to answer two sets of questions. The first set of questions deals with the child as learner and tries to find out to what extent he/she affects what happens to him/her. The second set of questions relates to the teacher's contributions in influencing the nature and direction of learning.
Any new approach as it develops from community to community is certain to have varying degrees of application; however, it is necessary to recognize that there are certain basic beliefs upon which open education is based. Classrooms that practice the open education approach will have certain common characteristics. Spitsbergen and Fry (1974) report that without an understanding of the philosophy, the teacher cannot meet the need to adjust to the situation accordingly, for they stress that new replication of techniques will not be sufficient.

The notion of open education is predicated on several key assumptions about the way children behave, develop, and learn. Barth (1972) listed in his research a number of such assumptions gathered through a review of available literature. Adapted from Barth the list is as follows:

1. Children are innately curious.
2. Children will explore their environment provided it is not threatening.
3. Children have the competence and the right to make significant decisions concerning their own learning.
4. Children who learn something of importance to themselves wish to share it with others.
5. Children develop intellectually at their own rate and in their own style.
6. Intellectual growth and development best takes place in a sequence of concrete experiences followed by (verbal) interactions.
7. Errors are an essential part of learning.

8. A child's learning is best assessed by close observations over a long period of time. (p. 38)

Teachers must provide the opportunity for the characteristics of the student's learning environment to develop to a point where they reflect an awareness of and an adherence to those assumptions recorded by Barth.

Stephens (1974) has identified what she considers to be the characteristics of open classrooms. She records that every open classroom will reflect in varying degrees:

1. A minimum of lessons for the whole class; most instruction geared to small groups or individuals.
2. A variety of activities progressing simultaneously.
3. Flexible scheduling, so that children can engage in different activities for varying periods of time.
4. An environment rich in materials, both commercial and homemade.
5. Freedom for children to move about, converse, work together, and seek help from one another.
6. Opportunities for children to make decisions about their work and to develop responsibility for setting and meeting their educational goals.
7. Lack of rigid, prescribed curriculum and provision for children to investigate matters of concern to them.
8. Some integration of the curriculum, eliminating isolated teaching of each subject.
9. Emphasis on experimentation and involvement with materials.

10. Flexible learning groups formed around interests, as well as academic needs, and organized by both pupils and teachers.

11. An atmosphere of trust, acceptance of children, and respect for their diversity.

12. Attention to individual intellectual, emotional, physical, and social needs.

13. Creative activities valued as part of the curriculum.


15. Honest and open relationships between teacher and pupil and between pupil and pupil; teacher avoidance of exploiting authority. (p. 26)

Although the characteristics listed above are, seemingly, basic requirements of open classrooms, teachers will implement these with varying degrees of commitment; however, it will be necessary for all "open education" teacher advocates to consider the implications of these characteristics in light of their own teaching.

Research reported by Smith (1974) reveals that if children are to develop their intellectual potential, the school must provide an environment that is intellectually stimulating and in which achievement of an intellectual nature is respected and nurtured. Rogers and Church (1975) add that the task of the teacher in an open classroom is to set up opportunities for learning experiences, both in and out of the classroom, where children can be watched to see what are
the educational motivators to which they respond.

According to the open classroom studies of Golding and Poad (1973) the classroom environment should allow a high degree of choice not only of areas of study but also of methods of proceeding with the inquiry and of presenting the findings. Another proponent of choice in the classroom (Taylor, 1972), stresses that the open classroom is, essentially, a form of organization in which the child exercises a greater degree of choice about what he/she is going to do and when he/she is going to do it, and the teacher integrates his/her daily program so that learning and progress take place.

The preceding section of this chapter has attempted to answer the question, "What is open education?" A number of operational characteristics coming from the literature seem to best answer that question. These characteristics are promoted by an educational approach that provides:

1. A rich and stimulating environment where learning takes place.
2. A place of trust and openness.
3. An opportunity for shared decision-making.
4. Provisioning for active learning
5. A place where individual needs are met.
6. An opportunity for acquisition of skills.

What is the role of the teacher in the open classroom? The role of the teacher in open education has been discussed at length by Anderson (1970), Bussis and Chittenden (1970), and Kohl (1969).
Traub, Weiss, Fisher, and Musella (1972) after examining the literature available, report that the open teacher often acts as a resource person and a counselor. The teacher is characterized as being concerned with diagnosing student problems and finding practicable solutions that are accepted and acted on by the students themselves. Another aspect of the teacher's role reported here is teacher as classroom provisioner: assuming major responsibility for placing suitable materials in the classroom and guiding student choice of materials and activities.

Rogers and Church (1975) commenting on the role of the teacher in an open classroom note that the teacher is less content-centered and more person-centered. They see curriculum being generated out of where the children are and what they bring to the specific learning situation. No distinction is seen between affective and cognitive development. The researchers do not find correct answers any more important than good questions.

Eight themes around which the role of the teacher could be conceptualized are presented by Thomas and Walberg (1971). The themes are:

1. Instruction--it is to be highly individualized.
2. Provisioning--the providing of a wide range of materials and equipment.
3. Diagnosis--the teacher continually watches each child and makes plans accordingly.
4. Evaluation--the teacher gathers information about each child's growth and learning that will help him/her gain
their goals.

5. Humanness—a respect and trust in the individual.

6. Seeking—the teacher's responsibility for personal growth.

7. Self-perception—the teacher views himself/herself and must believe in what he/she is doing.

8. Assumptions—the beliefs held about children and the process of learning. (Assumptions include a warm accepting atmosphere, reasonable rules, a dependable source of authority, and a faith in children's curiosity and ability to explore on their own. (pp. 16-22)

Thomas and Walberg arrived at these eight themes by examining the British and American literature on open education. They tried to find ways in which the thinking and practices of open education reflected and fit into the framework proposed in the Bussis and Chittenden (1970) report. They were able to locate a large body of literature which presented a great deal of specific information which could be organized along the lines of the Bussis and Chittenden dimensions (see Figure 1). After careful examination of the available literature addressing these 10 dimensions, the structuring of their own particular thematic ideology (eight themes) become more specific, concrete, and explicit.*

If teachers adhere to the eight themes presented by Thomas and Walberg, their actions would be consistent with the recommendations

*Subsequently Evans (1971) used this research to find significant differences between open and traditional teachers based on an instrument using these scales.
growing out of the literature in the preceding section of this chapter which indicate that students need a more humane environment and voice in decisions that affect their own learning (Rathbone, 1971; Stephens, 1974; Golding and Poad, 1973).

The implications of the role of teacher as described above have prompted some researchers to conclude that the most critical factor in an open education environment is how adults deal with the students on a personal level (Spitsbergen and Fry, 1974). These writers go on to make a personal statement on their overall perceptions of the open education approach:

We believe that education is an active process which must be experienced and lived, rather than passively endured. Significant learning happens when the person interacts . . . with other people and with events in the world around him. . . . The key to learning is activity. . . .action, giving, sharing of information, and experiences . . . with a variety of sources and resources. (p. x)

The role of the teacher has been stated in very glowing terms by Charity James (1968). She gives that role a two-dimensional slant. First is the pastoral role. The salient features of this role are the creation of an environment based on sharing and mutual trust. The teacher is viewed as the guardian of existing moral codes, loving is a little more easier to do, and the fear of failure is relieved. The environment strengthens the teacher's ability to act as a catalyst in bringing into being situations in which perceptions can emerge; hopefully through creativity. The teacher is expected to give regular undivided attention to each individual student.

The second role is that of specialist. If teachers are truly concerned with totally involving their students in subject matter, then
it becomes the responsibility of these teachers to know as much as they can about specific disciplines.

James (1968) gives a rather flowery description to the role of the teacher when she states:

If students are engaged in... creative education which is largely undertaken in small working parties, working with some autonomy, it is clear that the role of the teacher changes from being that of an instructor, giving a class lesson. He becomes rather a facilitator, an impresario, and a consultant. (p. 44)

It seems apparent from the literature that the teacher is the most important factor in the development of an open classroom. Most researchers concur with the conclusion drawn by Spitsbergen and Fry (1974) that the most critical factor in an open classroom environment is how adults deal with the students on a personal level. It thus becomes obvious that the key to successful open classrooms revolve around quality teaching.

What are the goals of open education for students? Twelve goals which should be attained when open classrooms are fully implemented have been formulated by Howes (1974). These goals are:

1. Children who know themselves as persons with limitations and strengths.
2. Children who think independently, act responsibly, and are self-propelled.

3. Children who use time efficiently and effectively for their own learning and living purposes.

4. Children who understand deeply democratic values and beliefs and apply them in daily life.

5. Children who show a great concern for other children, valuing the opinions of others in the solution of problems.

6. Children who like themselves and feel good about themselves.

7. Children who use their environment and available resources well.

8. Children who have healthy egos that are not dependent on or slaves to either the inner or the external worlds.

9. Children who like school, want to go to school, and are happy in school.

10. Children who make more and more learning decisions and accept responsibility for them.

11. Children who have confidence in themselves and in their ability to confront and solve problems.

12. Children who know how to learn, view learning as worthwhile, and think of learning as a lifelong process. (p. 12)

Open education teachers must be responsible. Rules need to be established, the teacher must uphold them and see that each student is able to move, explore, and choose freely. According to Bell (1974),
reports of studies which have compared students in open education classrooms with students in more traditional classrooms show that in general academic achievement is about equal (Case, 1971; Godde, 1973; Greener, 1973; Rosner, 1973; Scheiner, 1969; Williams, 1970). Bell also reports that students in open classrooms are better able to identify and solve problems, have more self-direction and self-responsibility, have a more positive self-concept, and are better able to use inquiry skills.

Supporting the statements made in the last few paragraphs concerning achievement levels of open classroom students is a group of studies reported in a recent book by Lynn S. Martin (1976). The book abstracts and summarizes several hundred studies from numerous educational interests. Among those interests are: (a) Children directing their own learning (Reel, 1973); (b) Child-rearing techniques (Lickona, 1971); (c) Homes where high achievement training occurs (Anderson and Evans, 1973); (d) Improved student attitudes toward school and school work (Mycock, 1967; Junell, 1971; Samuels, 1969); (e) Students' attitudes toward teachers, school, and the curriculum in open classrooms as opposed to traditional classrooms (Shapiro, 1972; Tuckman, Cochran, and Travers, 1973; Weiss, 1972; Wilson, 1972).

If children are to remain successful in open classrooms then teachers must constantly be aware of the goals of open education for learners: (a) shared decision-making; (b) skills acquisition; and (c) active learning. These goals can be accomplished if educators provide rich and stimulating environments where children whether
alone or in groups, find activities which interest and challenge their natural curiosity and desire to learn.

What is the state of open education at the secondary school level?

Circumstances alter, and experience grows. The door to change is never permanently shut. But there should be no mad rush to go through it because someone has said that the grass looks greener outside. To some children, it may be extraordinarily indigestible. (Taylor, 1972, p. 110)

Most of the advocates of open education and the bulk of the literature on the topic have referred to elementary school education. With the possible exception of James (1973), Mason (1973), Borton (1970), and Gross (1970) little has been written about an open approach at the secondary level.

Traditional secondary schools have been organized around time schedules of forty to fifty minutes per class; student loads of thirty to forty students; and class periods of eight to nine classes per day. The subjects are separated into their individual disciplines of English, History, Geography, Social Studies, Art, Science, Mathematics, Physical Education, Health, and other subjects taught by as many different instructors.

The traditional elementary classroom, on the other hand, has been managed by one teacher instructing in all the disciplines spread over a seven-hour work day. The teacher has had, in most cases, a great deal of input into the scheduling of subjects and maintains a constant group of twenty-five to thirty students throughout the entire school year. The organizational structure of the elementary
school, at first glance, would seem to offer not only the best, but the only arena in which the open approach could be implemented; however, not only has the approach been implemented at the secondary level but has reported as successful by researchers (Johanson, 1972; Samuels, 1969; Schwartz, 1972).

Open education implemented at the secondary level would have to allow, as Traub, et al. (1972) have stated, the student the opportunity to explore his/her environment; to make decisions about his/her own learning; to work at his/her own pace following his/her own style; to learn from concrete experiences before making abstract generalizations; to make errors, presumably without fear of censure, and to be helped to learn from them. These options to students would fit into the upper right-hand quadrant of the Bussis and Chittenden (1970) Double Classification Scheme, and would find much support in the literature of open education advocates (Stephens, 1974; Barth, 1970; Smith, 1974, etc.).

Up to now, open education learning approaches in public secondary schools have been offered only to a number of students. As open education programs prove successful, these programs should be expanded. The Reform of Secondary Education: A Report to the Public and the Profession (1973), a report of the National Commission On the Reform of Secondary Education notes that extension of successful alternative approaches at the secondary level has been relatively infrequent. The report states that a number of successful programs are in danger of not surviving. One main reason offered by the
Commission for the low survival of new approaches is that the effectiveness of these approaches is being assessed by the criteria for traditional school operation rather than by criteria that measure the objectives of the approaches. It would seem to this author that the negative results of such an evaluation would signal the end of new approaches or at least cast an unwarranted stigma of failure on what might otherwise be viable alternatives to teaching and learning.

When initiated at the secondary level, open education invariably requires the teachers to reassess their task. Charity James (1968) sees that task as, "... not to induct young people into known certainties but to invite them to collaborate with us into explorations of the unknown. We are concerned together to create the future, not merely to reproduce the past" (p. 142).

Teachers are charged to acknowledge the worth of the student as a collaborator in his own learning. Mason (1973) expands the rationale of this collaboration when he reminds us that, "If the young are to become decision-making adults they need to be decision-making youngsters sharing the definition of the problems to be resolved" (p. 64). Other authors have supported the claim that collaboration is an important ingredient of the open approach. Yeomans (1971) tells us that today's student is a more independent learner, who can follow up clues and resources on his own, or work effectively with others. The student is said to be accustomed to communicating in various media, as well as words. He is portrayed as one who is as much at home in a studio or shop as in a library or laboratory. This
independence on the part of the student Yeomans attributes to the collaboration between teacher and student that does not hold the student to a predetermined syllabus within a subject, or a school wide schedule within each day.

Yeomans (1971) describes the functioning of an open approach secondary facility. He relates:

Teachers have their specialities, and they teach them, but, the team has replaced the department, and integration of subjects has taken the place of separate courses within each field. Formal instruction is carried out in groups of twenty to thirty students. Other students were working in informal groups of their own choosing, and a few were working alone. . . . Some of the time is carefully planned and supervised by teachers, while some of the time is left to the interests of the students to be used as they see fit. Each one is made to feel responsible for the use he makes of it, and there are various devices for recording this accountability. (p. 33)

The preceding paragraphs have attempted to look at the operational differences of traditional classrooms at the elementary and secondary levels. There was also reported some characteristics of an open education approach operating at the secondary level. This has been an effort to focus on an open teaching and learning approach not an open plan building scheme. In order to add more clarity to this last statement, the author relates these statements from Bunker (1975). He states:

Frequently, people confuse "open education" with "open space." The two are not synonymous. . . . The classroom is more open than traditional when both teachers and children decide on the goals and means for their growth; these decisions occur in an open classroom regardless of the size of the space available. Active decision-makers, we would hope, will be making effective use of whatever space they have in terms of their needs. (p. 4)
The literature provides examples of new building construction utilizing the open plan structure; however, the question that is foremost in this researcher's mind is whether these structures are in fact open in their approach?

One study conducted by Brunetti (1971) and reported by Bell (1974) involves a survey of buildings constructed in 43 states from 1967-1969. The study found that approximately 52 per cent were of the open design and about equally divided as to elementary, junior high, and senior high school. The findings showed that most of the secondary schools classified as open facilities were open in only part of a building or in a department. Bell then visited sixteen secondary schools in eight states from around the country. Ten schools were senior high, four were junior high, one was junior-senior high, and one was K-12. There was an attempt to gather data in areas identified by the proponents of open education. These are the common points the researcher found prevalent in many of the schools:

1. There was some kind of openness to the building. This varied from one end of the classroom being open to a space which typically would have had four to eight classrooms being completely devoid of inner walls.

2. A library or media center which was very open to entry and use.

3. More variety of courses being offered than had previously been offered at these schools. Thus students have a greater choice of courses to take.

5. Schedules that are more flexible.

6. Students have more choice in how to spend their unscheduled time. This varied from being able to go to the student commons area to being free to leave the campus.

7. Provision in the building for a student commons area or gathering place.

8. Students very favorable toward the changes.

9. Teachers are sharing more with other teachers and utilizing the media center more.

10. A problem had developed with considerably higher loss and/or destruction of materials in the open media center. (p. 335)

After his research Bell concluded that secondary school educators in many parts of the United States are attempting to make their schools more humane and more interesting places for students to learn. However, as Bell points out, the impact seems to be mainly in facilities, organization, and course offerings; very little has been changed in other key concepts of open education such as:

1. Student's contribution to the learning goals, activities, environment, etc.

2. Individualized instruction.

3. Active learning approaches.

4. Skill acquisition in affective areas.
These very important characteristics derived from that early work by Bussis and Chittenden (1970) are necessary components for an open approach at any level, and were not found present in the so-called open schools Bell observed.

Other research efforts have been made in an attempt to determine how open education approaches have been implemented at the secondary level. One such research study was conducted to investigate the question of whether open-space high schools are more open than other schools (Hoyle, 1973). The study tried to answer these research questions: Is the learning climate more open in open-space or traditional high schools? Is the problem-attack behavior of principals more frequent in open space or traditional schools? Is the learning climate related to the principals' problem-attack behavior? The study was conducted in the spring of 1972 and used as a sample population eight Ohio high schools—four traditional and four open-space. The participants were eight high school principals and 309 teachers. The data gathering instruments were: The Learning Climate Inventory (LCI) and The Problem-Attack Behavior Inventory (PABI).

The results of the study found the learning climate more "open" in the open-space schools in the areas that concerned the teachers' freedom to use varied teaching materials and resource persons; the amount of shared decision-making, self evaluation, and overall job satisfaction. On only one item of the twenty item LCI were the traditional schools more open than the open-space schools. That particular item dealt with the teachers' evaluation of the principal. No differences in problem-attack behavior were found between principals
in open-space and traditional schools. There was a positive relationship between the total learning climate and problem-attack behavior scores.

The study indicates that the openness of the learning climate is affected by the frequency with which the principal attacks problems that involve students, teachers, and the broader community. A final point revealed by the study is that interpersonal relationships have an apparent effect on the preceptions of the school staff.

Numerous articles have been written that describe varying aspects of open-space secondary schools. In one such article Cutler (1972) describes an open plan school in East Aurora, New York. She comments that, "Most of the time it's older children who shape manners and morals for younger ones. . . . But where school building design is concerned, the trend reverses. Advanced ideas seem to get their start in elementary school projects and work up." (p. 25).

Cutler informs us of the close working relationship that existed between the school's architect and East Aurora's building committee. A plan of construction was devised that allowed for plenty of room, and at the same time allowed for an overall sense of community. The school was built on the so-called "house" approach. Houses are semi-independent schools-within-schools. Students were assigned to a house by alphabetical order and took most of their courses for four years in their respective houses. The teachers were not prepared initially to cope with their new environment, it took approximately eighteen months for relative adjustment to occur. After that period of time, teachers were experimenting with team teaching, modular
scheduling, and teaching aids.

Open education does not always depend on a new facility or even a total school-wide effort. In the fall of 1971 the Environmental Studies Project (ESP) began operating in two high schools of Carteret County, North Carolina (Spitsbergen and Fry, 1974). The ESP was offered to junior and senior high school students with credit for science, English, and social studies given on a pass-fail basis. The ESP open classroom was basically a school within a school functioning as it was in the regular high school setting.

Many misunderstandings with the "regular" school faculty as to just what was going on in the ESP program were reported by the researchers. The program was downgraded and considered irrelevant. The staff of the ESP program consisted of a director who coordinated the program in the two schools and who served as liaison to school administrators and the community. Four or five teachers per school joined the staff, a secretary for the director was hired, and a media-graphics expert was assigned to the program. There were usually 70-90 students involved in both schools.

The primary goal of the project was concerned with the self-development of the individual student. The ESP faculty wanted the students to become: (1) more self-directed; (2) more aware of their learning needs and how to fulfill them; (3) more positive about self-image; (4) more self-aware; (5) more knowledgeable about self-strengths and weaknesses; and more able to self-evaluate. The students spent half their time with the ESP staff and the other half in the traditional classroom (Spitsbergen and Fry, 1974, pp. 2-3).
The ESP staff felt they had accomplished their stated goals. Although they did not provide data to substantiate their claims, they did issue this statement:

The staff can see... objectively and subjectively... that the high school open classroom is striving to achieve the goals of person-centered open education, and is doing so to an extent unknown in most school situations. We also believe that the goals are being achieved. We know this by "gut feeling"... an aspect of teaching and learning that cannot be ignored no matter how unscientific it may be. (p. 200)

The conclusions drawn by examining the preceding researchers may not have any substance in scientific measurements but are not unlike most being reported in current literature. Truesdell and Newman (1975) writing about Comstock Northeast Middle School in southwestern Michigan which opened in 1973 did not refrain from subjectively analyzing the success of their school. They emphatically state that "... kids are happier and more enthusiastic about school, and they are progressing rapidly" (p. 77).

This facility operates with teams of approximately three to four teachers. These teams decided to approach their teaching in the more traditional manner with a gradual opening of the curriculum. Furniture was arranged in the classroom to provide barricades which established well-defined territories. The teacher still saw their role as that of information-giver. Reflecting on that part of the schools development the writers reveal, "Clearly we had no program. It was a single matter of surviving from day to noisy day... Behavior worsened and the noise levels began to creep up" (p. 75).

A further revelation is worth noting here. The authors admit:
Our procrastination had created the worst of all possible worlds—complete disharmony between teaching facilities and teaching approach, compounded by a mist of tentativeness and false security. So, knowing we had run out of options, knowing that further delay would only add more muck to the mire, and knowing that it was the kids who were victimized by our bungling, we moved to get ourselves back on track.” (p. 75)

The staff made a decision to reconstruct the physical setting. Barriers were brought down, and areas were designed so that the core of each would be visible from several points within the learning center. There were still fears about what they would do if this didn't work. An enormous amount of time and energy went into making activity cards, job cards, and into developing record-keeping schemes. Conferring with colleagues became quite necessary and textbooks became less important. The fact that the staff became more successful and confident is borne out in this statement by the writers.

The teacher who honestly believes that kids, for all their obvious faults, are human beings who are capable or who can become capable of responsible and intelligent choice will probably succeed in the open classroom. (p. 77)

Secondary schools with open curriculum and open learning spaces are still rare enough to attract many educators to see how the "new" education works. This researcher has investigated the research on five such schools (Juanita High School, Seattle, Washington; Castle Rock High School, Castle Rock, Washington; Parkway North School, Creve Coeur, Missouri; Clear Creek High School, Idaho Springs, Colorado; Wilde Lake High School, Columbia, Maryland), and was most interested in the organizational strategies developed beforehand that
hopefully would assure successful operation of the facilities. (Educational Facilities Labs., Inc., New York, 1973)

After reviewing the data available on these schools this author finds these to be the positive aspects of those strategies:

1. One principal hired six years before the planned opening of the schools
2. Principals assisting in the planning and design of the schools
3. The school resources available to the community after school hours and on weekends
4. Money secured through Title III funds to train the teachers over a three year period
5. Local colleges assuming the role of inservice provisioners
6. Principal leading the way and being the catalyst for inservice programming
7. Principal having the chance to choose his entire instructional staff
8. An orientation session provided students
9. Ongoing inservice seen as necessary
10. Teachers and learning consistent with open education philosophy.

Those factors which can be considered negative are:

1. Principal having no voice in the planning or design of the facility
2. Barriers set up in the school to designate turf
3. No particular inservice effort made prior to or during the schools operation
4. Facility too small to house students when it opened
5. Poor utilization of space due to construction design.

From this section we can conclude that what little open education exists at the secondary level followed open elementary schools by several years. The rationale was that it is easier to change the learning style of children who have not had eight or nine years of experience in traditional settings. One study investigating the openness of secondary facilities (Burnetti, 1971), showed that most were open in only part of a building or in a department. This study was supported by another conducted by Bell (1974) who pointed out that the impact of openness was mainly in facilities, organization, and course offering. He found little openness in the key concepts of (a) students' contribution to learning goals, activities, and environment, (b) individualized instruction, (c) active learning approaches, and (d) skill acquisition in the affective areas.

The final portion of this section investigated studies conducted, and articles written to determine the degree of openness and the success of openness at the secondary school level. Several schools were analyzed in an attempt to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the organizational strategies developed to assure successful operation of these open facilities.
What considerations need to be addressed to assure effective inservice programming at the secondary school level? How can designs for inservice teacher education be developed to help teachers move toward more effective approaches with students? Inservice education of teachers requires careful planning and a great deal of action and effort on the part of those who are responsible for the quality of the educational program (Moffitt, 1963). Meade (1971) insists that planning inservice education without performance criteria becomes an exercise in futility. "... developing those criteria without a sense of purpose and commitment is perhaps the highest folly" (p. 213). No program of inservice education will be efficacious unless it is based upon a realistic understanding of the many elements of the teaching act as it affects learning. It seems therefore, that the organization's leadership must determine the kinds of competencies they wish their teachers to have, and then must permit the teachers to acquire these competencies in whatever ways the teachers think best.

The foregoing statements relate what the ideal consideration for inservice programming should be, however, a major source of inservice directions come from "authority." This authority does not always seek to assess the needs of the inservice target group, instead; programs are developed and teachers' attendance is mandated (Meade, 1971). Should this rigid control by authorities affect the goals of effective inservice teacher education? Harris, et al (1969), state that,
Whether change is coercive or whether it is done willingly may greatly affect the genuine acceptance with which people proceed to change, thereby affecting the quality of the change outcome. Whether they have adequate opportunities to develop the necessary knowledge skills, or related attitudes and values to carry out the change will also affect the quality of the outcome. (p. 27)

It seems evident from the literature that skills acquisition, active learning and shared decision-making would be the ideal characteristics of inservice teacher education as well as for open education. However, the literature also indicates that mandated programs can be effective if they consider the skills and structure programs that lead to the acquisition of these competencies. A major purpose of inservice education is to increase the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom (Allen, 1971). The greater the teacher's repertory, and the more he/she knows about the effect of each teaching strategy on the expected performances of young people, the more apt he/she is to select that strategy which is most effective for a particular group or individual (Fischler, 1971).

Any organizational structure which emerges to meet an expanded provision of inservice training must be capable of identifying and meeting the needs of the educational institution, especially the teachers within it. Therefore, Rubin (1971) suggests that inservice offer a rich opportunity for teachers to acquire personal insights that lead to new ways of behaving in the classroom. This suggestion by Rubin is not unlike the comments of the noted English educator Lord James (1973) who writes:

Not only does knowledge change, but techniques of teaching change. The changes may involve whole questions
of attitude—associated with team teaching, or open plan schools. If the character of the society for which he prepares his pupils changes radically during his working life, it is clearly essential that the teacher shall have periodical refreshment. (p. 14)

Commenting on the general educational needs of the teacher, Roy A. Edelfelt (1974) says that general education that continues throughout the career of the teacher has largely been ignored. He feels that although programs of inservice education can and should never be uniform, more collaboration is required to plan direction, establish policy, promote programs and research, and evaluate stated outcomes. Edelfelt writing in a co-authorship with Gordon Lawrence (1974) indicates that there has never been a broad scheme of inservice education with a clear concept of purpose, appropriate undergirding of policy, legitimacy in commitment, or fixed responsibility for attaining agreed upon goals. Both writers indicate that goals serve to give direction to the long-range inservice efforts and to assist in the selection of more specific objectives for planned activities.

According to Harris et al (1969), one of the reasons that inservice programs frequently seem to have unclear objectives is that too little attention is given to the definition of desired outcomes.

Earlier research indicated that any effective inservice education programs should be concerned with finding new and better ways of changing the behavior of school children and adding to the knowledge or skill of the teacher (Moffitt, 1963). Bush (1971) admonishes that educators should be precise in defining the teacher behavior for which inservice educational programs are designed. Harris, et al (1969) concur and indicate that these teacher behaviors should be
stated in performance terms. They stress that perhaps the most important advantage to be gained from stating objectives in performance terms is that when they are so stated the appropriate activities for reaching the objectives are clarified. Allen (1971) insists that a meaningful inservice program can only be achieved when training is directed toward teacher performance goals, of immediate relevance to the teacher's everyday professional experience.

The central goals of inservice training according to Jackson (1971) should proceed from a growth perspective, "... to help the teacher become progressively more sensitive to what is happening in the classroom and to support the teacher's effort to improve on what he is doing" (p. 28).

The literature clearly indicates that in order for inservice programs to have optimum effectiveness they must be designed with an understanding of the kinds of changes or outcomes and goals that may be reasonably expected from the inservice effort. Consideration must also be given to provisioning for growth and progressive sensitivity of the teacher.

What leadership is needed for effective planning and implementation of inservice teacher programs? Improvement and renewal activities continue to be one of the major responsibilities of those charged with leadership functions in education. Those educators writing in the areas of inservice education and staff development point out the importance of competent, dynamic leadership to the success of teacher renewal programs (Harris, et al, 1969; Bishop, 1976; Rubin, 1971; Adams, 1975).
Other authorities suggest a more systematic approach based on collaboration of personnel and resources which provide leadership and assistance to teachers. They assert that the teacher, principal, supervisor, superintendent, and community must all begin to regard the arrangement of procedures for improvement of teaching and learning as one of their primary obligations (C. James, 1968; Mason, 1972; Sarason, 1971; Rubin, 1971; L. James, 1973).

In recent years school principals have been charged with increasing responsibilities for providing leadership in the improvement of instruction in their buildings. However, as Harris et al (1969) point out, "Leaders cannot be equally effective in all things, but neither can they become accepted as instructional leaders if they neglect other essential responsibilities" (p. 8).

This focus on the principal grows out of the rationale that any kind of system change invariably puts the principal in the role of implementing the change in his particular school (Mason, 1972).

Sarason states:

I have yet to see any proposal for system change that did not assume the presence of a principal in a school. I have yet to see in any of these proposals the slightest recognition of the possibility that the principal, by virtue of his role, preparation, and tradition, may not be a good implementer of change. (p. 112)

In summary, these statements probably reflect only in part these authors' considered estimate of the importance of collaboration between staff and administrator for effective inservice education programs. Despite these limitations, these authors clearly stress the importance of the principal in any inservice design.
What is the role of the participant in the basic inservice design?

We have been warned by Meade (1971) not to engage ourselves in inservice programs that have been initiated without clear thought of purpose. He reports:

The burden upon us is heavy to provide meaningful programs that demonstrate in their content, in their organization, and in their administration, an awareness and a sensitivity to the needs of the teachers as they facilitate the learning of children. We must learn what to do and what not to do; until there is health in this part of the educational system we cannot move ahead with the critical and primary goal—helping the young to learn. (p. 224)

Certainly, inservice programs should be planned with the active participation of those who are to be the benefactors. Rudd (1973) hints that inservice or local curriculum development programs must provide a setting within which teachers can become the willing agents of their own continuing professional education.

Social scientists have repeatedly asserted that the success of inservice programs largely depends upon the degree to which teachers themselves identify their problems. The recognition of one's inability or of the need for change in order to grow, dissatisfaction with one's behavior in teaching, or a determined effort to improve the school or the school system are more successful in motivating productive teacher action than are orders to do or not to do.

Moffitt (1963) recommends this when he writes:

Only under those circumstances in which teachers find their own problems and want to do something about them can effective inservice education programs exist. The faculty of an entire school system should actively participate in revising the philosophy of the school and the objectives of education. (p. 59)
The teacher must participate in the governance of his/her own professional growth (Tyler, 1971). Those who serve as facilitating agents must themselves acquire the skills of collaborative interaction which permit them to work effectively with teachers. Unfortunately, unless teachers have been involved in thinking through what curriculum or in-service is needed and in helping to plan it, they are likely to resist it or simply not to make the effort required to introduce or implement the in-service or curriculum objectives.

Essential to any in-service effort that sets about to provide significant improvement in education is the fundamental premise that the teacher should have a voice in determining his/her in-service training program simply because the teacher may be the most reliable judge of his/her own technical weakness. Edelfelt (1975) found few, if any, in-service programs which adhere to the preceding statements. Programs initiated by teacher organizations or teacher centers were also non-existent.

Moffitt (1963) emphasizes that the morale of a group is increased when (a) the individual is recognized for his/her contributions to the group, (b) when he/she is given responsibility for the development of better ways of enhancing the school program, and (c) when responsibility is shared among several persons rather than lodged in a single person. He goes on to list eleven reasons why faculty members should work as a group for in-service growth. The reasons are:

1. They can more readily and more accurately identify or limit a problem of common concern.
2. They are more selective in establishing a method of searching for answers.

3. They are able to analyze divergent points of view on any problem.

4. They can objectively evaluate ongoing programs.

5. They are able to analyze objectively the process of their group growth.

6. They can alter or expand their program of investigation.

7. They can share information.

8. They develop group interest and understanding.

9. They locate personal problems thwarting progress.

10. They are able to arrive at conclusions that change behavior.

11. They can implement decisions as they are made, thereby changing individual and group behavior. (p. 72)

Evaluation instruments, like all other segments of inservice education involving teachers, must emerge from a cooperative effort. According to Rubin (1971) the teacher must engage in repeated practice, evaluate his/her progress in some systematic way and cumulatively increase his/her skill.

Summarizing his findings Meade (1971) offers this statement, "If diagnosis and remediation are placed solely in the hands of outside experts, the teacher is deprived of the privilege of participating in his own development" (p. 219).

The implications, derived from the above statements, are that the participant must be actively involved in the basic design,
implementation, and evaluation of the inservice program. Successful programs exist where collaboration and cooperative efforts are in evidence. In a recent book, *Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures*, Leslee Bishop (1976) leaves us with this thought:

Most changes cannot be decreed; they must be facilitated and processed in accordance with the multiple and professional roles of all the participants. Token involvement begets token commitment; token commitment usually results in minimal response. (p. 139)

What vehicle will help determine the effectiveness of the inservice effort? The key to a successful teacher inservice training program according to Allen (1971), is a systematic and relevant set of evaluation procedures. Careful examination of the research conducted by Edelfelt and Lawrence (1974) reveals the low priority that schools appear to give to research on inservice programs. Only a few schools were reported to be conducting careful evaluations of their ongoing programs.

Bishop (1976) reminds us that evaluation should contribute to decision-making and in-process corrections to program improvement, reporting, and feedback; to creativity and variety in the inservice efforts; and to improved staff renewal programs and related teacher-learner gain (p. 145).

Some form of evaluation should begin as soon as a program has been organized. This type of evaluation provides periodic assessments made prior to the end of the program. It may include a review of
procedures--their strengths and weaknesses. This type of evaluation is termed "formative" and often indicates emerging needs of inservice leaders and participants as they occur at various levels throughout the inservice effort.

Another kind of evaluation occurs at the terminating point of the program. It gives feedback and provides evidence of the overall effect of the inservice design and of its implementation. This kind of evaluation usually serves to determine future inservice direction.

The effect of evaluation on the quality of inservice teacher education was seen as an important component in determining program goal and direction. Fischler (1971) reminds us that:

In education we tend to make changes without building in a research design that will enable us to determine the effect of our change. We tend to believe that if we do something, by definition it is a good thing. If we spend millions of dollars to upgrade the profession, then we should approach this process in a systematic way, gaining information and assessing and reassessing our goals. Any program aimed at changing teacher behavior, therefore, must have built into it a clearly defined method of evaluating the effect of the program. (p. 172)

The literature points out the neglected area of data-gathering in the total scheme of inservice teacher education. Without empirical data on which to base the effectiveness of inservice intervention, programs can not in a valid sense claim success. Sarason makes this clear when he writes:

The fact is that we simply do not have adequate descriptive data on the ways in which change is conceived, formulated, and executed within a school system. Obviously, there are many different ways in which it comes about, with differing degrees of success and failure, but it has hardly been studied. We are
therefore, in a position analogous to that of interpreting the data from an experiment without any clear idea of the procedures employed. (p. 20)

Some systematic design of data gathering must be a built in component of any inservice program that is intent on being successful. It will be of the utmost importance to gather data that reveals the nature of the responses of the inservice participants.

From the above literature this writer presents four considerations that must be addressed for effective inservice teacher education. These considerations reflect the suggestions and conditions the authorities in the field of inservice education and staff development have found important to assuring effective inservice teacher education. The four considerations proposed by the writer are:

- In order for inservice programs to have optimum effectiveness they must be designed with an understanding of the kinds of changes or outcomes and goals that may reasonably be expected from the inservice effort.

- Administrative leadership is needed to assure effective planning and implementation.

- The inservice participant must be actively involved in the basic design of the inservice program, including implementation and evaluation.

- Some evaluation design for gathering feedback must be built into the inservice component.

These considerations are consistent with the beliefs about open education as presented earlier and act as the framework for the proposed inservice approach.
Summary

This chapter began with a description of characteristics of open education. Five major questions guided this review and provided the theoretical framework around which the first section of this chapter was developed. Those questions were: (1) What is open education? (2) What is the role of the teacher in the open classroom? (3) What are the goals of open education for students? (4) What is the state of open education at the secondary school level? (5) What considerations, as a result of the conclusions drawn from the literature, need to be addressed to assure effective inservice programming at the secondary school level?

The research indicated that open education offers a humane approach to learning where teachers are seen as resources and facilitators (Rathbone, 1971; Bunker, 1976; Stephens, 1974; Golding and Poad, 1973; Traub, Weiss, Fisher, and Musella, 1971). The goals of open education tend to allow the learner a wide variety of choice about what his educational scheme will be. It was offered that as a result of the shared-decision-making allowed students they will display a more positive self-concept, self-responsibility, self-direction, and effective problem-solving skills (Spitsbergen and Fry, 1974; Bell, 1974; Howes, 1974; Barth, 1972).

Another section of this chapter investigated the state of open education at the secondary school level. The impact of open education on secondary education seems to be mainly in facilities, organization, and course offerings. Little has changed in other areas such as
individualized instruction, integration of content, vertical grouping, creativity, or self-direction. However, on standardized tests open classroom students scored as well as students from traditional schools; gains were reported for open classroom students in the affective areas of education as well (Bell, 1974; Martin, 1975; Brunetti, 1971; Case, 1971; Godde, 1973; Greener, 1973; Rosner, 1973; Scheiner, 1969; Williams, 1970).

In the remainder of the chapter, four considerations for effective inservice were proposed. Literature that supported the considerations was reported. The discussion of each consideration with its supporting literature becomes the basis for describing the proposed approach to inservice teacher education. The questions presented in Chapter I (p. 12) will be detailed in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

In this chapter the author will briefly recount the expressed inservice needs of the Shaw Junior High School administration and staff as they prepared to move from a very old traditional style building into their new open space facility. The case school will be described and the plan for inservice assistance will be discussed.

There will be an explanation of how agencies and individuals outside of the Washington, D.C. Public School system were contracted to provide the inservice for Shaw. Some background on the agencies and a brief introduction to those who delivered the inservice will follow.

The problems projected for this kind of intervention will be outlined as seen by the inservice facilitators. Their plan for resolving those problems will be presented.

This author will restate the questions posed in Chapter I. The instrumentation used to collect data that address the questions will be presented and graphically shown. A brief summary of the Chapter will follow.

The Case School

Shaw Junior High School, a school in the central northwest section of Washington, D.C. provided the staff for the inservice
training project. Shaw was an old structure built in 1903. The building at the time of the inservice project housed approximately eight hundred students and fifty-five professional and administrative staff members. Shaw, located at the corners of Rhode Island Avenue and Seventh Street Northwest, is in an area that is part of the Model Cities division of the city. This area is now in transition because of urban renewal projects and upgrading by private land speculators.

Part of the renewal planning was the construction of a new junior high school for the area. Along with the new school came a new school design. This design, the open space plan, was not new in terms of school construction but its use at the secondary school level was non-existent in the greater Washington, D.C. area. This new secondary school design meant that new strategies for teaching and learning had to be developed.

The administration and staff of Shaw recognized the need for an intensive inservice program and therefore in the fall of 1972 wrote a proposal which was later submitted to the Board of Education. The major goal of the Shaw proposal (1973) was:

The design and operation of a school program which will maximize learning by the students involved in order that they may effectively pursue further endeavors towards fulfilling responsible roles in our society. (p. 1)

The proposal outlined the problems and concerns as they directly related to the lack of knowledge about open education and open space designs on the part of the Shaw administration and staff. Those at Shaw were hopeful that the School Board would arrange for extensive inservice programs which would provide for their smooth transition
into the new open space facility.

The central administration of the School Board approved Shaw's proposal and decided to contract out the task of the intensive inservice.

The Associates for Renewal in Education

The task of delivering the inservice was contracted out to the Advisory and Learning Exchange (a teacher center which operates within the Associates for Renewal in Education, Inc., a non-profit organization in Washington, D.C.). This organization which began in 1971 had been involved in many teacher training projects in the Greater Washington Metropolitan Area and throughout the Mid-Atlantic region.

The Advisory stated it could contribute advisory and planning services to the District of Columbia school system because it was partially funded by foundation grants to encourage educational development of the citizens and teachers in the Washington, D.C. area. Since the Advisory had already been working with some teachers at Shaw and was providing its workshop services and resource center to those who wished to use them, it was found that by extending and focusing those Advisory resources on the total Shaw staff an effective inservice program could be maintained.

The personnel of the Advisory studied the general objectives of the Shaw proposal and combined them into a categorical set of objectives based on personal, knowledge, and skill competencies. Each of the competencies was categorized for the individual and for the group.

The Advisory personnel decided that two intensive two-week summer workshops would accommodate the needs of the Shaw staff. The
administrators, teachers, and aides, were to be the target groups for the two summer training programs. In their proposal, the Advisory and Learning Exchange staff re-stated the specific long-range terminal objectives for Shaw as was first developed and presented in the original Shaw proposal (1973).

Those objectives were:

Professional staff who will, in relationship to students:

1. Be constantly conscious of the necessity for fostering positive self-image through individual and group praise whenever appropriate and avoidance of negative reinforcement.

2. Be a booster and cooperator in activities that foster school spirit and morale.

3. Be proficient in the application of various tutoring techniques. Recognize the advantages of such activities to the tutor as well as the tutee.

4. Be proficient in assisting students in setting appropriate long and short term goals for themselves and support their pursuit of these objectives.

5. Be efficient in the diagnosis of student strengths and weaknesses and needs.

6. Recognize and respect each student for his unique individuality.

Professional staff who will, in relationship to community:

1. Implement the school's objectives and activities through involvement of students, parents, and community groups.
2. Encourage parent cooperation and participation.
3. Utilize community resources in the instructional process.
4. Use the community as a resource for career development activity programs.
5. Encourage the students to view the community from an informal point of view with awareness that attributes can be enhanced and deterrents reduced through school initiated volunteer projects.

The Advisory decided to bring in an outside consultant on open education to head up its inservice program to Shaw. The development of the curriculum and the design of the workshop sessions were under the direction of Dr. R. Mason Bunker, Associate Professor of Education from the University of Massachusetts/Amherst in association with Olive Covington (Director of the Advisory and Learning Exchange) and Mary Alexander (Director of the Advisory educational programs). Working very closely with the project from beginning to end were Andrea Irby (Shaw Coordinator) and this writer (Assistant Coordinator and Data Analyst).

The Inservice: Problems and Design to Resolve

The problems confronting the inservice facilitators were:
(a) making sure the inservice was relevant to the participants,
(b) building the workshop around strengths and concerns, (c) offering the workshop at a time and cost that would be most convenient to the participants and (d) trying to build success into the delivery scheme. These problems were similar to those posed by Lawrence, 1974; Tyler, 1971; Darland, 1970; and Waynant, 1971 in Chapters I and II.
A major problem faced by the inservice staff was how to plan for the training, curriculum development, and diagnostic procedures which had to be developed in order to implement and evaluate any program that grew out of open space and open education as adapted to the new physical plant of Shaw Junior High School. Another problem was how to best utilize the limited amount of inservice time allotted by the contract to individualize and indeed attain the working objectives.

The inservice facilitators met for pre-session planning and adopted a set of beliefs which would guide their planning. Those beliefs were developed by the staff of the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Those beliefs are:

1. Participants are their own instruments for change.
2. Participants do not sabotage their own projects.
3. Participants should run on their own energy (motivation, needs, drives) not on inservice leaders.
4. Participants learn to do what it is they do and not something else.
5. Participants learn by doing.
6. Participants can be better helpers when they feel good about themselves.
7. Learning is getting new information and interacting with it.

(Bunker, 1975)

In Chapter II this author stated four considerations that must be made in order for inservice programs to have optimum effectiveness. The workshop leaders planned to provide for each of those considerations. Consideration one (inservice programs must be designed with an
understanding of the kinds of changes or outcomes and goals that may reasonably be expected from the inservice effort) and consideration three (inservice participants must be actively involved in the basic design of the inservice program, including implementation and evaluation) were addressed via the construction of the original Shaw proposal and the pre-session planning. Consideration two (administrative leadership is needed to assure effective planning and implementation) was addressed by the facilitators' insistence that the administrative personnel of Shaw be active participants in the inservice workshops. How the workshop facilitators accommodated consideration four (some evaluation design for gathering feedback must be built into the inservice component) will be addressed in the "instrumentation" section of this chapter.

In order to assure that the elements of the inservice implementation would be consistent with their stated beliefs, the inservice facilitators developed a time-line which reflected those beliefs. That time-line was:

February, 1974: Pre-session planning—the inservice facilitators re-established their beliefs about inservice and also established tentative inservice goals.

April, 1974

Orientation Session—this session was held at the Advisory and Learning Exchange. The session was attended by the inservice facilitators and the total Shaw staff. An identification of those teachers and administrators who would be participating in the first summer's workshop was determined. Also, that informal session was used to establish the summer's goals and expectations. Wine and cheese were served at this informal gathering.
May, 1974: Pre-session planning--the inservice facilitators met to finalize the inservice plans for the first summer's workshop.

June 24 - July 3, 1974: Workshop "A"--dealt with the objectives of the Shaw proposal. The aim of the sessions was to establish interdisciplinary staff teams which would develop new means of interacting within the Shaw school. The workshop was to deal specifically with:

(a) defuzzing goal statements
(b) exploring alternative approaches to the use of time, space, and resources (human and physical)
(c) developing strategies for moving towards workshop goals
(d) developing strategies for building curriculum for the Fall of 1974.

October 20, 1974: Fall conference--the Advisory staff met with representatives from Shaw to set the agenda for the October 31st follow-up session.

October 31, 1974: Follow-up session--this session was an evaluation extension of the summer's workshop. Special emphasis was placed on continued skill building, group process skills development, and strategies for curriculum building. This session allowed for task groups that had been developed in Workshop "A" to report their progress. Also, each participant was to present documentation on the fulfillment of contracts negotiated with Dr. Bunker leading toward University credit.

November to April 1974-1975: Follow-up workshops--these were scheduled according to the expressed needs of the Shaw staff.

March 24, 1975: Follow-up meeting--the staff of Shaw and that of the Advisory met to plan for the next intensive summer workshop--Workshop "B".

May, 1975: Pre-session planning--during this session the inservice facilitators finalized the agenda for Workshop "B".
The questions outlined in the first chapter serve as the framework around which this researcher will collect data. Those questions are:

1. What is the proposed approach to inservice teacher education?
2. How is it applied at a secondary school level?
3. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants? (In other words, does the approach provide the administration and staff with sound and realistic knowledge of what the open space/open education theory entails?)
4. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?
5. What are the implications of this approach to future inservice training projects?
6. What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?
   (a) Did the workshop provide activities for classrooms?
   (b) Were these activities used by the teachers?
   (c) Did teachers change their perceptions of their role?
   (d) Did attitudes toward open education change?
   (e) Was there an allowance for shared decision-making?
   (f) Was there an opportunity for skills acquisition?
This researcher used the following instruments to gather data in order to respond to the above research questions; in some cases these data were used in a formative sense and in others as summative.

Assumptions About Children's Learning. This instrument was developed by Barth (1972) and is valuable as an instrument used to get information about the assumptions held by persons moving towards open education.

Barth (1972) reminds us that educators are quick to adopt, and assimilate new ideas and concepts into their cognitive and operational framework. He points out that in doing this these educators often distort the original concepts without recognizing their distortion or the assumptions violated by the distortion.

Barth contends that vocabulary and rhetoric are easily changed; however, basic beliefs and institutions often remain little affected. He states, "Implementing foreign ideas and practices is a precarious business. . . . Few have understanding of, let alone commitment to, the philosophical, personal, and professional roots from which these practices and phrases have sprung, and upon which they depend so completely for their success" (p. 97).

Barth charges every educator who is planning to use an open approach to consider the twenty-nine assumptions he's proposed and to examine their reactions to them. He believes that these reactions reveal salient attitudes about children, learning, and knowledge.

Barth reports that most open educators "strongly agree" with his assumptions. He doesn't feel however, that the success of a widespread movement towards open education in this country rests upon agreement with any philosophical position. Barth leaves no doubt on
where he stands on the open education issue when he states:

For some people, drawing attention to these assumptions may terminate interest in open education. All to the good; a well-organized, consistent, teacher-directed classroom probably has a far less harmful influence upon children than a well-intentioned but sloppy, permissive, and chaotic attempt at an open classroom in which teacher and child must live with contradiction and conflict. For other people, awareness of these assumptions may stimulate confidence and competence in their attempts to change what happens to children in school. (p. 99)

Who Decides Questionnaire. This instrument first used by Wolfson and Nash (1965) and adapted by Bunker (1974) asks 49 questions related to who makes what decisions in the classroom. The offered responses are (a) student, (b) class, (c) teacher, and (d) other.

According to Wolfson and Nash (1968) every day countless decisions are being made in the minor but some have major significance. For the most part these decisions are made by the teacher. Wolfson and Nash ask us to think about how the children in these classrooms view the decision-making processes as well as how teachers see them. Wolfson and Nash content that how individuals see a situation influences how they act.

Wolfson and Nash, based on their observations and teaching experience in the public school, believe that children in many classrooms have very little choice about the items listed in the questionnaire. They feel this is contradictory to one of the major goals of education—the development of independence.

Another point brought out by Wolfson and Nash was that in each classroom the proportion of direct to indirect teacher influence varies during the day. They remind us that the balance that one teacher maintains differs from the balance maintained by others, and that the
amount of controlling behavior has also been shown to differ among teachers. They feel that the vital issue of the balance between control and freedom has perplexed many teachers.

Wolfson and Nash (1965) ask those educators who use the "Who Decides Questionnaire" to consider some important thoughts. They state:

Teachers who value democratic objectives, such as freedom of choice, independent thinking, and individual responsibility, will find many ways in their classrooms to involve children in making choices, to explain the opportunities for decision-making that are available, and to provide opportunities for evaluating the decisions that are made.

We cannot predict the decisions that pupils will face. But we can provide a classroom atmosphere that encourages pupil participation, that values the individual, that leads toward openness to experience, and that encourages responsible decision-making. (p. 438).

Teachers Concerns Checklist. This instrument was developed by Frances F. Fuller and Gary D. Borich (1974) at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, Austin. The instrument lists 50 teacher concerns and allows the teacher to check the magnitude of his/her concern for each item.

Originally, the checklist developed by Fuller and Borich was intended to gather knowledge about teachers' concerns so that this knowledge could be used by teacher education programs at the preservice level. The concerns model predicted that concerns about teaching change over time and mature with experience. The self-survival concerns were hypothesized to be related to inexperience and pupil benefit concerns to be related to experience in teaching. By identifying the concerns felt by preservice and inservice teachers about their teaching, Borich and Fuller hoped to give teacher educators access to knowledge in order to
help them teach teachers what they felt teachers needed to know.

One obstacle to the development of the teacher concerns checklist used by this researcher was the difficulty of the authors in devising items about self-concern, impact concerns, and pupil concern which were of equal social desirability. A second problem was that when concerns were suggested to teachers, they wanted to choose them all. In addition the teachers did not choose from a suggested list the same concerns they wrote down spontaneously.

Self-concern items on the checklist are about self-survival, about insufficient skills or information, about discipline problems, about being evaluated, about being liked, and about presenting information adequately.

Concerns about others have to do chiefly with recognizing the needs of individual pupils and adapting self, teaching methods, and procedures in an attempt to meet these needs.

Impact concerns taps concerns about elements in the teaching situation that can interfere with or prevent effective teaching. Some of these concerns are (1) the lack of instructional materials, (2) insufficient clerical help for teachers, (3) lack of public support for schools, and (4) the psychological climate of the school.

Borich and Fuller give us insight into what we can expect to glean from the data provided by their instrument. They tell us:

It is our belief that differences in teaching are related to the relationship between concerns for others and concerns for self that co-exist in individual teachers. That is, teachers for whom concern for self is as high or higher than concern for others will focus less on individual pupils' needs than would teachers for whom self-concerns are less pronounced.
Still all in all, we find that teachers in all stages of training and teaching may well be the kinds of people whose basic concerns in teaching is the welfare of individual pupils. (p. 13)

Summary of Evaluations. This instrument was developed by Dr. R. Mason Bunker specifically for the Shaw participants in Workshop B.

Dr. Bunker asked the participants to respond to a number of questionnaire items. Those items were:

1. My goals for this workshop were:
2. The workshop has helped me to:
3. I still need to work on:
4. The best thing about this workshop has been:
5. I think the staff:
6. Some assumptions about Open Education:
   a. Learning is an active process
   b. Sharing decision-making increases student involvement
   c. Teachers must be responsive to students' needs
   d. Teachers need to be concerned with group processes
   e. Success is built upon success; teachers should build on strengths
   f. Teachers need to help students build healthy self-concepts.

When responding to item 6, participants were guided by two questions which provided a framework for their responses. Those guide questions were:

1. What evidence do you have that the workshop staff believe this?
2. What can you take back to Shaw?

The questionnaire ended with questions related to the participants' perceptions of the skill and competence of the workshop leader.
Dr. Bunker collected this questionnaire on the last day of Workshop B and presented his summary of evaluations to the Advisory and Learning Exchange in late July, 1975.

**Informal Questionnaire.** This instrument developed specifically for Shaw by the Advisory and Learning Exchange (1974) asked the participants to respond to six questions. Those questions were:

1. What were your goals for these few days?
2. How has the workshop helped you meet these goals?
3. What evidence do you have of your growth during these few days?
4. What evidence do you have of others' growth during these few days?
5. What do you see as your "next steps" in preparation for the fall?
6. How effective has the workshop staff been?

**Video-Tape Recording.** This researcher video-taped eight hours of the first summer's workshop. The tapes were part of the inservice design and were used to document many of the inservice activities. The eight one hour tapes were reviewed and then edited by this researcher to finalize a one-hour product. It was intended to be used as a sharing device with participants.

**Interview.** During the first summer's workshop this researcher interviewed participants asking questions which related to their perceptions of the intent of the workshop and how the workshop met their personal
expectations. Those responses were audio-taped and edited. A brief summary of those interviews appears in the Appendix.

The following figure shows how the six questions of the study were addressed by this researcher using textual material and specific and non-specific data-gathering instruments.

Summary. In this chapter the researcher identified the case school used in this study. The inservice needs of this school were detailed along with the individuals and agencies contracted to develop the inservice intervention strategies.

The problems inherent in this type of inservice effort were outlined. The plan and time-line developed by the inservice facilitators in conjunction with the Shaw administration and staff to address those problems were presented.

The author restated the six questions posed in Chapter I and identified those instruments which would be used to gather data that are important to answering those questions.

The following chapter will describe the inservice approach through the detailing of the case study.
Questions of the Study

1. What is the proposed approach to inservice teacher training?

2. How is it applied at a secondary school level?

3. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants?

4. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?

5. What are the implications of this approach to future service training projects?

6. What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?

Source of the Data

1. Review of literature in Chapter II.

2. Case Study, Chapter IV

1. Informal questionnaires
2. Bunker's study (1975)
3. "Fuller's Teacher Concerns Checklist.

1. Informal questionnaires
2. Bunker's study (1975)
3. Assumption about Children's Learning

1. Recommendations and findings in Chapter V of this study

1. Who Decides Questions
2. Informal questionnaires
3. Bunker's study (1975)
4. Interviews
CHAPTER IV
CASE STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter the writer will focus on a case study of the application of the inservice approach. The beliefs of the inservice facilitators will be restated. The two-year inservice will be described in detail and the pertinent data that resulted from that effort will be presented and analyzed. A brief chapter summary will lead to the author's final statements and recommendations that follow in Chapter V.

As was stated in Chapter III, a major problem faced by the inservice staff was how to plan for the training, curriculum development, and diagnostic procedures which had to be developed in order to implement and evaluate any program that grew out of open space and open education as adapted to the new physical plant of Shaw Junior High School. Another problem was how to best utilize the limited amount of inservice time allotted by the contract to individuals and attain the workshop objectives.

The inservice facilitators met for pre-session planning and adopted a set of beliefs which would guide their planning. Those beliefs were developed by the staff of the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Those beliefs were:

1. Participants are their own instruments for change.
2. Participants do not sabotage their own projects.
3. Participants should run on their own energy (motivation, needs, drives) not on inservice leaders.

4. Participants learn to do what it is they do and not something else.

5. Participants learn by doing.

6. Participants can be better helpers when they feel good about themselves.

7. Learning is getting new information and interacting with it. (Bunker, 1977, pp. 33-34)

In an attempt to establish an initial positive climate for the inservice effort, orientation sessions were held prior to the major inservice effort. The administration and staff of Shaw were invited to attend a half-day "Getting to know you" orientation seminar at the Advisory Center. Wine and Cheese were served those attending the initial and subsequent seminars. Parking for those who "car-pooled" was paid for by the Advisory.

The seminar was set up to inform the staff about the initiation of inservice development plans for the new school and to design a way in which selection of the participants could be made open to all the staff on the basis of informed understanding of what the nature and objectives of the summer training would be.

Those attending the orientation were told by Dr. Bunker and his staff that the workshop sessions would emphasize high energy output, creativity, and innovation. Discussions of open education and open space designs followed. At the end of the initial session, teachers were asked to commit themselves to attending the first summer's session.
Twenty-six teachers as well as the principal and one vice-principal signed up for the first session.

A second half-day orientation seminar was held with those participants who had volunteered. At this session the participants agreed upon and established expectancies and goals for the two-week summer program; thus, participants helped set goals and outcomes for their workshop and administrative support was increased.

The inservice workshop as described at the orientation seminars was specifically designed to help the teachers of Shaw prepare for their movement into the new school plant. Participants were expected to explore ways of developing the physical, temporal, and human resources within a team and within their classrooms. The initial workshop activities were to focus on defining and describing open education, looking at learners in open classrooms and participating in activities which demonstrated the underlying elements of open education.

Workshop A, Summer 1974

Schedule of Workshop Activities:

Monday, June 24: Defining the Open Classroom. What is it? What isn't it? What does it look like? What are the goals? How does it feel to participate in an "open" experience?

Workshop "A" began on Monday, June 24. The workshop facilitators arrived early and began to set up for the day's activities. Coffee, tea, and donuts were to be made available, free of charge the first day, to the participants. A large chart was placed on a table near the door to serve as a "sign-in" sheet. Next to the sign-in sheet was another sheet which detailed the day's project activities and topics.
These were tentatively set at the pre-session planning of the workshop facilitators.

When the participants arrived at the school at 9:00 a.m., the first thing they saw was the sign-in sheet and the instructions for the day's activities. The workshop leaders had brought Polaroid Square-Shooter—two cameras and film. The participants were instructed to pair off. Each member of the pair was to take a picture of the other. After they had taken the pictures, they were to get a 3" x 5" file card, pick up some refreshments and sit in a quiet place to interview one another.

The pictures were posted on a bulletin board within the workshop area. The information from the interviews was posted under the appropriate picture. Information about the person's interests, hobbies, other interesting aspects of the person's life along with his/her name and subject taught served as the core of the necessary information.

One of the first day's objectives was to expose the participants to an "open" experience. Dr. Bunker had placed in four separate areas one card out of a set of Environment Study Activity Cards (Elementary Science Study, Inc.). Dr. Bunker explained that this activity was to allow the participants to be involved in active learning and would be the first activity to develop group dynamics.

Dr. Bunker began a discussion on defining open education and its goals. The Bussis/Chittenden (1970) model of open education was used as the focal point of discussion. After discussing the model the workshop was open to general questioning and discussion. Two of the
participants asked questions about the relationship between what was to be presented in the workshop and its relevancy to the new Shaw facility. Several participants responded to the question.

Following the discussion on open education, there was a ten-minute sharing and discussion of the "ES" cards. The participants were asked to divide themselves into four groups centering around one out of the four activity task cards. Those cards read (a) collect materials to create art and create it, (b) collect materials from the environment and create something commercial, (c) collect evidence of a good change, bad change, and neither good nor bad change and tell how you feel about it. The smaller groups were then allowed to prepare for presentations to the larger group the following day.

The workshop leaders passed out bibliographies (see Appendix A) to the participants and encouraged them to check out books from the workshop library that was set up prior to their arrival. Many of the books were listed on their bibliographies. If a book from the library did not appear on the bibliography it was to be added.

Dr. Bunker and the Advisory leaders carefully outlined the expectations for the participants. The participants were asked to bring reactions to any of the day's activities to the next session. These reactions could be written and/or oral. The participants were encouraged to bring in refreshments for the next session.

Tuesday, June 25: Planning in the Open Classroom

How to extend learning experiences.
What are some planning strategies that work?
How can we begin planning for now? for Fall?
Tuesday's activities were to center around planning in the open classroom. After the participants signed in and had refreshments, the session began with the voicing of concerns about teaching in an open space building. This was followed by a discussion on various books which had been read overnight, borrowed from the workshop library.

Time was allotted for filling out the University of Massachusetts registration sheets, then the larger group formed into the smaller groups selected the previous day. Somehow a fifth group was formed the previous day. This new group decided to create a new numeration system as its presentation.

Each group was given ten minutes to explain its presentation which this researcher video-taped. After the group presentations the participants were asked to share their feelings about the activity. A number of participants felt the activity served to break down the tension usually associated with inservice workshops. One participant reminded the group that at the secondary level each teacher was subject-oriented and that perhaps the activity could not be used with her students. Others disagreed and were able to see ways of adapting the activity to their own classrooms.

In order to extend the environmental study activity and to address the concerns arising from it, brainstorming was the next strategy presented to the group. "Change" was used as the major theme to be considered. Many terms related to change were called out and written on the board. Flow-charting activities and courses for changes were presented. The idea of change was approached from various subject areas. The participants were asked to bring in a
flow-chart the following day that covered a daily lesson or an entire unit within their particular discipline. This activity was developed in order to give the participants an opportunity to practice the skill of brainstorming.

In their proposal there were three areas in which the Shaw staff felt they needed inservice input. Those areas were: (a) time, (b) space, and (c) resources (human and physical). After discussion in these areas, the workshop participants were asked, through self-selection, to enter into one of three groups which would address those areas.

The first task of each group was to brainstorm all related ways of solving their problem. They were encouraged to explore what others were doing and find out what people had done in other cities to solve the problems related to either time, space, or resources. The staff planned to provide work-time each day during which teams would work together during the next three days. On the fourth day they would be expected to share their findings with the larger group.

Wednesday, June 26: Curriculum Building in the Open Classroom

Opening conventional curriculum materials
Using integrating themes
Skill inventories for diagnosis and assessment
Using planning matrices

Dr. Bunker and three members of the Advisory staff structured this session's activities into four learning areas: (1) task analysis, (2) skills inventory, (3) record-keeping and (4) problem task groups. This working arrangement allowed the participants an opportunity to be active learners in an open environment. The timing of the session's were ar-
ranged to simulate one way of working in an open classroom. The participants were expected to go to each learning area on a forty-five minute per session rotation arrangement.

In these learning areas the participants became active learners. For example, they were shown current record-keeping systems used in open education classrooms. They were taken through the step-by-step process of doing a task analysis. They were shown a number of skills inventories that was being used by teachers--and not only by teachers in an open setting.

After these sessions the smaller groups came back to the larger circle to express their responses to the day's activities. The participants were told to insert into their notebooks a list of the skills and ideas shared over the course of the past few days. They were then given the overnight assignment of reporting to the group their reactions to the group sharing process at the end of the day. Also, they were to tell any plans they might have been making as a result of interacting with the new ideas and skills. Participants were challenged by the facilitators to tell how the ideas and concepts exposed thus far in the workshop made sense to them. How, for example, could they use the Environmental Study Cards in their particular classroom?

Time was again provided for participants to share their readings. The last few minutes of the session were set aside for the three main task groups to come together to discuss their concerns which evolved from the more in-depth discussion of the tasks in which they had become involved.
At the close of the session the participants were reminded of the next day's guest speaker, Mr. Robert H. Gillette (see Appendix B). They were given hand-outs which explained who Gillette was and how what he was to talk about would have a direct bearing on them.

Thursday, June 27: Provisioning in the Open Classroom

Record-keeping systems
Making use of space
Making use of resources
Making things for the classroom

This fourth session began with a discussion by the participants of books read during the past few days. Theory was translated into practical "how-to" realism as it was to be applied at the new Shaw school.

In order to add another dimension to the activities, the workshop leaders invited Mr. Robert H. Gillette, the holder of the Mary Gresham Chair, New England Program in Teacher Education, Fairfield, Connecticut to address the group. Gillette was asked to meet with the group because the facilitators felt his background of having worked with the same type of students that attend Shaw would give credibility to many of the workshop concepts.

Gillette began his presentation by involving all present in a name game. He asked each person to introduce himself/herself and prefix some action work to his/her first name, i.e., "Writing Jim," "Fussing Betty," etc.

His method of getting the participants to feel at ease prior
to presenting his lecture had a significant impact on the participants. Later, each participant voiced how this same "warm-up" could be used in the classroom, especially in the beginning of the school day.

Gillette described his Operation Turn-On (OTO) program initiated some five years previous to help troubled adolescents. The program which was developed to provide an integrated learning environment sought to accelerate student growth which included groping, making mistakes, and learning from the experiences. An effort was made to help young adults turn themselves on to the excitement of living and continued learning. Gillette stressed that the most important goal of OTO was to help students help themselves prepare for the future shock that awaits them. Gillette went on to state:

The key to future success in living is the possession of a positive stance that allows for continued educability. Even more than today, the future citizen will need to continue to grow, to be able to solve problems of the future and make decisions with clarity, intelligence, and compassion.

Teaching for educability means that we try to help the student become an agent of his own growth. We try to teach the skills and attitudes that ensure the students' ability and desire to continue to acquire knowledge and develop the self-reliance needed to cope with life's confusion and frustration. We try to nurture those skills of reasoning and attitudes which make for mature, autonomous, and humane individuals.
Emphasizing the process of learning and maturing doesn't mean that we sacrifice academic quality. The program is accountable for academic skill development along with the human potential development that is of such crucial importance to the adolescent.

Gillette admonished the group that they shouldn't duplicate the OTO model in its entirety. A few of the participants voiced their opinions that the OTO model could not possibly work with the kinds of students attending Shaw. They wanted to know if Gillette had tried the model with inner-city Black youth. Gillette acknowledged that he had not but felt sure many of the OTO's objectives could be realized by the Shaw staff.

Other Shaw participants concluded that they had to face the opening of the new Shaw with an open mind. They had a sense of "we can do it" in their commentary. A copy of Gillette's lecture was given each participant.

In attendance at this particular session was Mr. Gilbert Diggs, the Regional Assistant Superintendent. He stated that in order to preserve their sanity the participants must realize that any process will meet with some frustration. Diggs emphasized that as educators they had the responsibility to pursue realistic change.

Diggs was here as the official representative of the Superintendent of Schools and of the Board of Education. He made it clear to all present that this was an experiment in education at the secondary level that had never been attempted by previous administrations. He emphasized that the community would have a watchful eye on what
actually would happen at the new Shaw.

Also in attendance at this session was Percy L. Ellis, Jr., the Principal of Shaw. Mr. Ellis reacted to the lecture and talks by saying he felt the key to Gillette's success was Gillette himself. Ellis then gave the strengths, as he saw it, of the Shaw faculty. He then talked about the keys to a successful program and projects as they related to the old and new Shaw.

Ellis' attendance and supportive commentary gave additional boost and support to the participants who discussed the day's session well past the scheduled closing time.

Friday, June 28: Managing the Open Classroom

Shared decision-making, group processes, contracts
Planning teams sharing
Next steps?

When the participants arrived on Friday the bulletin board topic for the day was "Managing the Open Classroom." The sub-topics included using (a) "What? So What? Now What?" (b) shared decision making, (c) planning teams sharing and (d) next steps.

Dr. Bunker addressed the group and reiterated many of the ideas shared by the previous day's speakers. He challenged the participants to ask realistic questions as "What? So What? and Now What?" (see Borton, 1970, p. 22) as they relate to their own teaching situation. Discussion of those questions followed.

The workshop leaders held sessions on shared decision-making in which the participants were given problems which necessitated a
solution derived from consensus. Another session on group processes involved stating a hypothetical situation in which the world was coming to an end. Each participant was told that he would survive because he had vision enough to create a bomb shelter. The shelter could also accommodate seven other persons. The participants were given a list of names (well over seven) and told to select his/her seven companions. Descriptors followed each name (see Appendix D). The participants were told that they had to reach a consensus on those who would survive. Other participants became the activity observers. The third session was on contracts. Participants were exposed to the different kinds of contracts used in an open classroom. Discussions of these activities followed in the large group.

After these discussions the participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire, "Who Decides?" (Wolfson and Nash, 1968).

Dr. Bunker contracted with each participant that they would provide a plan (due the following September) on how they could more involve students in the decision making process. A brainstorming session took place and the participants voiced projected ways of doing this. Group task reports followed on the agenda (see Appendix D).

Monday, July 1: Integrating the Open Classroom

Turn on Agents: Bookbinding, Batik, Tie Dye
Extensions into other subject areas
Learning centers

The workshop was now entering its second week. Monday's agenda stressed integrating the open classroom. The participants would be exposed to (a) turn-on agents (bookbinding, batik, tie-dye)
(b) extensions into other subject areas, and (c) learning centers.

The session was constructed so that the three activities went on simultaneously in an area similar to that of an open space environment. The larger group divided itself into three smaller groups and went to one of the three activity areas.

At the area titled "turn-on agents," the participants engaged in the tasks of developing skills in binding books. This skill, as well as the other arts of batiking and tie-dyeing were taught by the art consultant from the Advisory. Participants brought to the workshop session pages to be included in their finished books. Tee-shirts were tie-dyed and handkerchiefs batikted.

The session on extensions into other subject areas was very informal. The participants had a "rap session" on the many ways a subject could be extended in order to incorporate concepts and learning from other content areas.

The session on "learning centers" provided the participants an opportunity to work at some of the centers set up around the room by the workshop leaders. The rationale behind learning centers and their effectiveness in the open environment met with much discussion. Participants were encouraged to create some learning centers for classroom usage.

At the end of the sessions, an exhibit of the artistic products was placed around the workshop area. The participants were asked to think of ways to incorporate these activities into their teaching/learning situations. Many creative ideas were suggested for each of the separate disciplines.
The three task groups met for the remainder of the session to plan for reporting to the larger group.

**Tuesday, July 2: Developing Curriculum for Shaw, September**

Set up interdisciplinary teams to:
- (a) plan a turn-on agent
- (b) brainstorm projects, skills, goals, concepts, etc.
- (c) flow-chart a schedule
- (d) list resources/materials needed
- (e) inventory skills lists (diagnosis)
- (f) plan for shared-decision making

Tuesday's session was given over to the Shaw staff so that they might focus on developing curriculum for Shaw in September. Interdisciplinary teams were set up to (a) plan turn-on agents (b) brainstorm projects, skills, goals, concepts, etc. (c) flow-chart a schedule, (d) list resources/materials needed (e) inventory skills lists (diagnosis) (f) plan for shared decision making, (g) create learning centers, activity packages, activity cards, (h) design record-keeping systems for self, for kids (evaluations, and (i) decide next steps.

The three original task groups (time, space, resources) met separately for an hour then came together for the final presentations. Each group listed priorities for the fall which included, among other things:

1. An open space pilot program--the intent being to divide the old Shaw building into pods by grade level and use an interdisciplinary approach to teaching. This plan was to include all Shaw personnel. The 46 teachers were to be divided into three groups. A session each semester was to be tried using either the space in the gymnasium or as
Mr. Ellis, the Principal, suggested, the cafeteria.

2. A modular scheduling plan--this was presented to the Principal as an option to the traditional scheduling that takes place in secondary schools.

3. A proposal for an open space teacher exchange--the thought here was to give Shaw teachers an opportunity to work in actual open space facilities. Since facilities did not exist in Washington, it was felt that contact should be made to the surrounding counties of Prince Georges or Montgomery where some schools had partial openness at the secondary level.

The Principal addressed the group and expressed his pleasure with the group's accomplishments during the workshop sessions. He enthusiastically welcomed the group's plans for the pilot open space plans and offered the cafeteria as an area for consideration. Ellis did however, express his concern over the planned 36 exits in the new building that would go unmanned during the school day. He charged the participants to assist him in finding a solution to that potential problem area.

Many positive comments were sounded during the course of the sharing sessions. Participants stated that:

We covered more territory in this week than we have in the past year. . . . We really know each other better. . . . Our bulletin boards communicate visually . . . Ideas can develop into realities and these can cause change. . . . In open space we cannot feel that someone is encroaching upon our private territory.

This was a very lively session with the participants feeling very positive about their accomplishments over the last 7 days.
Wednesday, July 3: Continuing Sharing, Evaluating, and Next Stepping

What have we done? Evaluating the workshop.
Where are we going? Sharing fall plans.
What will we need?
How can we help one another?
Now what? Contracting for the next meeting.

The last day's session centered on continued sharing, evaluating, and next steps. The participants were asked to address themselves to these questions (a) What have we done? (evaluating the workshop) (b) Where are we going? (sharing fall plans), (c) What will we need? (d) How can we help one another? (e) Now what? (contracting for the next meeting).

This was the final session for Workshop "A". The participants shared with the group their feelings about the value of the summer experience. Each participant also shared plans for the fall.

In order to satisfy the requirements of the course and more specifically the requirements of the University as they regard graduate extension credit, an individual contract was submitted to Dr. Bunker by each workshop participant. This contract was to be fulfilled by the October follow-up session.

A luncheon provided the informal setting in which extended sharing was conducted and good-byes were said. Most feedback from the evaluation forms, which will be discussed later in this chapter, indicated that this was a very successful workshop.

In agreement with the contractor, the Advisory and Learning Exchange agreed to provide follow-up activities for the Shaw staff during the fall semester following the first summer's workshop.
To fulfill that agreement the Advisory provided activities that facilitated communication among the "summer group," the total Shaw staff, and the Advisory.

Follow-up activities included:

1. **Committee Meetings**—where participants set up procedures for ordering materials, (by contract each summer participant was given $50 to purchase supplies) made decisions about follow-up activities at Shaw during the fall and planned for the next summer's workshop.

2. **Classroom Visits**—where Advisory staff saw evidence of plans made during the summer, and following through on "contracts" confirmed in the fall.

3. **Whole Group Meetings**—where participants shared their experiences and further identified needs.

4. **Workshop**—where participants were provided with specific skills related to subject matter and process, and fulfilled all requirements for credit from the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

5. **Letters and/or Telephone Conversations**—where individuals received information and/or shared concerns.

Because of the high motivation of participants during the first summer workshop, fall follow-up activities began almost immediately. Four committees functioned constantly to ensure that the mechanisms devised during the summer to keep the mutual support and enthusiasm going among the staff remained in operation. They were Time, Space, Resources and Follow-up.
Teachers were allotted $50 towards the purchase of materials. This money was provided so that the participants could purchase some of the material they had interacted with during the summer, or any other materials that would facilitate their movement towards openness. The Shaw teachers were reminded that this money could be used for individual purchases or in cooperative purchases with two or more persons. The latter was highly valued by the Advisory staff as it contributed to one of the mutual goals of the summer workshop which was to encourage sharing between and among teachers.

The early fall meetings were held at the Advisory and related to planning for communications with the total faculty about the summer. The Shaw staff came to the Advisory as individuals or in small groups to use the Advisory catalog file as they began to select materials to be ordered for use in their classrooms. Criteria for selection of materials had been established in the first summer workshop. All materials ordered should relate to some activity which would engage students to actively participate in their own learning.

Several interdisciplinary support groups were established during the workshop which helped sustain sharing across subject matter areas. This was seen as very important behavior in moving teachers from traditional to more open ways of teaching. The Advisory staff, as outlined in the proposal, provided advisory services to individual teachers through numerous on-site visits at their request.

In September, the Communications Committee of Shaw conducted a faculty meeting and informed faculty members who were not part of the first summer's workshop of what went on during the workshop and
how these summer participants planned to function during the current school year.

A one-day conference promised in the contract was held October 31. Advisory staff met with task group representatives and the follow-up committee of Shaw on October 20 to set the agenda for the conference. Conference activities included:

- Viewing slides and the edited version of the video-tape of the summer workshop.

- Reports from the Space, Resources, Time, Field Visits, and Materials Committees.

- Sharing of progress based on "contracts" negotiated by participants.

- Taking new measures of where each person was based on Barth's Assumptions and the Who Decides questionnaire.

- Reviewing what open use of space, time, and resources demanded of them as teachers and administrators--how theory affected practice.

- Exploring staff development needs and ways of finding time to achieve these.

This session held on Halloween was festive with an array of fall colors around the room and a table of refreshments prepared by members of the Advisory staff. Those present expressed considerable delight about the "Summer" group being together again.

Dr. Bunker shared that since they last met he had been talking with many educators throughout the United States and Canada and was beginning to realize just how far the Shaw staff had really come.
Most participants were excited about sharing their experiences over the past two months. One participant criticized the activity period of the pilot program. This person indicated that many activities were going on during the period involving many children and she didn't feel the period was functioning as it should.

Mr. Ellis, the Principal, explained that the period was to be used, by those with a homeroom group, to counsel students.

Dr. Bunker reminded the group that the movement from a traditional classroom to one that is open was not for everybody.

Another important part of the fall meeting was the "contract reports." These were the contracts the individual participants made with Dr. Bunker as partial fulfillment of the course requirements.

One participant told how she attempted to involve her students in planning a lesson. She explained to the students what should be included in a good lesson. Class discussion followed ending in the class asking her to just tell them what to do. The teacher indicated to the conference participants that the children were just accustomed to being talked to not with. Dr. Bunker suggested that the teacher set up a decision-making situation where the students would have to make a choice of doing one thing or another.

Another teacher told of his classes writing booklets. Some, he reported, were 35 pages long. The purpose of the books was to improve self-concept. The booklets contained a table of contents, poems, pictures of Black history, autobiographies, and summaries. Once a week the teacher and the students had a rap session. Those
students taking typing and/or art incorporated that learning into their booklet. This teacher also used the television situation comedy "Good Times" as a teaching tool.

Two of the teachers had decided to team teach and were using the techniques of brainstorming and flow-charting. Others who decided to team offered their students "free choice" activities, contracting, and committee work.

As this session was coming to a close, Dr. Bunker asked the participants to place on a 5" x 8" card the things they had been doing and the next steps they anticipated taking. The cards were to specifically state what the participants had been doing in their classrooms, what they meant to do, and what was ahead of them. These cards were to be given to a designated staff member by the 8th of November and these were to be sent to Dr. Bunker.

Throughout the year the Shaw staff requested and received, workshops, reading materials, and on-site support in the areas of:

- Test-taking, Record-keeping--this workshop was conducted by Dr. Masha Rudman, Associate Professor of Education from the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst.

- Human Relations/Group Dynamics/Values Clarification/Social Skills and Basic Skills--these were conducted by Dr. James Comer of the Advisory Board of Directors and an Associate Professor of Psychology, Yale University/New Haven.
The Advisory staff conducted these workshops:

- Interdisciplinary Approach
- Learning Centers/Teacher-made Materials/Individualized Instruction
- Room Arrangement

The Advisory staff was extremely satisfied with the leadership that developed from the committee structure and the follow-up sessions. The principal encouraged and supported teachers in making many of the decisions about how they would function in workshops and back at school. Time, which is always a critical factor in working with an inservice project, was manipulated successfully by this group. School time, as well as after school time, was negotiated for large and small group meetings as well as for workshops. The principal on several occasions gave regular faculty meetings over to the committee for follow-up sessions.

When the first summer's Follow-up Committee met to plan for the next intensive summer workshop they felt satisfied about the growth they could observe in themselves and others. This growth was manifested in the planning skills they were exhibiting towards a new group, and most importantly in their ability to face honestly where they still needed to go.

Workshop B, Summer 1975

The Follow-up Committee met at Shaw on March 25 to set up priorities of needs and made decisions about the substance of workshops for the remainder of the school year, and the dates and times of such workshops. The dates set for the second Summer Institute (Workshop B) were June 23 through July 3, in the Brookland School. This site
was chosen because it afforded the participants an opportunity to work in an open space environment. This school was also one which housed grades K-8. It was felt by the workshop leaders that some light could be shed on the particular problems associated with junior high students in an open setting. The administrators of the Brookland School were to be available to serve as resources to the participants.

Other planning meetings were scheduled for April 30 to involve those who were expected to implement the second summer's workshop. They were the original planning team of Dr. Bunker, Andrea Irby and this writer from the Advisory. A follow-up meeting was scheduled for May which would allow the team of facilitators to finalize the summer's inservice agenda.

The sessions for Workshop "B", the second summer's workshop were held at Brookland from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Participants included twenty teachers, one principal, one assistant principal, and two teacher's aides. Of the 24 participants, 11 were returning from Session A of the workshop held the previous summer.

It was the intent of the consultant team in designing the workshop to provide an environment in which participants could engage in team planning, be involved in decision-making, be active learners, and acquire specific skills with the emphasis on the assessment and development of individual rather than on the assessment and development of an over-all plan for the new Shaw.
Schedule of Workshop Activities:

Monday, June 23

Name tag
Picture taking/Interviews
Group introductions
Expectations
Task group
"Openness at Brookland" (host school)
Wrap-up

As with Workshop "A", the previous year, it was hoped that this format would allow the participants an opportunity to realize the full impact of the open approach in an open setting.

The first day's schedule was similar to that of the previous summer. The bulletin board was at the front of the learning area, and cameras, film and refreshments were ready. The agenda topics were: (a) Name tags (picture taking/interviews (c) group introductions (d) expectations (e) task groups (f) openness at Brookland (host school) (g) wrap up.

In order to develop an atmosphere of community, each participant was asked to make a name tag, pair off, take photographs, and conduct interviews. Each participant was introduced to the larger group through information provided by the interview strategy. The workshop staff then developed with the participants a number of expectations for the workshop. Task groups were formed to assist in the general maintenance of the workshop area and in materials and supplies dispersal.

Shirley Hammond, the Principal of the host school, addressed the participants on "Openness" as practiced at Brookland. This
informative talk included the areas of scheduling, grouping (teachers and students) record-keeping, evaluation, resources, and progress reporting. Brookland is a K-8 facility and functions more on the order of a secondary facility.

This first session was used to develop the format and direction of the remainder of the workshop.

**Tuesday, June 24**

Committee meetings and reports
"Team planning"
Small group discussion
Wrap-up

Committee meetings and reports, team planning, small group discussion, and the wrap-up highlighted Tuesday's agenda.

Andrea Irby, of the Advisory staff, began this session with an exercise which dealt with astrological signs. The objective of this warm-up was to discover points of similarity among the group participants and to establish group commonality, i.e., to focus upon the ways they were alike as opposed to the ways they differed. This activity was suggested as a strategy for getting students to work together.

Some general aspects of open education were discussed, such as (a) teaming, team-building and team-teaching, and (b) structure or model of teaching. This led the group into the next activity which was a presentation by John Lopez a doctoral student from the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, on "Team Planning."
In the system described by Lopez, children were grouped heterogeneously. Four general areas were proposed for consideration when deciding on a team-approach to instruction. Those general areas introduced by Lopez were:

1. Planning--Contents, objectives, process which included skills students need to know.
2. Instruction--Concepts, themes, suggested procedures.
3. Management--Time, space, record-keeping, resources
4. Evaluation--Student/Teacher

In order to provide clarity for these topics and to maximize participation by the Shaw teachers, Lopez divided the group into smaller groups to discuss the adolescent characteristics for each of the following four areas: (a) social, (b) intellectual, (c) psychological, and (d) physical. The adolescent characteristics derived for each area were:

1. Social
   a. conforming
   b. opinionated
   c. critical
   d. group oriented
   e. competitive
   f. vocal

2. Intellectual
   a. curiosity
   b. critical thinkers
   c. problem solvers

3. Psychological
   a. short attention span
   b. need to develop self-esteem
   c. resentment of authority
4. Physical
   a. rapid sexual growth
   b. active
   c. awkwardness

Lopez brought the smaller groups back together to form the large group. He stressed the importance of being familiar with the characteristics of the adolescent. He indicated that not only a knowledge of the adolescent but a plan for coping with this particular age-group should be developed. He then presented a six-step approach to problem solving. Those steps were:

1. Identify the problem or puzzling situation.
2. Exploration—Encourage the exploration of the problem through guessing, hypothesizing, experimenting, etc.
3. Collect data
4. Reconsiderations based on the data
5. Collect more data if necessary
6. Test solution

This was the culminating activity for Tuesday's session.

Wednesday, June 25

Announcements
Summer A Participants in Area 1
Summer B Participants in Area 2
Shaw Survey
Curriculum planning groups
Task group meetings

Wednesday's session was the first in which the group was divided into those participants who were attending their second summer session, and new participants. The agenda called for announcements,
separate group meetings (old participants/new participants), Shaw survey, curriculum planning groups, and task group meetings.

After general announcements were made, the larger group was divided into two groups, those who had attended Workshop "A" and those who were participating for the first time. The purpose of this division was to address the concerns peculiar to each group. Dr. Bunker met with the participants attending for the first time. He developed a plan that would duplicate last summer's agenda in terms of introducing vocabulary (open education), and the theoretical background of open education. The returning participants met with the two other workshop leaders. This latter group developed individual designs of workshop goals and objectives. This was done in order to facilitate the particular needs of the returning participants based on their experiences over the past year.

The larger group reassembled and were given the Shaw Survey to respond to and discuss. This survey asked specific questions about their views and concerns on open space classroom.

Several points of view were presented regarding the value of the survey. However, a number of key statements were issued and questions posed as a result of interacting with this survey. Those statements and questions were:

1. High interest material will result in more attentiveness on the part of the student.

2. Students are made more comfortable when they have a choice in selecting what they learn.
3. Students learn better when they are permitted to apply what they already know.

4. Test scores are a major concern regarding the effectiveness of the open classroom.

5. How does one get students to respond to content materials and to absorb the kinds of learning necessary for effective survival?

6. Each person gets out of an experience according to his/her own perspective of gain and also according to how he/she sees life and views situations in terms of his/her own exposures.

7. How a teacher relates to students depends on his/her values and priorities and is acceptable as long as the goal is to get children to learn.

These seven statements reflected the views of most of the participants as to the value of the "Shaw Survey" and its implications for movement into the new facility.

Following the discussion of the Shaw Survey, the participants were asked to self-select into smaller groups. The aim was to allow the working groups time to prepare real curriculum materials for the fall. The participants divided themselves according to existing friendships and common interests. Eventually four groups were formed.

A summary of each group's objectives are as follows:

A. Group I--"Informal Assessment Strategies Group"

Objective--To determine strengths and needs of students.
B. Group II--"Moving On Up"

Objective--To explore the chosen theme in each individual's subject area while simultaneously interlocking the various subject areas.

C. Group III--"Various Roads to Rome"

Objective--To create learning situations and activities that will be conducive to students self-knowledge, self-esteem and to present several teacher-chosen learning packets that will provide options for students.

D. Group IV--"Summer School"

Objective--To develop activities that will stimulate a desire for students to attend school with regularity during the summer session.

Thursday, June 26
Friday, June 27

Announcements
Mini-sessions:
Learning centers
Using media
Student contracts
Skill inventories
Shared decision-making
Getting to the content areas from a turn-on activity

Curriculum planning groups

Full sessions took place on Thursday and Friday of the first week. After the morning announcements the participants were given the choice of these mini-sessions: (a) learning centers, (b) using media, (c) student contracts, (d) skill inventories, (e) shared decision
making, (f) getting to the content areas from a turn-on activity. The day closed with the participants working in their curriculum planning groups.

These two workshop sessions provided the participants with an opportunity to develop and/or refine skills in a number of areas. The mini-sessions were selected from the needs assessment board set up at the first session. The participants had been asked to place on a 3" x 5" card some hands-on activities they wanted presented during the course of the workshop. Another board was used as a Resource Board on which participants were asked to list known resources at Shaw, both human and physical.

Each participant chose an activity in which to involve himself/herself. It was at this point in the workshop that the instructional staff had its best opportunity to model effective open education practice. Opportunities were given to the participants for shared decision-making, active learning, and skills acquisition. Movement was free and easy throughout both sessions.

Monday, June 30

Announcements
"Scheduling in open space"
"Modular scheduling"
Mini-sessions:
    Learning centers
    Using media
Curriculum planning groups

Monday's agenda was very tightly scheduled. Announcements, scheduling in open space, modular scheduling, mini-sessions and curriculum planning groups highlighted this session.
The warm-up activity, initiated this session by one of the participants, had the other participants divide into small groups by place of birth. The groups were then asked to list values according to priorities in a classroom environment. A consensus vote was necessary on all group decisions. The aim of this activity was to get the participants verbalizing the hierarchy of their own values in relationship to their colleagues and to place in perspective how those values had implications to what happens in the classroom.

The value of this experience was evidenced when the smaller groups rejoined to form the large and presented the following points:

1. Although many in the smaller group agreed with the overall concepts presented as being important in the classroom, several disagreed about the method used for arriving at a consensus.

2. The instruction given to the smaller groups by the leader of the activity allowed for creativity on the part of the group members.

3. It developed a broader area of learning because members of the groups were able to see that many times the limits we experience are self-imposed.

4. When groups are allowed to expand upon the rules on their own, others may feel that the conditions under which they worked were unfair.

In order to satisfy another of the workshop objectives, that of exposing the participants to persons practicing the open concept of
their level, the workshop leaders invited the host principal to address the group. Mrs. Shirley Hammond, principal of Brookland School, and Mrs. Edith Smith, Brookland's assistant principal, discussed "scheduling in the open classroom" and "modular scheduling."

Mrs. Hammond distributed literature that described the scheduling practiced at Brookland and that developed a rationale for student grouping. She shared with the participants the many resources that were available to the school. The participants were busy taking notes and suggesting ways of modifying some aspects of the Brookland program to meet the needs of the new Shaw.

The presentation by Mrs. Smith, which was supposed to be on modular scheduling, instead turned out to be a slide presentation highlighting the various programs in existence at Brookland. She hinted at times, about modular scheduling, but never gave the participants an in-depth discussion of modular scheduling or its implications to open space/open education.

The larger group later formed into three smaller groups and involved themselves in many of the activities introduced in the Thursday and Friday workshops. Later everyone met in their own respective curriculum planning groups to further define goals and objectives.
Tuesday, July 1

Announcements
Curriculum planning groups
Mini-sessions:
   Learning centers
   Questioning skills
Planning meeting, whole group

Tuesday's session focused on these topics: (a) curriculum planning (groups), (b) mini-sessions (learning centers and questioning skills), and (c) planning meetings and whole-group discussions.

The participants assembled themselves into their curriculum teams to further develop their ideas regarding the establishment of strategies to be used in the fall to facilitate student learning.

Dr. Bunker encouraged the group to think about the kinds of questions they asked during the "question-asking" session. He asked each participant to write six questions that they might ask students to respond to after completing a unit. Bunker then asked the members of the group to read some of their questions and tell the other members what the question expected the learner to do. From that beginning the group developed a list of thinking skills prompted by member questions. This question-asking session encouraged the group to think about the kinds of questions being asked of children. Questions were found that asked children to compare, contrast, and discriminate. It was the group's conclusion that when children are asked to create, all of the above skills and more are put into play.

The larger group reassembled for the wrap-up session at which time they decided to have a variety of refreshments for the last day's session. Each participant indicated what he or she would bring and in what quantity.
Wednesday, July 2

Announcement
Developing group process skills
Curriculum planning groups

Wednesday's session was turned over for the most part, to the participants. The limited agenda included (a) developing group process skills, and meeting in curriculum planning groups.

The first part of this session was used to develop group awareness. The participants were introduced, by the writer, to the theory behind Transactional Analysis, and were involved in a number of T.A. experiences. This activity led into another which allowed for the application of the T.A. theory. The activity called "strength-training" was used as a vehicle for getting the participants to behave in very positive and humanistic ways with one another. The activities appealed on a very emotional level to the participants.

The group moved into the curriculum teams and made final preparations for the next day's presentations.

Thursday, July 3

Announcements
Reports from curriculum planning groups
Luncheon

Thursday, the final day of the workshop, marked the end of Workshop "B". The curriculum planning group reported their plans to the larger group and gave copies of those plans to each participant (see Appendix E).

The workshop leader addressed the participants and expressed their pleasure at having been involved with the Shaw staff in their
inservice project. A luncheon followed, and the participants, as well as the workshop leaders, looked positively towards the transition from old Shaw to new.

Pre-determined follow-up sessions were not scheduled after the second summer workshop because the conditions of the inservice contract had been fulfilled. It was also expected that the new Shaw facility would open the following January. The administration and staff of Shaw were encouraged to take advantage of the many offerings regularly scheduled at the Advisory during the upcoming year.

Summary

In reviewing the inservice approach used for the Shaw Junior High School of Washington, D.C., the special note should be made of specific strategies used to promote workshop success. Those strategies as indicated by Dr. Bunker, Andrea Irby and this writer, were:

1. Room arrangement--The workshop area was set up to model a functioning open class. Learning centers were placed throughout the area; usage was made of a wide variety of audio-visuals; participants' work decorated the room; space was set aside for both individual and group work; free movement within the open environment was encouraged by the workshop leaders; materials were available to the participants for creative expression (construction paper, glue, magic markers, crayons, U-film, cassette tapes, cameras, thermal masters, ditto paper, etc.).
2. Opening and ending workshop sessions—Each day as the participants arrived at the workshop location they would sign in on a chart placed at the entrance. Refreshments were always available, usually in the form of coffee and/or tea and donuts. After each participant had been refreshed one of the workshop leaders or one of the participants would involve the total group in what was called a "warm-up" activity. Interesting commentary always followed the warm-up activity and set the tone for the day's other activities.

At the close of each session, the participants were brought back together in a large group to share reflections on the day's activities. Agenda items for the next day would be discussed and overnight and long-term assignments would be reviewed. The workshop leaders would meet after the participants left and organize the necessary plans and materials for the next session. They would critique that day's session in terms of their own performance.

This methodology always allowed closure for each day's session.

3. Committees—The workshop leaders promoted the establishment of working committees. These committees were responsible for setting up the refreshments in the morning, setting up and maintaining the bulletin boards, conducting some of the warm-up activities, maintaining the checking in and out of materials from the workshop library, monitoring
the appearance of the learning environment, completing
curriculum tasks, and developing curriculum plans.

These committees were vital in the smooth operation of
the workshops. The committees also served as models to be
tried in the participants' teaching/learning environment.

Staff gave particular attention to the considerations for effective
inservice proposed in Chapter II, as they planned and implemented the
two summer workshops. Consideration 1: "In order for inservice
programs to have optimum effectiveness they must be designed with an
understanding of the kinds of changes or outcomes and goals that may
reasonably be expected from the inservice efforts," was met through
the original proposal conceived by the Shaw staff, refined by the
Advisory staff, and made functional by the workshop staff.

Consideration 2: "Administrative leadership is needed to assure
effective planning and implementation," was attended to in a number of
ways:

1. Both the administration and staff of Shaw recognized the
   need for an intensive inservice program and therefore wrote
   a proposal.

2. The central administration of the School Board approved
   and financed Shaw's proposal.

3. The principal of Shaw was an active participant in both
   Summer workshops. His attendance and supportive
   commentary gave additional boost and support to the
   participants.
4. In attendance at one of the sessions and giving support and encouragement to the participants was the Regional Assistant Superintendent for the Shaw area.

5. The vice-principal of Shaw was also an active participant.

Consideration 3: "The inservice participant must be actively involved in the basic design of the inservice program, including implementation" was addressed in these ways:

1. The participants designed the inservice program through the formulation of the original proposal.

2. Participants provided input into the final inservice design through their participation in the pre-session planning meetings.

3. Interdisciplinary teams were established which dealt specifically with:
   a. Defuzzing goal statements
   b. Exploring alternative approaches to the use of time, space, and resources (human and physical)
   c. Developing strategies for moving towards workshop goals
   d. Developing strategies for building curriculum
   e. Keeping a "log" which recorded and evaluated each day's activities.

Analysis of the Data

Thus the original Shaw proposal and the subsequent advisory proposal dealt specifically with the salient points of consideration one. The pre-session planning Workshops "A" and "B", and the follow-up
sessions directly focused on the concepts proposed by considerations two and three. The remaining sections of this chapter will detail the plans built into the inservice design to specifically address consideration four. "Some evaluative design for gathering feedback must be built into the inservice component."

Formative Evaluation

In an effort to provide formative data the workshop staff as they planned and implemented Workshop A, a number of approaches were taken during the first few days.

Fuller's Teacher Concerns

One such instrument used to sample participant perceptions of what was of major concern to them was the "Teacher Concerns Checklist." This instrument developed by Fuller and Borich (1974) lists fifty teacher concerns, concerns which deal with self, others, and impact. The checklist allows the individual to check the magnitude of his/her concern for each item. The levels of concern are "not concerned," "a little concerned," "moderately concerned," "very concerned," and "totally preoccupied."

Raw data from this instrument were collected during the second day of Workshop "A" and were tabulated into the frequency of responses for each item on the checklist. The frequencies of response were converted into percentages. The tables used to reflect the data (Tables 1-3) focus on the three categories of concern addressed by the checklist. Twenty-one of the participants responded to the checklist.
Table 1 reflects the respondents' concern about those items pertaining to self. It appears from the data that all of the 21 respondents were "moderately" to "very concerned" about item one on the checklist. The item reflects a concern about teaching content. A closer look at the data reveals that the item receiving the second highest percentage (80%) of responses, item forty-eight, not only focused on content but upon improving one's proficiency in that content.

Teachers seemed the least concerned about insufficient time to think (item 17). Most indicated that in terms of self this was the least of their concerns.

Although teachers were not "totally preoccupied" with any item on the checklist and did not seem too concerned about whether or not the students really liked them (item 2), they were much more concerned about being accepted and respected by other professionals (item 41).

Almost all (N=18) of the respondents expressed a concern over being able to maintain an appropriate level of classroom control (item 11). Although five of the respondents indicated no concern whatsoever about receiving a favorable evaluation of their teaching (item 19) eighteen reveal a good deal of concern about feeling adequate as a teacher (item 38). All but four of the respondents have a concern over the lack of opportunities that present themselves for professional growth (item 21).

Overall the wide distribution of frequencies suggest that the respondents allow themselves varying degrees of concern about the checklist items related to self.

Table 2 outlines the respondents' degree of concern about others. Respondents were the most concerned about the learning problems of students (item 20). However, they were less concerned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Not concerned</th>
<th>A little concerned</th>
<th>Moderately concerned</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Totally preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Selecting and teaching content well.
2. Whether the students really like me or not.
4. Lack of freedom to initiate innovative instructional programs.
10. Feeling under pressure too much of the time.
11. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control.
12. Frustrated by the routine and inflexibility of the situation.
14. Being in constant demand by students.
15. Doing well when a supervisor is present.
17. Insufficient time to think.
21. Lack of opportunity for professional growth.
22. Too many noninstructional rules.

42. 0  0.0  5  23.8  8  38.1  8  38.1  0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Not concerned</th>
<th>A little concerned</th>
<th>Moderately concerned</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Totally preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  .28  15  4.2  104  29.13  237  66.39  0  0.0
about the slow progress of certain students (item 43). The data reflect a great deal of concern on the part of the respondents for others.

Ten of the seventeen items on this checklist received one hundred percent of the responses in the degree of "moderately concerned" or "very concerned." Although the data do not indicate any preoccupation with concern for others, the data do suggest that the respondents invest a good deal of concern about others, especially students' feelings (item 3), student motivation and need (items 7, 16, 26, & 46), student health and nutrition (item 31), and student intellectual and emotional growth (item 39). Sixteen were very concerned that they would be able to recognize the social as well as the emotional needs of their students (item 49). All but one expressed a moderate to very concerned position on those issues that relate to insuring that students have a firm grasp of the fundamentals (item 23) and that they be able to apply those fundamental skills effectively (item 28). Helping students to value learning (item 45), and being fair and impartial (item 18) each received fourteen responses that indicated a very high level of concern by those responding to the checklist.

The data reveal that almost all of the responses were either "moderately concerned" or "very concerned" in this section of the checklist that reflect concern for others.

The data in Table 3 reflect the respondents' concern about those issues which impact upon education. It is interesting to note that one hundred percent of the respondents were either "moderately"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Not concerned</th>
<th>A little concerned</th>
<th>Moderately concerned</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Totally preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 315 100
or "very concerned" about the nature and quality of instructional materials (item 5).

Three of the twenty-one respondents did not have concern about ineffective faculty meetings (item 27); although eight were "very concerned." The remaining ten were evenly divided between "a little concerned" and "moderately concerned."

Other than the one mentioned item on instructional materials, only one item mustered the overwhelming concern of the respondents. . . "lack of public support for schools" (item 36). Nineteen of the twenty-one respondents expressed more than "a little concern" for this issue.

In the area of teacher salaries (item 47), the respondents were almost divided evenly in their degree of concern. Eleven indicated "moderately" to "very concerned" while ten had "no concern" or only "a little concern" about this particular item.

A total compilation of the responses on this table indicates that the respondents were only slightly more than sixty percent "moderately" to "very concerned" about those issues, as presented by Fuller and Borich, that impact upon teaching and learning.

Another instrument administered to determine the approach to be used when setting workshop goals was the Assumption About Children's Learning (Table 4) developed by Roland S. Barth (1972). This instrument used to get information about the assumptions held by persons moving toward open education is a nominal-scale questionnaire. It consists of twenty-nine items dealing with assumptions about
children's learning (questions one through twenty-four) and assumptions about knowledge (questions twenty-five through twenty-nine). Below each assumption, five choices are given and each respondent checked his/her level of response. The levels of response are "strongly agree," "agree," "no strong feeling," "disagree," and "strongly disagree."

The number of participants responding to this questionnaire was twenty-four. Raw data for this instrument were collected on the third day of Workshop "A". Data are presented in frequency tables. The frequency of responses is converted to percentages for each item. Tables 4, 5 and 6 reflect the marked assumptions held by the twenty-four persons who responded to the questionnaire.

Table 4 reflects three of the four categories that are listed under "Assumptions About Children's Learning." The initial section of the questionnaire asked participants to indicate their level of response to assumptions about "motivation." Slightly more than eighty-three percent (N=20) of the respondents agreed with the first assumption that children are innately curious and will explore their environment without adult intervention. Respondents were seventy-nine percent (19) in agreement with the second assumption that exploratory behavior is self-perpetuating.

Under the section entitled "conditions for learning" it is interesting to note that for assumptions three and five, both dealing with the exploratory behavior of children, approximately eighty-seven percent (21) and ninety-one percent (22) of the participants agreed,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Strong Feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for Learning</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respectively, with the assumptions. There was, however, one participant in the group of respondents who did not agree that the child will display natural exploratory behavior if not threatened (assumption three) and there were two who disagreed with assumption five that active exploration in a rich environment will facilitate children's learning. Assumption four which underscores the importance of confidence in self as it directly relates to one's capacity for learning was held in agreement by all but two of the respondents. None of the respondents indicated any disagreement with this particular assumption. Assumption six addressed a concept that generates considerable discussion and debate whenever it is introduced into educational agenda topics, play and its importance to learning in the early learner. The participants were somewhat divided in their responses as a little more than twenty-nine percent (7) strongly agree with the assumption and slightly more than forty-five percent (11) agreed with its basic principle. Three indicated no strong feelings one way or the other, whereas two disagreed with the concept. Assumptions seven, eight, and nine allowed the respondents to reflect on the importance of learner decision-making in the educational teaching/learning environment. Even though these questions had the common denominator of decision-making, participant responses to the three assumptions varied. Assumption seven which held that children have both the competence and the right to make significant decisions concerning their own learning had six (25%) respondents who disagreed with its basic premise, and although fifteen (62.5%)
respondents agreed, three (12.5%) indicated no strong feelings whatsoever about the assumption. On the other hand, assumption eight stressed the fact that children will be likely to learn if they are given considerable choice in the selection of materials and choice in the questions they wish to pursue with respect to those materials. Here we find that twenty-two of the twenty-four respondents agreed with this assumption, none disagreed, and only two indicated no strong feelings. One respondent disagreed that given the opportunity, children will choose to engage in activities which will be of high interest to them (assumption nine). Twenty respondents did agree with this assumption and only three indicated no strong feelings. Assumption ten which is the last under the section "conditions for learning" also had but one dissenter. Four (16.7%) respondents indicated no strong feelings as to whether or not learning is taking place when a child is fully involved in and having fun with an activity. Nineteen (79.1%) respondents were supportive of this assumption with eleven indicating strong agreement and eight agreement. Under section "C" (social learning), assumptions which deal with sharing and collaborative efforts on the part of learners, the respondents averaged an agreement rate of slightly more than eighty-seven percent (21) with the held assumptions while there was only one respondent who disagreed with either of the assumptions and only five individuals indicated no strong feelings as regards to the two held assumptions.
Reflected in Table 5 are twelve assumptions under the general category of "intellectual development" (Section "D"). Levels of responses to these assumptions ranged from a little more than fifty-eight percent (14) for assumption thirteen (concept formation proceeds very slowly) to slightly more than eighty-seven percent (21) for assumptions fourteen (children learn and develop intellectually not only at their own rate but in their own style) and nineteen (errors are necessarily a part of the learning process; they are to be expected and even desired, for they contain information essential for further learning). Twenty-five percent (6) disagreed with assumption thirteen and a little more than twenty percent (5) disagreed with assumption twenty-two (learning is best assessed intuitively, by direct observation). It seems from the data that the great majority of responses (77.2%) were in support of the proposed assumptions as against those responses that reflected disagreement (8.5%) and/or no strong feeling (14.3%). However, the percentage of agreement under this section is somewhat lower than the percentage of agreement (83.3%) that was reflected in sections "A", "B", and "C" of Table 4.
TABLE 5
ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT CHILDREN'S LEARNING (1-24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Strong Feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 73  | 25.4 | 149 | 51.8 | 41  | 14.3 | 25  | 8.5  | 0   | 0.0 |
The second part of the "Assumptions" questionnaire (see Table 6) asked the participants to respond to those assumptions proposed about knowledge. There were only five assumptions presented in this section. It is, however, in this section that the data reflect the most controversial assumptions held by the participants. Assumption twenty-eight, which states that little or no knowledge exists which it is essential for everyone to acquire, was held in agreement by slightly more than thirty-three percent (8) of the respondents. Additionally, a little more than twenty percent (5) indicated no strong feelings as did the same percentage who indicated disagreement with the assumption. Twenty-five percent (6) strongly disagreed. It seems therefore, that less than half the respondents (11) felt that some knowledge does exist that is essential for every individual to acquire.

Conversely, twenty-two of the respondents agreed with assumption twenty-six which held that knowledge is a function of one's personal integration of experience and therefore does not fall into neatly separate categories or disciplines. Not one respondent indicated any disagreement with this concept.

The responses recorded in this section reflect the lowest combined total percentage of agreement (75.8%) for all sections of the held assumptions presented in the tables. It does reflect the highest percentage of strong disagreement (1.1%) and also shows the second highest percentage of disagreement (7%) of the three tables.
### TABLE 6

**ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT KNOWLEDGE (25–29)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Strong Feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The six questions which guided this study were addressed in a number of ways. The questions were:

1. What is the proposed approach to inservice teacher education?
2. How is it applied at a secondary school level?
3. What are the implications of this approach to future inservice projects?

The first of these three questions was a focus in Chapter II, Review of the Literature, of this dissertation. That section also began to answer question two which was more thoroughly addressed by the "case study" presented in this chapter. Question three will be dealt with in Chapter V of this dissertation. Other questions were:

4. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants?
5. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?
6. What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?

**Summative Evaluation**

**Informal Questionnaire**

Another instrument used to gather data about how participants perceived the effectiveness of the inservice intervention, in terms of goal accomplishment and impact upon teachers, was an informal
questionnaire which asked six open-ended questions. Those questions were:

1. What were your goals for these few days?
2. How has the workshop helped you meet those goals?
3. What evidence do you have of your growth during these few days?
4. What evidence do you have of others' growth during these few days?
5. What do you see as your "next steps" in preparation for Fall?
6. How effective has the workshop staff been?

Nineteen participants responded to this questionnaire. Raw data from this instrument were collected on the final day of Workshop "A". Data are presented in frequency tables.

Table 7 reflects the ten general responses to the question What were your goals for these few days? There were eleven responses (item 1) which indicated a need on the part of the participants to acquire a knowledge base about open space and open education. Other items (2, 3, 6, 8, 10) indicated a concern about how open education and open space would be addressed by the staff of Shaw. Learning new ways of working with colleagues (item 4) and investigating resources and agencies which might aid the educational program (item
TABLE 7
WHAT WERE YOUR GOALS FOR THESE FEW DAYS?

"My Goals for this Workshop were to..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Learn more about open space and open education.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Develop positive, optimistic, and receptive attitudes for the conversion to open space.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Develop and gain skills necessary for motivating students toward self-direction.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Learn more ways of working closely with other members of the faculty.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Plan for the Fall.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Get some idea of how open space/education might work at Shaw Junior High.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Investigate resources and agencies in the Washington, D.C. area which might be of aid to the educational program at Shaw.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Find a systematic way of implementing some of my ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Learn about the Advisory and Learning Exchange as a resource.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Understand how a &quot;shops&quot; core curriculum could be fitted into an open space program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were concerns expressed by some participants (3 for each concern). One participant wanted to learn more about the Advisory and Learning Exchange as a resource (item 9), while two participants had expected to address needs for the Fall (item 5).

These goals are reflections of those outlined in the Shaw proposal and formulated by the workshop facilitators in conjunction with the participants in the pre-session planning.

Table 8 addresses the question of *How has the workshop helped you meet these goals?* Three participants felt that the workshop created a better avenue of communications among the Shaw faculty (item 8). Items 4 and 5 also touched upon the theme of faculty cohesiveness. Many participants (8) felt the workshop brought them a better understanding of the concepts of open space/open education (item 1). Other responses (3) centered around integrating work in the classroom (item 3), the acquisition of materials, resources and suggestions (items 2, 7, 9, 10), and helping one participant to become more aware of student needs (item 6).

As a result of the pre-session planning, where participants were given an opportunity to have input into the structure of the workshop, all of the goals listed on the previous table (Table 7) were realized in the perceptions of those participants responding to the questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Brought about a clear understanding of what open space/open education is.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Offered many suggestions, resources, and materials that I can use.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Given me a better understanding of how to share and integrate work in a classroom setting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Helped me understand how to work with people whom I did not think possible before.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Helped me to better appreciate some of the problems other teachers have and has made me more willing to integrate my time and efforts with those of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Helped me become more aware of student's needs and desires as well as ways of fulfilling them in an open educational environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Helped me to learn how to &quot;brainstorm,&quot; make &quot;flow-charts,&quot; and become conversant with new terminology.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Through group interaction created a better avenue of communication among the faculty.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Helped me through hand-outs, readings, and concrete ideas offered by the workshop director.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Helped me by hearing first-hand experiences of people who have engaged in the open concept.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What evidences do you have of your growth during these few days? This question was addressed by the responses in Table 9. A number of responses (8) indicated that participants felt they were beginning to become more open in their approach to teaching and learning (items 1, 2). One respondent indicated more optimism about self (item 3), four felt more joy (item 11) after the workshop sessions. Two responses indicated evidence of growth based on personal opinion (items 5, 8). Feeling more knowledgeable about open education (item 12) and the opportunity to apply skills acquired during the workshop (item 9), were two interesting comments. Working with a team and communicating ideas were indicated by six respondents (items 4, 6, 7).

In Table 10 are recorded the responses to the question, What evidence do you have of others' growth during these few days? The most frequently offered response (7) was the knowledge gained through "sharing" during the sharing sessions (item 4). Better communications received five responses (item 3). Cooperation, concern for others, understanding and trust (items 1, 2, 5, 6, 8) reflected the evidence of growth by others within the workshop. One individual felt evidence was shown by the resourcefulness of the total group (item 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am more open to change, my thinking has become more open.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am more open to giving students more experiences in making decisions concerning themselves and their environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel optimistic and determined to overcome any and all obstacles.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am better able to communicate with others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teaching ability has improved.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I now have the ability to accept and utilize the ideas of others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have committed myself to work as a member of a team and to develop interdisciplinary units.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Personal opinion.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I have put some of the skills and ideas into practice at Sunday school and the kids were excited.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am more excited about implementing ideas next year.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I smile more and seem to enjoy being with others.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel more knowledgeable about open education/space.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

WHAT EVIDENCE DO YOU HAVE OF OTHERS' GROWTH DURING THESE FEW DAYS?

"Others' Growth Was Evidenced By. . . "

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A definite trend away from individual-oriented towards group-oriented.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The expressions of concern for each others' welfare and commitment to plan and work together.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Better communications.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The knowledge gained through sharing during the sharing sessions.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The show of understanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cooperation and participation.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Group resourcefulness.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>More extensive display of personalities and a willingness to attempt new methods.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to the question, **What do you see as your next steps in preparation for the Fall?** were tabulated and presented in Table 11. Several respondents (8) indicated the application of knowledge and skills gained during the workshop (item 2) as the present concern for the Fall. Five participants wanted to start right away to organize their classrooms (item 6). Planning for future sessions (item 9) was the concern of two participants. Two others wanted to share what they had learned during the sessions (item 3). Planning individual and group strategies (item 1) also received two responses. Other responses reflective of individual concerns were securing a variety of materials (item 4), keeping the spirit and determination developed by the staff during the summer alive (item 5), contracting with the workshop director (item 7), and making sure plans for the Fall have a chance of being implemented (item 8).

The last question, **How effective has the workshop staff been?** received the responses reflected in Table 12. The most frequent response to this question (7) was that the staff was very effective and supportive (item 2). Helpful, very helpful, and extremely helpful (items 1, 3, 6, 7) were other positive responses to this question. Two respondents related inspirational as the key ingredient (item 8) to the effectiveness of the workshop leaders. Excellent (item 10), responsive (item 11), and a good model (item 5) were other attributes attributed to the staff. One respondent felt the staff was instrumental in developing many intangible things (item 4). Another respondent awarded the staff an A++ (item 9) for their effort.
**TABLE 11**

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS YOUR NEXT STEPS IN PREPARATION FOR FALL?

"My Next Steps Are To. . ."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Plan individual and group strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Put into action the many useful things I have experienced during the workshop that help me attain educational goals.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Share with others what I have learned.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Secure a variety of materials to make for individual differences.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Keep up our spirit and determination.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Begin now to organize for my classroom.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Make a tentative plan for my &quot;contract&quot; with the workshop director.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gather representatives of various groups together to make sure plans for the fall are implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Plan for future sessions.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very effective and supportive too.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wonderful, understanding, helpful, and very, very resourceful.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Instrumental in developing so many intangible things—spirit, enthusiasm, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A good &quot;model.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Actively involved, helpful, informative and humane.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Extremely helpful... I have been &quot;turned-on.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A+++</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bunker's Study

The findings by this researcher, as to the effectiveness of the staff in conducting a workshop for the staff of Shaw Junior High School, using the open-ended questionnaire were supported in a report by Bunker (1975) which also summarized evaluations submitted by the participants involved in Workshop "B".

Bunker recorded the responses to the open-ended questions, "I think the staff . . ." in a frequency table (see Table 5 of Appendix F). The most frequently mentioned responses as reported by Bunker were ones which dealt with the staff's ability to successfully model open behavior (item 14), their knowledge (items 1, 12), and their flexibility and efficiency in meeting needs (items 2, 11). Bunker goes on to report that the responses he recorded were indeed a reflection of the strong, positive feeling participants shared about the staff.

Bunker also collected and summarized data from an instrument (Some Assumptions About Open Education) designed to identify participant perceptions of evidence that staff held particular assumptions about open education (see Tables 6 through 11, Appendix ). The data from Bunker's "Summary of Evaluations" (1975) indicate that the participants felt the workshop leaders:

1. Provided flexible groupings
2. Opportunities for movement through activities
3. Encouraged active learning
4. Acted as facilitators
5. Used a variety of materials and techniques
6. Provided for shared decision-making
7. Acted as resources
8. Provided opportunities for leadership development
9. Assisted the staff in determining its own needs and strengths
10. Built success into the workshop plans
11. Developed a sense of belonging
Who Decides Questionnaire

Another instrument used to gather data on the participants and their degree of openness was the "Who Decides Questionnaire" developed by Wolfson and Nash (1968) and subsequently adapted by Cussen (174) and Bunker (1975). The form used here was the Bunker adaptation.

Forty-nine questions were asked relative to who makes what decisions in the classroom. The offered responses were: (a) student, (b) class, (c) teacher, (d) other. The data from this instrument were collected on the day before the last session of Workshop "A". Tables 13 and 14 reflect the frequency of response to each of the "Who Decides Questions." The respondents were asked to mark their response in relationship to who would be making decisions in their classroom beginning in the Fall.

Items from the questionnaire fell basically into two categories, those decisions that are instructional in emphasis, and those that tend to be more non-instructional. This writer has separated the questionnaire so that the Tables (13 and 14) reflect the two outlined categories of questions. Most of the twenty-eight respondents marked responses in more than one column for each separate item; therefore, the great majority of the items (N=23) will reflect more responses than the total number of respondents.
Table 13 presents those responses to questions about instructional decisions. A glance at the frequency of responses indicates that there is no one instance in the classroom when the teacher or the student would be making a total instructional decision. However, responses to item twenty-five clearly indicate that the respondents were not willing, at that particular point in time, to relinquish the decision-making role of the teacher in regards to determining the time for specific activities.

Respondents appear to be willing to allow students a greater voice in making decisions about eight of the items (9, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 43, 48). Those items range from decision about how far or how many pages to read in a book (item 9) to when a student may create (item 27). Students were given the nod on decisions about what books to read (item 28) and what kind of products could be made (item 32).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Decision</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much work to do in class every day?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where your class will go for a trip?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How far or how many pages to read in your books?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How well you are doing in your work?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When you can write?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. What pages or activities to do every day?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When it's time to do a specific activity?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. When you can create?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. What books to read?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. What kind of products you can make?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. When you can go to an activity center, interest center, display?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. What you can write about?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. What you will do in subject area each day?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. When your work is finished?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. How many students can work at an activity center (area) at a time?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. When you've done enough subject area of the day?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The plans or work for the class each day?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses = 583
One interesting trend pointed out by the data is how, although
the respondents were willing to share, to a great extent, decisions
about when a student could go to an activity center, interest center,
or display (item 33) they were less willing to share the decision-
making about how many students could go to those areas (item 47).

Another look at the data clearly indicates that there were
four other items (21, 40, 47, 49) which reflected a certain reluctance
on the part of the respondents to extend to their students and/or the
class, a greater degree of decision-making. The items primarily
concern themselves with what pages or activities are to be done (item
21), what is to be done in specific subject areas (item 40), the daily
class plans (item 49) and how many students could participant in an
activity or at a learning center (item 47).

Decisions seemingly will be made by either the teacher, the
student, or a combination of both. The class, as this writer interprets
from the data, will have its greatest input when the time comes to
decide when to go on a field trip (item 4).

Table 14 presents those responses to the non-instructional
questions on the "Who Decides Questionnaire." Item eighteen (when
you can listen to music) is the first that reflects a total exclusion of
the student from any singular role in decision-making. This item
received twenty-seven responses, twenty-five of which was marked
"teacher." The "class" and "other" each received one response.

Two other items (16, 46) reflected almost identical responses.
Item sixteen, which deals with when to use the equipment in the class-

## TABLE 14
WHO DECIDES QUESTIONNAIRE

### Non-Instructional Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally in your classroom, Who Will Decide:</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. When you can tell something to the whole class?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What things will be on the boards, tables, displays, centers?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who can help you with your work?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What kinds of things students can bring to school?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you can work at the blackboard?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What areas of the room you can go to?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When you can talk or whisper to a friend in your room?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What to keep in your desk (drawer, locker)?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When &quot;break-time&quot; is over?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When it's time to straighten up (clean-up) the room?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When you can use the equipment in your room (tape recorder, film strip viewer, record player)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If you can work in another classroom or part of the school?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When you can listen to music?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How the room is to be arranged? (Are students involved in rearranging?)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Who erases the blackboards in your room?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If your work is to be hung up or displayed for others to see?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What to do when you come into the room?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. What things should be in your room?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. When you can sharpen your pencil?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Where supplies are kept in your room?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. What you can take home from the class?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. What kind of materials you can use?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. When you can talk with the teacher?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. When you can make things?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. What desk or seat you can sit in?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. When you can enter the classroom?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If you can eat in your room?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. When you can go to the toilet?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Whose job is it to water the plants?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The rules in your class?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. When you can get a drink?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. When you can go outside?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses Table 14: 1,039

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>394</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>533</th>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses Tables 13, 14: 1,622

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>498</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>918</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I
TEACHER CONCERNS CHECKLIST (SELF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Not concerned</th>
<th>A little concerned</th>
<th>Moderately concerned</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Totally preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0 0.0 7 33.3 14 66.7 0 0.0</td>
<td>1. Selecting and teaching content well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4 19.1 9 42.8 8 38.1 0 0.0 0 0.0</td>
<td>2. Whether the students really like me or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2 9.5 7 33.3 9 38.1 4 19.1 0 0.0</td>
<td>4. Lack of freedom to initiate innovative instructional programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3 14.3 6 28.6 9 42.8 3 14.3 0 0.0</td>
<td>10. Feeling under pressure too much of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3 14.3 2 9.5 9 42.8 7 33.3 0 0.0</td>
<td>11. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>5 23.8 8 38.1 7 33.3 1 4.8 0 0.0</td>
<td>12. Frustrated by the routine and inflexibility of the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4 19.1 5 23.8 8 38.1 4 19.1 0 0.0</td>
<td>14. Being in constant demand by students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>7 33.3 7 33.3 6 28.6 1 4.8 0 0.0</td>
<td>15. Doing well when a supervisor is present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>6 28.6 10 47.6 5 23.8 0 0.0 0 0.0</td>
<td>17. Insufficient time to think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>5 23.8 5 23.8 5 23.8 6 28.6 0 0.0</td>
<td>19. Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4 19.1 5 23.8 6 28.6 6 28.6 0 0.0</td>
<td>21. Lack of opportunity for professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>4 19.1 6 28.6 6 28.6 5 23.8 0 0.0</td>
<td>33. Too many noninstructional rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>6 28.6 5 23.8 5 23.8 5 23.8 0 0.0</td>
<td>32. Insufficient class time for rest and class preparation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>4 19.1 6 28.6 7 33.3 4 19.1 0 0.0</td>
<td>34. Clarifying the limits of my authority and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>3 14.3 6 28.6 5 23.8 7 33.3 0 0.0</td>
<td>39. Feeling more adequate as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>0 0.0 10 47.6 6 28.6 5 23.8 0 0.0</td>
<td>41. Being accepted and respected by professional persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>0 0.0 8 38.1 8 38.1 0 0.0 0 0.0</td>
<td>42. Adequately presenting all of the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>0 0.0 4 19.1 5 23.8 12 57.1 0 0.0</td>
<td>43. Increasing my proficiency in content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 378 100
room (tape recorder, film-strip projector, etc.), received twenty-eight responses; "students" received one response, "other" received one, and the "teacher" received twenty-six responses. When will the class go outside (item 46)? Responses indicated the teacher would make that decision (N=24). The student's responses (N=2) seemingly indicate that they will not be able to have much input in this area.

"Others" seem to have their greatest impact when questions arise about when students should enter the classroom (item 38). The "student" has the greatest say on matters that determine who will water plants (item 42), who will erase chalkboards (item 20), when to sharpen pencils (item 26), and what items shall be kept in the desk (item 11). The "class," as the data indicate, should decide how the room is to be arranged (item 19) and what things will be on the boards, tables, displays, and centers (item 3).

When making decisions about what things to bring to school (item 6), when to talk or whisper to a friend (item 10), when to talk to the teacher (item 35), or when to make things (item 36) shared decision-making between the individual student and the teacher seems to be the policy that will be followed.

Four items directly relate to who decides where learning will take place within the classroom. Item seven (who can work at the chalkboard) is a question which will generally be decided by the teacher with very little student input. What areas of the room students to go (item 8) will be decided jointly between teacher and
student. In order to work in another area of the room or school (item 17) students will have to get the permission of the teacher in practically all instances. Students will in the majority of cases be able to decide what desk they want to sit at within the classroom.

Those questions that concern themselves with time, "break-time (item 12), "clean-up" (item 13), "toilet-break" (item 41), and "time to get a drink" (item 45) are decided, for the most part, by the teacher. Teachers were also reported to be the ones to make decisions concerning the displaying of the work of students (item 22), materials to be available in classrooms (item 24), the use of those materials (item 31), supplies that will be kept in the classrooms (item 29), and what things the students will be allowed to take home (item 30).

The data indicate that rules established for the classrooms will be determined by the teachers, students, and at times by the classes (item 44). Sharing information with the classes (item 2), and knowing what to do upon entering the classrooms (item 23) will be questions decided by the teachers as will the question related to whether or not food can be consumed in the classrooms (item 39). The data reveal that teachers as well as students could decide on who will be able to assist with assigned work (item 5).

Interviews

Another method used by this researcher to acquire data was the audio-taped interview. Participants were randomly selected (N=7) and asked specific questions related to their perceptions on the effectiveness of the workshop (Workshop "A") and its impact upon them during the two-week sessions (see Appendix G). The respondents met with
this writer and were asked to share their feelings and/or apprehensions as they moved towards occupation of the new Shaw open-space facility.

Data from the interviews indicate that the respondents felt the workshop was of tremendous value to them. One respondent remarked:

I feel also, to a large extent, that the basic usefulness of the workshop has been to show us as a group how many divergent paths are open to me regardless of how innovative one may be, how creative his thinking, you do reach a plateau and to that level I do think we need the stimulation of seeing and hearing other things and other people. I have constantly taken course after course, but I do think I have run into more new things here than any other workshop-type course I have taken.

Another responded that,

When I signed up for the workshop it was supposed to be one in open space education and about the open school. During the week or two weeks we've been here, I was quite impressed with several of the ideas as a means for working in open space.

Other favorable comments were, "... a lot of things are new ideas that I've picked up since I've been in the workshop," and "As far as I'm concerned, the workshop has served its purpose."

One respondent, however, felt she had not gotten from the workshop answers to her question, "What's that something that you can use in the schools with walls that you can't use in schools without walls?" When asked by this writer how this question could best be answered, the respondent indicated she wanted follow-up sessions at Shaw that specifically addressed her concern.

Three of the seven respondents indicated their enthusiasm for applying, in the Fall, some of those skills acquired during the summer.
Similarly, four individuals stressed the need for a duplication of the type of inservice intervention for the remainder of the Shaw faculty.

Participants responding through the interview indicated a number of things that made them apprehensive about their move to the new Shaw. The recorded apprehensions were:

1. Concern for discipline in the open environment.
2. Holding on the traditional ways of operating
3. Unforeseen stumbling blocks
4. The lack of knowledge reflected by colleagues not taking part in the workshops
5. Actual movement into the open setting
6. Noise
7. Scheduling
   a. time segments (periods)
   b. student ability grouping
8. Pupil/teacher ratio (class size)

Summary

In this chapter the writer identified the case school for the application of the inservice approach. A detailed description of the approach was outlined in the beginning of the Chapter and data collected during the inservice intervention were presented in the remainder of the Chapter.

The inservice intervention was conducted over a two-year period. The administration and staff of Shaw Junior High School wrote
a proposal which detailed their specific inservice needs as they began to plan for movement into a new open space facility. The Advisory and Learning Exchange, a teacher center in Washington, D.C., was contracted to provide the extensive inservice. The Advisory sub-contracted the job to Dr. R. Mason Bunker of the University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Advisory personnel, including this writer, assisted in the inservice delivery.

Data were collected which offered insight into the participants perceptions of the effectiveness of the approach. The data indicate that the participants viewed the workshop leaders as effective in their modeling of "open" behavior and exemplary in the reflection of their articulated beliefs. Participants did outline, via the taped interview, a number of issues which made them somewhat apprehensive as they began to move into their new open space facility. Among those concerns were (1) discipline, (2) noise, (3) the open setting itself, (4) class size, (5) scheduling, and (6) other colleagues not taking part in the inservice. It also appears, from the data, that students will be able to share, in part, some of the decision-making that will occur in the classroom. Respondents to the "Who Decides Questionnaire" reveal that students and/or the class will share in approximately forty percent of the classroom decision.

In the chapter that follows, this researcher, as the data allow, will analyze the data, draw some tentative conclusions and make recommendations for further study, thus focusing on the final question: "What are the implications of this approach to future inservice training projects?"
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study was undertaken to describe an approach to inservice teacher education and its application at the secondary school level. Shaw Junior High School, located in the central northwest section of Washington, D. C., was used as the case school in this study.

Five major questions were posed by this writer prior to a review of the relevant literature. Those questions were:

1. What is open education?
2. What is the role of the teacher in the open classroom?
3. What are the goals of open education for students?
4. What is the state of open education at the secondary school level?
5. What considerations, as a result of the conclusions drawn from the literature, need to be addressed to assure effective inservice programming at the secondary school level?

Six questions guided this study. Five of the questions were addressed in the previous four chapters. In this chapter the writer will analyze and interpret the data from Chapter IV which
provides some real answers to these questions:

1. Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants?
2. Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?
3. What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?

The writer will also attempt to respond to the question which asks: "What are the implications of this approach to future inservice projects?"

In order to determine the effectiveness of the proposed approach, data were collected during the two-year inservice project. The data have been presented in Chapter IV. A thorough analysis of that data will occur in this chapter along with implications for Shaw and recommendations for future study.

Analysis of the Data

Is the approach practical and effective in the judgment of the participants?

The first analysis of data must attend to the inservice approach design itself. In order to examine the effectiveness of the workshop design, we refer back to the conclusions reached from an analysis of the literature (Chapter I, p. 9).

Two questions are interesting. (1) What did the staff do to deal with each conclusion? and (2) What do the data collected from participants indicate about the effectiveness of the inservice approach?
The staff addressed the conclusions in the following ways:

1. Inservice education too often takes place on the teachers own time and frequently at their own expense (Lawrence, 1974).

A review of the information on the case study as presented in Chapter III and detailed in Chapter IV reveals that the inservice programs were held during the summer months. There was no cost to the participants for the inservice. Each participant was given a stipend with which to purchase instructional materials.

2. Teachers have found programs threatening, confusing, or irrelevant. Teachers feel their techniques have been wrong and that their skills are inadequate (Tyler, 1971).

The principal and staff of Shaw decided that they needed inservice training in the area of open space/open education. Their proposal outlined the objectives of the inservice based upon what they felt were areas of deficiency. Their participation throughout, in the planning sessions, provided a vehicle for continued goal-setting and inservice direction.

3. Traditional inservice programs often have been ineffective in spite of substantial investments of time, funds, and consultant services (Darland, 1970).

Researcher bias tends to indicate that the inservice program for Shaw was effective and that time, funds, and consultant services were maximized by the stated design of the project. However, this conclusion will be addressed more in detail when we examine the relevant data supplied by the participants.
4. Relevant and effective inservice programs must be built around teacher strengths and concerns.

The workshop staff and the personnel of the Advisory studied the general objectives of the Shaw proposal and combined them into a categorical set of objectives based on personal, knowledge, and skill competencies. Each of the competencies was categorized for the individual and for the group.

The inservice facilitators met for presession planning and adopted a set of beliefs which guided their planning. The planning included incorporating into the inservice design activities that would allow the workshop facilitators opportunities to model open education techniques.

The workshop leaders also structured the participants into curriculum teams. This approach allowed each participant an opportunity for active learning, shared decision-making, and skills acquisition. Participants were encouraged to provide input into the planning of each day's session.

What do the data collected from participants indicate about the effectiveness of the inservice approach?

When asked to give evidences of growth during the inservice, eight of nineteen respondents indicated that they were beginning to become more open in their approach to teaching and learning. Six indicated the enjoyment of working with a team and communicating ideas. Two others stated feeling more knowledgeable about open education and being able to apply new skills as their evidence of growth. All these statements are consistent with Rubin's (1971)
position on inservice. He suggests that inservice offer a rich opportunity for teachers to acquire personal insight that lead to new ways of behaving in the classroom.

The data further indicate that the participants were supportive of the role active exploration in a rich learning environment played in facilitating the students' learning. Of the twenty-four participants responding to this concept, twenty-two agreed that this is a consideration which must be addressed by the open teacher. The way children learn, develop, and behave, was addressed by Barth (1972) who reported in his research a number of assumptions about children's learning. The partial list of these assumptions is presented in Chapter II, Review of the Literature, and the complete list was presented in Chapter IV (Tables 4, 5, & 6) of this dissertation. Looking at a list adapted from Barth, it seems evident that his findings support the expressed feelings of the participants. The list is as follows:

1. Children are innately curious.
2. Children will explore their environment provided it is not threatening.
3. Children have the competence and the right to make significant decisions concerning their own learning.
4. Children who learn something of importance to themselves wish to share it with others.
5. Children develop intellectually at their own rate and in their own style.
6. Intellectual growth and development best takes place in a sequence of concrete experiences followed by (verbal) obstructions.

7. Errors are an essential part of learning.

8. A child's learning is best assessed by close observations over a long period of time. (p. 38)

Eighty-three percent of those participants who responded to all of the items on the list agreed with Barth; thus apparently they were in the main as would the effective open teachers Barth observed.

One participant responding, during the interview, to the question on the usefulness of the workshop stated:

I feel, to a large extent, that the basic usefulness of the workshop has been to show us as a group how many divergent paths are open to one, regardless of how innovative one may be, or how creative his thinking. You do reach a plateau, and to that level, I do think we need the stimulation of seeing and hearing other things and other people. I have constantly taken course after course, but I do think I have run into more new things here than any other workshop-type course I have taken . . . I have confidence in this group to feel that whatever they might do we would profit from. (p. 5)

The Shaw staff members participating in this study were all actively involved in the writing of the Shaw proposal. As such, this writer directs attention to the objectives given first priority in the Shaw proposal under the heading Human Relations (Appendix H).

In view of the fact that those responsible for the proposal were also participants in this study, special note should be taken of the data reported by Bunker (1975) in Table 4 of his summary. The data reveal that twelve of the sixteen participants responding to the instrument indicated that having the opportunity to work in groups
was the best thing about the inservice workshop. Other data from other tables indicate that group interaction and opportunities provided for sharing and communicating ranked high on the participants' minds as positive aspects of the workshops.

The attempt on the part of the inservice facilitators to establish a theoretical and philosophical framework for the participants was well documented by Bunker (1975) and is in compliance with the beliefs of Spitsbergen and Fry (1974). They remind us that teachers cannot meet the need to make adjustments without the proper exposure and understanding of the intended philosophy. Data presented by Bunker reveal that those participants (Workshop "B") who responded to the questionnaire item, "I think the staff. . ." felt the staff's ability to successfully "model" open behaviors, their knowledge of the theory and philosophy of open education, and their flexibility and efficiency in meeting individual and group needs all added to the success of the inservice project.

Is the approach effective in accomplishing the workshop objectives?

The fact that the participants were involved to such a degree as reported in the "case" allows this writer to conclude that Darland's (1970) concern about traditional inservice programs has been addressed. Darland believes that these traditional programs have been ineffective because even though supported by substantial investments of time, money, and consultants, the content of them has been prescribed by high-level administrators. He also states that programs should be based on teacher need.
The data indicate that the participants felt their goals and objectives for the workshops had been accomplished. One participant in the first summer's workshop when asked, "What are your goals for these few days?" responded by saying, "I want to find a systematic way of implementing some of my ideas."

A further examination of the data reveal that participants responses to the question, "What were your goals for these few days?" (Table 7), were satisfied almost item for item by the offered responses in Table 8 ("How has the workshop helped you meet these goals?").

Commentary drawn from Bunker's (1975) summary give added support to this writers' contention that in the opinion of the participants, the approach effectively accomplished the goals and objectives of the workshop. That commentary was:

A comparison of responses between Tables 1 and 2 indicate that all articulated goals of participants were met. This evidence leads us to value the early workshop experience which provided opportunity for needs assessment, individual and group goal-setting, shared decision-making for planning, workshop activities, and the use of time, space, and resources. (p. 6)

What effect did this approach to inservice have on teachers?

Did it provide activities for the classroom?

Date from Bunker's summary (1975, Table 6B) reveal a number of workshop activities and strategies that participants felt they could take back to Shaw. Among some of them were (a) daily "warm-ups", (b) variations in the use of materials, (c) provisioning for more direct experiences for students, and (d) allowances for students to be involved in decision-making. Other responses to this question can be
found in Table 8B. Participants indicated that they were interested in better assessing the needs of their students. They felt this could be accomplished by using surveys or informal observations.

Other data given by the author of this study as reflected in Table 8 seem to indicate that participants felt they were now able to go back to their classrooms and apply methods and concepts derived from the workshop. Some of those participant responses were the workshop has (1) "Offered many suggestions, resources, and materials that I can use," (2) "Given me a better understanding of how to share and integrate work in a classroom setting," and (3) "Helped me become more aware of student's needs and desires as well as ways of fulfilling them in an open educational environment."

Were these activities used by the teachers?

Information supplied by the "case" in Chapter IV highlighting the Fall follow-up session to Workshop A, and the procedures stated for setting up the "pilot" summer school project for Workshop B indicate that participants did in fact take some of the activities and strategies back to Shaw and attempted to implement them.

One participant involved her students in planning a lesson. Another teacher, in an attempt to improve student self-concept, had his students write booklets containing poems, pictures of Black history, autobiographies, and summaries. Two of the teachers decided to team teach and used the techniques of brainstorming and flow charting. The data are supportive of the efforts made by the workshop leaders to address the four conclusions stated earlier. Contracts agreed
to by the participants and Dr. Bunker, also included this practical application as part of the requirements for course credit.

Did teachers change their perceptions of their roles?

There are substantial data to support this writer's view that the participants viewed their role as one going through change. Statements provided by the participants and collected by informal questionnaires used by this writer and Bunker (1975) reflect that state and/or degree of change. Participants commenting on their change stated:

1. "I am more open to change; my thinking has become more open."
2. "I shall change my method of grouping."
3. "I will use group dynamics with children."
4. "I will use other teachers' strengths and offer myself to them."
5. "I have committed myself to work as a member of a team and to develop interdisciplinary units."

These comments reflect some of the many roles (internalizer, diagnostician, facilitator, human resource, and accommodator) that the participants felt they were moving towards.

Again, the roles that, according to the participants, they are moving towards are not unlike those proposed by Charity James (1968). She saw the teacher serving in a two-dimensional role. One being pastoral and the other specialist.
James (1968) in describing the role of the teacher states:

If students are engaged in ... creative education which is largely undertaken in small working parties, working with some autonomy, it is clear that the role of the teacher changes from being that of an instructor, giving a class lesson. He becomes rather a facilitator, an impresario, and a consultant. (p. 44)

The statements drawn from the interview seem to indicate that the participants were becoming less concerned about themselves and more concerned about working with others, namely students and colleagues. Rogers and Church (1975) advocated "open" teachers being more person-centered rather than content-centered.

The data from Tables 1, 2 and 3 (Chapter IV) indicate that when it comes to concerns about "self," fourteen of the twenty-one participants who responded to the checklist are most concerned about selecting and teaching content well. However, seventeen of those same respondents, when responding to items about concern for others, indicated diagnosing students' learning problems as their major concern. This is consistent with what was outlined by Traub, Weiss, Fischer, and Musella (1972) who attempted to describe the "open" teacher. They indicated that the teacher in the open classroom should be one concerned with diagnosing student problems and finding practical solutions that are accepted and acted on by the students themselves.

The data from the "Teacher Concerns Checklist" reveal that the participants were most concerned about students and the quality of the materials used to educate those students. Of all the responses offered on the checklist reflecting concern for self, only fifty-six percent were of a "moderate" to "very concerned" nature. Of the responses given dealing with issues that impact on learning, approximately
sixty-one percent produced degrees of concern ranging from moderately concerned to very concerned. However, of all the responses given related to concern for others practically ninety-six percent were from "moderately" to "very concerned." Apparently these teachers are feeling that their focus should be on students and their working relationship with colleagues.

Overall the data suggest that the participants were moderately to very concerned with approximately seventy percent of all the items on the checklist. This indicates that there were certain issues, such as whether students like their teachers, insufficient time to think, or boredom with routine that barely stirred the concern level of the respondents. Surprisingly, of the twenty-one individuals who responded to the checklist item related to over-crowded classrooms, eleven responded by checking "little" or "no concern." Only two respondents stated they were very concerned about this situation.

The conclusions drawn by this writer from the data reflecting participants' perceptions of their role are interesting. A review of the "problem statement" presented in the proposal developed by the Shaw administration and staff (see Appendix H) reveals this statement:

Teachers often see themselves as specialists in 9th grade English or 7th grade mathematics instead of teachers of the whole junior high school student population. It is therefore particularly important that an attitude of "our" in terms of total school responsibility rather than "my" students be developed among all students, school personnel, and community participants. (p. 2)

If, as this writer contends, participants perceived themselves as being concerned about students, colleagues, and interdisciplinary units, then the problem offered in the Shaw proposal was fully
addressed through the inservice project.

Did attitudes toward open education change?

The data from Chapter IV 9Table 8) indicate that the workshop brought about a clearer understanding of what open space/open education is. While being interviewed by this writer, one participant stated, "During the week or two weeks we've been here, I was quite impressed with several of the ideas as a means for working in open space." Another replied, "I already knew a lot about open space that we covered, about the parts in designing learning stations, but a lot of things are new ideas that I've picked up since I've been in this workshop." One teacher stated, "The workshop helped me become more aware of student's needs and desires as well as ways of fulfilling them in an open educational environment." Finally, one participant indicated that, "The workshop helped me by hearing first-hand experiences of people who have engaged in the open concept."

Data presented by Bunker's (1975) summary (Table 1) reveal that a number (N=7) of the sixteen respondents to his informal questionnaire indicated gaining a better perspective on open education as their goal for the workshop. Further data (Table 2) indicate that seven respondents felt that they had either achieved their goals or had developed a workable philosophy of open education.

Was there an allowance for shared decision-making?

Conclusions drawn by this research after thoroughly analyzing the data reflect upon the advice offered by Bush (1971). He indicated that the teacher should determine inservice needs as well as the kinds
of help needed to resolve their concerns. The information provided through the detailing of the "case study" clearly reflects the degree of involvement the Shaw participants had determining their own inservice goals and objectives. This inservice intervention was a direct end-result of the expressed concerns of the administration and staff of Shaw.

One participant, while being interviewed by this writer, was asked what was the purpose of the workshop. The response given was, "So far as we knew, it was merely a matter of our initiating some type of preparation to teach in an open space school. I have been one person who has really advocated this at the faculty meetings. . . and as such, I registered for the course merely because I had said that we needed training and I felt that I should take the training."

Another participant remarked, "The atmosphere of the workshop was relaxed and therefore we could react and think more readily." Still another said, "Instead of just saying this is thus and so, they helped you discover for yourself."

Data summarized by Bunker (1975, Table 14) reveal that participants felt they had an opportunity to make choices and decisions. Participants also indicated that they would take back to Shaw and utilize the process of shared decision-making in their classrooms.

This recognition of the importance of provisioning for decision-making is not unlike the position taken by Stephens (1974) who offered fifteen characteristics which she indicated reflected the open classroom. One of those fifteen characteristics was one which stressed provisioning for opportunities for decision-making on the part of the
child for goal-setting and development of responsibility. Traub et al., 1972; Taylor, 1972; Rathbone, 1971; and Golding and Poad, 1973, all support the concept which indicates that students need more voice in decisions that affect their own learning. These options for decision-making will fit into the upper right hand quadrant of the Bussis and Chittenden (1970) Double Classification Scheme.

In order to gain insight into the way participants expected to provide opportunities for students to be involved in decision-making, they were asked to respond to the "Who Decides Questionnaire" (see Tables 13 & 14). Participants were given the questionnaire on the day before to mark their response to the forty-nine items in relationship to who would be making decision in their classrooms beginning in the Fall.

The data reveal that teachers would continue to make those instructional decisions which regulated the time-sequencing of activities, the detailing of what pages or activities to do every day, what is to be done in the subjects, and how many students at one time can work at activities or learning areas.

Students, on the other hand, will apparently be able to make shared-decisions or at least have great input into decisions which relate to what books to read, how many pages, what will be the products of the classes, and when to engage in activity or interest centers.

In the non-instructional areas it appears that teachers will decide if students can use the chalkboards, when break-time is over, when music in the classrooms is appropriate, when instructional aids
and equipment will be used, where supplies will be kept, which materials can be taken home or hung up for display, and if work in another part of the room or school is permissible. Although this list seems broad, students will have much input into those issues such as when they can talk to friends, when they can sharpen pencils, who will erase the chalkboards, or whose job it is to water the plants.

These selected items are not registered as "tongue-in-cheek" statements, however, it is interesting to note that although most students will not be able to decide when they can use the chalkboards, a large number will be able to decide when to erase those boards.

Overall the data from both tables (13 & 14) reveal that teachers projected they would be making approximately fifty-six percent of the decisions to be made in the classrooms. Students will be providing input on close to thirty-one percent of the decisions to be made in the classroom. Decisions by total classes will happen approximately nine percent of the time with the remaining four percent of the decisions being made outside the parameters of the classrooms. Although the data indicate that students will be providing classroom input, this area of shared decision-making could stand further review by the participants.

Was there opportunity for skills acquisition?

The data clearly indicate that all participants believed they had acquired proficiency in a number of skill categories. Among those acquired skills which consistently appear in the data are:
1. Ability to share and integrate work in a classroom setting.
2. Ability to better communicate with colleagues.
3. Ability to acquire resources and materials for use in the classroom.
4. Ability to articulate the goals and objectives of open education.
5. Ability to provision for shared decision-making.
6. Ability to effectively apply group process techniques.
7. Ability to work as a member of an interdisciplinary unit.

A closer examination of these acquired skill competencies, as expressed by the participants, show a high correlation to those reported objectives for the workshop participants outlined in the Shaw proposal (see Appendix H) and listed as the first primary objective of the inservice training program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings from the data indicate that the participants had a sense of accomplishment at the end of the two-year inservice intervention project. The inservice facilitators were viewed as competent, receptive, and exemplary in the expounding the ideas and concepts of open space/open education. The six questions which guided this study were addressed as were the goals and objectives outlined in the proposals of Shaw Junior High School and the Advisory and Learning Exchange.
The final conclusions to be drawn from this study are:

1. The approach to inservice education was an effective alternative at the secondary school level as viewed by these participants.

2. The approach was viewed by participants as one with much practical and realistic value to participants.

3. Workshop objectives can be realized by utilizing an approach which provides the participants with opportunities for shared decision-making, active learning, and skills acquisition.

4. The belief statements, which were developed by the staff of the Integrated Day Program at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst and adopted by the inservice facilitators, effectively guided the planning of the inservice project in the eyes of the participants.

What are the implications of this approach to future inservice projects?

Implications for Shaw

On the basis of the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the writer submits these as implications for Shaw:

1. More inservice sessions should be designed around concerns identified by the total staff and uncovered during interviews.

2. The staff should continue moving toward more openness.

3. The staff should continue with plans to implement an interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning.

4. More opportunities should be given to students for shared decision-making.
5. The staff should continue to develop strategies that facilitate team-building.

6. The staff should continue to assess program strengths and weaknesses.

7. The staff should continue to take advantage of the supportive services and agencies within the community.

Suggestions for Further Study

There is little empirical data available in the area of open space/open education inservice training for secondary school personnel. This study has been an attempt to document such an effort.

There is a need for descriptions of what happens in inservice training programs and the information that formative evaluation does provide. The researcher realizes that by design this study had certain limitations relative to the findings. Among them were:

1. No control group
2. No pre-test-posttest design
3. No systematic comparisons of groups "A" and "B"
4. No instrumentation supported by tests of reliability and/or validity
5. Researcher/leader bias

However, this study does provide an experiential base and now we are more able to focus on more controlled research studies. Further studies will have to be made and more literature will have to be reviewed to complete the picture of the impact this approach had on inservice training at the secondary level.
The success of this approach, in the view of the participants, as indicated by the analysis of the data, suggests that those charged with the responsibility for inservice delivery at the secondary school level should:

1. Examine current inservice programming at the secondary school level
2. Acquaint themselves with the approach to inservice as presented in this study
3. Solicit the input of teachers at the secondary school level when developing inservice designs and/or strategies.

Since the participatory group used for this study was small, few generalizations can be drawn for the whole of secondary education. However, the study does suggest a number of hypotheses that may be tested; among them:

1. In light of the "back to basics" movement in many parts of the country, what are the implications for the continued implementation of this inservice approach?
2. What are the practical effects of this approach being applied to inservice personnel at the pre-secondary level?
3. What are the effects of this inservice approach when applied to all personnel working at various levels of the teacher/learner setting (open — traditional)?
4. What effect would this approach have on the students in the classroom?
5. What are the effects of this approach when applied through a longitudinal study?
This writer takes encouragement from those in education who support the role that open education plays in promoting teacher/learner success. This dissertation ends with a quote taken from Open Education—For Me? by Pflum, Hanks, and Waterman (1974). These writers state:

We know most teachers care about children, but for one reason or another they've been teaching content, not children. Some have known the system was wrong, but now teachers everywhere are beginning to realize that the students in their classrooms are human beings, and deserve to be treated as such. Our pleas is to humanize education. . . by opening up your minds and your hearts, you can open up education, care for and meet the needs of individual children, and still teach the children. (pp. 9, 10)
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The Concept


"Open Classroom: Symposium" (Bibliography) Teacher College Record, 74: 547-574, May, 1973.


Secondary Open Plan


"Literature on Open Education", Music Educators Journal, 60: 81-82, April, 1974.


Miscellaneous


Examples


Evaluation

"Open Plan: They Tried It, They Liked It", American School and University, 44: 18-20, March, 1972.


Vaiuable is the New Children's Education, New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1972 ($7.95). This is a valuable sourcebook for seeking further information about the assumptions underlying the movement toward open education. Useful ideas for how the principal can function are provided. Competencies for teachers are suggested. Earth describes his own experiences in an urban school program.

Borton, Terry. Reach, Touch, and Teach, is an account of Borton's attempts to help high school learners learn. The book explores student interests, humanistic approaches in the classroom, and a process-oriented curriculum.

Bresar, John. "Curriculum, A Vigor, A Local Abstraction," Center Forum, Center for Urban Education (105 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016). This is a penetrating article on curriculum by the British educator who was founding director of the Parkway School in Philadelphia.

Bresar, John and Michael von Heschzisker, The School Without Walls. Here is the descriptive account of the Parkway Program - the School Without Walls in Philadelphia.

Brown, George. Human Teaching for Human Learning. New York: The Viking Press, 1971 ($2.45). In this book strategies are described which combine affective and cognitive aspects of learning into what Brown calls confluent education. This is especially useful because it provides specific activities to try out. There are also examples of classroom applications written by high school and elementary teachers.


Carsswell. Open Sesame, Goodyear: Pacific Palisades, California, 1974. ...or, A Primer in Open Education. This book contains excerpts from books and articles, strategies for moving toward openness, and things to do in classrooms. Useful. Readable.

Charles, C.N. Educational Psychology the Instructional Environment. N.V. Mosley Company, St. Louis, Mo., 1972. While this is an educational psychology textbook, it goes beyond the conventional theory to provide activities which will lead teachers to find ways of developing skills for creative teaching. Among the areas explored are planning the working/learning experiences, questioning, and evaluating. This is a cleverly written book which invites participation.

Engle, S. H. and Longstreet, W. S. A Design for Social Education in the Open Curriculum. Harper & Row: New York, 1972. The aim of this book is to provide elementary and secondary teachers with strategies for developing interdisciplinary curriculum based on the social studies. It describes decision making processes, steps in curriculum development, process-action strategies, scope and sequence patterns, and provides examples of evaluation-diagnostic techniques. The authors have included examples throughout this useful book.

Fahim, Don. The Children of Change, 1969; On Motivation, 1968; Communication, 1968; You and Creativity, 1968; and Three Roads to Awareness. Beverly Hills, California: Glenmore Press. These exciting books are stimuli for integrating themes, projects, writing, and discussion; they deal with the real world of youngsters and are "right on".


Fox, R.; Luszki, M.; and Schmuck, R. Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environments. Chicago: SRA, 1966. This book contains examples of processes for gathering data on the state of affairs in the classroom. It is particularly useful for suggesting strategies to change the classroom learning environment.

Gambrell, L. B. and Wilson, R. M. Focusing on the Strengths of Children. Fearon Publishers; Belmont, California, 1973 (paperback; $2.25). If you share a belief that a focus on learners strengths is a healthy approach to encouraging learning, this book will do at least two things for you: (1) reinforce that belief, and (2) suggest some strategies for managing the approach. This is a readable and useful teacher aid.

Gorman, A. H. Teachers and Learners: The Interactive Process of Education. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, 1974. This very useful book examines the interaction process in schools. It provides a large number of exercises for use with teachers and learners from K through high school. The authors have included instruments for gathering information about groups as well as reaction and evaluation instruments. This is a very good resource for looking at group dynamics in our classrooms.

designed to help children succeed. The book is particularly useful for providing specific examples of things to do as a way of beginning to "open up".


Hunks, V. Informal Teaching in the Open Classroom. MacMillan Co.; New York, 1974 (paper). This book has lots of suggestions for moving classroom toward openness. Here are ideas for observing, record keeping, managing, planning, and evaluating.


Kaplan, S.N., Kaplan, J.B., Madson, S.K. and Taylor, E.K. Change for Children. Goodyear Pacific Palisades, California, 1973. These teachers have compiled an extremely large collection of ideas and activities for individualizing instruction. There is a particularly useful section of ideas for developing and using learning centers in the classroom. There are good examples of record keeping and evaluating. It's the kind of handbook that provides hundreds of "how-to-do-it" ideas with sketches.

Lancox, E.B. Teaching and Learning in City Schools. This is a comprehensive yet detailed description of classrooms in urban centers.


Lorton, H.B. Workjobs. Addison-Hesley, Phillipines: 1972. This book focuses on activity centered learning by providing ideas for workjobs or activity cards and for creating learning centers. Though directed at teachers of younger learners, our secondary teachers are finding exciting ways to adapt the materials to needs of older learners.

Lyon, H.C., Jr. Learning to Feel - Feeling to Learn. Charles E. Merrill: Columbus, Ohio: 1971. This book is chock full of ideas and strategies for bringing feeling into the classroom from kindergarten through graduate school. Use it! Extremely so. Many of the authors and contributors to this book are colleagues at the School of Education.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum K-13. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1968. This is a comprehensive and extremely useful English program focused on the learners themselves. It includes specific plans and strategies.

Nyquist, E.B. and Itzes, G.R. Open Education, A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers. Bantam Books, New York, 1972. This paperback is an especially useful collection of articles related to how children learn, the roles of teachers and children in open classrooms, descriptions of classrooms, research in open classrooms, ways of opening up classrooms, and the underlying assumptions and rationale of open education. There is an extremely usable annotated bibliography and source listing.
Open Door. A Report by the Program Reference Service Center for Urban Education, 105 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10016, 1971. Open Door is a report of the corridor classrooms established with Lillian Weber in PS 123 and PS 84, New York City. The book describes the rationale and program implementation as well as evaluation statements. Our studying among the observations is the fact that discipline problems in those schools decreased and general reading ability seemed higher than ordinarily found in ghetto classrooms.

Proctor, Robert. High School: The Process and the Place. A report from Educational Facilities Laboratories; EFL, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10022 ($3.00). High School is designed to explore solutions to the physical and emotional housing of high school students. The report is designed to describe "...school houses, particularly high schools, that are more responsive to the contemporary needs of the young schoolhouses that are more sensitive, humane, more supportive of learning and growth."

Rowe, M.R. Teaching Science as Continuous Inquiry. McGraw Hill: New York, 1973. This book was designed for use by pre-service and in-service teachers with the following goals: (1) to provide a conceptual scheme for using science programs more effectively; (2) to give teachers skills for implementing an inquiry based service program; (3) to help teachers plan and evaluate activities; and (4) to provide materials which individualize curriculum.

Sapples, B. and Wohlford, B. Opening. Phillipines: Addison-Wesley, 1973. We've found it to be an interesting and useful approach in the movement toward openness. The book deals with such topics as values, prejudice, insight, and core personalities. The book is fun to read, inviting in format, and informative.


Science 5-13: Teachers' Resource Units Purnell Educational, 850 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10019. Science 5-13 is designed to help teachers help children ages five to thirteen years old learn about science..."a child centered program...inquiry approach..." matches the mental development of the child with the behavioral objective..." Among the units available are "Science From Toys", "Minibeasts", "Working with Wood", "Holes, Gaps and Cavities", "Changes"...etc.


Thompson, James J. Beyond Words. New York: Citation Press, 1973. This book deals with nonverbal communication in the classroom and is particularly useful in pointing out the elements of nonverbal communication. The book provides a survey of the current knowledge available and suggestions of useful strategies for teachers. The book deals with use of space, color, faces, body posture, gestures, touching, and time.
Toffler, Alvin. Learning for Tomorrow. Vintage: New York, 1974 ($2.95). This is a compilation of readings related to the role of the future in education. Among the contents are examples of secondary school curriculum focusing on the future, a chapter on the black child's image of the future, and readings on values and approaches to value clarification. Authors emphasize moral as well as cognitive and affective education. Toffler has provided syllabi from various schools along with human "contacts" at those schools.

Tools for Change. Interaction Associates, Inc., 149 9th Street, San Francisco, California, 94103, Second Edition: This book introduces the Tools for Change approach to process learning and problem-solving. Directed mainly at teachers, it lays the foundation for using process awareness in the classroom to enhance both teaching and learning. Offered in the book are definitions of key words and concepts, along with suggested ways in which people can improve their ability to learn and solve problems, as well as increase their understanding and use of change.


Trump, J.L. and Miller, D.F. Secondary School Curriculum Improvement. Allyn & Bacon: Boston, 1973. Though this is a "conventional" curriculum textbook for teachers, it is useful because it provides a survey of alternative curriculum approaches and descriptions. Among the other useful areas explored are assumptions about education, issues and approaches in various subject areas, humanistic curriculum approaches, evaluation strategies, and procedures for change.

Wankel, W.F., Wigg, P. and Wigg, M. Arts and Crafts for Elementary and Junior High School Teachers. M. C. Brous; Dubuque, Iowa: 1968 (Paper, $6.50). Just what it says...a handbook crammed full of ideas for arts and crafts projects. Useful!


Wigginton, Elliot (ed.) The Foxfire Book. New York: Anchor Books, 1972. Foxfire is the product of a group of ninth and tenth grade high school students at Rabun Gap - Nacoochee School in rural Georgia. The project happened as a result of a teacher's interest to provide an integrating theme which would enable learners to learn and use communication skills and to develop a healthy sense of self esteem.
It was a hot day and everyone in the group was exhausted. They had biked and hiked nearly 50 miles through the foothills of the Berkshires in western Connecticut. Now, as they approached the last leg of the journey, the boys and their teacher saw a steep cliff of a hill ahead. Everyone looked up to survey the new effort required of them.

Suddenly, Joe let out a scream. "My gosh!" he cried, making his teacher and the whole trip. He announced that he couldn't go any farther. In fact, he was going to the right there.

The boys' teacher suggested that he sit on the side of the road "out of courtesy to the Department of Public Works." Joe responded by threatening to throw his bike into a nearby stream. The group ignored this threat and pressed onward, leaving him behind.

This story has a happy ending. Robert Gillette, the bicycle-riding teacher, recalls, "As I struggled up the hill, the 11th-grade boys in the class said, 'That's for you, Mr. Gillette.'"

"Then, about half an hour later, I heard a shrill whistle—like the kind that only a teenage boy can muster. I turned to see Joe pushing up the hill and slowly gained on us. The conversation, Pub Gillette remarked, went like this.

"Hey! Wait up!" Joe panted, his face all smiles.

"What happened?" the teacher asked. "I thought you died back there. Did a truck pick you up?" Joe's response, Mr. Gillette insists, will always remain clear to his mind.

"I looked up at that hill," the boy said, "and I saw a big big tree, maybe 30 feet above the road. I knew I could make it. When I made it to the tree, I saw a big red barn further up and decided to make it that far. Well, now I'm almost to the top!"

Mr. Gillette comments: "I don't think that any experience within the walls of the traditional classroom could have led Joe to this new perception of himself and of reality. Only the world of real experience can teach such important lessons about growing up." He adds, "And just think—it was through a school experience that Joe was able to encounter himself."

A school experience? Yes, the bicycle trip through the Berkshires is one of many outdoor experiences Mr. Gillette has initiated over the past four years. An English teacher at the Andrew Waters High School in Fairfield, Connecticut, Bob Gillette calls his program Operation Turn On. Warmth and genuine concern for the growth and welfare of his students comes through when he recounts the genesis of this program.

Four years ago, Gillette was asked to work with a group of eleventh-grade boys who were turned off by school. They lacked self-esteem and were frequently in trouble; some were about to drop out. Given freedom to experiment, the teacher decided to do just that. He began by asking himself some important questions—and answering them.

How do kids learn best? Obviously, they learn best when they are involved in reality.

How can a teacher help kids grow up? He can help by giving them responsibility and the chance to make mistakes.

What do kids like to do? They like to engage in physical activity and to test their capabilities.

When Gillette asked these eleventh graders what
they would like to do, they indicated that they would "like to get out of here"—the "here" being school. It was then that he decided to "trip it" with his class, Huck Finn style—to undertake a series of adventures which would combine the curriculum with challenging real-life experiences.

After having all the boys take a physical exam, his first move was to set up a fitness program to get the group in shape for the trips "out there." Among other things, he had the boys run around the track field each day—"in full sight of the other students at work in their classrooms. This strenuous workout developed a feeling of group identity, attracted considerable attention, and began the process of building up the boys' self-esteem as well as their physical fitness. In addition, a bell was rung for the feeling of camaraderie that developed on the hiking and biking trips which followed.

In preparing for the trips, the boys began to take pride in their studies as they researched various aspects of diet to help them plan food for an expedition or looked up historical, literary, and geological information about the area they planned to visit. "Putting it all together this way gave them a good idea of the interdependence of knowledge," Bob Gillette says.

In time, members of this class became virtual celebrities at school, and when they returned from their expedition, they began to produce in all their classes. Potential dropouts did not drop out; truancy all but disappeared. Obviously, the students saw themselves—and the world—in a new light.

Bob Gillette and his OLY program attracted a good deal of attention in Fairfield. Today, however, he is known internationally. Letters from teachers, students, and administrators have poured into the Gillette home from all over the world.

Last May, Bob received a $180,000 grant from the New England Program of Teacher Education (NEPET), centered in Durham, New Hampshire. He will receive an additional $265,000 over the next two years if Operation Turn On retains support. The money is practically a no-strings-attached grant. Gillette is quite free to use the funds as he sees fit to implement a variety of educational programs for students, although he works closely and effectively with Lewis Knight, the NEPET project officer. He then LEFTE, as an agency with courage and a flair for futuristic thinking in education. (There are two stipulations—that the program funds not be used to buy major physical equipment for the school and that his salary be $4,000 more than that of his superintendent.)

The idea of the grant was the brainchild of Deigh Allen, dean of the University of Massachusetts School of Education and a member of the NEPET board, who proposed it by saying: "Let's see if this experiment captures the imagination. You can blow your mind just thinking about it!" one of Gillette's students commented. And a stunned administrator remarked, "One hundred thousand dollars—to a teacher?"

Robert Gillette believes the award has reinforced the importance of the classroom teacher. "The teacher is the most important member of the learning situation—next to the student," he notes. "If the teacher is so close to the learning happening, it seems only reasonable that he should assume a decision-making role in the expenditure of monies which are translated into programs and experiences for kids."

In his original proposal to NEPET, of what he would do if he had the money and freedom to teach as he wished, Gillette asked two questions: How can we develop an educational program which makes the student loose from his "Sophie's" state and which sensitizes him to himself and the society around him? How can we integrate a program of studies so that the student can experience himself and the group in real ways, thereby encountering the real world, which is
TEACHING IS WHAT I WANT TO DO

I wanted too much from being a teacher. I never realized that teachers love their students.

"Now I know what it's like to be a teacher. I didn't. I didn't ever know that you teach another person.

These are typical student comments after a day spent on the other side of the desk, an experience made possible by a high school education course that blends practical preparation with learning theory. The course, called "Teaching in the High School," is offered to seniors interested in a career in education.

Future teachers can find out what teaching is all about before deciding on an education major. The course is an introduction to the profession, and offers a glimpse of the responsibilities that come with it.

Students gain hands-on experience by working with actual students in real-life classroom settings. They also have the opportunity to observe and participate in various educational programs, such as the "Teaching in the Elementary School" course and the "Teaching in the Secondary School" course.

In addition, students are encouraged to reflect on their own learning experiences, which helps them develop a deeper understanding of the teaching process. This course provides a comprehensive introduction to the field of education, preparing students for success in their future careers as educators.

We've come home because the students didn't plan to come back. But says with a smile, "That animal can be kept because of the additional empty stores. I continually stress to the staff of the teacher to reach that the teacher is not needed anymore. The same thing goes for the parent. It's a difficult concept for parents to understand the fact that they can't be fulfilled by programming them selves right out of the picture.

What about the future? First, the OIT program will expand more that funds are available for new experiences. OITJ stresses, however, that the current program's limitation will be retained with regard to student expenses and that almost any other high school could afford to set up a similar program because the costs have been so low. Here.

Next summer Gillette hopes to take a group of students on an exploration of Long Island Sound. Plans call for the students to tour boats to help children see the world. Gillette is a proponent of using real-life experiences to teach children. The next time theforsetp is the picture in the event that physical form or impressional form of a book is less than ideal.
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WHAT IS EDUCATION? Where does it take place? What happens? How can one tell that education is in process? Who applies it? and to whom? And most of all, why?

Towards not only are the answers indescribable, but the questions, too, even on the surface. Most anyone, with high school education and perhaps a college training, have spent time doing it and can point to how. With a piece of paper, a diploma which certifies that the holder has met all of the requirements of education as stipulated by the state and federal authorities by his people, there is a continued support and patronage for the diploma itself.

But the diploma is merely a symbol, a ticket purchased at a long distance in preparation of life. Much like a train trip of education is the process from point A to point B, in which the student travels over the same tracks and in the same cars, and still finds the consummation of the same process is, ordinarily, every other American in history.

To the 2,500 or so cars currently occupied by administrators, broadening education, broadening down to education of the individual, and a door of new past. The hope of education is a large building, a school, with a number of students, boys and girls, old and young, whose old, untrained minds and their young face for a brief time is the single person called a teacher. Education occurs in the teacher's consciousness and figure which the teacher requests to assimilate and follow in order to get into the murky, who diligently n'est them in your fashion.

The order to which one is thereby educated and the chance for receiving official recognition of such are established by the teacher's art. In the extent that a student can spell on a test or read a what the teacher tells him, he is "educated" and may apply for a diploma.

The paper, though, the form of education is even more subtle, less grand, perhaps. Although written may spell out reasons such as the paper, in man's position of the state, education is generally recorded as being for the betterment of the child, and to acquire goals to be the future better educated student of arts.

While tests are employed by the school paper, these are given outside the classroom, but the teacher and the student, or a student, have to be present to get where the action is.
It's not the case that the primary goal is to develop children who will be able to perform well on standardized tests. Instead, it's about providing a meaningful education that fosters critical thinking, creativity, and personal growth. This means that teachers need to adapt their teaching methods to meet the needs of individual students, rather than focusing solely on test scores. Today, schools are using a variety of strategies to achieve this, including project-based learning, personalized instruction, and technology integration. By doing so, they are helping to prepare students for the challenges of the 21st century and beyond.
Students who have completed the course at the end of the semester will be asked to complete a survey that assesses their understanding of the course material. The survey will be anonymous and will be used to improve the course offerings for future students.

It is important to note that the course will be offered again in the fall of 2023. Interested students are encouraged to register early to secure their spot in the class.

In summary, the course on [insert topic] is designed to [insert course objectives]. Through a combination of [insert course methods], students will gain a [insert skill/understanding]. The course is taught by [insert name], who has extensive experience in [insert relevant field].

If you have any questions about the course, please feel free to contact [insert name] via email at [insert email].

Thank you for considering this course as part of your academic journey.
APPENDIX C

Bomb Shelter Activity
Simulation Activity #1

Problem: The world has just suffered a very catastrophic event; a nuclear war has just about wiped out all of the human race. You had enough foresight to build a defense shelter. In addition to you, there are twenty persons who have survived the dreadful event. However, your shelter will only accommodate seven persons in addition to you. You must now select those seven persons from the survivors listed below:

1. White male, 28 yrs. old, 3rd year medical student, homosexual
2. White male, 58 yrs. old, "jack-of-all-trades", deaf mute
3. White male, 65 yrs. old, priest
4. Black female, 26 yrs. old, prostitute
5. White female, 32 yrs. old, six months pregnant
6. Black male, 8 yrs. old, son of number 4
7. White female, 1 yr. old, mothers' whereabouts unknown
8. Black male, 19 yrs. old, pimp, suspected heroin dealer
9. Black male, 25 yrs. old, militant author
10. White female, 10 yrs. old, retarded, daughter of number 5
11. White male, 30 yrs. old, Vietnam veteran, double amputee
12. White female, 16 yrs. old, high school drop-out
13. White female, 44 yrs. old, schoolteacher
14. White male, 49 yrs. old, bus driver
15. Black male, 26 yrs. old, ambulance medic
16. Oriental male, 46 yrs. old, engineer, has suffered two near fatal heart-attacks
17. Black female, 47 yrs. old, nun
18. White male, 35 yrs. old Rabbi
19. Black male, 60 yrs. old, gardener
20. Hispanic male, 16 yrs. old, migrant farm worker
Open education may be the approach whereby students will experience courses that give confidence in their abilities, strengths and talents.

Allowing teachers time to explore in order to make critical judgments about the time requirements of their subjects, and to request varying numbers of modules for different courses can clearly be seen as an expression of confidence in their professional capabilities.

Teachers are prepared to experience some flexible scheduling practices this coming school year.

Provisions for building control must be built into any schedule or program requested or designed.

Situation Including:

-- Philosophy of the Superintendent for Shaw in the Open Education concept.

-- The new Shaw building which will be completed by the fall of 1975 is designed architecturally as an Open Space school.

-- The workshop proposal provides for total involvement of the Shaw staff.

-- The workshop is involving approximately half of Shaw's teachers in the "hands-on" of Open Education.

-- These teachers are expected to utilize Open Space "hands-on" to experiment with other ideas and to share experiences with others beginning September, 1974.
-- Lack of aid
-- Lack of space for large groups
-- Lack of sufficient release time for planning and evaluation;

Possible first solutions:

1. Utilization of elements of traditional and flexible schedules

Objectives:

-- To involve the entire school in simple flexible scheduling through modification of the traditional schedule
-- To provide an opportunity for teachers to learn to manage a larger block of time
-- To give students a feel for a varied program
-- To provide time and encouragement for all teachers to try cooperative planning and interdisciplinary planning, team teaching and other varied activities
-- To gradually make the schedule more or less varied as times or situations demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Schedule Modification of Traditional Schedule to Reflect Individual Flexibility</th>
<th>First Time Blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1770.00

Plan.
XI. Pilot Project

Several of the teachers in this workshop are excited and are very anxious to plan and to teach in cooperation with teachers in the core and in different subject areas. A pilot project will provide an immediate opportunity for these teachers to share their information, talents, interests, and to develop additional competencies.

Objectives:

-- To find better ways of teaching students through an Open Education approach.
-- To increase cooperative planning, sharing and teaching among teachers and across disciplines.
-- To find better ways to utilize space, resources and time by doing.
-- To provide valid input or a part in setting up a new schedule for the new Shaw Open Space Junior High School.

General Guidelines:

-- That the project involve seventh graders only.
-- That four sections be assigned to this project.
-- That the same teachers of mathematics, science, English, and social studies be assigned to these four sections.
-- That these teachers be assigned the same planning period.
- Task release time, in addition to regular staff development days, be granted at the beginning of each quarter for broad-based planning and evaluating
- Task no special bell schedule be provided for the pilot project
- That the cooperating teachers plan the modules for implementation, alter the modules as needed, and be responsible for the academic and temporal learning progress of the students in all four sections
- That a number of the teacher aids be assigned to the pilot project on a fulltime basis.

### Project #1: Teacher-Filled Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not all students in the pilot project will be successful
- Not all students during the project
- Not all teachers will be successful in the project
- Not all students will be successful in the project
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Mrs. Harris
Miss Wheeler
Mrs. Nolan
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Mrs. Watkins
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Mrs. Flack
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Miss Ferguson
Mr. Hughes
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Mr. Anick, Chairman
REPORT TO LARGER GROUP  
July 2, 1974

Rationale
Mrs. Bordley  
Miss Wheeler

Objectives
Miss Ferguson

The New Shaw Floor - Plan
Mrs. Harris

Inventory for the Use of Space in the New Shaw
Mrs. Nolan  
Mrs. Watkins  
Mrs. Adams

The Use of Furniture
Mrs. Flack  
Miss Estes

Training Sessions for the Fall
Mrs. Brooks  
Miss Estes  
Mr. Hughes

Summary
Mr. Amick
Because space is one of the most important factors in any building, it is necessary to know how the entire area will be allotted. There is a need to know the actual size of each instructional area. Will all areas be the same or will they vary in size according to instructional purposes? Provisions must be made space-wise for all activities; educational, recreational, and social.

In order to obtain the optimum benefits of space, the use of that space should be planned rather than haphazardly assigned.

Wise use of space will have positive benefits upon the effectiveness of the total school program.
Space Objectives

1. To develop skill in planning effective use of space.
2. To provide areas whereby teachers can plan and work together.
3. To have an input in deciding on the kind of furniture and other teaching aids for the new school and its placement.
4. To enable the personnel to become acquainted with the new building by providing floor plans.
5. To provide a space (environment) which is satisfying emotionally and visually.
6. To provide a proper space for books and other teaching materials.
7. To provide a space for working with materials.
8. To secure a space for audio-visual aids.
9. To secure a space for storage of working materials and other equipment.
10. To determine how many children, teachers and subjects will be within a space.
I. Purposes
   A. Experience in open setting
      1. students
      2. teachers
   B. Student reaction
      1. suggestions
      2. criticisms

II. Participant
   A. Teachers
      1. all faculty members
      2. 15 per session
      3. arranged in three groups
   B. Students
      1. regular classes
      2. in regular class time
   C. Member of administrative staff

III. Procedures
   A. Sessions
      1. Choice
         a. once a month
         b. 3 per semester
      2. located in cafeteria
   B. Teacher Preparation
      1. Time Choices
         a. faculty meeting
         b. planning period
c. lunch and guidance periods
  d. outside of school
2. Relocation of Furniture

C. Planning
1. location of each teacher
2. integrated curriculum
3. administrative input
4. correction of previous negative aspects

D. Follow-up Activities
1. Teacher evaluation of session
   a. written
   b. discussion
2. correction of undesirable aspects
3. student expression
Space is a very important requirement in any school. We must know where classrooms will be located and where other important locations in the building will be.

The New Shaw Junior High School will be Open Space. It will be important to all those concerned to know the nature of the use of space in this new building. The space group has made the following proposals that will put space as one of the focal points in the building.
1. Space should be provided for conferences with students.

2. There will be about 300 students per part and 10 sections of 30 students each. There should be space available to these students.

3. There should be space suitable for larger groups to meet.

4. There must be a media center for each house.

5. There should be a display center for each house.

6. There must be equalization of work loads that will enable the teachers to reach their objectives in teaching in terms of students at any given time.

7. Space must be used for one subject matter only unless the teachers decide to team.

8. The teachers will decide where their desk should be.
Same proposals suggested for the Time group.

1. There should be time for conferences with students.

2. There must be time for planning together and evaluating the compatibility of personalities.

3. There should be time to experiment with students in the open space classrooms.
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"Moving On Up"

Submitted by:
Curriculum Committee

Barbara Hubbard
Collette Preston
Audrey Higgs
Marion Davis
Frances Spencer
Dorothy Carter
REPORT TO LARGER GROUP

July 3, 1975

THEME: "Moving On Up"

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:
To explore the theme, "Moving On Up", in each subject matter represented in the team while simultaneously interlocking the various disciplines: Art, Music, French, Social Studies, Business, and Home Economics.

WARM-UP ACTIVITY:
Each of us, as team members, shall designate a period to discuss all of the learning disciplines with our students. This will be done as a warm-up activity from the viewpoint of careers. During the warm-up we will play the recorded theme, "Moving On Up", from the television program The Jeffersons.

USE OF MEDIA:
There will be a five-minute presentation by each teacher in the team using some form of media. Note: alternatives may be utilized if any activity is not effective.

FOLLOW-UP AND CULMINATING ACTIVITY:
Each member will decide which was the most motivating activity and share what we have done with the entire student body. This will be exhibited in the following ways:
1. Display cases in hallways.
2. Display cases in classrooms (bulletin boards).

EVALUATION OF TEAM PLAN:

Evaluation of the team plan will take the following forms:

1. Students will complete a Pupil Feed Back Sheet. Some other modes of pupil evaluation will be through presentation of scrapbooks, bulletin boards, role playing, and participation in a learning center.

2. Teacher Evaluation -- members will compile a list of our strengths and weaknesses that were noted throughout our planning unit. Thus we will come together and compare our methods of improvement by way of a discussion.

SPECIAL NOTATION:

All members agreed to work on this mini unit for a total of ten days, as some of our team members will only meet with students two or three times a week.
Specific Objective:
Given the theme, "Moving On Up", the class will be motivated to select ways to explore music for entertainment as well as a productive career.

Suggested Activities:

1. Tape the themes, "Moving On Up" and "All in the Family". What do the themes suggest to you?
2. Use other subject fields, concentrate on the career of how to produce the above shows.
3. Improvise the theme on bells and piano.
4. Write a second verse, using the ballad style.
5. Use role playing and identify the people behind the television scene.
6. Compare television programs with live shows, showing the advantages and disadvantages.
7. Write a fifteen-minute television script.
8. Draw a cartoon about emotions (love, hate, fear).
9. Select background music; put them together to compare or become another score.
10. Make up a word puzzle.
11. Make up a commercial; discover what is needed to get the attention of the public.
12. Make a filmstrip; select music to accompany it.
13. Turn off the sound on the T.V.; list the reasons music makes it interesting.
14. Make your television schedule, using the programs you enjoy most (1 day).
15. Tape five of your most enjoyable themes; try them out on members of the class to see if they know the name of the show it represents.

16. Make a bulletin board of students' work.

17. Discuss early Saturday morning T.V. as opposed to late T.V. shows.

18. Sing songs used on T.V. which were commercially used, etc. (i.e., Coca Cola theme).

19. What are some of the careers involved in producing a radio show, an opera, a musical, or a television show?

20. Construct a radio which plays.

21. Produce a puppet show; make the puppets, construct the stage and script.

22. Learn the music to the latest musical.

Evaluation:

1. Informal observation by students, culminating program.

2. Student self-appraisal.

3. Oral examination by peers.


5. Keep record of what was done; list strengths and weaknesses.

6. Teachers in the group will evaluate the program according to its success through the success of the students.
THEME
"MOVING ON UP"

In Relation to the World of Work -- In Textiles and Clothing

Individual Objectives:

Textiles and Clothing

1. Help students learn more about jobs available in the world of.
2. Encourage students to select careers in textiles and clothing.
3. Assist in training them for advance work in the field.
4. Encourage learning basic principles and engineering skills.

Instructional Outcomes:

1. (a) Encourage creativity and understanding;
   (b) increase interest.

Activities:

1. Research work on Careers, vocations, and jobs; on qualifications for each, training locations, courses to pursue, places to find employment, salaries and wages.
2. Make students make posters with pictures representing each job analysis.

Resource Materials:

Library, Magazines.

Invite resource people in for discussions if possible -- model, alteration worker, seamstress.
Follow-Up Activity:

Have students select other activities of interest to complete our work on the theme for the final activity -- end of 10 day period.

Marion Davis
"MOVING ON UP" THROUGH SOCIAL STUDIES

Specific Objective:
Students will make scrapbooks and posters showing what services are in the community, and how each works.

Activities:

1. Work individually for ten minutes listing careers.

2. Form groups -- decide which careers (occupations, businesses, or services) are found in the neighborhood.

3. Walk through the neighborhood to see what businesses we can find.

4. Discuss theme, "Moving On Up", from "The Jeffersons".
   a. Why did the Jeffersons move?
   b. What kind of business is George in?
   c. Which neighborhood is similar to this one, the one they lift or the one they moved to?

5. Plan a trip to the fire department (then take it).

6. Have a fireman visit us to talk about "safety in the home".

7. Follow-up exercise: answer in your own way, "When can security be unsafe?".

8. A visit from a policeman who will show films and answer questions about the services of the police department.

9. Follow-up exercise: "Is your policeman a "pig" or a "pal". Defend your answer. (May be in the form of a short debate.)

10. Interview a person in your community whom you admire. (We will work together on a short questionnaire.)
Suggestions:

a. Ed Murphy (Supper Club - Georgia Ave.)
b. Bishop S.E. Williams of Bibleway
c. the manager of the Golden Rule Supermarket
d. a doctor of nurse in the Health Clinic
e. someone in the New Howard University Hospital
f. Mr. Turner (B&B)
g. Mr. Webb (Photo Shop)

11. "How will the Bicentennial affect community services?" Elicit answers from pupils; make a list on the travelgraph.

12. Committees will be organized to document activities by making a bulletin board using pictures taken, materials collected on trips, and students' "follow-up" work.

Evaluation:

1. Completion of scrapbooks and posters.

2. Feedback sheets from pupils indicating to us how successful they think we have been while "Moving On Up" through the study of this mini-unit.

Materials Needed:

- poster board
- paste
- scissors
- construction paper
- fasteners
- permission slips
- tape recorder and tapes
- travelgraph
- hole punch
- camera
- film
- flash bulbs
Objective:
To have the art students participate in individual and group activities centered around their interpretations of the theme.

Individual Activities:
1. Express the theme in a drawing (color media—pastels or wax crayons).
2. Make a poster or collage on occupations.

Group Activities:
1. Prepare bulletin board in the room on the theme after "brainstorming".
2. Discussions with art teachers and artist in the neighborhood.

Culminating Activity:
1. Display of flat work done.

Method of Evaluation:
1. Student evaluation.
2. Class critique.
3. Teacher critique.
"MOVING ON UP" - FRENCH LANGUAGE

Specific Goals:

1. After listening to the theme, students can have a simple conversation in French about the Jefferson family. This will help to introduce the career of George Jefferson, and the roles of his wife, Louise, and their son, Lionel.

2. Let the students become acquainted with the President of France, Monsieur Giscard d'Estaing, and his family as another view of an important career.

3. Hopefully the students will learn to sing the French version of Look At Me, I'm In Love, by the Moments. Purpose -- enjoyment and understanding of the song.

4. Students may talk about careers at the French Embassy and/or those at the United Nations; also include careers or positions held at the popular French Market in Georgetown.

Activities:

1. Working with the already popular French version of Look At Me (by Moments).

2. Students to visit French Embassy and/or African Embassy where French language is dominant.

3. Visit La Maison des Crepes (restaurant) and/or the popular French Market.

4. Draw up a newsletter to summarize accomplishments.
Specific Objective:

Given the theme, "Moving On Up", the students will be asked to examine various business occupations and how typewriting can introduce them to the world of work.

Activities:

1. Prepare two bulletin boards: (a) "Entering the World of Work Through Business". This will entail pictures, job descriptions and brochures. (b) "Moving On Up". This will entail material on low-level jobs, middle-level jobs and top-level jobs in the area of business. (Pictures and information will be in a hierarchy type of form.

2. Set up seven different (will take place at seven different times) simulated office situations and have student role playing. There will be hypothetical relationship designed between employers and employees.

3. Have students analyze occupations of friends, relatives and two television characters. One of the two television characters must come from The Jeffersons.

4. Have students read and summarize two occupational briefs and have them list five ways typewriting will be an asset in obtaining a job.

Evaluation:

1. Student rating sheets.

2. Teacher observation.

3. Class discussions.

4. Brief essay report on "How Typewriting Can Assist Me in Obtaining the Job I Liked Most".
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TURN - "OF" ------- NOT "OUT"

Submitted by:
Curriculum Committee

Abrans, Lila B.                         Marshall, Louise L.
Cosby, Phil H.                                  Mattingly, Julie B.
Ellis, Jr., Percy L.                  Patton, Dorothy P.
Lineberger, Robert L.                   Thomas, Ella M.
1. **LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVE:**

   Given a daily ten-minute "turn-on" activity based on the students' current interests, 80% of the students, because of increased motivation, will attend school with more regularity.

2. **RATIONALE:**

   Many students have been "turned-off" as far as school is concerned and, therefore, spend more time "out of" school than "in" school during the designated school hours. This fact is revealed in the summer school assessment made recently for prospective summer school enrollees. We at Shaw Junior High School are greatly concerned about this problem and feel a commitment to improve the situation.

   In view of our personal commitment and the philosophy underlying the summer school program - "To develop increased skill proficiency in students through an interdisciplinary approach with strong motivational appeal to students" - we have agreed to try the following project.

**TURN-ON ACTIVITIES:**

   The beginning ten minutes of each day will be highlighted with a different "fun activity" that will have appeal to our students. Upon the introduction of the first activity, the students will be told that they can anticipate a different "fun activity" every day.

**IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE:**

   (This would be the objective for each warm-up activity.)

   Example:

   Given an opportunity to become thoroughly familiar with the locations of visible objects within the classroom, the student upon re-entering the room from which he was sent while an object was rearranged, will be able to orally identify that rearrangement with 100% accuracy.

**SKILLS INVOLVED:**

1. speaking
2. observing
3. listening
4. selecting
5. decision making

Each activity will be analyzed in our report in the following manner:

1. Educational objective of the activity
2. Alotted time
3. Description of Activity
4. Skills involved
5. Evaluation

(Cont.)
EVALUATION:

Two groups will be observed for three (3) weeks.
Group A will be given the "Turn-on" activities.
Group B will not be given "Turn-on" activities.
A comparison will be made in terms of interest and attendance for both groups. At the end of the three (3) week period the "Turn-on" activities will be discontinued with Group A. An evaluation will then be made of Group A for the remaining three (3) weeks to determine if the interest and attendance remain the same or are affected in a positive or negative way.

Group B will be re-evaluated also at the end of the second three-week period.

A uniform method of recording daily attendance will be utilized.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

2. Cosby, Phil H. 6. Mattingly, Julie B.
3. Ellis, Percy L. Jr. 7. Patton, Dorothy P.
4. Lineberger, Mr. Robert L. 8. Thomas, Ella M.
1. Implement the activity in the classroom for a three week period:

   Ella Thomas
   Lila Abrams
   Phil Cosby
   Robert Lineberger

2. Collecting Materials:

   Louise Marshall

3. Evaluation:

   Julie Mattingly
   Dorothy P. Patton
   Percy L. Ellis, Jr.
A School-wide Project
Dealing with the Affective
Domain of Students at
Shaw Junior High School

Gwendolyn Flack
Ann Kinard
George Stover
Gloria Bolds
Bettye Brooks
Kathleen Ferguson

"Roads to Rome!" Team
Introduction

School, among other things, is a relatively "closed community" that functions best when a strong sense of cooperation and interdependence can be established. We believe that where no real sense of "family" exists the institution is limited in the overall success it may attain. It, therefore, becomes necessary for all personnel and staff to seek ways to encourage in students a greater understanding of the need to cooperate and to share responsibility.

Since the ability to cooperate and to share responsibility may be reflective of one's personal pride, we would like to suggest an activity that is closely associated — pride of one's school, which must also have a personal component.

Perhaps, through a campaign to improve the cleanliness of our school we may be able to get all members of the Shaw "Family" to understand and to accept the futility of attempting to get students to cooperate with our efforts simply because we, as authority figures, suggest them. We believe that children will give the best that is in them, when they understand why it is necessary.
Of course, we must be supportive of this philosophy in our own content areas. As individuals, we will put forth our efforts with a program in our content areas.
Objectives:

1. To get students to become aware that they must be responsible for their personal space and the cleanliness of it.

2. To instill in the Shaw students pride within themselves, which will be reflected in a cleaner learning environment.

3. To encourage each staff member to participate and to help promote the idea of a cleaner learning environment.

4. To encourage the community to participate in promoting the idea of a cleaner learning environment.

5. To solicit the efforts of charismatic community resource persons or organizations to publicly reward those students for making their personal space indicative of the best which is found in all Shaw students.

6. To negotiate with the principal to make this campaign for self-worth, top priority at the first faculty meeting.

7. To solicit volunteers from each class and each student organization to be involved in the program which fosters a cleaner learning environment through self-worth or pride.
Activities:

1. To include a statement in the "Back to School" letters to teachers concerning the school-wide project concerning self-worth as evidenced in the cleanliness of personal space.

2. To employ the use of a suggestion box for teachers at the first faculty meeting.

3. To employ the use of a suggestion box for students in the homeroom period on their first day back to school.

4. To present assemblies whereby the principal and counselors appeal to the students' sense of cooperation concerning self-worth as reflected in the cleanliness of the school plant.

5. To enlist the expertise of the Art Department to make posters on ecology.

6. To have student ecology monitors to rate each room periodically and to reward those students with some immediate recognition.

7. To dramatize skits on self pride/cleanliness at school using the expertise of the English Department. Values concerning oneself should be stressed.

8. To beautify rooms with plants, flowers, and shrubbery. This should be a prefect joining teachers and students.

9. To advertise for "Saturday Volunteers" to beautify the grounds at Shaw.
10. To post in each classroom, cafeteria, halls, lavatories, and auditorium a list called, "The Attributes of a Positive Shaw Student" which states that he:
   a. Keeps lockers clean
   b. Puts trash in receptacles
   c. Does not write on walls
   d. Helps teachers to beautify classrooms
   e. Removes trays from cafeteria table
   f. Does not spit on floors
   g. Picks up after himself
   h. Understands that maintenance of his personal space engenders respect and love of himself
   i. Understands that maintenance of his personal space engenders respect and love of others
   j. Keeps lavatories clean.

11. To employ "The Washington Redskins", Mayor Walter Washington, Representative Fauntroy, or local merchants to render support to positive Shaw students with positive public acclaim.

12. To have a student inventory of those values which are priorities to students.

13. To have an inventory from teachers of those values which they observe in positive students.
Criteria for Evaluation:

1. To compile responses from the student inventory.

2. To compile responses from the teacher inventory.

3. To take pictures of the school plant and grounds before "Pride in oneself and pride in one's personal space" campaign and after the campaign is in progress.
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Carol Fizer
Susie Thornton
Janalene Ferguson
INFORMAL ASSESSMENT

Objectives:
To explore various "teacher-made" and commercial games with a focus on using these games as assessment instruments.

Strategies:
1. Collect games and other activities that could be used to assess visual perception, auditory discrimination, students' interests, and memory span.
2. Present these games in an informal manner to the group.
3. Act as consultants during the fall to other group members, to help with assessment.
4. Individual contracts.
APPENDIX F

Bunker's Summary of Evaluation 1975
SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS
SUBMITTED ON JULY 3, 1975, BY
PARTICIPANTS IN SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
SUMMER WORKSHOP

SUMMARIZED BY
Dr. R. Mason Bunker
Workshop Director
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
September, 1975
The attempt to sample participant perceptions of their summer workshop experience included the following instruments:

(1) Open Ended Statements:
"My goals for this workshop were..."
"The workshop has helped me to..."
"I still need to work on..."
"The best thing about this workshop has been..."
"I think the staff..."

(2) Some Assumptions About Open Education:
in which six assumptions were listed with space for participants to respond to:
"What evidence do you have that the workshop staff believes these?"
"What can you take back to Shaw?"

(3) An Invitation to Write a Letter to the Workshop Director to:
"Evaluate his teaching ability"
"Describe his strengths"
"Suggest next steps"
"Evaluate his leadership of this workshop series"
Data from these instruments were collected on July 3, 1975 (the final day of the workshop) and have been summarized to indicate all responses received and the frequency of incident of any response from participants. Data are presented below in frequency tables. Following each table are discussion, conclusions, and implications for next steps. The total number of workshop participants was N=23; the number responding on these evaluation instruments was N=16.

Open Ended Statements

Data are presented and analyzed for the five sub statements below in Tables 1 through 5.

"My goals for the workshop were..."

There were eleven different responses to the goal statement (see Table 1).

The most frequently held goals dealt with a need participants had for developing methods, materials and curriculum for use in their classrooms (items 1,2,4,6) and for developing a personal meaning for the open education approach (item 6). Several responses dealt with needs to help students (items 2,5); and in at least seven instances need for working more closely with co-workers was a stated goal (items 9,11). At least six times participants indicated that a goal for them was to function more effectively in their professional roles (item 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop curriculum materials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Improve atmosphere/environment of my class/become more open</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Help my students realize potential</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Develop individualized instructional strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Uncover students' motivations to learn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Develop group processes for my class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Function more effectively in my role</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gain perspective on open education approach</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Get to know this faculty/team</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gain criteria for decision making</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Share with my fellow colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These articulated goals are consistent with those established for this series of workshops:

* To relate the theory of open education to practice of teachers in the field
* To help teachers move their classrooms toward more open classrooms
* To establish procedures leading toward staff development and cooperation

Clearly this congruence is an indicator that participants and staff shared objectives for the workshop. Given this evidence it is appropriate to continue under the assumption that shared decision making in terms of goal setting is an effective way to bring agreement on purposes between those staff and participants.

"This workshop has helped me to..."

Two participants responded to this statement with the simple reply that the workshop had helped them meet their goals (item 1, Table 2).

Several participants (N=8) felt the workshop had helped them develop better methods and materials and at least four mentioned a gain in knowledge about new materials (item 7). Interesting to note are the number of instances in which participants thought the workshop had helped them gain a better understanding of self (items 2, 4) and of work with others (items 6, 8). That three participants felt the workshop had led them to include students in decision-making (item 5) is closely related to one of the original goals of this project (that shared decision-making would increase).
### Table 2: "The Workshop Has Helped Me To..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Achieve my goals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Develop workable philosophy of open education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Better use methods/materials to meet goals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Become more aware of my strengths/weaknesses (values)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Include students in planning process (providing choices)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Utilize roles/groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Know new materials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Relate better to my co-workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Focus on learners' needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of responses between Tables 1 and 2 indicate that all articulated goals of participants were met. This evidence leads us to value the early workshop experience which provided opportunity for needs assessment, individual and group goal setting, shared decision-making for planning, workshop activities and the use of time, space, and resources.

"I still need to work on..."

There was a wide spread of responses to the statement dealing with perceived next steps for individuals (Table 3). This spread is an indication of the heterogeneity of the group and is evidence for the need to provide for individual differences. This confirms that workshop staff should continue to provide learning experiences to meet individual needs and should arrange opportunities for participants to recognize their strengths and assess their needs frequently.

Interesting to note are the frequency of "next steps" which suggest that participants will continue practicing and using what they have learned during the workshop (items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13); in each of these areas workshop experiences was offered. There is a personal intention on the part of participants to practice what they are learning. This situation indicates it will be important for staff to continue the use of such strategies as:
* Using Borton's questions (What? So What? Now What?) as a format for the daily logs
* Contracting with participants individually and in groups for "next steps"
* Discussing ways of transfer from workshop to school setting during each learning experience

What enthusiasm for next steps is held by one participant who responds, "I still need to work on more of everything!"

"The best thing about this workshop has been..."

At least twelve responses to this statement indicate the participants' values of the opportunity created for them to work in groups (item 2, Table 4). This is evidence in support of the major project goal to encourage staff renewal in this group of participants.

Strong favorable response toward the dynamics of the workshop and the atmosphere created is indicated by items 5, 6, 8, 10. More evidence of the planned transfer of workshop experiences to participants' own classrooms is apparent in items 3, 4, 7, 9.

Workshop staff should recognize in these responses reinforcement for continued planning of experiences which demand group participation, varied approaches to the use of time, space, and resources, and frequent opportunities to plan for transfer of learning experience to one's own classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maintaining cooperation between home/school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Practicing group processes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locating kids with negative self concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Developing/using learning stations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Planning/decision-making</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Uncovering learners' interests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Deciding what's necessary to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>A few of my hang-ups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How to reach the &quot;unreachable&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Understanding my co-workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Using camera/films</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Getting more open</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Organization/scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>More of everything</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Helped me attain goals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Opportunity to work in groups</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Skill inventories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Questioning skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere created (dynamic leadership)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Recognized need to work on our own mental health before being turned loose on children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Planning activities to take back to my class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Helping us find our own way</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Morning “Warm-Ups”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The building the workshop was held at</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Hearing positive aspects of open education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"I think the staff..."

Well over a score of responses represent the perceptions of participants about the workshop staff and appear in Table 5. The consistent and persistent attempts by staff to individualize instruction and to personalize workshop experiences are reflected in such a range of perceptions.

The most frequently mentioned responses dealt with the staff's ability to successfully model open behaviors (item 14), their knowledge (items 1,12), and their flexibility and efficiency in meeting needs (items 2,11).

The responses could have been reduced in number by combining more of them into like categories; however, the original responses to this statement elicited such lengthy and specific comments that it appeared more useful to examine them as individually as possible. The responses are indeed a reflection of the strong, positive feeling participants share about the staff. There are no negative perceptions reported.

Staff should continue to provide the helping behaviors which were perceived by participants so positively. Among those behaviors are:

- Asking clarifying questions
- Remaining knowledgeable in materials, methods, strategies
- Combining the presentation of new data and the opportunity for learners to interact with those data
- Sharing decision-making
TABLE 5: "I THINK THE STAFF..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wealth of information shared</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Delivery very effective and efficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kept discussions flowing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Concerned about solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Effectively included all members in discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Effectively included all members in activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Correlated information from Summer '74-'75 workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Well trained</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Flexible and open</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Conscious of new trends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Accommodating to wishes of group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Presented relevant books and materials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Very good working relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>together/excellent team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Modeled atmosphere to lead others</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to be cooperative/ resourceful/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to work as a team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Helped me get a better understanding of open space</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Helped me to clear up misconceptions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>They did so much with so little</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Shared in discussions/assisted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Wonderful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Offered services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Added to our success/made workshop a pleasure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Helped me learn about learning centers/T.A./turn-on activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Helped me help my students/other Shaw staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>They (ARC Team!) helped me make great strides toward openness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Were humanistic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Assumptions About Open Education

Tables 6 through 11 present summarized data from the instrument designed to identify participant perceptions of evidence that staff held particular assumptions about open education; the instrument also provided opportunity for participants to indicate ideas, concepts, and experiences they would carry home to their school situation related to each of these assumptions. Data are presented below with discussion.

"Learning is an active process."

Participants offered nine indicators that staff believed and acted on this assumption (Table 6A).

Agreement on evidence related to opportunities for interaction with others (item 2) and for direct learning experiences (item 3) was made by six respondents. Four participants stated that the staff had provided flexible groupings (item 1) and opportunity for movement through activities (item 5) consistent with the notion of active learning.

Staff should continue to act in ways recognized by participants as congruent with this assumption. Staff should determine strategies to help participants "see" the many other ways in which they intended to demonstrate belief in this assumption.

Table 6B indicates nine various transfers participants hope to make in order to encourage active learning in their own school. The daily "warm-ups" were popular (N=4) and mentioned in other places as well. All items stated are
TABLE 6A: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Flexible small/large group discussions activated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Opportunities for interaction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Direct experiences/activities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Used learning stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Movement through activities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Many, varied materials, things to use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Learned from each other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Staff acted as facilitators (active listeners)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Fun activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"LEARNING IS AN ACTIVE PROCESS"

**TABLE 60: "What can you take back to Shaw?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Daily Warm-Ups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>More direct experiences for students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Staff interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Set up learning stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Use variety of materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Involve kids in decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Help kids get information rather than tell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>More active listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Copy staff actions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consistent with the major goals of the workshop series and
with articulated participant goals (Table 1). This con-
sistency between intended behavior and articulated goals
appears strong, and a positive indication that participants
intend to carry out that workshop experience in their own
domains.

"Sharing decision-making increases student involvement."

Of importance to nine participants appears to be the
opportunity to have input to the workshop plans (item 1;
Table 7A). Of nearly equal importance as evidence of staff
belief in shared decision-making, is the articulated evidence
that the participants made choices and decisions (item 2).

Clearly the statements offered by participants indicate
their recognition of staff belief in sharing decision-making.
The emphasis during the workshop on shared decision-making
was sufficient to make participants highly aware of it.

Participant intention to utilize greater shared decision
making in their own situations is strong as well (items 1, 2,
3, 4, 5; Table 7B) and is consistent with a major goal of
this workshop. Staff should be encouraged to continue acting
on their belief that shared decision-making increases student
input.
"SHARING DECISION-MAKING INCREASES STUDENT INVOLVEMENT"

**TABLE 7A: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Entire staff had input to workshop plans</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students made choices/decisions (groups/tasks)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Played decision-making games</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Discussed decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Staff shared responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>We planned the last day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7B: "What can you take back to Shaw?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Assign management to students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Share decision-making with students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Staff will have input in organizational/operational plans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use decision-making games</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Help students assume more responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Teachers must be responsive to students' needs."

Nine participants indicated that the staff had arranged workshop activities to be responsive to their needs (item 1: Table 8A).

Staff responsiveness to resource needs (item 5) was seen as consistent with this assumption. Participants saw congruency between staff behavior and the assumption in each case and appear determined to use strategies they've learned in their own situations (Table 8B).

Interesting to note, are the intentions to use needs assessment instruments with children (item 6) and to plan more with children (item 5). At least two participants will use contracting schemes (item 3) learned in the workshop.

Staff should be encouraged and continue to use "Getting to Know You" activities and needs surveys. They should continue planning experiences which are responsive to individual needs and which help participants see next steps through discussions and feedback on daily logs.

"Teachers need to be concerned with group processes."

Table 9A offers indicators that participants recognized staff behavior consistent with this assumption. They were cognizant of being grouped in many ways (items 1, 4) and of the benefits of understanding received using group dynamics (items 2, 3, 5, 6).
"Teachers must be responsive to students' needs."

Table 8A: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Workshop activities geared to student needs (the needs assessment)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Involved in activities/strategies we can use in the fall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A nurturing environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Emphasis on meeting individual needs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Staff provided resources when we requested them</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8B: "What can you take back to Shaw?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Use scientific approach to learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Use more media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use contracting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Needs of staff will be a vital part of planning of any activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Plan with children</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Assess children's needs (use surveys/observations)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Give children as much time as they need to finish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Individualize my instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Use skill inventories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All items indicate a strong intent by participants to use group dynamics in their own situations, (Table 9B).

Staff should recognize that their constant emphasis on using flexible grouping styles, teaching the dynamics of groups, and helping participants visualize transfers to their own situations have resulted in participant perception of congruence between staff belief and behavior in this area.

"Success is built upon success; teachers should build on strengths."

At least one participant recognized that staff took leadership roles in areas where they themselves had strength (item 7; Table 10A).

Participants felt that staff helped them determine their own needs and strengths (items 1,3). Four recognized and mentioned that staff used positive reinforcement (item 4).

One participant questioned whether staff could get to know her strength in such a short time (item 6).

In Table 103 are participant intentions to build a success-orientation into their own situations by providing more activities for children which will lead them to success (items 1, 2), by cooperative planning (items 4, 6, 7, 8), by using positive reinforcement (item 9), and by continuing to recognize their own strengths (item 5).
"TEACHERS NEED TO BE CONCERNED WITH GROUP PROCESSES"

**Table 9a: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Grouped each day</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Learned from one another</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learned about each other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Experienced group process: in action</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Analyzed roles of group members</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>We made decisions for ourselves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9b: "What can you take back to Shaw?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I shall change my method of grouping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff will have opportunities to work in groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use &quot;fish bowl&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use group dynamics with children</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Use of personalized instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"SUCCESS IS BUILT UPON SUCCESS: TEACHERS SHOULD BUILD ON STRENGTHS"

**TABLE 10A: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Helped us plan what we wanted to learn and how to accomplish it</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>We were in situations where success was made possible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Surveyed our needs to learn about us</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>We were praised for work well done</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>We built skill inventories focusing on &quot;healthy self-concepts&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Did you really get to know my strengths in this short time?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Staff led workshops in which they had strength</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Books/articles/materials stressed this</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"SUCCESS IS BUILT UPON SUCCESS; TEACHERS SHOULD BUILD ON STRENGTHS"

**TABLE 10b: “What can you take back to Shaw?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide more activities for students to build on strengths</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Entire staff will contribute individual talents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Use “Getting to Know You” survey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use skill inventories (self-concept)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Continue recognizing my strengths and building on them</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>More student involvement in setting goals and decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>More daily pupil-teacher discussions on strengths/needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Use other teachers’ strengths and offer myself to them</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Use a positive attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff should note the range of suggestions for implementing this assumption in participants' own situations and recognize the equally lengthy list of observable behaviors which indicate participant perceptions of congruency between staff assumption and behaviors.

"Teachers need to help students build healthy self-concepts."

At least thirteen different evidences of staff behavior are offered by participants in Table 11A; these are indications that staff recognize and act on a belief in the importance of healthy self-concepts. A number of participants (N=8) said they felt welcomed and valued by the staff (items 1, 3, 4). The wide range of responses offer specific examples of ways in which staff contributed to participants' feelings of self worth. Several evidences recall specific workshop experiences (items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13). Staff should view these participant perceptions as evidence that the activities planned have indeed led participants toward one of the project subgoals: the development of healthy self-concepts.

Intended transfer of workshop experiences to participant classrooms is apparent in Table 11B.

Once again, participants have listed specific workshop experiences which will be carried back to their own school (items 1, 2, 3, 9, 11). Interesting to note are items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 in which participants have listed workshop processes they themselves have experienced as processes they intend to structure in their own situations.
"TEACHERS NEED TO HELP STUDENTS BUILD HEALTHY SELF-CONCEPT."

TABLE IIA: "What evidence do you have that workshop staff believe this?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Each participant was made to feel welcome by instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Workshop involved movement, communication, creativity, planning, and the development of self-direction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Each participant made to feel he had something valuable to contribute (worth).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Staff developed sense of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Individual differences accepted by staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Active participation allowed our competence to show</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Emphasis on affective as well as cognitive skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Positive attitudes of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mason's written comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sharing information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Use of warm-up activities stressing similarities of group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Use of &quot;Who Am I?&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Developed list of characteristics of adolescents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"TEACHERS NEED TO HELP STUDENTS BUILD HEALTHY SELF-CONCEPTS"

TABLE 11B: "What can you take back to Shaw?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Use camera/photo board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Use &quot;Who Am I?&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I will continue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Each staff will have opportunity to use and develop his area of expertise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Give children more choice of activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Discuss more about children's self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Offer controlled opportunities for students to prove competence to be successful</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Help children create a positive self-image</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Provide positive reinforcement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Demonstrate respect/friendliness toward pupils</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I will try to be less a &quot;critical parent&quot; (TA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recognize that these participant intentions are evidence that both the process and content of the workshop have led participants to value and act on the belief that students must be helped to build healthy self-concepts.

"An Invitation to Write a Letter to the Workshop Director."

This invitation brought lengthy responses from participants. Each letter listed specific examples of participant perceptions of the director's strengths and leadership style. The "next steps" suggested by participants were often next steps for themselves rather than for the director.

The data from the letters has been arranged in table form and appear under the categories: "Perceptions of the Director's Teaching Ability", "Perceptions of the Director's Leadership Skill", and "Perceptions of Next Steps." Written letters were submitted and analyzed at the writing of this report (July 29, 1975).

"Perceptions of the Director's Teaching Ability"

Letters are overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the workshop in general and the director's teaching ability and strengths specifically. Table 12A presents at least eighteen specific participant examples of the director's teaching ability as they perceived it.

Of particular interest to note are the number of instances participants indicated their value of the director's "wealth of information" (N=10; item 2) and the strategies he used
which they in turn could take back to their classrooms (N=6; item 7). The responses in these items are evidence that project subgoals and articulated participant goals dealing with gaining new information and strategies to take back to classrooms are being met. Other items which offer evidence that workshop goals are being met include item 8, dealing with group process; 14, that learning needn't be drudgery; and 9, focusing on learner strengths. Those items pertaining to the personal style of the director (1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18) provide evidence that participants were perceiving a variety of attributes of the director.

That participants felt they were learning (items 3, 7, 10, 14, 15), is interesting self-report and is validated by the staff evaluation of those participants who responded in such a manner. At least one participant was impressed with the amount of time the director spent with workshop participants (item 13) and two stated they felt the director was an extraordinary teacher (item 6).

The director should view the positive perceptions of participants toward him and his teaching ability as reinforcement for that particular style of working with people in a workshop setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wealth of information</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Made it easy to understand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Met individual differences and needs (in terms of difficulty and interest)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warm, friendly manner; human-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extraordinary teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modeled strategies I can use in my classroom; teaches by example</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skillful in implementing group processes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Focused on student strengths</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Probed and challenged students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Secure in what he's doing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spent time with us</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Helped me see that learning can be fun</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Helped me grow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good voice projection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Has a sense of humor; is direct and tactful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Has a pleasant appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13 responses
"Perceptions of the Director's Leadership Skill"

Table 12B lists participant perceptions of the director's skill at managing the workshop. The seventeen statements represent a wide range of perceived attributes, yet form a consistently positive collection in total. Two very important perceptions are items 5 and 6 in which three and four participants perceived that the director had affected positive attitude changes in participants and that he had encouraged students to arrive at educational concepts in a way which has personal meaning for them. Another perception shared by two participants is that the director avoided acting in authoritarian ways (item 7).

Items of a summary nature regarding the workshop as a whole are positive (items 2, 3, 8, and 12). Praise for the director's leadership is consistent and again positive (items 14, 15, 17). That eight participants perceived the atmosphere created by the director as valuable to their growth is apparent in items 1, 4, and 8.

Staff goals included that of modeling a style of working together which would lead participants to recognize the value of positive reinforcement, the warmth of humanistic approaches, the notion of learning as the development of personal meaning, the belief that there is no single "best" way, the sharing of decisions, the importance of listening, and the necessity of
structuring success into activities. Indications are that the director and staff were able to reach these goals in the perceptions of participants reported in Table 12B. The staff should continue these processes in future workshops.

"Perceptions of Next-Steps"

Participant responses in the letters to the director regarding suggestions for his next steps pointed out no areas of improvement perceived as necessary to the improvement of his teaching and leadership style, but did suggest "next steps" in the future relationship among the director, the staff, the participants, and the sponsoring agency. These are shown in Table 12C.

Interesting to note is the fact that no two participants suggested the same next steps. This appears to be more evidence that individual differences exist and have been encouraged in this workshop. Encouraging to the staff should be the items which demand that they continue their work with participants (items 1, 2, 4, 6).

Several participants made suggestions for new content and processes in future workshops (items 1, 5, 8, 9, 10). The staff might choose to provide a continuation of the summer workshop into the fall in order to deal with these new goals and others which would arise from a new needs assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Encouraged participation by withholding undue criticism (gave us the courage to explore)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A gratifying experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I enjoyed being here</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Created relaxed learning atmosphere</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Effected positive attitude changes toward open education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Allowed students to arrive at valuable educational concepts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Did not proclaim a &quot;right way&quot;, did not dominate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I enjoyed sharing and cooperating here</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>We shared in decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>He had a low-key profile in the room; used democratic procedures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Well structured management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Pleasure to anticipate coming each day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Materials were useful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Leader and real soul brother</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Surprised to hear he's a doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Giving; listening; evaluating; guiding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>he must rest well, with a secure feeling, after a day's work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=13 responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Observe in our classes for application/hold evaluation sessions in fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Work with us again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Find a way to reach more educators (they need it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Increase length of workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Move into community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Come work with us in our new building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>At times would have wanted more direction and decision, but realizing your goals for us, I was stimulated and responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Plan interdisciplinary mini-units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Make learning stations, not just talk about them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Deal with: Does the open classroom place too much responsibility on the child?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to the approach chosen by the staff to lead participants to their own personal meanings for the concepts explored, in item 7, in this statement the participant recognizes the value and goal of the new approach, yearns for the more directive authoritarian approach, yet is stimulated and responsive. Piaget would agree with Festinger and suggest that this participant probably has a good chance of learning at this point of disequilibrium.

The director and staff should accept the challenge offered in item 3 and help other educators by bringing these workshop processes and content to the larger field.

Another Look at the Perceptions:

Regrouping participant perceptions of their experiences and plans under the three major goals for the summer workshop component of the project provides additional evidence of the success of the workshop in meeting those goals.

Tables 13, 14, and 15 show the workshop goals and participant perceptions taken from the data gathering instruments above.
TABLE 13: TO RELATE THE THEORY OF OPEN EDUCATION TO PRACTICES
OF TEACHERS IN THE FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Workshop helped me...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...develop a personal philosophy of open education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to know new materials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...by letting me hear positive aspects open education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Workshop was planned so that...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we could participate in the planning and accomplishment of the plans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we were in situations where success was possible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...our needs were surveyed and our interests discovered</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we were praised for our successes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we were made to feel welcome</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...we felt we had something to contribute</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1: "To Help Teachers Move their Classrooms Toward More Open Classrooms"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The workshop has helped me...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...make better use of methods and materials to meet my goals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to include students more in planning/developing choices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to focus more on learners' needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...plan activities to take back to my class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| "I had an opportunity to..." | |
| ...move through activities | 4 |
| ...use many, varied materials | 2 |
| ...help plan workshop activities | 9 |
| ...make choices/decisions | 8 |
| ...see activities planned in terms of my needs | 9 |
| ...be involved in activities I can use in the fall | 3 |
| ...have resources provided when I need them | 5 |

<p>| &quot;Now, I will take back to School...&quot; | |
| ...use of warm-up activities | 4 |
| ...direct learning experiences | 3 |
| ...opportunities for children to assume responsibility for planning/managing | 13 |
| ...opportunities for shared decision-making/make choices | 15 |
| ...ways of assessing needs | 11 |
| ...opportunities for group process | 11 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...activities for students to build on strengths</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...activities for students to demonstrate competence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...opportunities for children to develop more positive self-images</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...more use of positive reinforcement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...an emphasis in my own behavior on respecting others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15: "To Establish Procedures Leading Toward Staff Development and Cooperation"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workshop has helped me...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...become more aware of my strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to utilize groups and recognize and use roles in groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...relate better to my co-workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...by providing opportunities to work in groups</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...recognize the need to work on my mental health before being turned loose on others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...learn in flexible sized groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...by providing opportunities for interaction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...learn from others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I had the opportunity to..." 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...be in different, varied groups</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...learn from others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...learn about others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...experience group processes in action</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...analyze group roles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding Statement

Recognizing that the instruments used in gathering data here are bound by the subjectivity of self-report, and equally mindful of the necessity to tap participant perceptions of their experience, we submit these data as evidence of unusual success in meeting the established goals for this workshop.

Participants were lavish in their oral and written praise of the experiences and the people who provided them. Some of these written accolades follow:

"Incomparable"
"To be commended"
"Wonderful job"
"Dynamic leadership"
"Worked beautifully together"
"Thanks for your inspiration"

Particularly encouraging to this staff should be the following quote from a participant's letter to the directors:

"Work with us again and you'll have the staunchest traditionalist converted."
APPENDIX G

Interview-Audio (Edited)
INTERVIEW

J. First, what did you see as the purpose of this workshop?

R: To give you some ways to help you to operate in open space.

J: Was this your expectation? Is this what you expected the workshop to be about? Open space or open education or facilitating what you're going to do in September? Basically ou saw it as something to help you with open space.

R: Right. You want me to be honest.

J: Right.

R: Well, let me see. What did I expect. Well I really just thought of it as just what we were supposed to do; various activities in and what's expected of me, and so forth. Then, as I went along I see that you do not have to do this; it's not compelling. In other words, it's something you can do if you want to. And if you don't want to, then you don't have to do it.

J: What did the staff do? How did the staff facilitate some of your expectations?

R: They did give some helpful hints in handouts. These are things you can do in open space to help turn the children on.

J: What was your raction to Bob Gillette?

R: I would say that I found his presentation very interesting. And I also could see where it would fit into his situation where he is working, but I didn't see it fitting into mine.

J: What kind of support from the administration in relationship to your program do you think you'll need in September?

R: In my particular case, if I want to do something, I go on and do it.

J: What kinds of follow-up do you want from the agencies that will be working with you? What kinds of workshops do you want throughout the year specific to you?

R: I would say the same type of thing that we're in now; but when I go back I do plan to teach my class basically the same thing that same tradition.

J: Do you expect any workshops in your subject area? Do you want any workshops in your subject area?
R: Dealing with open space, yes.

J: But not the broad concept of what took place. You want it to cue into what you're going to be doing.

R: I can say really that it would be a mixture of both. It would be helpful for the whole property, and then we could take various days and set them aside for social studies, math, and so forth.

J: Workshops in areas themselves.

R: Right, but still keep this overall to include everybody.

J: Are you familiar with the Advisory and Learning Exchange, this group that Andrea, Mary, and I are working with? Have you ever been to the Advisory and Learning Exchange?

R: No.

J: They are the ones who along with the Shaw proposal are trying to set up workshops, and we want to know what you think an outside agency like the Advisory, not directly connected to the school system, what kinds of support do you think an agency like that can offer you?

R: From your particular group I really got a lot of help because I really have no idea of what is supposed to be done or how to do it. I think it would be helpful for the Advisory to come in and show the people what can be done. Not what they have to do, but that they can use these various activities if they want to.

J: You answered what I wanted you to. Do you have anything to add as far as the documentation, because this is your documentation. There may be something you want put down on record as having stated. Is there anything that you want to put into your documentation? This is for you.

R: Just that I have learned quite a bit being in the workshop. I didn't think at first that I was going to get anything out of it, but I have received some helpful information.

J: You say that in September you're going to go back to traditional. Do you think that the following year you're going to be traditional?

R: I would say that in my particular situation where I work, in a low-income black neighborhood, primarily with black children, you have to be traditional with black kids because they need an education. After I'm sure they have the basics and fundamentals of what they need to help them to make it later on, then if I have time I would try to include some of these activities.

J: Thank you.
J: We're just going to interview for documentation purposes, to put you on record, if you want to go on record, as having made some statements. I just an honest interpretation of what you saw as the purpose of this workshop, when it was introduced to you at school, when you signed up for it, as opposed to what actually happened after you got here.

R: So far as we knew, it was merely a matter of our initiating some type of preparation to teach in an open space school. I have been one who has really advocated at the faculty meetings--the faculty, the school body, the community--from the reading which I have done these were my preconceived notions. I have found in talking with members of the faculty that very few of them have the same concept of open space schools and education as I have. And, of course, like everybody else I feel that I'm right. I find so often that everybody has been talking along the lines of interpersonal relationships among the faculty members, the idea that the faculty must learn to work together. And as such, I registered for the course merely because I had said that we needed training and I felt that I should take the training. But, I did not want any training in interpersonal relationships. I have had several courses whereby we have studied dynamics and things of this type and I have always thought it was a total waste of time because facts, being told what one is supposed to do or one should do, do not change attitudes. The ability to work with other people is a matter of attitude. So one needs more than being told what to do or how to do it in order to develop the ability to work together. Therefore, when I came I was more than pleasantly surprised. I doubt you can find anyone better than I if you are looking for a compliment because I had been in bed the entire week before the workshop began and I spent this past weekend in the hospital. I had been physically ill every day. And I came the first day with the intention that if it did not hold my interest I would just not return. But I have come every day since because it has been holding my interest, truly holding my interest. Now I feel that the readings which we have been able to do, and I'm speaking only of myself because I do not know how much other people have read, have been most revealing for me. I feel also, to a large extent, that the basic usefulness of the workshop has been to show us as a group how many divergent paths are open to one regardless of how innovative one may be, how creative his thinking, you do reach a plateau, and to that level I do think we need the stimulation of seeing and hearing other things and other people. I have constantly taken course after course, but I do think I have run into more new things here than any other workshop-type course I have taken.

J: How do you see Dr. Mason's style, his leadership style? Do you see him as a person who is always putting himself up as the authority, or do you, I know you say you do a lot of reading on
your own, is this what he did, shuffle out the readings so you can get that for yourself? How do you see the role of the staff?

R: I felt that the staff was trying to teach by example the type of leadership which we in the open space school should use as teachers. This is what I truly have felt. Whether or not this is their personality or their own ordinary style of leadership I do not know. But I do feel that Mason has been most unobtrusive. And I noticed on one or two occasions, I heard him say to other staff members, "Give the question back to her," when someone had asked a question. I know myself when I asked a question, he asked me the same question, making it personal. I know this is a technique. I felt I knew what he was doing, but I still felt that he was doing it to set an example as to the type of leadership that we should use.

J: What kind of support do you anticipate that you need from the administration in your particular program, your language arts? Do you see that there'll be a certain kind of support that you'll be expecting from the administration, not only in open space but in something that you might want to implement in September?

R: Well so far as administration is concerned, and I'm speaking only for myself because I know everybody doesn't feel this way, I have always received total support. I have never asked the administration for anything that I wanted to do that I was denied. This is a fact. There have been times when I have been asked to wait to do it later. So I truly feel that anything I would want to do, the administration would support my doing it. I do know that on more than one occasion the administration has organized and reorganized in keeping with ideas or things which I have said I wanted the language arts department to be able to achieve. I don't foresee any difficulty.

J: So you see that the Administration has been quite supportive and that this will continue, even in the open space situation?

R: Yes.

J: What kinds of follow-up workshops do you want, specific kinds of follow-up throughout the next year to get you ready for that open space?

R: I'd like to see some workshops where; I've seen in this workshop two basic ideas which seem to be confusing people. One is the idea of the open space school as contrated with open concept of education. The idea that certain techniques are connected with the open space school. I'd like the kind of workshop where this could be cleared up. I also see that there seems to be confusion between the terms of team teaching and interdisciplinary teaching. I think that this
should be cleared up. Perhaps it's just my training in language arts, but I am very keen about using words properly. I feel the sloppy use of words is the cause of sloppy thinking and sloppy accent. And I have seen too often where people are confusing these thoughts. I have liked the freedom where each of us can more than likely pursue whatever part of the manner that we are interested in. I don't feel that I really know enough about it to really say what the other workshops should be. But I have confidence, let's say, in this group, to feel that whatever they might do, we would profit from.

J: But you definitely feel that there is a need to clear up the fact that you don't have to have a certain building to have a certain style?

R: Yes. I definitely feel that.

J: You think that this is some of the misinterpretation that has been gathered by some people?

R: In conversations which I have had, I get this feeling.

J: That's good feedback. This next question is about apprehensions about the open space. Apparently you don't have any apprehensions yourself. Do you feel that there will be a lot of apprehension on some peoples' part as far as going into that open space?

R: Yes I do. I feel that much of the disparaging remarks which have been stated are really feelings of insecurity. I think the chief thing that is on most people's mind is the matter of discipline. And I will truly state that in this regard I am apprehensive. Adolescents tend to be wild, and unless every teacher has a program that is truly stimulating I feel that the whole concept is going to be torn apart by perhaps only a very few children, but nevertheless I do feel this. My second apprehension is that we will be calling it one thing and really just going on with the same old traditional teaching which we have been doing. I'm really afraid of this. When I say afraid I mean afraid that it might happen. If we're going to do it I would like to see it done properly.

J: This tape is being made so that we can edit remarks and statements from the tape so that no one will in fact be able to pinpoint and say that any certain person made a definite statement. With that out of the way, I'll ask you a leading question. The question is, do you feel that there are staff members who will not open themselves up to this open education philosophy, who are going to, like you say, stick to the traditional way regardless of whether it's going to be the benefit of everyone who's going to be operating in the open space situation? Do you think there will be some who will be stumbling blocks? Not stumbling blocks as far as the kids learning, but stumbling blocks . . .
R: I understand what you mean. To developing the type of program. Yes, I do, because we have some now who, in my regards, are stumbling blocks. Just because I think that they are, that doesn't mean that they are. But there are, for example, it is always the teacher's fault. For example, we have a particular teacher who is not physically able to carry on a full day's activities. I think that this teacher is willing to leave, but Central Administration insisted that the teacher should stay. So when we were trying to develop some programs, no one else wanted to work with this particular teacher. I would understand because I didn't either. So I don't feel that all of the stumbling blocks are going to be intentional or because the person is not trying to cooperate. I am a little disappointed in the workshop in that regard. I feel it should be for all teachers. I know it's a question of financing. But even if we have a follow-up in the fall and next summer's course, there's no way there can be an exact duplication of what we've had. And I feel that everybody who's going to be concerned should start on the same basis; at least being able to say that we have all been exposed to the same thing. Because we know there are going to be variances in how much each person has gleaned. So I think we are already starting under a handicap.

J: What proportion of your faculty does this group represent?

R: Less than one half.

J: How many were interested in taking the workshop?

R: To my understanding, we were told that 25 would come, and I understand that at the original session more than 25, something like 35 or 40 people, because you see we have been talking about this since last summer and everybody was conscious of the fact and awaiting some type of course. So I really feel that had it been said that all people must, all people would have. There were more people willing to take it than have actually been enrolled.

J: I don't have any more specific questions. Is there something that you want to talk about; that you want the staff to consider?

R: ... There should be at least one day when a person can say this day I learned this, that, and the other which I know applies to myself, rather than just saying maybe I can use this. Because actualy everything I've seen I can think of ways I can use. He was showing her these snails, for example. I was just telling someone how I could use the same thing in teaching figurative language, in my language arts course. But this person, even though I have of some way that she could use it, she couldn't think of anything that she could do with it. For this reason I really feel that we need at least one day that's devoted to specifics of subject matter.
J: Maybe this could be part of what you were saying about the workshops throughout the year that should be scheduled. They should deal specifically, some of them, with the subject matter.

R: Yes. As I see it, it would not have to...

J: I just want to ask some questions in regards to the workshop. The purpose of this is so that the staff can sit down and take things from the tape we found people wanted to say and sort of compile them into some sort of a publication to give to the teachers at Shaw. There won't be any names mentioned, but it will be comments that we feel were relevant and that we think teachers should have. First, I want to ask you about your participation in this workshop. When you first signed up for the workshop, what did they tell you the workshop was going to be about? And, if in fact this is what really happened during the workshop.

R: When I signed up for the workshop it was supposed to be one in open space education and about the open school. During the week or two weeks we've been here, almost, I was quite impressed with several of the ideas as a means for working in open space. One ideas was the ES card. The next one was using the warmups to get groups attuned to present your learning situation. And the other was Mr. Bob Gillette from the Fairfield County, Connecticut, Open School Education Project. I thought he was quite dynamic in expressing to us how his program had worked and in giving us some of the advantages and disadvantages in his particular program.

J: I got a comment from one of the other participants that what Bob Gillette was presenting was something that was unreal for the students at Shaw. Did you feel that he was trying to say this is what you are supposed to do or do you feel he was giving you some kinds of options? And is it unreal for students at Shaw?

R: I don't think it's unreal for students at Shaw. In a sense, he was working with what he considered potential dropouts and students with problems, and if it worked for them, I don't think it's unrealistic for Shaw but I do think necessary funds and time allotment would have to be offered to the teachers involved in the program as well as to the students. But I don't feel it's unrealistic. I think it can happen.

J: How did you feel the staff facilitated the workshop? Let's just speak specifically about staff members, specifically Mason Bunker. What do you see was their specific role during the week?

R: I could see that Mr. Mason's was one of letting us do our own spontaneous thinking without really forcing us to do it. He created
situations where you had no choice but to retaliate, yet he was not forcing us; he was not forcing you actively so that you could really see. He stayed as sort of a background figure as head and sort of and he placed us in a relaxed atmosphere and therefore we could do our own reaction thinking, and thinking more readily.

J: Because of your participation in this program, do you see your role as changing or your strategy changing for September as far as your teaching is concerned?

R: Yes. I have thought within myself that I might inject some of this kind of teaching where feasible. Now, we will probably be working in the same type scheduling situation which is going to make a difference in as far as carrying out an entire project; but I do plan to inject some of these ideas where feasible.

J: You said that you see that you're going to be on the same kind of schedule. What kind of support do you think you're going to need from the Administration to bring some of these ideas into your program?

R: In physical education we're going to need longer periods because we take part of our period for changing into a uniform, showering, and things of that nature before we actually get into the learning process. So I think longer periods would be a must if you are going to do any lengthy projects. But I was speaking in terms of using some of the ideas even though I might be in the same type schedule situation.

J: What kind of follow-up workshops do you specifically want to see happen during the school year that would best facilitate what you're about? The Advisory and Mason, we're all supposed to get together and present some more workshops. How do you want these workshops to go as far as you're concerned?

R: I think they could be carried out in the same manner in which this one was carried out. I think this one was quite profitable; but I think that we could go to some other learning centers, other than just the same setting every day. We might go out into the community as a group and use some facilities there.

J: So you'd like to see the workshop taking place in another setting?

R: In another setting, other than just the same place every day.

J: Do you have any apprehensions about September or about the following September, any kinds of apprehensions that you might want to voice?

R: Well, I'm a bit anxious about getting into an actual open situation which I think is natural for any new situation, but at the same time I'm anxious to try it.
J: There was one person who had an apprehension about discipline. Is that an apprehension that you share?

R: No. I think if it works you would have less discipline problems; if you can get your group ready or anxious to learn what you have to offer and they're so busy and the time passes, you would have less problems because of group interest.

J: You know, traditionally, physical education has been looked upon on a subject as not being that important. I don't know whether you get a feeling sometimes that people minimize the role of PE and the PE instructor. But do you think if and when these plans are made, let's say rescheduling and so forth, that people will actually take a long look and actually do some constructive thinking about the role of PE as far as scheduling is concerned, or will they schedule just schedule basically for the academic courses and put PE off and music off like they traditionally do?

R: I think they will do that if we as physical education teachers don't speak up for our field and demand or forcefully ask for the same type of treatment everybody else is getting.

J: What kind of facilities are provided for you in the new open space? Do you have a physical education plant which will be used exclusively for PE?

R: Well it's designed that way, but in the open space education program, as I see it, it can be utilized by other teachers to have a better program. But it is set up the same as it is in the schools now, where physical education, or the gym, is off to itself. Now, we will not have a problem when it comes to adjusting to noise, because we are already adjusted to noise and we won't have the problem of adjusting to working with another person or team of people because we've been doing this too over a period of years. So regardless as to how it is presently set up in the plant itself it can be utilized by others to make a workable, flexible program to benefit the children.

J: Do you get a lot of requests from the teachers in the so-called academic subjects to integrate your PE program with something that they're doing or they just see that as a means to send kids over to you to blow off some steam?

R: Some do and some don't. I have worked with the English teachers and the Social Studies teachers in integrating the two subjects.

J: Are there any questions that have come into your mind during the past two weeks that have not been discussed in the classroom setting? Is there something that you want to put down in the documentation as having stated? Even though your name won't go along with it, at least the idea.
R: I would like to know if class size really has anything to do with whether or not an open space program will work. Say, can you do more with 10 children than you can with 30? 40?

J: Do you think that some people have voiced some concerns about class size?

R: Yes. It has been voiced, but I didn't hear too much actual comment as to the effectiveness of 10 children or 30 or 40.

J: So this is a concern that you have?

R: It is.

J: Thank you.

J: I just want to ask some questions. The only people who will hear this tape will be the staff. Then they will take excerpts from the tape that may be pertinent for you for your evaluation to share with the other teachers. But no comment will be pointed out as specifically having been made by any person. So you can be as candid as you'd like to be. Basically, when the workshop was presented to you--it was presented in a certain light, that this is what the workshop is going to be--how do you feel that the workshop lived up to your expectations? Or, did it live up to your expectations?

R: So far, it's lived up to them pretty good. I already knew a lot about open space that we covered, about the parts in designing learning stations, and a lot of things are new ideas that I've picked up since I've been in the workshop. What we did this morning, I didn't know anything about that, the way that Bob Gillette--he had a good idea, just taking a group of kids and working with them over a period of time.

J: I've had two people comment on Bob Gillette, and one felt that he was talking about a situation that's unrealistic to Shaw, that is has no relevance to Shaw, and another person felt that you can take bits and pieces of what he was saying and apply it to Shaw. What is your opinion?

R: I feel that whatever someone presents, you can take and transfer it to your own use. Take the best you have and the best he has and put it together and make mine. I know we couldn't get bicycles and ride to Harper's Ferry, but we still motivate the kids to participate some other way and still incorporate all the subject material.

J: What's your area of concentration?

R: Social Studies.
J: How did you see the staff functioning, Mason and Andrea and Mary, as far as facilitating this workshop?

R: As you say facilitated; instead of just saying this is thus and so, they helped you along the way, helped you discover for yourself. And that's what we're going to have to do over there in the new school, facilitate. Not just be talking faces.

J: What kind of support do you think that you may need from the administration in September and in the following year to facilitate or to get across some of the things that you may want to do?

R: Our administration, the boss, is exactly that, the boss. He runs the school pretty much the way he wants to, but he's shown some signs of change. Anything I want to do or any other teacher wants to do at Shaw, he backs you up. He backs his teachers 100%, but he doesn't like radical change. This makes it kind of difficult. We're going to need a whole lot from him and I think going into the new school's going to be a model and he'll try his best to help us, but he's also going to want a tight discipline ship. He'll need that too.

J: Is that one of his priorities?

R: Yes. Discipline is. He's one of the best disciplinarians around, so I've heard, but I've only worked at one school. It's very quiet. Everyone says, Wow, you work at Shaw! But when they come to Shaw they say hey, this place is beautiful. And teachers never transfer.

J: Is quiet something that the teachers toward? Is it something that takes a lot of their time away from their subject area? Or is it just a matter-of-fact thing with the kids and they fall right in line and you don't have to be constantly on them to maintain it?

R: Junior high is a difficult level, but it's a set pattern at Shaw. You must behave yourself; you act like you've got some sense. We don't have any pansies (?) running around, any good-good boystuff, but they know how to carry themselves when they're in school.

J: So the teachers don't have a lot of time...

R: The tone in the building is already se; but sometimes it gets rough.

J: What kinds of follow-up workshops do you think the Advisory, or Mason and staff should provide, specific workshops throught the year for Shaw?

R: Other than coming to the school to see if we're utilizing what we learned.

J: You mean like an evaluation?
R: Like saying I'm coming to observe your class to see what you're using. Are you learning these learning stations? Are you using any of the ideas. Don't just take them and stick them away and say well for eight days it was fun, and then forget about it.

J: Do you think some of the teachers will be threatened by that?

R: I don't think any of the teachers here will because these teachers volunteered. The ones who will be threatened didn't volunteer.

J: How real is that in that we only have less than half of the Shaw staff? Are we really going to make any changes in Shaw?

R: It will be slow change; but then there's only 25 who entered the program and then we'll have 25 next year to come in. I think we'll have some changes at our school because 80% of the teachers have Masters degrees already and they're pretty wise to change and new ideas and have done a lot of reading. I guess that they'll be able to shake up on their salary scale and be pushed out. The boss, he pushes people to get their higher education. He tries to head you into a higher income bracket; the more you learn, the better you can teach the kids.

J: Do you think there's a congenial feeling among the staff that when the change does come, most people will line up with the change rather than resist it?

R: No, you're not going to have everybody lining up.

J: But I'm saying that most of them.

R: Most of the teachers who elect to go to open space will, but I think about a third of our faculty, I don't believe they're going to go with it.

J: You think a third of them might transfer?

R: Right. I think a third of them. We have some teachers who have just one or two years to teach; they'll probably just go ahead and retire. I foresee a lot of new people coming into the school. If you have new people come in and you have a model set up already, they'll probably go along.

J: What apprehensions do you have as a teacher having gone through this workshop, maybe wanting to try something different? What apprehensions do you have for next year?

R: Next year, not too many because I had the experimental teaching when I worked on my Masters degree, but as far as going to open space, I've seen a junior high school open space in action. It's noisy. That was out in the suburbs in Norback. It's very noisy and some people can't deal with noise; some people don't like other people
looking at anybody teaching. I like to show off. I like to demonstrate and say Yeah I'm doing this. Watch. Some people might feel threatened, but I think the ones who really feel insecure won't really be there. That's how I feel.

J: But they'll be on the firing line all the time, exposed to it.

R: If they feel that way, they'll probably say open space is not for me. The guy at Norbeck said that he had about a 60% turnover in teachers the first year. The next year was kind of slack. And then after three years it started running pretty good.

J: Do you do a lot of integration of subject areas? Do you work with other teachers in other areas, or do you basically work with teachers in social studies?

R: I've worked with art teachers, art and English mostly.

J: Do you see that you're going to be bringing in other areas this year?

R: We'll probably bring in math. Andrea asked me about that in using the batique. To kind of use the math to get the kids to say well this things going in order and when you get a kid with some good artistic talent, he could actually picture some of the scenes were were talking about.

J: That's all the questions that I have. Are there any statements that you want to make that you think should go into the documentation, any ideas, any things that weren't covered during the week, any questions that weren't asked? Anything that you want?

R: I would like to set up a kind of model with people teaching at the same time; use the multi-purpose model and maybe have some people acting as students, one teaching math, one teaching history, and another teaching art just to show that there is going to be some distraction no matter how dynamite you are or might think you are.

J: Thank you.

J: First I want to say that anything that's said will be recorded on tape. The staff will review it and take parts from it to be put into a book to be given to the teachers. No statement will be attributed to any one person. What you say will be strictly confidential. In the beginning this workshop was set up for a specific purpose. How do you feel? Did the workshop really do what it was supposed to do?

R: As far as I'm concerned, the workshop has served its purpose. I have enjoyed working in this workshop. When I first started I didn't think I was going to enjoy it, but after getting started and now I'm convinced that I have actually learned quite a bit to carry back to my classes next semester.
J: How did you see the staff relating to the participants in the workshop? What did you see as their role as far as Mason, Mary and Andrea are concerned?

R: The staff was great! All; not one, but all. All participated 100%. And of course we enjoyed working with the staff.

J: You're in metal shop; do you get many requests from people to facilitate anything that they're doing? Is there any possibility of integration of your subject area with another subject area?

R: Oh yes. With math; math plays an important part. Without knowing how to measure, we're paralyzed, we're crippled. We can't get along in shop.

J: Is this an intentional integration; is metal shop separate specifically from math?

R: Well, it is, but I try to integrate with the match teachers. Two years ago I might be teaching the rule at one time and the math teachers will be teaching it at another time. At about the end of the semester we would get together and see if we have been able to put the whole math program over.

J: Are the students required to have projects? Are they required to report on those projects in writing to give you some idea of how they're progressing on these reports?

R: Everybody. A student has to read the information. Then after he's read the information, the student has to lay that project out on brown paper. Then after they've done that, we're ready to work, to actually do the project.

J: So there are a lot of different skills coming into this. A lot of times, like I was telling the PE teacher, people don't see some of these other areas as being as academic as their particular area. Some of them think that they're the only one. Do you think that people are not putting enough focus on the different kinds of concentration that you focus in on in metal shop? Do they just see you as someplace where the kids go and blow off steam?

R: It's a dumping ground; that's what most folks think.

J: Do you think that in the rescheduling that may have to be done in the next school year that consideration will be given to the areas like shop, PE, and art?

R: I hope so because as it is now is somewhat of a problem. They will have to do some rescheduling because instead of putting all the slow learners or something worse, if you can get anything worse than slow learners, put them in with students who actually are
excelling in their work, they have to do some rescheduling because, especially in the new building, because if not we might as well stay over in the old building where we are. They've got to do a whole lot of rescheduling if we want to be successful.

J: How much time is allotted for your shop?

R: A single period; 45 minutes. And then of course for majors, we have a double period.

J: What kind of follow-up workshops do you want the Advocacy or Mason and his staff to provide for you, specific workshops for next year, this year coming up, I'm not talking about the next summer workshop but from September to June. What kind of specific workshops do you think should be carried out?

R: I haven't given that too much thought. But maybe if we could have something like team teaching like art and math as team teaching, along with the metal, I think I would enjoy that very much.

J: You mean workshops that show how to integrate subject areas?

R: Right. And also maybe social studies, like the manufacturing of steel.

J: What kinds of apprehensions do you have about September of 1974 as against September of 1975? Do you have any particular apprehensions?

R: The only apprehension I might have is about scheduling. I think if they can get that schedule in, I think we're going to have a pretty good program, from what we have already learned this summer.

J: Some people voiced concern about discipline.

R: You can make discipline yourself. If you've got your plans all laid out, you make your plans, you don't have any discipline problems. Sometimes a teacher makes his own discipline problems.

J: What about noise?

R: I hear noise. The things happening in the shop all day long, if you don't call that noise I don't know what noise is. Noise is just like music, it depends on who they are and what they're doing. Although they can be in there just banging on the table at their own free will, but if you know, if they're working they will make noise.
J: Is there something that was not covered during the week, that was not covered in the interview here, that has not been stated that you want to state? That you want to go into the documentation? Something that you feel that is a concern of yours that should be a concern of other people?

R: No. I learned so much, I've picked up so many good things that my head now is full of a whole lot of ideas. I don't know how much more you could add to what we actually have gone over.

J: One person was saying that they would like to see the staff come in and actually see if people are implementing some of the things that they've learned here in the workshop. Would that be something that you would see as being useful?

R: Sure. Certainly.

J: Others have voiced concern about support. They seem to feel that the administration will support them in these changes, if they're changes that are not really radical.

R: I hope that the administration will see that far, because that's what they are going to have to do. If it's going to be successful, they're going to have to make a whole lot of changes.

J: Do you think that the staff at Shaw, the staff as it is now, will transfer in whole to the new building or do you see that there may be some who will opt out and ask for a transfer because they feel that the open space will be too traumatic for them?

R: I'm afraid to voice my opinion on that. To tell the truth, like you say, you can be a problem and you can make problems yourself; some people might be looking for something like that to happen, so that they can back out. Instead of giving it a try, go and see; then if they see they are misfits, then go on out. That's what I'm doing. I can't tell anybody I'm going to be a success, but I'm going to give it a try. And if I don't like it, I'm not going to worry about it. I'm going to come on out. Because there's a lot to learn, and that's the reason I'm here this summer, to try to pick up, to find out what I can learn so that I can go into it. Then if I find out it's a problem, I'm not going to worry all the other people. I'm not going to grumble with everything that goes on; I'm just going to come on out.

J: Thank you.

J: Everything that is being taped will be listened to by the staff, Mason, Mary, Andrea and myself, and we'll take pieces off the tape to be published for everybody who was in the workshop. No statement will be attributed to any one person. I'm trying to
interview everybody. When you first signed up for the workshop they told you that something was going to happen. I wasn't there, so my question to you is, according to what they told you was going to happen, what actually happened?

R: Maybe I didn't understand what they were trying to tell me. I'll tell you why I signed up for it, what I thought I was going to get. I thought I was going to be told the difference between what happens in a building with walls and what happens in a building without walls. That's what I wanted to find out, not necessarily what are some of the techniques to use in a building with walls and transferring these techniques to a building without walls. I was looking for that one thing, or two or three things, that, I wanted to see the line, the dividing line. There must be something that's good over here and something good over here; something that you can use in the open space and a building with walls. Both of them have students; so they're alike in that respect. Both of them have teachers, so they're alike in that respect. You want to use good methods in both of them, so they're alike in that respect. But where do they differ? That's what I have not gotten. That's what I want to know. What's that something that you can use in schools with walls but you can't use it in schools without walls. Or, this works over here with walls but it does not work without walls. I want to find that difference. I have not found that difference.

J: Okay, going along with that, what kinds of follow-up workshops do you specifically want Mason and his staff to provide for you next year from September to June?

R: I want that same thing; I want to find out what it is I can do without walls that I couldn't do with walls. I just want to know what that difference is. To me there must be a difference or else they wouldn't be playing with this. The reason we're getting this is because we're moving to a new school without walls; if we were moving to a new school with walls, we wouldn't get the training. So it must be something.

J: You're saying that by implication there has to be some kind of difference or else they wouldn't go through all this trouble to re-educate you.

R: Right. I don't think that they would train us to do something that we should already be trained to do or something that we should train ourselves to do. The fact that they're paying for it says to me there's something different. And I want to know just what it is.

J: So you see that the next series of workshops should be specifically about what that difference is. What about workshops that are geared specifically to your area? Do you think there is a need for workshops that would deal with math in this open space concept specifically?
R: Yes. Specifically. I've read and I've been in other classes, and they always say now this can be related to math, but they show it being related to English or they show it being related to social studies. They always say this can be used for math also. But you never get that example of how it can be applied. Like this teacher used to say, once upon a time, every teacher has to be a teacher of reading. They show you how it works in English, and they show you how it works in social studies, and they show you how it can be applied in science, and they say it can be applied in math. You may get one example and no more. Never something concrete about how it is actually done.

J: So you see they have a need for that too. How did the staff facilitate your expectations? What I think you're saying, you can clarify if I'm wrong, is that the staff did not in fact meet your expectations in that they didn't relate to this problem that you are trying to deal with.

R: I learned some things but not exactly what I want to deal with. I've been in certain schools that have open space and the noise was a problem. How do you deal with that? Just what is going on that's going to tell me that I do this differently?

J: Would you be willing to participate in a program where you would be able to go to an open space classroom and actually teach a class or along with the teacher to see in fact if that noise will distract you?

R: Yes.

J: Do you think that would be more helpful to you than just talking about it?

R: Not necessarily--you've been in one and you know what the differences are, I think I could get it like that. I don't think I have to actually go there and find out, but I do think there's a difference and I don't want to just burst the open space wide open. I don't want to walk in there and then it all hits me at one time. I'd like to be prepared for what I'm going to get.

J: What apprehensions do you have about the new school other than the noise. What other apprehensions do you have?

R: The space. I can't see how it's going to be divided. In my mind I'm still thinking this is my space; this is for my children. I can't get that erased; at least I haven't got that erased yet.

J: So what you're saying is that even though there are no walls the dividing line will still be there, that certain areas will be for certain people regardless.
Yes. Regardless of whether I see the wall or not, in my mind the wall is still going to be there. The problem is how do I deal with the fact that I hear another teacher. It can't possibly be like I think it is. To me it seems just pure confusion. It can't possibly be as bad as I think it is.

Do you think the teachers are going to be teaching side by side? How was it when you went to visit the other school?

It was completely noisy to me. It was chaos. My little brother attended the school and he seemed to be doing very well.

He may not know any other way though. This may be the school that he started in.

No. He went to a little school in Florida; when he got to the middle school they started this in sixth, seventh and eighth grades. And he enjoyed it. Of course they had a situation where the children who couldn't function were put in a contained classroom, so it wasn't entirely open. It was open for those children who could function that way; they put the discipline problems in contained classrooms or they sent them home, which we can't do here, in a portable building outside with a teacher. They came in for gym, they came in for cafeteria, but as far as all their classes were concerned, they were outside.

That was almost the ideal situation. Did the teachers teach side by side, or did one teach in front and another one across the room? Is this what you're saying, where will you be in relationship to all the other teachers and how much confusion are we going to have.

In a situation where the school is built and you automatically know that you're going to be overcrowded. The small is built too small in the beginning. You go into a situation that's overcrowded. And then, without the walls that's farther. If they were going to have the ideal number of children in each group, in each classroom, maybe 20 or 25 children per teacher, and you have space enough for just that, that would be just fine. But if I've got to take 35 or 40 kids, that's too many people. This is the part that's bothering me.

Do you think the school is being built too small to handle the number of kids that you have?

I believe so. I think the fact that you don't have the walls, you need smaller groups. And I doubt that we're going to be able to get smaller groups because we're not going to have a larger faculty.

They haven't made any allowances for larger faculty?

That's the last that I heard. It appears that we are the ones who are going, give or take two or three.
J: What is the pupil/teacher ratio now?

R: That's hard to say because we don't all carry the same load.

J: Is it lower for academics, people who teach strictly the academic students? Is their pupil/teacher ratio lower than others?

R: No. In the classes where the students are slower and need more teacher attention, the classes aren't too large.

J: What do you see as the role of the administration for support for you, for some changes that you may want? Suppose that this is a change that you want, you want smaller class loads, do you think this is something that the administration should support you in?

R: Yes. When they count pupil/teacher ratio they count counselors who teach no classes, they count the nurse who teaches no classes. They count everybody. In other words, they count the number of adults; they count the principal, assistant principal.

J: So that you may have a pupil/teacher ratio of 22 to 1 when actually it may be closer to 35 to 1.

R: There's nothing much I can do about that. The thing is if I can get into my mind how I'm going to function without the walls and about the noise; sometimes now you have to close the door if anyone is across the hall. In something like mathematics, you just can't have but so many distractions.

J: So you're saying if you have to close the doors now to cut down on noise, what are you going to do when you don't have any doors to close.

R: Right. You close the doors now to keep the people who are walking in the halls from disturbing the children, but what are you going to do when you can't? How do I cope with these situations? If would be nice if everyone would mind his own business and go about his business, but let's face it, even I holler across the room sometimes. I need some guidance in coping with this situation. Classroom management in that situation, now I can handle it. After you've been teaching for so long you automatically pick up ways of handling disturbances. But in a new situation you say how I am going to handle the problems. Now that I'm anticipating problems. But I have to be realistic about it; I know there are going to be some.

J: Have you set any options for yourself? Like suppose you go into that situation and you decide that you don't have enough preparation, are you going to still go into that situation or are you going to transfer or what?
R: Yes. If I get there. I was hoping that I would get the preparation before I got there. After you get there in September, it's hard to say well now I want to transfer. If I get there and find that I can't handle it, I'm not a quitter, I'll stick it out for a while, but I'm not going to beat my head against a stone wall.

J: So you think some workshops, some opportunity should be provided for you to learn how to deal with the situation, and that somehow class load is going to make a difference in the way that noise level and as far as kids being able to really concentrate on what they're supposed to be doing?

R: In mathematics you need this; you've just got to have it. You can't learn mathematics in passing. Some things maybe, but the basic you just don't learn in passing.

J: And you say that you have kids that are not on grade level.

R: Yes. I have many children, the past few years, eighth grade class, three-fourths of them couldn't subtract whole numbers. They had to regroup, say, 30 to take away 25. Number like 501 take away 27 are just out of the question. These children just don't need any distractions. They need a teacher right there with them holding their hands most of the way. Some kids can't write decimal points in adding numbers. They need a teacher sitting right there with them. They don't need anybody hollering at them; they just don't need any distractions. It's hard enough with the teacher right there in the classroom. What about the children who are working on the fifth grade level? Some of them have to work with counting chips. In many cases the children who had to work with counting chips didn't mind; some of them would take their counting chips and either come to my desk or go to the back of the room so that children passing in the hall wouldn't see them using counting chips. I'm concerned with how these children are going to feel with everybody seeing them working with counting chips. I'm concerned with how the child is going to think of himself. He might begin to withdraw or he might become a discipline problem. All of these are things that I'm concerned about. I don't know if I'm saying how do I protect them I don't think I want to protect them. I'm saying how do I manage.

J: You're trying to see how you can make them feel secure and help them in that kind of a situation where they're exposed to everybody.

R: Yes. And I've still got to go through the multiplication tables. Just because the walls are down I can't not do that remedial work that is required. I still have to do it, but I don't want to embarrass them. Some of them might say you know we don't know how to do that; I don't know how they'll be without walls, but in a regular classroom they'd be more honest about what they know and what they don't know.
J: Are there any provisions made in your building for self-contained classrooms? Like you were saying this school had a place where kids who couldn't function went to a place that was set aside.

R: I think that the different labs may be closed, but as far as mathematics it seems like I'm right out there on the floor. The way we're scheduled now all eighth graders on the same level will take math at the same time. So, say if child in Section A is doing something on grade level, and the child in section B is doing something on another level entirely, they already know that some children do different things, but having to expose them to it, that's a problem. How do I deal with this situation?

J: So you want some more input in that area.

R: I want something concrete, I want to say that guarantees, that says this is how the situation is handled. Strategies that have been worked out by teachers who have actually been in it; not ones who have just started, not with all these pretty ideas, these paper ideas. I want something factual. This is something that bothers me, distinguishing between promotion of the program and children actually learning. So that if they were given a test, they could at least pass the test. How would you feel if you were a student in Washington, D.C. and they said, you see it in the papers at least twice a year, the children in Washington, D.C. made the lowest scores in the whole country? That's a whole lot of people. And you're at the bottom. And if you're at certain schools, you're at the bottom of Washington, D.C. You're the worst child in the whole country! That's got to do something to you. So if you're going to continue to give these tests, then the children have to learn something, at least learn how to pass the test, at least learn something! If you're not going to give tests, fine. If you're going to cut out tests, good. But if you're going to continue to give these tests, these children have got to learn something to pass the test. If you want to get a job at the Post Office, you have to pass a test. If you want to be a typist, you have to pass the test. If you want to go to college, you have to pass the tests. You've always got to take tests. Tests, tests, tests! And until these tests are cut out, you've got to teach concrete subjects, like mathematics, so that I can pass this test and then I can get a job. I can get off the welfare. You don't have to tell me I'm somebody because I know I'm somebody. I know I'm able-bodied; I don't have to sit around and wait for handouts. Then all the values you're going to teach me are not going to help because I know I've got to wait for somebody to give me, if they want to, when they want to, whatever. I can go and pass the test and get a good job and make a decent salary. You don't have to tell me I'm somebody.

J: You're saying what you're doing in the classroom, what they need is to be self-sufficient. And that the only way they can do that is if they have certain guidelines to follow. And that the only way they can do that in your classroom or any other classroom is that they
learn certain information. And you're saying they already have a short attention span; they're already easy to distract in a self-contained classroom. What's going to happen to these same kids when they're exposed to the open space? I can see that really concerns you.

R: And how do I deal with it? When things are going along fine in a way, how do I feel with it when it's not? That's what I'm concerned about.

J: Is there anything that has not happened this week or has not been talked about or anything that you think should go into the documentation, any ideas that you have, any recommendations, anything that hasn't been discussed that you want to go into the documentation?

R: Nothing, except that I need to be able to deal with the space. That's my problem, that's my concern, dealing with the space. I'll go along with some of the things, that teachers and students should plan together, but I only go along with that for certain levels of students where the kids are able to deal with it. I don't go along with it on certain levels, where the kids can't deal, we just can't plan together; on certain things, I've got to plan. They need direction, and they know they need direction. They come in and say what are we going to do today, or, are we going to finish what we did yesterday. Maybe I should help them to want to plan for themselves, but at this point that's kind of low priority. There are other things that are higher priority. Some of these things might help the "average" kids to turn on; they might say this isn't so boring after all. Maybe children will be turned off, I'm turned off by too much game playing. To give a good example, last year I had a class where we used a chart wheel, a dart wheel, and all the children enjoyed throwing the darts, but it got to be THROWING THE DARTS. And the children who could do the problem without playing the game, they could do it. You had to be able to add the score; you had to be able to add everyone's score so that you wouldn't be cheated on. I played with one particular boy. I was playing the game really for him; I was trying to help him get it together. He was always my partner. He ended up saying, "You ain't never going to learn to throw those darts." I couldn't ever hit the board. "And I ain't never going to learn to add these fractions, but together we make a good team." It was that type of thing. He was turned on by throwing the darts. This was fun. He always wanted to do it. But it was just a matter of the game and he never gave the information that he was supposed to give. He never did learn. He said he was never going to learn and he never did learn. We played card games matching the fractions and that type of thing; most of the children enjoyed the card games because at that age they like to play cards, but it got to be a thing where one person was doing all the applications. But that was a child who
J: Thank you.
APPENDIX H

Shaw Proposal
STAFF DEVELOPMENT
FOR
THE NEW SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

I. GOAL

The design and operation of a school program which will maximize learning by the students involved in order that they may effectively pursue further endeavors towards fulfilling responsible roles in our society.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Ground has already been broken for the new Shaw Junior High School replacement which is scheduled to open in September, 1975. This proposal is being made to ensure maximum utilization of this facility in a manner which will provide a superior educational program. We perceive the operational program to be one which affords the maximum participation of the total school community. This includes teachers, non-teaching personnel, such as engineers, custodians, cafeteria workers, aides, counselors, media specialists, office staff, students, parents, administrators, and Shaw Community residents. It is only through the total involvement of all of these persons that the full benefits of this new facility will be realized.

For several years the District of Columbia Public School System has been committed to the open-space educational concept. Several elementary schools have already opened, following very effective and community training programs. The total new Shaw Preparation Plan may differ from previous open-space plans because this will
be the first District of Columbia secondary school built to use open-space education. Educational planning for the new Shaw may encounter the subject matter categorization concept that often interferes with interdisciplinary planning and teaching at the secondary level. Teachers often see themselves as specialists in 9th grade English or 7th grade mathematics instead of teachers of the whole junior high school student population. It is therefore particularly important that an attitude of "our" in terms of total school responsibility rather than "my" students be developed among all students, school personnel, and community participants.

III. POPULATION

The Shaw Junior High School student population will number approximately 1,078 students including sixth grade pupils, students from conventional grades seven through nine and approximately fifty students from Cardozo High School, who will spend one-half day studying at Cardozo and the other half-day serving as Teacher Student Assistants at the new Shaw for which they will be paid.

There will be about fifty-seven teachers assigned to the new Shaw as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. The primary objectives of the training program are:

A. To enable staff members, who will serve in the new school, acquire the skills and techniques they need to enhance the educational welfare of students in a secondary level open-space design.

B. To provide training or orientation for fifteen community members, parents and employees of community organizations in order that they will contribute positively to the effective utilization of the Shaw School as teacher aides.

V. GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

A. Individual Development

This applies essentially to the personal learning activities of the professional, however, input from students and parents is vital to the success of this component. A professional staff member should be able:

1. To identify basic educational theories and develop flexibility regarding alternative modes of application.

2. To explore one's own value system and decision-making techniques and learn to assist students in the same process.

3. To stress tolerance and respect for values which are different from one's own.

4. To acquire diagnostic-prescriptive techniques in appropriate subject matter areas.
5. To be able to locate and make perspective learning materials to correct diagnosed deficiencies.

6. To acquire additional and recent psychological information regarding human development so that one's understanding of individual students can be enhanced.

7. To learn to write behavioral objectives for individual student needs with emphasis upon quality and self-motivation.

8. To learn the effect and affect of verbal and non-verbal communicative behavior through the study of social dynamics.

9. To understand the expanded application of the Instructional Resources Center.

10. To become aware of student needs.

11. To expand one's repertoire of instructional techniques, i.e., the preparation of learning packages, games techniques, role playing, creation of original instructional materials, tutoring, etc.

B. Human Relations

It is desirable that a humanistic approach to school operations will prevail at the new Shaw. Teachers and administrators should:

1. Develop the ability to work constructively with others in various team situations. This requires the development of insight into the processes of group dynamics and interpersonal trust. It requires the professional to
develop attitudes which will allow him to accept observation by his peers, and offer and accept constructive criticism.

2. Learn to participate effectively in designing and implementing interdisciplinary approaches to the use of time and space.

3. Be prepared to include teachers of special subjects as shop, art, music, etc., in project development.

4. Recognize and incorporate community services within the open-space school complex for both information, and service to school families.

5. Develop efficient and comprehensive record keeping methods in cooperation with other team members in order that teacher effectiveness can be enhanced.

6. Increase the use of supportive personnel for advice and assistance in solving individual and group problems.

C. Adjustment to Open-Space

Staff members should:

1. Learn to observe others as a means of improving their own teaching skills.

2. Develop a variety of ways for using open-space including individual conferences or tutoring, small self-directed student activities, large group formats for show or lectures, etc.

3. Adjust to the concept of variable time modules rather than equal "periods" and eliminate the "bell" syndrome.
4. Learn to work together as an "open space team" to increase the use of resources and staff potential.

D. Relationship with Students

Staff members should:

1. Be constantly conscious of the necessity for fostering positive self image through individual and group praise whenever appropriate and avoid negative reinforcement.

2. Be a booster and cooperator in activities that foster school spirit and morale.

3. Be proficient in the application of various tutoring techniques by teachers, aides, and other pupils. Recognize the advantages of such activities to the tutor as well as the tutee.

4. Be proficient in assisting students in setting appropriate long and short term goals for themselves and support their pursuit of these objectives.

5. Be efficient in the diagnosis of student strengths and weaknesses.

6. Recognize and respect each student for his unique individuality.

E. Relationship with Community

The new Shaw staff should:

1. Implement the school's objectives and activities through the involvement of students, parents, and community groups.
2. Encourage parent cooperation and participation.
3. Utilize community resources in the instructional process.
4. Use the community as a resource for career development activity programs.
5. Encourage the students to view the community from an informal point of view with awareness that attributes can be enhanced and deterrents reduced through school initiated volunteer projects.

VI. METHODS

A. In 1974-1975, prospective staff members may enroll in "core courses" at universities, primarily Federal City College.

Examples:

- Contemporary Problems and Issues in Open-Space School Education
- Curriculum Design and Construction in the Open-Space School
- Classroom Management Techniques in the Open-Space School
- Theories and Content of Mathematics, Reading Diagnosis and Remediation for Teaching of the Open-Space School
- Socialinguistics: Language and Culture
- Visitation and Observation of Open-Space Schools
- Values Clarification and Decision Making in Open-Education
- Staff Development Seminar in Open-Space Education
- Strength Training for the teacher going from Self-Contained Open-Space classroom to the Flexible Scheduling for the Open-Space School.

VII. PROPOSED SELECTION OF STAFF

A. Professional

1. Priority will be given to teachers who are currently assigned to the Shaw Junior High School and who voluntarily participate in a program of staff development for the new school.

2. The opportunity to participate in the program for staff development on the secondary level with emphasis on the new Shaw School is to be extended to other D.C. teachers and administrators who may seek this opportunity and who may aspire to become a member of the new Shaw staff as the educational program develops and the need becomes apparent.

3. The assignment of teachers to the new Shaw School will be completed by the current practices of certification and placement with local school administration, personnel office and the Model School Division central office involvement in final decisions.

B. Community

1. It is intended that fifteen teacher aides will be trained and employed for assignment to the new Shaw School.

2. These teacher aides will be assigned to content areas such as English, science, industrial arts, business, etc., or any
alternative academic structure which may emerge.

3. Related community services will be provided by appropriate agencies.

VIII. STUDENT ENROLLMENT

1. An extension of the conventional enrollment pattern for junior high schools will capitalize the positive aspects of a multi-age school population with students from conventional elementary schools, students from Shaw Junior High School, and from Cardozo, who will serve as teacher student assistants.

2. The elementary school student will be selected by recommendations from the counselors, principals, and teachers according to:
   - interest, parental approval and social maturity as determined by the teachers and counselors.

3. The Cardozo students will be selected according to the following guidelines:
   a. In group guidance sessions the Cardozo High School counselors will inform the students of the Shaw Youth Opportunity Program, its operation and the duties.
   b. Interested students will fill out information blanks with their names, sections, areas of tutoring interest and any previous work experience.
   c. The Cardozo counselors will search the academic, health, and citizenship records of those students.
d. Each candidate will have a personal interview.

e. After the Cardozo counselors make their selections, they will send those students, introductory notes, to the Shaw counselors and Project counselor who will also interview them. Prospective members of the Shaw Opportunity Program will be placed on probation for a specified period having been informed of job requirements and expectations.

IX. NON COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

X. COMMUNITY SCHOOL ASPECTS

1. The Office of Continuing Education, Summer School, and Urban Service Corps will develop plans for the organization and administration of community services using the community facilities section of the new school.

2. The above community school program will be a full day operational design.

EVALUATION

The evaluation component will consist of the use of D.C. School System internal resources supplemented by external consultant service. The evaluation design will consist of:
1. an analysis of feedback of the participants in the staff development program.

2. a survey of the attitudinal changes in school relationships among teachers, students, student teacher assistants, parents, community members, and teacher aides.

3. an assessment of on-the-job practical applications of theories and concepts of instructional techniques in an open-space structure.
Appendix I

Fuller's Teacher Concerns Checklist
Teacher Concerns Checklist
Frances F. Fuller
Gary D. Borich
Research and Development
Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
at Austin

DIRECTIONS: This checklist is designed to explore what teachers are concerned about at different points in their careers. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his or her own concerns.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think they should be concerned about or expect to be concerned about in the future. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know only what you are actually concerned about NOW.

On the following pages you will find statements about some concerns you might have now. Read each statement. Then ask yourself: WHEN I THINK ABOUT TEACHING, AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

If you are not concerned about that now, or the statement does not apply, write the number "1" in the box.

If you are a little concerned, write the number "2" in the box.

If you are moderately concerned, write the number "3" in the box.

If you are very concerned, write the number "4" in the box.

And if you are totally preoccupied with the concern, write the number "5" in the box.

Be sure to answer every item. Begin by completing the following:

1. Name ____________________________ Male____ Female____ Age____

2. Circle the one that best describes your teaching experience:
   1. No education courses and no formal classroom observation or teaching experience
   4. Presently student teaching
   2. Education courses but no formal observation or teaching experience
   5. Completed student teaching
   3. Education courses and observation experience but no teaching
   6. Presently an inservice teacher

3. If you are a student: Freshman____ Sophomore____ Junior____ Senior____
   Graduate____

4. The grade level you plan to teach (if student) or are now teaching (if inservice):
   Preschool____ Elementary____ Junior High____ Senior High____
   College____ Other__________________________

5. If currently teaching: Average number of students you teach per class: ________

copyright 1974 by F. F. Fuller and G. D. Borich
For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you now. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as accurate as you can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not concerned</th>
<th>A little concerned</th>
<th>Moderately concerned</th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Totally preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ 1. Selecting and teaching content well</td>
<td>□ 2. Whether the students really like me or not</td>
<td>□ 3. Increasing students' feelings of accomplishment</td>
<td>□ 4. Lack of freedom to initiate innovative instructional programs</td>
<td>□ 14. Being in constant demand by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5. The nature and quality of instructional materials</td>
<td>□ 6. Too many students in each class</td>
<td>□ 7. Motivating students to study</td>
<td>□ 8. Lack of instructional materials</td>
<td>□ 15. Doing well when a supervisor is present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 9. Rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change</td>
<td>□ 10. Feeling under pressure too much of the time</td>
<td>□ 11. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control</td>
<td>□ 12. Frustrated by the routine and inflexibility of the situation</td>
<td>□ 16. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 18. Frustrated by the routine and inflexibility of the situation</td>
<td>□ 20. Diagnosing student learning problems</td>
<td>□ 21. Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals</td>
<td>□ 22. Too many noninstructional duties</td>
<td>□ 23. Adapting myself to the needs of different students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Ineffective faculty meetings
28. Whether students can apply what they learn
29. Students who disrupt class
30. Inadequate fringe benefits for teachers
31. Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning
32. Insufficient class time for rest and class preparation
33. The psychological climate of the school
34. Clarifying the limits of my authority and responsibility
35. Inadequate assistance from specialized teachers
36. Lack of public support for schools
37. Chronic absence and dropping out of students
38. Feeling more adequate as a teacher
39. Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
40. Too many standards and regulations set for teachers
41. Being accepted and respected by professional persons
42. Adequately presenting all of the required material
43. Slow progress of certain students
44. Insufficient clerical help for teachers
45. Helping students to value learning
46. Whether each student is getting what he needs
47. Inadequate teacher salaries
48. Increasing my proficiency in content
49. Recognizing the social and emotional needs of students
50. The wide diversity of student ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds

Please use the back of this page for any comments. These may be about the questionnaire in general, about specific items or about any additional concerns you may have.
APPENDIX J

Barth's Assumptions
INSTRUCTIONS—Make a mark somewhere along each line which best represents your own feelings about each statement.

Example: School serves the wishes and needs of adults better than it does the wishes and needs of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT CHILDREN'S LEARNING

Motivation
Assumption 1: Children are innately curious and will explore their environment without adult intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 2: Exploratory behavior is self-perpetuating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conditions for Learning
Assumption 3: The child will display natural exploratory behavior if he is not threatened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 4: Confidence in self is highly related to capacity for learning and for making important choices affecting one's learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 5: Active exploration in a rich environment, offering a wide array of manipulative materials, will facilitate children's learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 6: Play is not distinguished from work as the predominant mode of learning in early childhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Assumption 7: Children have both the competence and the right to make significant decisions concerning their own learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 8: Children will be likely to learn if they are given considerable choice in the selection of the materials they wish to work with and in the choice of questions they wish to pursue with respect to those materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 9: Given the opportunity, children will choose to engage in activities which will be of high interest to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 10: If a child is fully involved in and is having fun with an activity, learning is taken place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Social Learning

Assumption 11: When two or more children are interested in exploring the same problem or the same materials, they will often choose to collaborate in some way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 12: When a child learns something which is important to him, he will wish to share it with others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Intellectual Development

Assumption 13: Concept formation proceeds very slowly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 14: Children learn and develop intellectually not only at their own rate but in their own style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Assumption 15: Children pass through similar stages of intellectual development, each in his own way and at his own rate and in his own time.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 16: Intellectual growth and development can take place through a sequence of concrete experiences followed by abstractions.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 17: Verbal abstractions should follow direct experience with objects and ideas, not precede them or substitute for them.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Evaluation

Assumption 18: The preferred source of verification for a child's solution to a problem comes through the materials he is working with.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 19: Errors are necessarily a part of the learning process; they are to be expected and even desired, for they contain information essential for further learning.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 20: Those qualities of a person's learning which can be carefully measured are not necessarily the most important.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 21: Objective measures of performance may have a negative effect upon learning.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree

Assumption 22: Learning is best assessed intuitively, by direct observation.

Strongly agree | Agree | No strong feeling | Disagree | Strongly disagree
Assumption 23: The best way of evaluating the effect of the school experience on the child is to observe him over a long period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 24: The best measure of a child’s work is his work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT KNOWLEDGE.

Assumption 25: The quality of being is more important than the quality of knowing; knowledge is a means of education, not its end. The final test of an education is what a man is, not what he knows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 26: Knowledge is a function of one's personal integration of experience and therefore does not fall into neatly separate categories of "disciplines."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 27: The structure of knowledge is personal and idiosyncratic; it is a function of the synthesis of each individual's experience with the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 28: Little or no knowledge exists which it is essential for everyone to acquire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Assumption 29: It is possible, even likely, that an individual may learn and possess knowledge of a phenomenon and yet be unable to display it publicly. Knowledge resides with the knower, not in its public expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No strong feeling</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX K

Who Decides Questionnaire
See Also:


and


Name: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

School: ___________________________ Teacher: ___________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally in your classroom, Who Decides:</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much work to do in class everyday?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When you can tell something to the whole class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What things will be on the boards, tables, displays, centers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where your class will go for a trip?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who can help you with your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What kinds of things students can bring to school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you can work at the blackboard?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What areas of the room you can go to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How far or how many pages to read in your books?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When you can talk or whisper to a friend in your room?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What to keep in your desk (drawer, locker)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When &quot;break-time&quot; is over?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>When you can go to an activity center, interest center, display?</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>What you can write about?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>When you can talk with the teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>When you can make things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>What desk or seat you can sit in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>When you can enter the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>If you can eat in your room?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>What you will do in subject area each day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>When you can go to the toilet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Whose job is it to water the plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>When your work is finished?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The rules in your class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>When you can get a drink?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>When you can go outside?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>How many students can work at an activity center (area) at a time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>When you've done enough subject area for the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>The plans or work for the class each day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

Informal Questionnaire (1974)
WHAT WERE YOUR GOALS FOR THESE FEW DAYS?

HOW HAS THE WORKSHOP HELPED YOU MEET THESE GOALS?

WHAT EVIDENCES DO YOU HAVE OF YOUR GROWTH DURING THESE FEW DAYS?

WHAT EVIDENCE DO YOU HAVE OF OTHERS' GROWTH DURING THESE FEW DAYS?

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS YOUR "NEXT STEPS" IN PREPARATION FOR FALL, 1974?

HOW EFFECTIVE HAS THE WORKSHOP STAFF BEEN?
APPENDIX M

Course Outlines (1974-1975)
The Shaw Junior High School
Summer Workshop 1974

Course: Lex. 808: Seminar in In-Service Teacher Education: The
Open Classroom and the Development of
Resources - Human, Temporal, and Physical.
3 Graduate Credits: School of Education,
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Location: Seaton Elementary School
10th and Rhode Island, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Instructor: Dr. R. Mason Bunker, Co-Director, Integrated Day Program

Dates: June 24-July 3, 1974, 8:30-12:30 daily workshop activities
Independent and group projects

Post sessions: Follow up sessions will be scheduled throughout the
school year, 1974-1975.

Aims: To relate the theory of open education to practices of teachers
in the field.
To help teachers move their own classrooms toward open classrooms.
To establish procedures leading toward staff development and
cooperation.

Course Description:
This workshop is specifically designed to help a team of junior high
school teachers prepare for their movement in September, 1975 into the new
Shaw Junior High School in Washington, D.C. Participants will explore
ways to develop the physical, temporal, and human resources within their
team and in their classrooms.

The initial activities will focus on defining and describing open
education, looking at learners in open classrooms, and participating in
activities which demonstrate the underlying elements of open education.

Subsequent workshop activities will help participants to develop
competence in:

* articulating goals
* developing planning schemes
Opening conventional curriculum materials
Increasing group processes for self and others 
Adapting published materials
Extending new materials
Integrating subject matter
Moving toward increased shared decision making with learners and peers
Increasing management skills for the physical, temporal, and human environments

Expected Gains:

Participants will:

* Attend sessions and “get involved” in activities, discussions, planning and evaluating sessions
* Read and use readings in the workshop and planning for Fall, 1974
* Serve on committees and planning teams
* Develop a project for the beginning of school in September
* Share experiences in the follow-up sessions during the school year
* Share with other teachers who have not attended the workshop
* Have fun

Tentative Schedule of Workshop Activities:

Monday, June 24: Defining the Open Classroom

What is it? What it isn’t.
What does it look like?
What are the goals?
How does it feel to participate in an “open” experience?

Tuesday, June 25: Planning in the Open Classroom

How to extend learning experiences.
What are some planning strategies that work?
How can we begin planning for new? for Fall, 1974?

Wednesday, June 26: Curriculum Building in the Open Classroom

Bob Gillette will join us on Thursday to share his open education work in secondary schools. How do they do it?
What is integrating themes? (Oh, I know that!)
How do we get the “basics” (the tools) into all of this?
How do tasks work together?
What are learning centers?

Thursday, June 27: Provisioning in the Open Classroom
Friday, June 28: Managing the Open Classroom

What? So What? Now What?
How do we share decision making?
How do we manage the time, space, resources?

Monday, July 1: Integrating the Open Classroom

What is a "turn-on" agent?
How does it feel to get involved in an interdisciplinary starter activity?
How do we extend "turn-on agents" into our curriculum areas?
(Sue Chilvers, Director of the New School, will join us.)

Tuesday, July 2: Developing Curriculum for Shaw Junior High School
September, 1974

How can we begin to plan for Fall, 1974?
How do the ideas of this workshop fit together?
How can we design a plan for starting off in September?

Wednesday, July 3: Continuing Sharing, Evaluating, and Next Stepping

What have we done?
Where are we going?
What will we need?
How can we help one another?
Now what?
THE ADVISORY AND LEARNING EXCHANGE

THE SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SUMMER WORKSHOP 1975

Course: Lec. 0868: Seminar in Inservice Teacher Education: The Open Classroom and the Development of Resources - Human, Temporal, and Physical.

3 Graduate Credits: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Ma.

Location: Brookland School
Washington, D.C.

Instructor: Dr. R. Mason Bunker
Associate Professor
Co-Director,
Integrated Day Program

Dates: June 23 - July 3, 1975; 8:30-12:30 daily workshop activities;
1:30-4:00 independent and group projects.

Postmeasures: A follow-up session will be scheduled at the Advisory and Learning Exchange during October.

Aims: To relate the theory of open education to practices of teachers in the field.
To help teachers move their own classrooms toward more open classrooms.
To establish procedures leading to staff development and cooperation.

Course Description:

This workshop is specifically designed to help a team of junior high school teachers prepare for their movement in 1976 into the new Shaw Junior High School in Washington, D.C. Teachers will explore ways to develop the physical, temporal, and human resources within their team and in their classrooms.

The initial activities will focus on defining and describing open education, looking at learners in open classrooms, and participating in activities which demonstrate the underlying elements of open education.

Subsequent workshop activities will help participants to develop competence in:

[Continued on next page]
- articulating goals
- developing planning schemes
- opening conventional curriculum materials
- increasing group processes for self and others
- adapting published materials
- creating new materials
- integrating subject matter
- moving toward increased shared decision making with learners and peers
- increasing management skills for the physical, temporal, and human environments

Experiences:

Participants will:

- attend sessions and "get involved" in activities, discussions, planning and evaluating sessions
- read and use readings in the workshop and planning for Fall, 1975
- serve on committees and planning teams
- develop a project for the beginning of school in September
- share experiences in the follow-up sessions in October
- share with other teachers who have not attended the workshop
- have fun!
APPENDIX N

Diagram of School