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This study traces and analyzes the development of an integrated
theory for enhancing adolescent development. The promotion of
human/adolescent development has been the primary goal of the Maple
Valley School program since its inception in 1973.

This examination illuminates the unique nature of the program's
developmental progression. Three programmatic stages from 1973-1981
are distinguished by differences in theory and practice. An
extensive description of each phase includes the corresponding
theory and its impact on the students, staff and structure of the
school. This study also highlights the program's maturation within
the larger socio-cultural context.

The Behavior-Person-Environment paradigm (Hunt and Sullivan,
1974) is used to organize the program's process of translating
theoretical constructs into psychoeducational design and implementation. Specifically, this paradigm is employed as a means of identifying the ways in which the program's underlying view of human development influenced the conception of individual differences/needs (P), the establishment of learning goals (B), and the determination of specific methodologies (E), during the three programmatic stages.

The study is descriptive in style and organized in an effort to effectively integrate an objective analysis within an appropriately subjective context. The methodology utilized provides documentation that draws upon a range of data sources.

This study has significance on two levels. Firstly, the study illuminates Maple Valley's programmatic heritage in such a way as to provide staff members currently associated with the program with a comprehensive knowledge for contemporary practice. Secondly, this historical analysis has direct applications for a wide range of settings. Specifically, this study makes a contribution to a growing body of knowledge directed at the development of psychoeducational programs for adolescents. In a more general sense, these applications include the delivery of human services to adolescents, parenting, schooling, psychotherapy and social work.
PROLOGUE

This section is directed toward providing the reader with an historical profile of the myriad of personal and interpersonal dynamics underlying the creation and establishment of the Maple Valley project. Particular attention will be given to the recognition and clarification of the fundamental perspective underlying the nature and course of this study. The discussion will focus on two basic themes.

Firstly, I will provide an historical sketch of this author’s experience relevant to my initial commitment to and participation in the establishment of the Maple Valley program. Secondly, I will outline the nature and composition of the original staff group prior to and immediately following the establishment of the program.

The opportunity to engage in the analytical examination of the Maple Valley program’s psychoeducational development represents an interesting challenge for me. As a principal visionary, founder and director of the school since its inception in 1973, this undertaking has significant implications for me on both personal and professional levels. The primary thrust and purpose of this study is rooted in my desire and commitment as a mental health professional to make a positive contribution to the field of psychoeducational programming for adolescents. (A more detailed examination regarding the purpose of this study may be found in Chapter I). On a more personal level, however, this study represents a unique opportunity viii
for me to step back and examine the development of a project in which I've invested so much of my heart and soul. The mere prospect of such an undertaking stimulates feelings in me ranging from wonder and excitement to a high level of anxiety. I am excited to be able to reflectively focus on my creation; I am anxious when I think of the difficult task of utilizing objective scrutiny. It is my belief that it is essential for the reader to have a basic understanding of this author's personal relationship with and commitment to the Maple Valley project. This knowledge will not only provide the reader with a more comprehensive picture of the development of the program itself but will also enable the reader to gain a greater insight into the nature of the unique perspective expressed throughout the study.

My personal relationship with and commitment to the establishment of the Maple Valley program has its roots in my early childhood and adolescent experience with schooling. It is a most difficult task to attempt to isolate the specific historical antecedents which I believe to be most relevant to this discussion. However, the following represents a summary profile of my life experience which provided the basis and context for my determination to undertake a project as immense as the creation of a school/community.

My overall associations with school during my early grade school years are generally of a positive nature. However, this rather pleasant experience soon began to deteriorate as I advanced into the later primary grades. It was during this period that I
began to experience significant difficulty in adequately fulfilling expectations assigned to me in my emerging role as "student." Simply put, school and I were growing more and more "out of sync." My interests and attention were not focused on the academic tasks at hand.

J.D. Salinger (1951) offers an incisive critique of American Society in his famous novel, Catcher in the Rye. His view of society in the 1950s and early 1960s is circumscribed by the emptiness, narrowness, arbitrariness and rigidity of its mores and institutions. I grew up during this era and thus I was acutely aware of the "standards" by which I was being evaluated. I was becoming all too familiar with labels imposed on me such as "day dreamer," "underachiever," and "problem child." This emerging awareness signaled a new stage for me with respect to my school life and, more importantly, within my internal life itself. My self esteem and overall sense of adequacy had been profoundly threatened by my "inability" to do what was expected of me. Thus, a most serious and dysfunctional cycle—a cycle that ultimately would characterize my development for many years to come—was set in motion. In simple terms, my pattern was as follows: as I experienced increasing difficulty academically, I received increasing negative reinforcement that would then increase my sense of inadequacy, resulting in increased inability to succeed academically. This destructive pattern permeated my school life throughout my high school years.
I graduated from high school in the mid 1960s with fair grades and much uncertainty about my overall direction. However, as a child from a middle class home which placed tremendous value in the pursuit and acquisition of a college education, I felt obligated to give college life a try. I would rate my first two years as an undergraduate with mixed reviews. As I approached the second half of my undergraduate program, my life course began to take a radically different direction. It was during this period, that a revolutionary social and political movement began sweeping college campuses across the country and appeared to impact on the larger society as well.

During the late 1960s the social forces which initially coalesced around the protest of the war in Vietnam began to take on a more comprehensive and profound cultural character. Various descriptive labels such as the "Counter-Culture" or "Human Potential" Movements were often used to describe the rather dramatic cultural activity occurring at the time. These movements would ultimately exert a significant measure of influence on a number of institutional levels including politics, economics, education and psychology. (For a more in-depth examination of this subject, see: The Social and Cultural Context--THE EARLY YEARS).

Although I was swept up in the overall excitement, fervor and protest of the times, I was most captivated by and drawn to the revolutionary movement occurring in the fields of psychology and human development. "Third Force" or Humanistic Psychology as it was
later to be called (see: Theoretical Underpinnings--THE EARLY YEARS) represented a view of mental health, personal growth and development substantially different from either the mechanistic, objective, behavioral school or orthodox Freudianism. At the center of this new theoretical framework was a view of the person as fundamentally unique, positive and forward moving. This new vision was not rooted in a deficiency or pathology orientation, nor was it directed toward the inherent value of behavioral mastery and adjustment. The Third Force vision represented an entirely new way of perceiving and thinking about individuals, society and values as well as future possibilities and directions.

My earliest exposure to and participation in various human relations training and personal growth experiences was at once instantly captivating and personally validating. The message was clear--personal and interpersonal development represented a super-ordinal goal and direction which posed substantial implications for the fields of psychology, education, psychiatry and social work.

My final years in college were quite exciting and markedly different from any I had known since I was a young child. I became genuinely interested in the areas of education and human development. I sensed that my own life experience as a student was not as isolated and essentially idiosyncratic as I had imagined it to be. To the contrary, the more I learned, the greater I became convinced that there were significant and identifiable gaps in the traditional model. In other words, it occurred to me that there
might be many more "Holden Caufields" (Salinger, 1951) than previously considered. I was not one of a very few.

My dual undergraduate internships as a Social Studies teacher in a high school setting and a Special Education teacher in a southern Florida junior high school provided me with a valuable experiential opportunity. This reality served to reinforce my emerging vision for the need for educational alternatives. It was during the latter part of my undergraduate experience that I began to formulate and refine my own notions regarding such alternatives.

These ideas were primarily inspired by the Summerhillian experiment (see: Theoretical Underpinnings--THE EARLY YEARS) and became the single most influential factor in the ultimate determination of my personal and professional direction. Upon graduating from college, I set out to find a position as a teacher in an alternative or "Free" school whose educational philosophy approximated my own. After traveling throughout the country and visiting quite a number of school/communities, I was offered the opportunity of taking a staff position in one such school located in southern California. This school was organizationally structured as a parent cooperative and was philosophically rooted in the Summerhillian conception. This teaching experience was pivotal in terms of the role it played in charting my future.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s there was a proliferation of alternative schools throughout the country. This was particularly true in California; there appeared to be a new
alternative school opening on a weekly basis. Many of these schools would close almost as quickly as they opened (see: Alternative Schools Movement--THE EARLY YEARS). There were a multitude of factors contributing to the demise of many of these projects; I noticed that the lack of competent professional leadership was a central one. In this respect, as in many others, my California experience was atypical. I was extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity of working with a highly motivated, dedicated and competent group of professionals. Furthermore, the school's director was the most high-powered, talented professional I had ever encountered. Her impact on the students, staff, and parent group was intensely productive. It was not long before I began to realize the golden opportunity I had to train with "one of the best." Her demonstrated ability to establish the type of learning environment (rooted in the Humanistic/Existential tradition) (see: Theoretical Underpinnings--THE EARLY YEARS) whereby the learning potential for both students and staff was maximized was simply outstanding. During the year, the director and her husband and my former wife (also a staff member) and I began to formulate a plan to migrate back to the east coast and create a residential school/community of our own.

We returned to New York and invited a fifth individual (a long time personal friend of mine) to join our group. We began to make our collective dream a reality. We spent our first year in New York working as teachers while we actively planned the creation of the
school. The group spent most of our time outside of our "regular jobs" (which meant long evenings and weekends) setting in motion our vision of creating an alternative residential and day school/community for children. We chose the New England area as our geographical target for two primary reasons. Firstly, it was our view that the type of school/community we envisioned (as in the case of Summerhill) was best suited to a country environment. Secondly, the New England area was viewed as a "hotbed" of progressivism with the clear potential of providing our program with the necessary environmental and cultural supports and resources. (Note: During this period, Massachusetts ranked third behind California and New York in terms of the number of alternative schools in operation).

Our weekends generally consisted of traveling the highways from New York to Massachusetts as we searched for the "right" geographic location. We talked with anyone and everyone who appeared the least bit interested in our project. In May of 1973, after some initial setbacks, we purchased (with our pooled resources supplemented by critical financial support from friends) a 16-acre farm 20 miles northeast of Amherst in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts. The months between July and September of that year were spent remodeling what had been a working farm into what would become a residential school/community. We all worked long and hard and were driven by our common conviction that our dream was becoming our reality.

Maple Valley School officially opened its doors in September, 1973. The group consisted of the five original staff members,
eleven residential students (several who followed us from California and New York) and five day school students. In spite of the lack of preparedness in our physical facilities, those first few months of operation were exhilarating. There existed a powerful sense from both students and staff that we were truly pioneers in an unchartered terrain.

The school's reception from the Wendell community was relatively mixed and ranged from a mild case of xenophobia to genuine interest and support. (Note: For a more detailed description of the composition of the Wendell community, see: Cultural Setting—THE EARLY YEARS). We received the blessing of the town's selectmen and were given a temporary license to operate from the school committee; thus, we became and viewed ourselves as truly legitimate.

Each stage of the school's development possesses its own unique character. However, as in the case of a new romance, the program's earliest days were rife with all the emotions, innocence and desire peculiar to the beginning of this type of relationship. Naturally, all honeymoon periods must come to an end. If the relationship is ultimately able to survive, it is essential that the individuals, group or organization have the capacity to successfully move the relationship from the romance of the honeymoon to the realities of daily life. This continued as our organization challenge.

I could provide the reader with a comprehensive description of the complexities of the interpersonal dynamics during this period;
however, this task would require an entirely different format which I will reserve for another time. It is important to point out that this chapter of the interpersonal saga represented a most difficult and trying process for the original founding staff group. There existed a myriad of factors which played a significant role in this ongoing interpersonal/organizational process. On an external level, the nature and scope of work-related responsibilities were simply overwhelming. These responsibilities ranged from counseling and teaching to cooking and maintenance functions to the overall leadership and administration of the program.

The school's physical plant (for a more detailed description of the school's physical plant, see: School Characteristics—THE EARLY YEARS) during this period consisted of a large colonial farm house, a large barn (which had been converted into classroom and common areas) and a student dormitory structure connecting the two main buildings. All of the original founding staff members lived and worked at the school. It was in these close quarters that the staff began to "live and breathe" Maple Valley. Life was a twenty-four-hour day, seven-days-a-week commitment. These were most difficult days. Friends had come and gone, and by the end of the second year, only two individuals from the original five remained. This change was profound. The disillusionment, anguish and anger resulting in the ultimate demise of the original collective dream had a profound impact on all those involved. However, in tribute to each member of the original group, it must be recorded that the high level of
personal and professional integrity demonstrated by these individuals through these difficulties enabled the school to survive. Everyone was highly dedicated to the cause; that is, members prevented their break-up from being the break-up of the school.

After the second school year, the two remaining original founders formed a partnership that assumed and shared the leadership and directorial responsibility for the school. Together with a new group of young and talented individuals (two of whom had begun their involvement with the program in its second year), a new team was established. New staff members began to make their own unique contribution in refining and redefining the original vision. This new team was injected with the energy, caring and wisdom from those individuals who came to represent the new bedrock of the school/community.

Over the years, the staff group would develop and mature and change in many ways. Some staff appear to me, in retrospect, as a "flash in the pan" in terms of either their tenure in the program or the peripheral nature of the involvement and investment in community life. Other staff members, although connected to the school for a relatively limited period of time, were able to make a significant and life-giving contribution. There were several individuals (whose involvement with the school would continue for many years) whose total commitment to each other and the healthy development of the program would ultimately provide its life-blood.
There exists one more critical component necessary to examine before the picture is complete. This component is the extraordinary level of demonstrated commitment on behalf of the two original founders who have always been and currently remain responsible for the program's overall leadership and direction. Simply put, without their central participation, there would have been no school.

Thus, I have made it clearly evident that this study does not represent a detached academic exercise for me. To the contrary, this project reflects an outgrowth of many years of personal commitment and investment. I hope that the reader's understanding and knowledge of this subjective background information will enhance her/his overall comprehension of the purpose and rationale of this thesis.
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The enhancement of adolescent development has been the primary goal of the Maple Valley School since its inception in 1973. An integrated theory for psychoeducational practice emerged as a direct result of the school's development from 1973-1981. The purpose of this study is to trace and analyze the development of the Maple Valley program and then to synthesize these data into a psychoeducational theory aimed at enhancing adolescent development. The analysis and the theory result from a constant interplay between theory and practice—i.e., theories were applied to practice, then these new practices in turn changed theoretical perspectives, effecting new applications—a cyclical process that was constantly broadening in scope.

This study seeks to illuminate the unique nature of the program's developmental progression and then place this development in a larger socio-cultural context. There are three main periods of the program and each required institutional adaptation and change for survival. The EARLY YEARS (1973-1976), The MIDDLE YEARS (1976-1979), and The LATER YEARS (1979-1981), are three periods that are distinguished by differences in theory and practice. It is the purpose of this dissertation to describe each phase, the
accompanying theory of each phase, and the impact of the phase on the students and staff of the school.

It is this author's view that this type of examination offers great promise on two levels. Firstly, for those staff members currently associated with the Maple Valley program, this study will shed light on the program's theoretical and practical heritage and therefore will provide greater insight into current practices. Secondly, an historical analysis of the program generates the type of data that is rooted in a real life/long-term commitment and investment (as opposed to short-term empirical/experimental data) that will, by its very nature, have direct applications in a wide range of settings. These applications include the delivery of human services to adolescents, parenting, schooling, psychotherapy and social work.
Background of the Study

Maple Valley School: Vital Statistics

Maple Valley School was organized in July, 1973 as a non-profit private school. From 1973 to 1981, Maple Valley School operated a residential and day school program on middle and secondary school levels. Maple Valley School is located in Wendell, Massachusetts—a rural town approximately twenty miles north of Amherst, Massachusetts. In 1973, Maple Valley was a private alternative school; in 1981 Maple Valley was a fully licensed residential care and school program providing a broad range of psychoeducational and social services to publicly-aided adolescents. In 1973, Maple Valley School was comprised of 5 staff, 12 students and one renovated colonial farm house; in 1981, there were 20 staff, 30 students and four additional buildings. In 1973, the students were typically economically advantaged and from stable families; in 1981, the population primarily consisted of economically and psychologically deprived adolescents from chaotic and harmful environments. Since 1973, Maple Valley School has defined its mission to consistently broaden and improve its ability to provide a full array of services to adolescents. The author of this study has been a founder and director of the school since its inception.

Maple Valley School and the Larger World

Maple Valley School can best be understood as a phenomenon
that is both unique in its existence as an on-going, innovative, experiment in psycho-education as well as an entity that is typical of a very specific socio-cultural context. This socio-cultural context spawned the birth of Maple Valley and fueled its on-going processes of dynamic change. Throughout this study, I will identify and elaborate the various elements of its uniqueness. I will also make mention of the many ways in which its very existence and growth was intimately connected to the larger context.

Maple Valley School: Development and Applications

The development of the Maple Valley program required attention to educational issues that are generic in nature, and therefore broadly applicable to a variety of settings. For example, issues of matching educational strategies to student needs, designing relevant curricula, establishing environmental structures, establishing, ordering and implementing learning goals, clarifying the nature of the student/staff relationship, emphasizing and evaluating program changes and innovation, etc., are all processes that are representative of and integral to a variety of learning institutions. Thus, this study validates the underlying implicit assumption that the premises, processes and methodologies of the development of this single school can be directly relevant and applicable to the development of other educational systems.

Institutions must adapt in order to survive in an ever-changing and complex world. This investigation covers the period
(1973-1981) when Maple Valley School underwent three distinct periods of dynamic change. THE EARLY YEARS (1973-1976) was a period of birth and infancy in which Maple Valley directly reflected the basic tenets of the Human Potential and Free School Movements.

During the MIDDLE YEARS (1976-1979) program planners began to direct the program's development in a more systematic, sequenced and focused manner. During THE LATER YEARS (1979-1981) the foundation had been established that then allowed for an even more scientific and sophisticated application of psychological theory to educational practice. Thus, this development over eight years resulted in an integrated psychoeducational theory for enhancing adolescent development.
Significance

Theory and Practice

This study has significance insofar as it contributes to refinement of educational programs for adolescents whose aim is the deliberate promotion of individual development. The investigation has both theoretical and practical significance in that it identifies theoretical underpinnings which guided program design and also discusses the outcomes of the application of specific theories to on-going program practices.

This historical analysis of a psychoeducational program spanning the period 1973-1981 places the evolution of an integrated theory for enhancing adolescent development within a "real-life" educational context. Thus, the reader is afforded the opportunity of viewing the natural process of translating psychological theories underlying human development into educational design and implementation. Kohlberg (1979), speaks directly to this issue in suggesting the need to avoid the trap of what he termed the "psychologists fallacy". The basic notion here is that psychological research does not necessarily have value in the design and implementation of educational programs. It is Kohlberg's (1979) view that meaningful theories of educational practice, "...cannot be simply based on psychological theories for ordering value-neutral psychological data motivated by pure research." To the contrary, he believes, as does this author, in the need for educational design to
be rooted in the context of an on-going real-life program. This position should in no way be construed as the negation, preclusion or diminishment of the valuable role played by the development of an empirically grounded basis for psychoeducational programs. Rather, it should be taken as a defense of the position that suggests the need for real-life/on-going applied research in the field in addition to the more experimental/empirical-oriented research.

Identifying Philosophical Roots

The basic value orientation that defines the educational experience in terms of the promotion of fully functioning, autonomous members of a democratic society can be traced back to Socrates and through Rousseau, Tolstoi and, more recently, the progressive education movement inspired by Dewey. The resurgence of this ideological thread can be found in the early days of the Human potential and Free School Movement's of the late 1960's and early 1970's (see: Early Years--Socio-Cultural Context). Along with this most recent of age-old values has occurred the proliferation of studies focusing on existing educational programs. These studies include Neill's classic description of the Summerhill School (1960), as well as the most contemporary studies related to the structural development approach--i.e., The Cluster School in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Wasserman, 1980). The above studies had as their primary aim the education of children"...psychologically/personally...to provide significant experience...and a systematic analysis of that
experience in natural settings...under conditions that are real, with genuine responsibility" (Sprinthall, 1979).

A Model for Analysis

The Behavior-Person-Environment paradigm will be utilized as an organizing vehicle to enable the reader to gain a comprehensive view of the program's development (see: Overview and Methodology section for a more detailed description of this model). Thus, the B-P-E Schema will provide a "road map" for understanding not only how specific theories were historically applied in practice, but also as a means of organizing and promoting the on-going internal evaluation of the Maple Valley program. The B-P-E application allows Maple Valley to change in a systematic fashion in ways that can enhance its desired goals.

Summary

In summation, this study will have significance insofar as it contributes to a growing body of knowledge which is directed at the development of psychoeducational programs for adolescents. In our rapidly changing and increasingly complex and dangerous world, it is a noble mission to educate our youth in such a way as to engender in them the hopes and competencies they will need in order to confront societal dilemmas in just, intelligent and compassionate ways. "Acts of aggression, hate, and violence perpetrated by individuals, groups, and nations become more frequent and increasingly
generalized.... Feelings of isolation, alienation, frustration and impotence, along with the loss of identity and purpose, at the least touch most of us; surround many of us" (Brown, 1971a). George Brown suggests that the greatest potential for this individual and collective condition lies at the heart of the educational process. Finally, according to Dewey (1964)

"The aim of education is development of individuals to the utmost of their potentialities. But this statement leaves unanswered the question as to what is the measure of development. A society of free individuals in which all, through their own work, contributes to the liberation and enrichment of the lives of others, is the only environment in which any individual can really grow normally to his full stature."

This study of the Maple Valley School program is significant in that it contributes to the understanding of this type of educational process.
Methodology

In this section, I will discuss the nature of the selected participant/observer approach, the descriptive style, the collection of data, and the utilization of a specific theoretical organizer.

Participant/Observer Approach

The author is not and does not pretend to present an exclusively dispassionate and objective observer and recorder; to the contrary, as will be noted in the prologue and epilogue, the author has been intimately involved as an ongoing director and participant in this educational experiment. Thus, it is incumbent upon me to exercise maximum effort in attempting to provide an effectively documented study that will meet its stated goals. Toward this end, it is imperative to note that the author does not view his personal involvement and investment as an impediment to the goals of this study; rather, the author's ability to integrate an objective analysis within an appropriately subjective context is seen as a means of enhancing the purposes of this study. Simply put, my direct access to experience and information within the context of sufficient objective rigor enables a powerfully effective investigation.

Descriptive Style

This study is descriptive in style and is organized in
conceptual and theoretical terms. I am of the opinion that there exists a direct and causal relationship between the content of this study and the chosen methodology. It is my view that the most effective means of analyzing the psychoeducational development of the Maple Valley program can be served by electing a format that focuses on a descriptive method. The very nature of this examination that includes theoretical approaches regarding human development, the identification of individual needs along with the selection of corresponding methodologies and goals is integrally linked to the study of human behavior in general. Therefore, it is my intent and purpose to employ a methodology that can illuminate the above in a manner that provides the type of documentation that will be useful to others in the field. In addition, I will include a prologue and epilogue which will provide the reader with an understanding of the relationship between this author and the project under scrutiny, as well as the more personal, interpersonal and organizational elements deemed inappropriate for inclusion in the text of the study (but which may be helpful in facilitating a comprehensive understanding).

Collection of Data

In addition to descriptive information generated by use of the participant/observer method, a research procedure that also allows for more objective analyses is an essential component of this study. Toward this end, I have drawn upon the following data sources:
- recorded transcripts of school meetings and functions
- student progress reports and evaluations
- direct and structured interviews with former students and staff members, and,
- a number of newspaper articles highlighting particular aspects of the program's development

Interview Schedule

This research interview will consist of two sets of data from students and staff who participated in the program for the period 1973-1981. A total of 15 students will be interviewed—five students who entered the program in each of the three periods as outlined in the study. A total of 12 staff members will be interviewed—4 staff who began their employment at the school in each of the three periods as outlined in the study.

Theoretical Organizer

The Behavior-Person-Environment model (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974) is a way of organizing and analyzing the ways in which psychological and educational theory is translated into psychoeducational design and implementation. Specifically, this "matching model" will be employed in an attempt to identify the ways in which the program's underlying view of human development influenced the conception of individual needs (P) the selection of specific methodologies (E) and the determination of learning goals (B), during the
three programmatic stages. Hunt and Sullivan's (1974) paradigm \( B=f(P,E) \) is rooted in Kurt Lewin's (1936) conception that Behavior \( B \) is a function of the Person \( P \) and the environment \( E \). This framework suggests an interactive process which focuses attention on the differential effects various strategies or interventions \( E \) have on a given individual or population \( P \) in promoting a particular goal or outcome \( B \).

This interactive model has previously been used in the context of curricula design for academic subject areas (Joyce and Weil, 1972; Hunt and Sullivan, 1974; McLachlan and Hunt, 1973). Also, the B-P-E model has recently been employed by researchers in the field of psychological education by those who have attempted to utilize a developmental framework with the aim of "matching" the individual's or group's level of development \( P \) with a particular intervention \( E \) in pursuit of a specific goal \( B \) (Blasi, 1972; Hunt, 1977, 1978; Ziff, 1979; Schiller, 1983).

Thus, the utilization of the B-P-E interactive paradigm as a means of providing a conceptual analyses based on historical and specific data from a variety of sources clearly serves to effectively implement the previously discussed purposes of this study.
Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are a direct result of the utilization of the participant/observer research method and the historical case study method.

The author's involvement as director of the school increases the possibility of personal bias influencing the study and diminishing its validity.

The historical case study method has two primary drawbacks. Firstly, reconstruction of events and data that is almost ten years old presents the problem of revisionism, thereby weakening cause-effect hypotheses and conclusions. Secondly, the case study method does not have the predictive cause-and-effect strengths as does experimental/empirical designs.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I provides an overview of the study including its purpose, significance, and research methodologies. Chapter II provides a detailed analysis of THE EARLY YEARS (1973-1976) including theoretical underpinnings, a program description and analysis and a summary. Chapter III discusses THE MIDDLE YEARS (1976-1979) and Chapter IV analyzes THE LATER YEARS (1979-1981) according to the same format as Chapter II. Chapter V outlines an integrated theory for enhancing adolescent development that grew out of the Maple
Valley experience. Chapter VI provides summary conclusions of the study with particular focus on future applications. The appendicies will include primary data sources (school records, meeting transcripts, etc.), structured interview narratives with program participants and a bibliography.
CHAPTER II
The Early Years (1973-1976)

This section will examine several important areas necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the Maple Valley program during this period. The first segment will provide an analysis of the program's theoretical underpinnings. This discussion will consist of a profile of the program's underlying conception of human development as well as a more detailed description of those specific theories and models which significantly impacted on program design. Particular attention will be given to the ways in which individual needs, psychoeducational goals and corresponding methodologies were determined by these theories and models.

Secondly, an extensive examination of Maple Valley's program design and implementation during this period will be provided. This analysis will highlight the six following areas:

- a profile of the socio-cultural context existing at the time just prior to and during the inception of the program (e.g., "The Greening of America" and The Alternative School Movement)

- a description of the nature and definition of the student population with particular emphasis given to the ways in which student needs were determined

- a study of the ways in which the program's psychoeducational goals and objectives were established

- an analysis of the parameters of the program's environmental design with particular emphasis on methods and structures employed at the time.

- an identification of the ways in which original
theoretical conceptions were reconsidered in light of on-going practice and implementation, and, finally, - a chapter summary which includes a profile of a transitional framework providing conceptual linkage to the next programmatic stage: "The Middle Years"

The _Behavior-Person-Environment_ model (Lewin, 1936) (see: Overview and Methodology section) will be used as the primary vehicle for the purpose of organizing the aforementioned analysis. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.
Theoretical Underpinnings of the Maple Valley Program

Theoretical Conception of Human Development

In clarifying and defining the nature of the Maple Valley program at this stage of its development, it is necessary to provide a synopsis of the program's underlying theoretical orientation regarding human development. This conception of development and change is a central aspect of the program's overall construction. Following this summarization, I will examine those theories and models within the fields of psychology and education which had a significant impact on programmatic design and implementation during this period. The aforementioned discussion will provide a theoretical context within which one may more clearly understand the ways in which program planners construed the psychological needs of students (P) along with corresponding methods (E) and goals (B).

The primary ideological thread running throughout the educational system has been anchored in what Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) describe as the Cultural Transmission philosophical orientation. The central idea within this framework concerns the impartation of the requisite skills, knowledge and discipline directed at enabling the child to acquire an appropriate place within the economic and social structure. Mosher and Sprintall (1970) argue that this perspective typically manifests itself in the way a school's psychological services are implemented; that is, the fundamental aim is one of helping children to adjust to the system
the way it currently exists. From this perspective, the underlying investment is in maintaining the status quo. Significantly, it was the very nature and composition of this status quo that was being challenged by individuals invested in the promotion of a "cultural revolution" both within and outside the worlds of education and psychology. (This socio-cultural phenomenon is discussed in a following section of this paper.)

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, there was within the educational field a movement that was gaining in prominence and coalescing around an entirely different ideological perspective. The Romantic (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972) philosophical conception represented a radical departure from traditional thinking as well as an alternative construction. Contrary to the cultural transmission framework—with its emphasis on training children to meet societal expectations as the basis upon which curricula designs are made—the romantic perspective considers the unique and full development of an individual's potential as the foundational operating premise.

According to Kohlberg, the romantic or maturational position (the use of the term maturational, as opposed to romantic, implies a shift away from the philosophical and towards the more psychological construction) considers development as occurring as a result of an organic or unfolding process. This perspective may include the belief that children possess a natural and inner sense of truth and goodness. The role that environment may play is in either the provision or denial of support and nourishment to the individual as
s/he negotiates this process. The environmental prescription from
this perspective is oftentimes translated into "getting out of the
child's way so that s/he may get on with the business of growing."
A.S. Neill, founder and chief ideolouge of the Summerhill School and
widely regarded as representative of this type of position, believed
that children have within them the innate capacity for wisdom and
realism. He stated that if given the necessary space by adults,
they will develop to their full potential. This view clearly
demonstrates the idea, when juxtaposed with the cultural
transmission perspective, that education should not be aimed at
training children to fit into the existing order but to help them to
realize their own potentialities; it is the school's role to meet
the child's needs rather than the reverse situation. The primary
area of interest from a maturationist point of view is the Self--the
internal life of the individual.

The above discussion focuses on trends within the world of
education; similar movements can be traced in the world of psy-
chology. The emphasis on the psychological health and well-being of
individuals, coupled with the conviction that people are essentially
positive and forward moving, are key concepts reflected in the
Humanistic/Existential viewpoint. These factors are of particular
significance in the conceptualization of the growth process. This
process is viewed as organic in nature and always moving in the
direction of self-actualization. Implicit in this framework is the
notion that the individual can and must take control over her/his
own world. Common to both the Humanistic and Existential conception are: the importance of the individual's role in making active choices and taking full responsibility for those choices, the idea that a healthy individual is one who views possibilities as opportunities for taking positive action, and the formulation of counseling goals that direct clients toward helping themselves to resolve conflicting parts of their inner selves (e.g., the incongruencies between the ideal and genuine self), thus enabling them to become more authentic in their interpersonal relationships. The greater the unity, the less room for extraneous anxiety, thus allowing the movement toward self-actualization to proceed. In this view, inner turmoil and anxiety are most often construed as obstructions in the pursuit of mental health. Gestalt Therapy (a therapeutic modality rooted in the existential tradition) considers human nature in wholistic terms. Individuals consist of a totality (or Gestalt) of their component parts. The focus is on enabling the individual to more fully integrate and re-own aspects of the self that are split-off from the center. Maslow (1968), regarded by many as the father of Humanistic Psychology, suggests that an individual may be understood in terms of her/his negotiations with the process of individuation, autonomy and self-actualization. In examining the Humanistic/Existential position, Ivey and Simeck-Downing (1980) state that a primary goal of counseling--from this perspective--is helping the individual to "get in touch" with her/his inner self in order that s/he move towards more positive action and fulfillment.
The idea that each individual is unique, and must be understood and experienced on that basis, represents another philosophical link between the Humanistic and Existential positions. This premise is operationalized by helping individuals discover their own inner nature so that they will become more open to experience and more able to trust their own instincts and feelings. The role of feelings in the process of "becoming" is given primacy within the Humanistic/Existential framework. Feelings are regarded as unfiltered and true expressions of the inner self. Theories of development that emphasize an individual's inner world as the critical arena for change (as opposed to environmental factors) include psychoanalytic, maturational, humanistic and existential theories. Thus, we see a consistent vein in the thinking of these psychological theorists.

The above discussion outlines a general view of human development. The following discussion examines those specific theories and models which functioned as programmatic cornerstones during this period.
Theoretical Conceptions: Understanding Individual Needs (the "Person")

The work of Carl Rogers, in addition to the writings of Abraham Maslow and A. S. Neill and Frederick Perls, represent four major forces in the fields of psychology and education who had a profound impact on shaping the Maple Valley program in its earliest days. I will begin the next section by outlining those ideas of Maslow and Rogers which illuminate their conceptualization of individual needs. It was these two theoreticians, more than any others, who played a primary role in influencing Maple Valley's earliest formulation of student needs.

Maslow:

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs offers a fairly systematic (however general) means of characterizing individuals—as Table I indicates
Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Self Actualization:</th>
<th>to reach one's potential—to be fully what one can be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Needs:</td>
<td>adequacy, mastery, competence, self-respect, recognition and achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness, Affection and Love Needs:</td>
<td>connection to family roots, sense of community, focus on peer group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Needs:</td>
<td>security, stability, avoidance of anxiety, need for order and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological Needs:</td>
<td>sex, hunger, thirst and fatigue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Maslow, 1970)

Maslow (1970) states that this sequence is invariant in nature—higher needs cannot emerge until lower ones have been satisfied. Therefore, behavior is influenced more significantly by lower needs prior to higher needs and will continue to be so until satisfied. Self Actualization is the term Maslow used to describe his highest stage characteristics. This includes a more accurate view of reality, acceptance of self and others, spontaneity and simplicity, problem centeredness, the need for and utilization of privacy, independence of culture and environment, freshness and appreciation, capacity for utilizing peak experiences, social interest, capacity for intimacy, being democratic in nature, ability to discriminate between means and ends, possession of a healthy sense of humor, creativity and ability to resist enculturation.

In a later revision, Maslow (1970) formulated what he termed...
the "B-Values". The individual, upon reaching the highest stage, is no longer engaged in the process of becoming self actualized. S/he has progressed through the entire hierarchy of needs. At this point in her/his development, an underlying "growth motivation" takes on primary significance in charting one's life course. This movement is in the direction of what Maslow described as being "B(being)-Values" or being-needs. The basic theme reflects an increasing need to become more fully aware of self and others and to fully express oneself in pursuit of reaching one's true potential. Maslow (1970) argued that self-actualizing people are primarily motivated by "meta-needs" or B-Values and not by basic needs. In his later writings, Maslow suggested that an individual's development may be arrested at the Self-Esteem stage. One reason proposed for this halt in one's development is what Maslow described as "existential listlessness" or apathy. To be truly self-actualized Maslow believed one must be committed to long-reaching goals and not be overcome by apathy. According to Maslow, self-actualized individuals engaged with B-Values/needs will be open to and capable of fully encountering what he termed the "peak experience" (Maslow, 1970). In an earlier work (1962) Maslow describes the after effects of peak experiences in this way:
Table II

Maslow's Conception of the After Effects of Peak Experiences

"1- they may be so profound as to remove certain neurotic symptoms forever after.

2- they can change a person's view of himself in a healthy direction.

3- they can positively change the view and relations one has with other people.

4- the change is more or less permanent with respect to one's view of the world.

5- energies may be released for greater creativity, spontaneity, expressiveness and idiosyncracy.

6- one remembers the experience as desirable and significant and wishes to repeat it.

7- the person is generally more likely to view life as more meaningful."

Although Maslow postulated that many types of individuals may have peak experiences, it will only be the self-actualized person who is capable of utilizing the peak experience meaningfully. The B-Values such as unity, global justice and transcendence are all greatly intensified in the state of peak experience. Significantly, Maslow construed the peak experience as a basis for suggesting a person's higher and transcendent nature as an essential part (albeit further along the evolutionary path) of her/his more biological, species-wide nature.

There is at least one more important concept that should be mentioned in this summary of Maslow's view of the person. His
distinction between the growth-motivated, self-actualizing individual and the deficiency-motivated individual suggests the type of differentiation which readily lends itself to correspondent environmental responses.

Rogers:

Common to many Humanistic/Existential psychologists is a fundamental reverence for the uniqueness of each and every individual. This theme is particularly evident in the case of Carl Rogers. It is quite natural and understandable that there be resistance from these quarters regarding any attempt to systematically characterize individuals for fear of "type casting" them. However, Rogers (1958) did offer a tentative definition for the measurement of process in psychotherapy. It is illuminating to attempt to define Roger's conception of the person by delineating which aspects of personality development are given prominence in his schema.
Table III

Seven Areas on the Change Process of Client-Centered Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 1. Relationship to Feelings and Personal Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Feelings are unrecognized or unexpressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Feelings are experienced freely in the moment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 2. Manner of Experiencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Individual is remote from experiencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Experience is an accepted inner referent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 3. Degree of Incongruence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Individual is unaware of contradictory self-statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Individual is able to recognize temporary moments of incongruence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 4. Communication of Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Individual avoids revealing himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Individual experiences himself and is able to communicate his self-awareness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 5. Manner in Which Experience Is Construed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Individual has rigid constructs which he accepts as fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Constructs are recognized to be ways of construing a moment of experience and are open to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 6. Relationship to Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Problems not recognized or perceived to be external to self, and individual is closed to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Individual lives his problem and seeks to cope with it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand 7. Manner of Relating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Stage: Close relationships avoided as dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stage: Individual risks being himself in the process of relating to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these dimensions of personality were central for Rogers. The self is, after all, the locus of control. All growth emanates from this central point. For example, progress made regarding one's movement away from a dysfunctional fear of intimacy and towards a greater sense of ease and freedom with interpersonal relationships is indicative of the type of fundamental change in the self-system that Rogers views as productive and necessary.

Rogers (1959) emphasizes the role that positive regard plays in helping the child to develop a healthy self-structure. Basically, the child "introjects" or internalizes the evaluations of significant others. As this process continues, the child begins to develop a capacity for self-regard. This development occurs regardless of the specific nature of the relations themselves. It is out of this capacity for self-regard that the child develops a sense of her/his "conditions or worth" (ibid). Positive experience which enhances one's perception of worth are perceived accurately in awareness. Experiences which are inherently negative in nature are selectively screened out of and denied access to awareness. It is precisely this process of denial that, according to Rogers, may form the basis for psychological turmoil. If experiences begin to be selectively denied, the discrepancy between the self-picture and the objective reality runs the risk of growing larger. This enlarging discrepancy results in a heightened state of vulnerability to anxiety each and every time a new experience potentially threatens the child's perception of self-worth.
Rogers (1974) was committed to the notion that individuals have within themselves a tremendous capacity for self-understanding. Given a facilitative environment, they are able to alter their self-concepts, attitudes and self-directed behavior.

It is important to note that, according to the nature of his underlying conception of the person, much of Rogers' work logically focused on creating the necessary environmental (therapeutic/educational) conditions aimed at fostering the individual's movement toward self-actualization. Each of Rogers' three major periods of growth and development—the non-directive, client-centered, and the active counselor involvement, clearly delineates his overall view of what constitutes an effective helping relationship. Rogers' ideas as to what makes for the most fertile environment (along with other theorists—Neill and Perls in particular) had a significant impact on the way program planners construed the M.V.S. environment. This relationship will be considered in a later section of this paper.

Both Rogers and Maslow view human nature as inherently good. They also regard development as a natural striving for increased autonomy, self-direction, self-responsibility and self-awareness. Rogers and Maslow tend to view psychological maladjustment in similar terms. That is, individuals become psychologically debilitated as a result of learned behaviors which effectively block the natural and spontaneous expression of the inner self.
The Definition of Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

Hunt and Sullivan (1974) suggest that psychoeducational goals are derived from one's underlying view of individual needs. For instance, if one's view of the person is conditioned by a mechanistic orientation, one is more inclined to establish goals which are behaviorally specific, contemporaneous, predictable and easily measurable. If, on the other hand, one's perspective on human nature emanates from a Humanistic/Existential framework, then the pursuit of self-actualization (in the broadest sense) would more likely represent the primary thrust. This section will examine the theoretical underpinnings upon which psychoeducational goals and outcomes were established at Maple Valley during the Early Years.

Abraham Maslow (1968) argued that the highest aim of education is to help students discover what is uniquely within them rather than to reinforce or shape the individual into a predetermined mold. According to this view, the educational process should not be based on a learning theory which emphasizes extrinsic, arbitrary and external learning. To the contrary, the movement should be directed at encouraging the individual's search for identity. The goal is "...learn who we are, what we love, what we hate, what we value, what we are committed to, what makes us feel anxious, what makes us feel depressed, what makes us feel happy, what makes us feel great joy." At a more general level, Maslow outlined two broad types of learning: learning-to-be-a-person and the more impersonal learning of skills and information.
Carl Rogers (1969), operating within a similar framework as Maslow, suggests that education and psychotherapy share common endpoints: the fully-functioning, self-actualized person. Rogers elaborates his conception by profiling outcomes of the ideal educational process. Following is a breakdown of person-specific characteristics which represent a reconceptualization of his basic view of individual needs.

**The Person is Open to Her/His Experience**

This concept translates into an openness to all experience of both internal and external origin. New experience, potentially incongruent and threatening to the self, can be integrated into the individual's self-system.

**The Person Lives in Existential Fashion**

The individual truly open to her/his experience lives each new moment as freely and easily as it occurs. In this view, the self grows out of experience rather than the force-fitting of experience into a rigid self-structure. Therefore, the individual's self-system exists in a constant state of flux. According to Rogers, the most stable personality traits are the individual's openness to experience and her/his flexibility in negotiating contemporaneous environmental factors.
The Person Trusts Her/His Own Organism in Arriving at the Most Satisfying Behavior in each New Situation

This individual is one who allows her/himself to act freely on the basis of what "feels right" in a given situation. The assumption here is that all the information (both internal and external) necessary for determining an appropriate response in many instances is available in the existential moment. Rogers believed that what makes this process unreliable for most people is the interference of irrelevant information of a non-existential nature.

As mentioned earlier, this profile characterizes Rogers' view of the fully functioning, self-actualized person. Following will be a summary of the overall Humanistic/Existential position.

In summary, the fully functioning, self-actualized individual is the ultimate goal of psychotherapeutic and educational practice within this framework. This end point, although never really attained by the individual, is one toward which s/he continuously strives. This ongoing process characterizes the individual who is constantly learning how to learn. This individual has access to a great creative potential in her/his capacity to continuously form new relationships with her/his environment.

The Humanistic/Existential position considers the predictability of behavior in different terms than the more "scientific" or deterministic view. In fact, these two conceptions are diametrically opposed. The scientific orientation regards the prediction and control of human behavior as its primary function.
The Humanistic/Existential view considers the fully functioning, self-actualized individual to be one who is open to experience and the freshness of each moment; this assumes a large measure of stability, but an obvious loss in the predictability of her/his behavior. It is the maladjusted individual, in fact, whose behavior is more easily predictable as a function of the rigidity and impermeability of personal constructs and patterns. In this view, the main purpose of psychology is construed as "...a science of understanding" rather than "...the prediction and control of behavior."

In summation, Maple Valley's conception of psychoeducational goals was firmly rooted in this framework. The superordinal aim was the development of fully functioning, self-actualized people. The central belief was that each individual possessed the innate wisdom to achieve this level of functioning. The notion that each student's journey toward self-actualization is unique implies that goals only have meaning within a student-centered, subjective context. (A more detailed examination of Maple Valley program goals, during the Early Years, is provided in the section entitled Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior").
Defining Methods and Strategies (the "Environment")

As noted earlier, program planners were greatly influenced in their thinking by several prominent figures quite popular in the fields of education and psychology. In order to establish a meaningful context for a discussion of the program's environmental design, I will briefly highlight central elements comprising these formulations. Particular attention will be given to those environmental ingredients which impacted most significantly on program design.

A.S. Neill: The Summerhill School

Much of what was proposed by Neill as early as the 1930's would, ultimately, come to be subsumed into the larger and better defined schools of Humanistic and Existential theory and practice. Although trained in the psychoanalytic tradition which influenced his theoretical formulations (most clearly expressed by the primacy given to sexual content in the therapeutic encounter), Neill expressed an unmistakably Humanistic/Existential approach to the education of children. Therefore, fundamental philosophical and methodological links to other theorists previously examined are apparent.

More than any other theorist, it was A.S. Neill's notions about child rearing and education which fueled the Maple Valley experiment. It is for this reason that I have chosen to begin this section by profiling the Summerhillian conception.
For the purposes of economy and relevance, I will outline the Summerhillian conception by delineating two sub-sections. They are: basic school organization and the nature and role of the teacher in the learning process. (While this characterization of Summerhill is useful for the purposes of analysis, it should be understood that it was the entire tapestry, taken as a whole, which provided the greatest meaning to the Maple Valley staff. For many staff, Summerhill truly appeared to represent a "vision of the world" rather than a prescriptive environmental cookbook.)

The following represents a profile of central features comprising the Summerhill School's organization as derived from Neill's work (1960). This program's underlying operating principles will be described at the beginning of this section. A discussion of Summerhillian practices emanating from these principles will follow.

Summerhill School Organization:

Principles: First and foremost, Neill believed that it is the school's responsibility to meet the child's needs; it is not the child's responsibility to conform to the school's program. The view is that a child who genuinely wants to learn, will learn, regardless of the teaching methods employed. However, Neill cautioned that this natural learning process can take place only if adults allow the child the necessary and appropriate space within which s/he
may develop. According to the Summerhillian view, there is no such thing as a lazy child. Children who are commonly referred to as being lazy are either genuinely disinterested or psychologically disabled. Older children who stay away from classes often do so in direct proportion to the hatred and fear their previous school experience instilled in them. Neill vehemently disagreed with those educators and psychologists who maintained that a child will not develop in a functional way unless forced to do so.

Academic achievement at Summerhill is not given a primary focus. The underlying view is that success in this area bears no direct correlation to an individual's ability to lead a more loving, complete life. Also a basic assumption relevant to this position is that intellectual development will naturally follow emotional freedom. "Learning," in and of itself is not nearly as important as personality development.

Neill believed that children need to live out, as fully as possible, their self-centered fantasy and play lives. The view is that in the absence of play a child might be "hothoused" into adulthood prematurely.

At Summerhill, children were given the freedom to govern their own social lives. The underlying assumption was that children have the capacity to determine for themselves how to lead their own lives—-they should not be pressured by anxious parents or "all-knowing" educators.

Self-government was a central feature at the Summerhill
School. However, as Neill points out, successful self-government occurs when there exists a core group of older children willing to combat the tyranny of younger children at the "gangster age." It is incumbent upon these older children (even when outvoted) to insist on effective self-government because they have not reached the "social age." The minority will secure its rights in a democratic community by reasoning with the larger community. Also, they will persistently demand their rights. The underlying theme is that children have the capacity for an acute sense of justice, appropriateness and compassion, particularly when it concerns the punishment of an anti-social act committed by another community member.

**Practices:** The Summerhill School is democratically structured. Regular school meetings function as the primary forum by which democracy is learned as it is lived. Both child and adult have an equal vote. School rules focus on the essentials and not on appearances. These meetings not only function as a time to make school rules, but as a rich opportunity to deal with a full range of social and community affairs. All community members enjoy full equality. The concept of Freedom and not License applies. Staff and students obey the same community rules. The entire community is responsible for determining the ground rules and direction for its own learning/living.

All classes and lessons are optional at Summerhill. Externally imposed time-lines exist only for staff and not students.
Most classes are grouped according to interest and not chronological age. Teachers focus on real connectedness with students and not on teaching methods.

Summerhill School - Nature and Role of the Teacher:

The nature and role of the teacher in the learning process is one level of environmental design which is inexorably linked to and interwoven with any school's organization. Below are two separate accounts offered by Neill which serve to highlight the Summerhillian orientation in this matter. One can derive from these accounts key elements which constitute the essence of what Neill (1960) believed was a productive helping relationship.

Winfred, aged thirteen, a new pupil, told me that she hated all subjects, and shouted with joy when I told her she was free to do exactly as she liked—"You don't even have to come to school if you don't want to," I said. She set herself to have a good time, and she had one—for a few weeks. Then I noticed she was bored. "Teach me something," she said to me one day. "I'm bored stiff." "Righto!" I said cheerfully. "What do you want to learn?" "I don't know," she said. "And I don't either," said I, and left her. Months passed. Then she came to me again. "I am going to pass the college entrance exam," she said, "and I want lessons from you." Every morning she worked with me and other teachers and she worked well. She confided that the subjects did not interest her much but the aim had interested her. Winfred found herself by being allowed to be herself.

In another circumstance, Neill (1960) recalls the story of a different child's experience while at Summerhill in this way:
Barbel, Swedish, fifteen, was with us for about a year. During all that time, she found no work that interested her. She had come to Summerhill too late. For ten years of her life, teachers had been making up her mind for her. When she came to Summerhill, she had already lost all initiative. She was bored. Fortunately, she was rich and had the promise of a lady's life.

In commenting on the role of the teacher in the learning process, Neill (1960) would emphatically suggest (in tongue n' cheek fashion) that the teacher should not "seize the opportunity" to teach a group of children happily playing on the banks of a riverbed a lesson in the ecology of soil erosion. The idea was to let children play just for the sake of play itself.

Several noteworthy elements follow that can be derived from these two accounts which are characteristic of the Summerhill idea and clearly define the role of the teacher.

The teacher—

- permits the child the necessary space in which to truly be her/himself
- clarifies and elicits psychological content from the child but does not direct the learning process
- regards her/himself as a flexible resource to be utilized by the child
- waits for the child's own time to learn
- promotes an atmosphere wherein children are encouraged to make choices and take responsibility for their learning/life
- recognizes the nature of limits in the context of the therapeutic/educational endeavor

In summary, the Maple Valley staff viewed Summerhill as a representational vision of the great potential that the world of education possessed for the lives of children. When viewed in
terms of the Maple Valley experience, there were a number of Summerhillian tenets which were adopted as programmatic cornerstones during this period.

Summerhill was a world where living and learning were free of fear, coercion and manipulation. A basic and unyielding faith in the innate goodness of children operated as a governing principle. The concept of freedom without license applied; that is, freedom is synonymous with a mutual respect for the rights and individuality of both child and adult. Freedom is learned as it is lived. Neill believed that the ultimate and highest aim of education is helping children to work joyfully and find happiness in their lives. Within this perspective it is clear that authoritarian relationships/environments only serve to promote fear and hostility in children. Neill's view was that life is there to be lived; it is the individual's primary task to live it. For most other theorists and practitioners the distinction between therapy and education appeared quite significant; Neill dismissed the entire matter as irrelevant. He believed that the fundamental purpose of both therapy and education is to help individuals to lead more meaningful and happier lives.

Basic to the Summerhillian concept was the emphasis placed on authenticity in the interpersonal relationship. The assumption is that only in a mutually respectful, caring and collaborative relational atmosphere, can meaningful learning occur. Thus, at Summerhill we see that the child's emotional development was
viewed as a primary aspect of her/his education. Implicit in this is the assumption that psychologically healthy individuals will be naturally, enthusiastically and pro-actively capable of taking responsibility for their own learning. The Early Years at Maple Valley were rooted in these values and beliefs.

**Carl Rogers:**

The description of Neill's Summerhill blends readily with the work of Carl Rogers in the world of psychology. The task of explicating those environmental conditions necessary for personal growth and development represents a consistent theme evident throughout Rogers' work. In his widely read essay entitled "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change" (1957), Rogers outlines in clear and parsimonious language those elements that must be present if the client is to grow. Many mental health practitioners during this period (including Maple Valley staff) quite possibly regarded his construction as "the six commandments of personal growth."

Essential to an understanding of Rogers' conception of the necessary conditions for individual growth is the recognition of the centrality of the interpersonal relationship in his construction. Although Rogers stressed the nature and definition of the psychotherapeutic relationship in much of his work, he viewed this helping relationship primarily as a heightening of those positive qualities which appear in healthy relationships in general. Therefore, the
conditions described below, although cast in a therapeutic context, can be easily applied to a variety of different relationships.

Rogers maintained (1957) that in terms of the therapeutic/educational relationship, a number of key ingredients must be present in order for the client/student to develop. It is necessary that the facilitator make some form of psychological contact with the client. It is also essential that the client be in a state of incongruence in terms of her/his actual and idealized self. This discrepancy may either be consciously perceived by the client (in which case s/he will experience a considerable degree of anxiety) or the client may have little or no awareness of this gap (which would translate into a heightened susceptibility to the potential for anxiety and disorganization). Rogers believed that, in either instance, positive forward movement is possible. It is a requirement that the facilitator accurately represent her/himself and not engage in any form of deception. However, Rogers cautioned that this emphasis on authenticity in the helping relationship should not be misconstrued as a license for the facilitator to be "honest at all costs" (as was unfortunately all too often the case). Another prerequisite for client growth is an unswerving and unconditional attitude of positive regard on the part of the facilitator in relation to the client. This involves caring for the client as a separate individual while allowing her/him enough space to have her/his own feelings and experiences. It is essential that the helper experience a high degree of empathy in relation to the
client's perception of her/his own experience. This involves the helper's ability to experience the client's world "as if" it were her/his own. However, it is critical that the helper maintain a consistent and healthy separation and not become emeshed in the client's world. Finally, Rogers was emphatic in his assertion that if the client is to experience positive personality change, it is vital that s/he accurately perceive the degree to which the facilitator feels empathy and acceptance toward her/him. In other words, it is the responsibility of the helper to make certain that these attitudes are effectively communicated to the client. Otherwise, from the client's point of view, these feelings do not exist in the relationship. Thus, Rogers has enumerated these six essential conditions for psychological health and development.

In a later period Rogers (1969) outlined a number of principles comprising the facilitation of learning. He believed that it is the facilitator's role to promote an appropriate group atmosphere and experience. This atmosphere should be one in which students feel encouraged and supported in drawing on their own desire to engage in those tasks which have meaning for them. The view here is that the primary motivational force underlying the educational process is the students' genuine interest in becoming actively involved in their own learning. The facilitator's role, according to Rogers, is to elicit and clarify issues and directions for individuals and the group as a whole. It is also her/his responsibility to make accessible to the group a range of learning
resources. The facilitator must be able to accept and legitimize both emotional as well as intellectual material generated by the learner(s), while placing emphasis on those aspects most meaningful to the individual or group members. It is important that, once this conducive climate has been established, the facilitator participate as another learner in the group. Within this context, if the facilitator initiates self-disorders in the group, it is imperative that s/he do so in a way that represents personal sharing which can simply be either accepted or rejected by other group members. The facilitator must always remain alert to powerful emotional messages from group members. Finally, s/he must learn to recognize and reconcile her/his own limitations as a helper.

Rogers (1969) elaborated his convictions concerning the educational process by defining a number of basic principles regarding the nature of learning. Rogers believed, as did Neill, in the individual's natural capacity for learning, and in the occurrence of genuine learning only when the learner perceives the content as relevant to her/his own life. According to Rogers, individuals become easily threatened when they perceive any learning as involving a fundamental change or reorganization in their self-concept or self-organization. However, the learner can begin to integrate the type of learning that might otherwise be threatening in the context of a safe environment. The basic view here is that when an individual perceives a minimum threat to the self, experience may be appropriately screened and integrated, and
learning may proceed.

Rogers regarded experiential learning as having great potential and power. He believed that learning is facilitated when the student is a full and responsible participant in the process. In a similar vein, the fully functioning individual is characterized as one who typically expresses self-initiated and self-directed learning styles. Learning is facilitated when the student has the opportunity for self-evaluation and self-criticism. It is at this level that the opinions of others become less significant than one's self-assessment. Rogers emphasized the essentiality of the student's knowledge of the process of learning in the context of today's ever-changing world. An individual's ability to remain open to the possibility of change and new experience is viewed by Rogers as a most important and positive personality characteristic.

In summary, Carl Rogers explores human potential for development in the therapeutic relationship. His emphasis (1969) is on the quality of the interpersonal relationship between facilitator and student as the primary condition necessary for positive personality change. This relationship may be used as a catalyst in inducing a client's positive forward movement. This stress on "the helping relationship," within the Rogerian framework, had important implications for the Maple Valley staff. Program planners became engaged in the process of identifying and explicating those positive qualities inherent in all healthy/helping relationships. The information generated by this investigation was applied on a number of
programmatic levels (extensively examined in a later section of the Early Years). Simply put, however, it may be said that the major thrust of Rogers' work, from a Maple Valley perspective, lay in his characterization of the facilitator as an open and flexible individual actively involved in the process of change, daring to be authentic, caring, trusting and respectful toward the client/student in the critical context of the therapeutic/educational relationship. As Maple Valley defined its purpose to promote a definition of education to encompass the "whole" person, it naturally followed that the work of Carl Rogers in the world of psychology would be essential and foundational.

Frederick Perls: Gestalt Therapy

The work of Fritz Perls was steeped in the Humanistic/Existential tradition. Gestalt Therapy, as do the Rogerian and Summerhillian conceptions, places great emphasis on the self—the individual's inner world. Human development from this perspective is considered in "wholistic" terms. The underlying movement reflects the balancing of intellectual, emotional, social and moral areas of personality development. Gestalt Therapy has basic premises in common with other Humanistic/Existential modalities. These commonalities include: the conviction that each individual is unique and has worth and dignity, the belief that the organism is born with a natural capacity for coping with life, the establishment of authenticity in the interpersonal relationship, and the notion
that each individual can and must take control of and assume responsibility for her/his behavior and life.

Embedded in the art of Gestalt Therapy is a theory of learning. At the heart of this theory is the view that living/learning is an ongoing process of the individual's completing aspects (Gestalten) of various wholes (Gestalt) (Brown, 1975). The organism is motivated by a basic drive toward equilibrium, or a state of wholeness. This drive translates into fundamental needs that underlie one's perception and behavior.

The individual initially experiences stimuli on a preconceptual or visceral basis: "I'm beginning to get a stomach ache." Experiencing becomes experience as the individual conceptualizes it: "I'm very upset." The next movement within this framework is the individual's need to take responsibility or "own" her/his experience. It is at this point that the experience is fully integrated into the self: "I'm feeling badly about myself." This process continues until the individual has reached a point of wholeness. Individual growth occurs only when this entire cycle has been completed. The overall movement "...from experiencing to conceptualization to integrating and experiencing is the cornerstone of Gestalt learning theory" (Brown, 1975).

Gestalt Therapy offers an array of powerful methods designed to help the client remove those obstacles blocking her/him from experiencing the existential reality--i.e., "the moment." Gestalt methodology promotes the individual's rapid movement toward deeper
levels of awareness of themselves and their condition. This awareness begins with the individual's recognition of her/his internal world and moves toward greater understanding of the external environment. The following Gestalt practices were chosen on the basis of the extent to which they influenced or were integrated into Maple Valley's program design; they should not be construed in any way as representative of the totality of Gestalt theory itself. Examples of various applications of these techniques from a Maple Valley perspective will be provided. Following this section, I will summarize the implications Gestalt Therapy had for the Maple Valley program in particular and the world of education in general.

Gestalt Therapy—Principles and Practices:

Emphasis on being in the Here and Now:

The therapeutic value of experiencing one's reality as it truly exists in the present is common to many modalities in the Humanistic/Existential arena. However, it is the level of adherence to this position that delineates the Gestalt approach from related methods. The underlying assumption is that allowing people to fulfill their potential in their current situation enables the natural process of Gestalt formation to occur. Furthermore, one's full awareness of the present is a central ingredient necessary for continued growth and development. George Brown (1975) points out that getting in touch with what is, and staying with what is, brings one closer to the only reality one can experience, the reality of
the moment—"Gestalt can teach this."

In contrasting the Rogerian and Gestalt positions, Ivey and Simeck-Downing (1980) suggest that, while both seek the promotion of authenticity in relationships, Gestalt tends to place more emphasis in the Here and Now. Brown (1975) states that the Gestalt position requires the person to orient her/his attention to her/his current situation; otherwise, s/he is likely, when confronted with a discrepancy between the ideal self and real self, to seek meaningless explanations, then to repeat the same unacceptable behavior. The overall movement is aimed at thwarting excessive involvement with either the past or future (or, for that matter, anything) that blocks or distorts full awareness in the present.

Stress placed on centering one's awareness in the "here and now" was a technique used by Maple Valley staff in the context of both the individual and group experience. In order to maximize the learning potential inherent in the current situation and forestall unwarranted excursions into events outside this context, staff would limit and focus the student(s) attention to the immediate situation. This method was also used when staff perceived a student's over-reliance on verbal explanations about a given issue rather than on attending to valuable information available in the present circumstance.
Taking Responsibility for One’s Behavior and Life:

Once again, while this theme is integral to many Existential/Humanistic modalities, it is the degree to which it is emphasized which delineates Gestalt practice from the rest. By comparison, Ivey and Simeck-Downing (1980) suggest that the Gestalt model places more stress on the individual's assumption of personal responsibility than the Rogerian schema. Also George Brown (1975) whose Confluent Education model is rooted in Gestalt theory suggests that the individual, in taking personal responsibility for her/himself, opens up new possibilities for growth and creativity. The notion that people can and must take full responsibility for themselves represents a superordinal position.

The task of encouraging a student's awareness of personal responsibility for her/his feelings, thoughts and behavior was given primacy by Maple Valley staff. The underlying assumption is that by "owning" one's experience one is able to fully internalize its meaning, complete the Gestalt, and move on to new experience. One way in which Maple Valley staff implemented this practice in the group context was to insist that in all group interactions people speak directly to each other without use of the third person pronoun. This directness, in and of itself, had the dramatic effect of helping the individual to connect their positions with their own experience. Thus, the norms taught children to say "I want" and "I feel"—statements that denote personal responsibility.
The Role of the Facilitator:

Fritz Perls (1969) has stated that:

"...anyone who has a little bit of good will benefit from the Gestalt approach because the simplicity of the Gestalt approach is that we pay attention to the obvious, to the utmost surface. We don't delve into a region which we don't know anything about, into the so-called "unconscious." I don't believe in repressions. The whole theory of repression is a fallacy. We can't repress a need. We have only repressed certain expressions of these needs. We have blocked one side, and then the self expression comes out somewhere else, in our movements, in our posture, and most of all in our voice. A good therapist doesn't listen to the content of the bullshit the patient produces, but to the sound, to the music, to the hesitations."

The Gestalt facilitator's approach may be characterized as considerably more directive and influencing than most modalities within the Humanistic/Existential framework. Ivey and Simeck-Downing (1980) suggest that the Gestalt therapist may express strong influencing behaviors such as forceful mannerisms and quite direct eye contact. They also indicate that Gestalt therapists tend to give less attention to personal warmth while stressing confrontation. "Where Rogers emphasizes empathy and warmth and positive regard, we find Perls as somewhat personally distant and remote during the session, for his respect for others showed only when they became truly themselves (Ivey and Simeck-Downing, 1980)." They go on to suggest that while Rogers and Perls both sought authenticity in relationships, Perls would be considerably more demanding and less patient than Rogers concerning its emergence. Whereas a Rogerian facilitator would typically offer affirmation to the client/student,
a Gestaltist might emphasize dealing with resistances.

As a whole, the Maple Valley staff group demonstrated a full repertoire of helping styles in the context of this non-directive/directive dimension. Certain staff were closer to the more patient non-directive, Rogerian framework; others were more directive and intentional in their interventions. On a general level, this full range of responses on the part of the staff was considered healthy and productive in the context of a differentiated system that implicitly matched student needs with desired outcomes.

George Brown (1975) examines the role of the Gestalt facilitator and argues that the therapist's emphasis is on helping the individual to become more aware of her/his experience; and not attempting to interpret their client's experience. In other words, the stress is on helping the client to become more fully aware of what s/he is doing and how s/he is experiencing it rather than in helping her/him to understand why s/he behaves or feels in a particular way.

It is the task of the facilitator to provide the client/student with the type of feedback that promotes her/his experiencing her/himself in the present. Within this context, much attention is focused on the use of projection as a primary form of disturbed communication between self and others. Maple Valley staff might be quick to provide students with this type of feedback, thus enabling her/him to "own" an aspect of her/himself that s/he had been attributing to forces residing outside the self. It is the facilitator's
role to thwart any interference created by the client that moves her/him outside the immediate learning situation.

In the context of the learning environment, the role of drama is vital for the Gestalt practitioner. Dramatization allows the client and facilitator an opportunity to move quickly to deeper levels of understanding, rather than processing the experience verbally by following one thread after another.

An outbreak of anarchistic rhetoric that swept the student/community illustrates the use of drama in the context of the Maple Valley experience. Many hours were spent by staff (as well as by some students) attempting to passionately and systematically explain the need for community rules. At a community meeting, the determination was made by staff that reasoned, patient dialogue was simply "missing the boat." Therefore, the decision was made by a staff member to introduce a motion to the community which would effectively eliminate all school rules. The motion was accepted by an overwhelming majority of students. For three days there were, in fact, no school rules. During this period, various rumblings could be heard from some students concerning the increasingly chaotic state of affairs. "People aren't knocking on my door before entering my room any longer!" "I haven't slept well for the last few nights, the boys were blasting their stereos until very late!" The staff's response to these proclamations were sincere and compassionate. (They did not communicate an "I told you so" attitude to the students. This is a critical point; meaningful learning occurs
only in an atmosphere of mutual respect.) By the end of the fourth day, most of the school/community (staff and student alike) was exasperated. A special meeting was convened in order to confront the situation. After some brief discussion, a motion was made to reinstate most school rules. Following the meeting, staff and students processed the entire episode. Most people expressed relief at having regained a semblance of law and order. More importantly (from this writer's point of view), the students expressed their appreciation for having had the opportunity to "see for themselves" the value of rules. Thus, the staff as facilitator promoted and utilized personal responsibility in a dramatic/experiential/here-and-now fashion to aid in learning. (See appendix A--Community Meetings--for additional examples of institutionalized dramatization at Maple Valley School.)

Language Changes: (Ivey and Simeck-Downing, 1980)

The use of language is important in promoting the necessary conditions whereby the client is more able to fully experience the present and take greater responsibility for her/himself. For instance, Gestalt therapists tended to view most questions asked by their clients as more 'smoke screens' covering the more truthful hidden personal statements which needed to be made about themselves. They typically confront their clients in this area and attempt to foster this recognition. As a general rule, how and what questions are preferred over why questions.
Staying with the Feeling: (Ivey and Simeck-Downing, 1980)

Essentially, this principle translates into the Gestalt facilitator's extra sensitivity to the identification of key emotions expressed by the client. Upon recognition of what the facilitator perceives to be significant emotional content, s/he might refocus attention on the expression of those feelings and its potential meaning. Very often the goal in such situations is defined as the diminishment of the gap between the client's objective and subjective realities so that s/he may encounter the wholeness of the nonverbal experience. Along these same lines, Gestalt facilitators typically regard body messages as potentially revealing and worthy of recognition and scrutiny. The role of emotions in the learning process is a consistent theme evident in the Humanistic/Existential tradition and was given primacy in the Maple Valley environment.

In summary, Gestalt Therapy offered a dynamic framework for personal growth with implications for psychoeducational practice. George Brown (1975) argues that Gestalt Therapy offers both a philosophy and a methodology aimed at helping people move toward creativity and life and away from the empty maintenance of the status quo. Brown's Confluent Education model provides a clear representation of the effectiveness of this methodology applied to educational practice. In this view, (1975) education is construed as the promotion of an individual's capabilities, talents and uniqueness, with its aim as the development of a balanced and
healthy personality. He believes that through the application of Gestalt principles in the educational environment, the teacher is more able to see the child as s/he actually is and, that this awareness is essential for effective and creative teaching. The fundamental aim of Gestalt Therapy is the emotional growth of the individual.

As Maple Valley defined its purpose to promote a definition of education to encompass the "whole" person, it naturally followed that the work of Fritz Perls in Gestalt Therapy would be essential and foundational. It was during the Early Years period that staff members first began to appreciate what they perceived to be the immense power inherent in Gestalt methodology. The principles and practices that emphasize the Here-and-Now, the primacy of personal responsibility, the responsibility of the facilitator that includes directive, intentional confrontation to highlight that Here-and-Now awareness and responsibility, the use of language to promote personal growth, and the concept that staying with the feeling in order to understand emotionality as a tool for learning about self and others, were systematically utilized and integrated into the design of the program itself.

In summation, the work of A.S. Neill, Carl Rogers and Fritz Perls provided the theoretical basis upon which the Maple Valley program was constructed during its Early Years. Neill's belief in the innate wisdom of the child, the primacy of the child's emotional world, and the essentiality of an environment of freedom and
spontaneity provided a radical approach to child rearing in general and schooling in particular that was highly consistent with Humanistic/Existential thought. Carl Rogers, a Humanistic/Existential psychologist, developed a theoretical and operational view of human development that emphasized the interpersonal relationship as the primary condition necessary for positive personality change. His contributions included the delineation of the necessary conditions for human growth and development and specific principles relating to the nature of learners and learning. Finally, the examination of the work of Fritz Perls illuminates his emphasis on educating the "whole" person—and not just attending to the intellect at the expense of the emotional self. Additionally, the Gestalt approach to learning theory is rooted in the world of Humanistic/Existential psychology. Gestalt practice places primacy on developing ways to enhance awareness, authenticity and personal responsibility. Thus, Summerhill, Rogerian Psychology, and Gestalt Therapy combined to provide a consistent base in the Early Years of the Maple Valley program.

In addition to the more general organizing impact these theorists had on the development of the Maple Valley vision, each specifically related to the school to provide a range of contributions. Summerhill provided not only the inspiration that came from the real life existence of a vision; it provided a working model of a school organization—both principles and practices—by which the program was structured. Carl Rogers provided the "map" by
which staff could define, assess, and reevaluate their performance as helpers of children. Gestalt Therapy empowered the staff with a functional array of principles and methods directed at promoting a dynamic atmosphere in which learning goals (in the broadest sense) could be accomplished in the shortest possible time and with the maximum impact. Thus, we see that Summerhill was the overriding frame for the Maple Valley picture; within that picture, principles as enunciated by Rogers and Perls served to help the staff organize the experience and their practices served as tools for staff use.
A Description and Analysis of the Maple Valley Program

A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context

The "Greening of America". "There is a revolution coming. It will not be like the revolutions of the past. It will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require violence to succeed, and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence" (Reich, 1970). Charles Reich's famous edict represents an historical characterization of what many regarded at the time as the dawning of a new era: "The Greening of America" (Reich). At the very heart of this "revolution" was a metamorphosis of consciousness; a new way of understanding what it means to be human. On a general level, the "greening movement" envisioned a more human world and liberated individual. This new consciousness included the individual's capacity to reason at higher moral levels. The movement aimed to create a new way of life—where culture was non-artificial and non-alienating, where a mutual respect for caring and learning would take the place of the competition and isolation of the past.

The influence of this new movement was discernable on both political and social levels. Society's social structure as well as its laws and institutions were changing as a result of this growing activity. The movement was comprehensive in nature and was directed
at confronting and counteracting several pressing issues concerning
the very fabric of society. Reich included among these issues the
existence of disorder, corruption, hypocrisy and the war in Vietnam,
poverty, distorted cultural priorities and an elitist legislative
structure, a technological system out of control coupled with the
wreckless destruction of the environment, the decline of individual
liberty and a pervasive sense of powerlessness, the artificiality of
work and culture, the breakdown of any semblance of community, and,
finally, the "loss of self." Reich argued that this revolutionary
movement needed to confront and attempt to resolve each one of these
issues. However, he believed that the "loss of selfhood" on a col-
lective basis represented the most devastating and urgent issue in
terms of the overall well-being of society.

The high value placed on the recovery of selfhood, according
to Reich, is rooted in the view that only through its emergence will
people have the capability of shaping technology and science in ways
that are life-giving and non-toxic. The assumption is that only in
a framework of self-definition can people take responsibility for
the degree of freedom they enjoy (particularly in the western
democracies). The essence of this new society would not only
maintain the historical value placed on the quality of work and
dedication to excellence, but would also make certain that the
individual's work life was non-alienating: i.e., an expression of
her/his individuality and freedom of choice.

Theodore Roszak (1978), another prominent social commentator,
described this "cultural revolution" of the late 1960's and early 1970's as primarily a youth movement which he termed the "counter-culture." This counter-culture movement was expressed in a myriad of ways, the most obvious and apparent being in the art and music of the young. Roszak's conception of the counter-culture or greening movement is similar to Reich's on a number of levels. They both define the emergence of a new and expanding consciousness as the underlying premise of the movement. They also share in the conviction that while the movement needs to work in political, economic and social spheres of activity, it is the area of personal identity and self-discovery which represents the central ingredient.

The counter-culture movement is characterized by Roszak as consisting primarily of white, middle class youth rebelling at having been "...maneuvered into careers and social roles, tastes and values, into a picture of reality predetermined for them by a highly industrialized society." Simply put, these young people were reacting to the perception and belief that their very selfhood had been taken from them. The counter-culture movement represented a fundamental challenge to a system that, according to this view, sought to impose upon individuals false identities. Roszak argues that there was much about the expression of this youth culture that might readily lend itself to a "faddish" characterization. However, he maintains that the counter-culture movement had enough substantive material on a content level, as well as honesty and imagination, to give it historical significance.
Although Reich and Roszak both recognize the political and economic nature of the "movement" (referred to as its "public direction" by Roszak), they regard the search for identity, or the "rights of the person" (referred to as its "private direction" by Roszak) as the very essence of the cause. There was, in fact, great interplay between the spheres of social/political activism and personal consciousness-raising.

This fundamental and revolutionary search to discover and define a new image of human nature came to be known as the "Human Potential Movement." The basic drive was to become a person in a world which obstructs its emergence. The ultimate aim of the Human Potential Movement, according to Roszak, is that "...of a post-industrialized society whose highest social value is the project of self-discovery, whose principal wealth is the richness of the autonomous personality." Inherent in this assumption regarding the individual's basic right to self-discovery is the notion that people are created in order that they live fully as people, and that this singular mission comes before all other "social allegiances." The central idea is to legitimize the basic human need for personal growth.

This overriding cultural emphasis on self-discovery and personal growth found a natural theoretical and philosophical "home" in the context of "Third Force" (Maslow, 1968) or Humanistic/Existential psychology. The term "Third Force" psychology was first used by Maslow to describe a new psychological orientation
which recognized man's innate capacity for goodness, creativity and freedom. This new theoretical perspective was juxtaposed with the determinism of Freudian psychoanalysis and the mechanism of contemporary behaviorism. In addition to what the more traditional psychologists of the time had to say about human development, Maslow believed that man had a higher nature that is instinctive and part of his essence. Thus, the Humanistic/Existential viewpoint was defined as a "third force" in order to emphasize its position as a solid, alternative and comprehensive conception. At the height of the Human Potential Movement, there existed a number of new therapies rooted in this optimistic, forward moving psychology of growth. The theoretical and methodological implications that these new perspectives had on the formulation and implementation of the Maple Valley program is extensively examined in the section entitled Theoretical Underpinnings of the Maple Valley Program (Early Years).

It is important to note that these new therapies had as unifying themes the exercise of man's higher creative powers, the invitation of open self-expression, the forward direction regarding the possibilities for growth, and a conception of the helpee as "client" rather than "patient," thereby avoiding the use of a negative and unnecessarily dependent definition.

In summary, the Human Potential Movement represented a collective search for authentic identity. The emergence of this "new person" would, according to this view, naturally translate into the overall well-being of society and the environment. Roszak
believed that the "...needs of the planet are the needs of the
person. And, therefore, the rights of the person are the rights of
the planet." In addition, he believed that there would be and could
be no retreat for those individuals who negotiated their way through
the process of self-discovery to the point of proclaiming their
individuality and uniqueness.

Maple Valley School opened in the fall of 1973. Prior to its
inception, the original group of founders spent two years conceptu¬
alizing and organizing the program. The early 1970s (as the above
review indicates) marked the pinnacle of the Human Potential
Movement. The Maple Valley idea was conceived of and implemented
during this period of great cultural activity. Many staff,
including the original founding group, personally identified with
and regarded the Maple Valley concept as a reflection of the Human
Potential Movement. In fact, the generation of "Woodstock" was
their generation (see Staff Demographic Profile — Early Years).
Staff members tended to construe their involvement with the Maple
Valley experiment in a larger context; that is, they appeared to
view themselves as humanistic change agents playing a strategic role
in the movement toward development for a more compassionate and just
society. Staff members generally regarded theoretical positions
contained within the Humanistic/Existential framework as living
principles by which to govern their own personal and professional
lives and not merely abstract principles to be applied to the
educational/therapeutic process. Maple Valley was construed as a
therapeutic community where each and every person's development—child and adult alike—was regarded as essential.

The Alternative Schools Movement

Maple Valley was created as a private non-profit alternative school in the fall of 1973. Its creation and establishment is inexorably linked to the emergence of the Alternative Schools Movement. It is for this reason that I have chosen to provide a profile of this movement. This review will include an examination of the movement's origins, a topographical profile and a summary of the unique learning environments common to these schools. The Alternative Schools Movement had both public and private sector dimensions. There are areas of commonality as well as significant divergence between these two aspects. For the purposes of economy and relevance, this examination will highlight the emergence and development of the private alternative school as one prototype of the larger movement.

Within the Human Potential Movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s, much activity was directed at the reformation of the educational system. The establishment of the private alternative school was one response to what many regarded as the inherent dehumanization of the contemporary educational scene. The origins of the Alternative Schools Movement can be traced to the commonly perceived level of repression and lack of freedom indigenous to the public system (Goodlad, 1975; Helm, 1979; Fantini, 1973).
Roszak (1978) argues that within the "personalist" ideal of education reflective of the Human Potential Movement can be found the "libertarian" model of education. This tradition, according to Roszak, includes such prominent figures as Rousseau, Leo Tolstoy, A.S. Neill, Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich. For these individuals, education is not a matter of instruction but rather the free growth of children. From a libertarian perspective, nobody has the right to educate children but children have the inalienable right to be educated. The view holds that children do not need to be forced to learn anything; they will learn what they need to know as a result of their exercise of free choice and authenticity in the process. This libertarian view of the educational process found its expression in what became known as the Free School. (Maple Valley was commonly referred to as a Free School by its staff, children and parents.) Mario Fantini (1973) traces the roots of the alternative education movement to three sources: the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the counter-culture movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s and, the British integrated day school. Fantini also traces the educational stream emanating from the counter-culture movement to the "romantic" ideologues such as A.S. Neill and Ivan Illich. Allen Graubard (1972) argues that understanding the relationship of the Free School to the Summerhillian conception is essential in clarifying the nature of the libertarian learning/living environment; and its emphasis of the child's freedom from coercive approaches.
Graubard estimates that in 1972 there existed approximately six hundred Free Schools committed to non-authoritarian and non-compulsory learning environments. According to Graubard, the rapid rise and growth of the Free School Movement begins with about fifty schools as late as 1967. He then states that the mortality rate of these Free Schools was astonishingly high. His data indicated that a "...considerable number of Free Schools close after two or three years of existence ... and, at most, one out of every five new schools closes before the end of its second year." Donald W. Robinson (1971) examined the mortality rate of the Free School and stated that many of them are run by idealists without much training and experience and therefore their life expectancy is around eighteen months.

In his article "The Free School Movement", Allen Graubard (1972) describes the "classical" Free School, together with its extension, the Free High School, as being essentially steeped in the Summerhillian idea. These schools are usually quite small and encompass a wide age range of students. Many of these schools were therapeutic, self-sufficient living communities. These schools typically emphasized the affective aspects of personality development over the traditional thrust. The promotion of mental health (as contrasted with achievement) is a central theme. The student population that comprised this type of alternative school typically consisted of white children from middle class families deeply disenchanted with the public system. Students as well as
teachers were involved in and responsible for the governance and decision-making functions of the program. The facilitation of self-awareness, active choice making and personal responsibility were key constructs common to the "classical" Free School.

Terrence E. Deal and Robert R. Nolan (1978) also describe the "do your own thing" Free School as being related to Kohlberg's and Mayer's (1972) romantic conception (this ideological perspective is examined in Theoretical Underpinnings of the Program -- Early Years). This model closely resembles Graubard's notion of the "classical" Free School; that is, both are steeped in the Summerhillian tradition (an extensive examination of the Summerhill School is provided in the Theoretical Underpinnings of the Program -- Early Years) and present themselves as therapeutic mini-communities.

In his article "Alternative Schools: A Behavioral Analysis" (1974), Chris Argyris examines the underlying assumptions, objectives and characteristics of Alternative Schools. In his view, two basic assumptions underlie this alternative construction. Firstly, the major cause of the students' lack of involvement with their educational process is a function of the failure of the public system to create an effective human environment. Secondly, when students and teachers are brought together in a noncoercive atmosphere, they will naturally create new and effective learning environments. In profiling the alternative learning environment, Argyris makes a number of important points. Effective learning
environments allow children to take responsibility for their own learning/education and to make the educational process a self-directed experience, promote a relationship between student and teacher that is mutually caring and trusting, eliminate or revamp grading procedures and chronological age groupings and delineations.

A final note. The Maple Valley experience with regard to its organizational development over time was highly congruent with both the typical patterns of the origins of Free Schools and many of the patterns of those few schools that made transitions allowing them to survive and grow. The specific nature of this development will be discussed in depth throughout the chronological sequencing of this study.

Using the Behavior--Person--Environment Model: An Introduction

As initially stated in the Overview and Methodology section, the B-P-E model will be used as the primary vehicle for the purposes of defining individual needs, determining psychoeducational goals and understanding programmatic design. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.
The Nature and Definition of the Student Population (the "Person")

At the time Maple Valley opened its doors in September, 1973, there were eleven boarding students and five day school students enrolled in the program. The students ranged in age from five years old to seventeen years old. (A demographic profile of the student population will be provided at the end of this section.) The earliest group of students came from predominantly middle class backgrounds. In most cases, there existed at least one parent fully committed to and responsible for the long-term care and welfare of the child. With the exception of a few working-class children from nearby towns (enrolled only in the day school), the fundamental nature of the school population remained relatively consistent throughout this period. Thus, by utilizing the case study format that follows, specific individual characteristics provide a base upon which inferences can be drawn to clearly illuminate the nature of the student population.

The Typical Student: Two Case Studies

In order to provide a functional context for understanding the ways in which the school's leadership conceived of the Person (in psychological terms), I will offer profiles of two representational types of students attending the Maple Valley program during this period. These student groups may be characterized as "the child in distress," and "the child seeking enhancement." This delineation is an important one for a number of reasons. Firstly, these two groups
of children came from substantially different backgrounds and presented two different sets of psychological strengths and needs. Secondly, the ways in which success became defined for members of each group were significantly different. The profiles provided below are intended to elaborate these differences. It should be made clear, however, that these delineations regarding student type are offered solely for the purpose of general characterization. In reality, the differentiation within each group could be quite varied. For instance, there were students attending the program who originally enrolled primarily out of a desire for personal enhancement but clearly had areas of intra/interpersonal distresses. The reverse situation was also true. Each profile will include a psycho-social sketch of a particular student who is representative of her/his respective group. In addition, a generalized summary is included. (Note—specific names have been changed as a matter of confidentiality.)

The Child in Distress:

Aaron Feldman was a seventeen-year-old boy in 1974. The staff had extensive contact with Aaron and his family throughout the time of his enrollment in the program. A composite sketch, rooted in the reported perceptions and observation of staff involved at the time, may be posed in regard to Aaron's case.

Aaron lived with his family in the suburbs of New York City. They originally learned of Maple Valley through prior contact with
one of the school's directors. In the year preceding the opening of the school, Aaron was a student in a social studies class taught by this director. This was a private school designed for children having a difficult time either behaviorally and/or academically in the traditional classroom situation.

Aaron's mother and father had worked their way out of an inner city, lower-middle class/working-class environment to a middle class, suburban life style. His father owned and operated a small and successful contracting business. His mother was a housewife. Aaron's brother, six years younger, was also experiencing difficulties in school at the time.

Mr. and Ms. Feldman reported a rather lengthy and grueling period of frustration, anguish and, finally, desperation in terms of their son's development. They appeared resigned to considering any educational approach, however seemingly radical the conception. In a sense, their expectations can be ideologically linked to Kohlberg's and Mayer's (1972) definition of the 'cultural transmission' perspective. That is, the child's development is assessed on the basis of how well s/he is adjusting to the order as it existed--whether it be in school or at home. To the staff, Aaron's parents appeared to be rigid with regard to expectations defining his success. His poor level of functioning in school was considered by his parents as indicative of a deficiency in their son. The relative appropriateness of varying educational programs was of secondary importance. From his parents' perspective, Aaron
was clearly the one with the problem.

Aaron entered the Maple Valley program with feelings of anger and confusion, a poor self-concept and with a formidable history of failure and rejection. His entire primary school experience was fraught with failure in terms of his inability to master grade level concepts and skills. Thus, Aaron began to experience the dynamics of stigmatization (associated with academic failure) from both teachers and peers. By the time Aaron had reached the fifth and sixth grades, he had begun to act out his frustration, fear and anger in a manner unacceptable and inappropriate in a traditional classroom situation. He had not or would not fit the roles assigned to him by family and school alike. His relationship with his parents had deteriorated to the point where almost any attempt at communication resulted in crises. Aaron was a defiant, angry, withdrawn and overweight adolescent. He was also a top-notch auto mechanic. The world of mechanics was the only area in which Aaron enjoyed a measure of success and in which he took great pride. As typified by the character Holden Caufield in Salinger's (1951) Catcher in the Rye, Aaron was a child who was advantaged as a result of economic opportunity but was psychologically and socially in turmoil.

On a more general level, the staff shared their impressions at staff meeting discussions as to the number of parents (similar to Aaron's) who enrolled their children in lieu of parental concerns regarding the apparent lack of academics, the anti-intellectual
undertone, the old renovated farm house, the long hair, the casual life style, the disregard for convention, the spontaneous expression of emotion and the overall level of exuberance. When doubtful, as was often the case, parents chose to take the necessary risks in order that their children have another chance. From a parental point of view, a critical factor in this decision-making process appeared to be a recognition of a high level of interest and excitement on the part of their children—and this translated into hope. These parents would express the hope that the staff might establish meaningful relationships with their children. In short, parents seemed ready to put aside many conventional expectations concerning their children's development. The children, on the other hand, generally viewed the staff as part of the younger "with it" generation—capable of truly understanding. They were responsive to the staff and were quite open with regard to their potential participation in the school/community. And finally, in spite of their dreadful associations with school, these children took quite a gamble themselves—they willingly enrolled in the Maple Valley program.

The following excerpt from a student interview (see: Appendix C) illustrates his understanding of his reasons for coming to Maple Valley:

...it became apparent to me right away in school that I was a failure. The way that the school system was set up for me—someone having learning problems and not being able to do the things that people learn how to do in elementary school, like reading, writing and
spelling—all those things were hard. All of a sudden I was in the failure group...

I'm somebody who makes my own rules, which is hard but I'd rather make my own rules and structures and go through the hard work than to have somebody do it for me and do it wrong. When I got to Maple Valley, I thought the decision-making process worked very well. There were avenues in which people could have impact or could take responsibility for themselves. And in learning—taking responsibility works well.

(5th student interview)

The Child Seeking Enhancement:

The 'child seeking enhancement' can be identified within a very specific cultural context. During this stage of the school's development (1973-1976) the Human Potential Movement was in full bloom. As mentioned earlier, the school's leadership personally identified with and regarded their program as an expression of the 'revolution' occurring at the time. There were a number of families who also viewed the Maple Valley program as philosophically harmonious with their own beliefs. They viewed Maple Valley as representing an educational alternative. The underlying commitment to and value placed on non-authoritarian, collaborative, individualistic and nurturing environments, appeared to translate into a basic attraction toward and eventual participation in the educational experiment that was Maple Valley.

Dana Allen enrolled in Maple Valley in September, 1974. She was fourteen years old. The school staff had extensive contact with Dana and her family throughout the time of her participation in the
program. A composite sketch—rooted in the reported perceptions and observations of staff involved at the time, may be posed in regard to Dana's case.

Dana lived with her mother and grandmother in a small town in southern Vermont. Her father also lived in a Vermont town not far from Dana's home. Dana had two older sisters who no longer lived at their parents' home. Although separated two years prior to Dana's enrollment at M.V.S., Mr. and Ms. Allen continued to maintain a strong joint commitment to their daughter's welfare. Dana's mother was in the process of redefining her life's plan and her father was a successful top level engineering consultant.

Dana's parents came from affluent, educated backgrounds which afforded them great opportunity. They both described themselves as fairly liberal and progressive, particularly with respect to their child rearing practices. They permitted great latitude in allowing Dana to direct her own life.

The Allens interviewed the school's staff during their initial visit. Their questions and concerns primarily focused on their desire to ascertain whether and to what extent the program was consistent with their overall philosophical position. The Allens wanted to know if Maple Valley would afford Dana the degree of freedom they believed she needed. They were not interested in the number of class periods in a given school day; their emphasis was on the degree to which the children might decide for themselves the composition and direction of the school day. The initial inter-
viewing process was quite casual and brief. When the Allens were satisfied with the program's overriding values, they formally enrolled their daughter.

The decision to join the school/community was primarily Dana's. After a brief visit (a few days) at the school, Dana proclaimed her readiness and desire to make a commitment to the program. Dana entered the M.V.S. program with an overall sense of adventure and anticipation. She presented herself as an open, spontaneous and intelligent adolescent. Her academic skill level was beyond the standard expectation for her age level. However, she perceived her successes in this area to be of relative unimportance; these skills were primarily valued as a specific means to an end. Dana had strong interests in music and art. She was also beginning to express real interest in a social life particularly with respect to boys. She expressed her belief that she would have the opportunity and freedom to explore this full range of educational experience during her time at Maple Valley.

On a general level, children such as Dana Allen were truly advantaged in several important ways. They not only experienced the benefits of relative economic stability but, more importantly, they were fortunate to have been reared in an atmosphere of psychological support, intellectual stimulation and unconditional caring. This atmosphere was one in which individual uniqueness, expression and creativity were encouraged and where intellectual curiosity and discovery were promoted. These children viewed the M.V.S. program
as a natural and positive alternative to the public system which was
generally regarded as oppressive and deadening. They came to Maple
Valley wide open, accessible and ready to learn.

Families of "children seeking enhancement" tended to define
success in the program on the basis of intrinsic factors such as the
level of excitement and commitment to the program; success for
families of 'children in distress' was typically determined on the
basis of extrinsic factors such as academic achievement.

The following excerpts from student interviews (see: Appendix
C) illustrates their understanding of reasons for coming to Maple
Valley:

...My family felt strongly about putting me in an
alternative system for education. And I guess I was
responding mostly to what I didn't want from what I'd
experienced before. They had hopes for what could come
out of the situation. They were the ones who found the
place. I was in Mohawk Trail Regional High School when
I started at Maple Valley. I was just doing time—
really wasn't anywhere. Up until a year or two before
that I was a straight "A" student. And, it all broke
apart. In the eighth grade I started cutting classes
and I never finished that grade. I mean it deteriorated
rapidly. I got cocky—I said, I'm a smart guy, and I'm
not happy...

(6th student interview)

I was unhappy with the public school system, and there
was a whole history of me rebelling against the system.
But I think it wasn't so much the rebellion, it was just
that I was looking for a place that fit my needs in
terms of my values and in terms of being in a place
where I could grow as a human being. I think that was
the most important thing. And Maple Valley was the
place that I found after a long search.

...I think sometimes people came with some real anger
--and real problems that Maple Valley wasn't able to
address at that time. I guess I experienced that with
some of the violence and conflict. Stuff that was going on that really forced people to have to leave the place. And I don't think Maple Valley was equipped at that time or wanted to be a place for kids who really had a lot of anger and didn't know what to do with it. Because I think more of what it was, was a community and it provided a place for people who could operate within a community and be cooperative to some extent.

(4th student interview)

"Having "set the stage," I will now begin the analysis of the ways in which program planners during this stage of development construed individual needs.

Analyzing Individual Needs

The perceived task of the program included the necessity of organizing, linking and integrating the realities of student-specific characteristics (as outlined in the previous case studies) with the broader theoretic1 underpinnings of defining the person. As previously discussed, the Maple Valley perspective regarding the nature of the individual was firmly anchored in a blend of the Maslowian and Rogerian theoretical conceptions. Central constructs were thoroughly integrated and shaped the ways in which both child and adult were understood by the staff. A romantic orientation with regard to development represented a programmatic underpinning; that is, a predetermined, organic unfolding process needed to occur. In this view, each individual is inherently forward moving and may be partially understood in terms of either the stage level (in Maslow's schema) or as being at a given point along a number of personality dimensions, as suggested by Rogers
Program planners considered individual needs primarily in global terms. They actively resisted any attempt to systematize or categorize children in any way. This position reflected both proactive and reactive elements. From a positive standpoint, the M.V.S. staff was committed to a view of the person as truly unique. This required that staff time and energy be expended in pursuit of gaining a greater understanding of each person's experience rather than categorically defining it. This represented a cardinal principle of humanism as understood by the staff. On the other hand, the spirit of rebellion against the public or traditional approach (which many staff considered demeaning and dehumanizing) was intense. This feeling was particularly strong with respect to the recognition of the ways in which children were 'ranked ordered' and defined (i.e., slow learner, above average intellect, etc.) and very often stigmatized in that process.

For the staff, Maslowian and Rogerian conceptions provided a rough outline. The schemata themselves were not only broad enough and amorphous enough so as to not interfere with the experience of individuality and uniqueness; to the contrary, they promoted a more focused consideration of the child's inner nature.

To provide an additional glimpse into the ways children were understood, I will once again use the profile of the two types of 'typical' children as a reference point.

The 'child in distress' came to the program in a state of
psychological turmoil. From a Maslowian perspective, s/he had been unable to satisfy many of her/his most basic needs, such as the need for security, belongingness and affection, as well as his/her needs for self-respect, competency and adequacy. On a scholastic level, they had become accustomed to the "slow learner" and/or "problem child" label. In many instances this was the most persistent message these children had encountered throughout their lives. Their familial circumstances did not fare much better. The family represented (for many of these children) another critical forum within which their experience was mostly painful. The typical parent was, at the very least, quite disappointed in and discouraged with his/her child and, at worst, outwardly hostile and aggressive. Simply, their children had failed them.

Rogers' conception of the role that positive self regard plays in a child's development is illuminating in understanding the psychological needs of this "type" of child. These were children who had grown all too familiar with the desperate struggle to preserve and protect their fragile estimations of their own self worth. Very often this occurred in ways that effectively denied a great deal of experience to their awareness. The more estranged they became from their experience, the more "blocked" and arrested was their development. In terms of Rogers' personality dimensions, these children evidenced the following characteristics: general inability to recognize and/or express their feelings, disengagement or distance from their immediate experience and inability to utilize the self as
an inner referent, typical unawareness of contradictory statements regarding themselves, desire to avoid self-disclosure, being locked into an impermeable system of personal constructs which they would regard as a matter of fact, being closed to change and a tendency to disregard personal problems or keep them external and apart from the self, and inability to form intimate relationships and an overall view of themselves as tentative and quite risky.

The "child seeking enhancement" represents a very different picture. An entirely different sort of tapestry is woven with respect to their psychological needs and development. In terms of the Maslowian construction, these children generally had satisfied most of their lower order basic needs prior to entering the program. This included physiological safety, belongingness and affection needs. As described earlier, these children came from homes where support, stimulation and love were prominent. They were, for the most part, children who were determined to satisfy their needs for mastery and adequacy within the full range of person-specific parameters. This process very often took the form of the striving for artistic, scholastic or academic prowess. In most cases, their self-esteem was solid enough to enable them to take the necessary risks—to allow for the possibility of failure. Failure did not symbolize a complete rejection of the entire person. Failure was exclusively related to the particular situation at hand, such as the inability to learn to play the saxophone.

From a Rogerian standpoint, these children had received much
in the way of positive self regard. Their sense of worth was strong and consistent. This child represented the antithesis of the type of child previously described. In using Rogers' scale of the change process in psychotherapy, these children would place rather high along each of the seven personality dimensions. They appeared alive and well and on a steady path toward reaching their full potential.

Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>100% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>100% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15/10</td>
<td>12-19</td>
<td>90% C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that during the third and last year of the Early Years stage (1975-1976) the student population began to change in terms of its socio-economic and cultural composition. This shift in the nature of the population, coupled with a perceived weakness in methodology (to be examined in a later section), would ultimately set in motion a major revision of the ways in which program design was construed. In addition, a redefinition of corresponding outcomes and goals was stimulated. In fact, this process was a metamorphosis that was substantial enough to require a discrete designation which I've chosen to characterize as the Middle Years Stage. The Middle Years section will be a complete analysis of this programmatic movement.
Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

In outlining Maple Valley's psychoeducational goals during this stage of its development, it is important to reemphasize the fundamental relationship that these goals had to the underlying conceptualization of the individual student. That is, the program's goal was the development of self-actualized, fully functioning individuals. In fact, this conception represented a superordinal construct employed by program planners during the program's initial stages. The view was that individuals not only possessed the capacity to reach their highest potential, but, in essence, they needed to do so. The core belief was that there existed within each person the capacity to undergo an organic unfolding process whereby movement along any central personality dimension (described in the theoretical conceptions of individual needs section) would occur if given the appropriate environmental prescription. The Maple Valley staff inexorably linked the assessment of student growth with this ongoing ontological perspective. The emphasis on mental health characteristics defined the functional parameters of this ontological perspective and is described by Rogers in these terms (1969):

"...the best of education would produce a person very similar to the one produced by the best of therapy."

The ultimate goal of self actualization represented a mega-need that was regarded as universal in nature. The notion that each individual was naturally endowed with the capacity for inner wisdom, therefore enabling her/him to become fully cognizant of what was
truly in their own best interests, represented a central theme for
program planners. This principle applied to both child and adult.

The earliest conception of psychoeducational goals at Maple
Valley was embedded in this overall theoretical framework. Bloom
(1963), in a discussion of educational goals, suggests that
"Educational objectives have been defined as the statement of
desired changes in thoughts, actions, or feelings of students that a
particular course or educational program should bring about." Maple
Valley's goals were quite global in nature. Very simply, program
planners refused to make arbitrary categorical differentiations with
regard to the establishment of individual goals. The primacy of
regarding each student's journey toward self actualization as
fundamentally unique implied that all goals had meaning only within
an individualized, subjective, client-centered context. Program
planners saw absolutely no need to differentiate individual goals on
any other basis. The umbrella concept of self actualization was
interpreted in such a way as to reinforce the notion of an
existential and relativist subjective reality.

Growth and development were considered long-term processes
including change on attitudinal, value and self-precept levels---
movements ethereal and amorphous in nature. The program did not set
goals in the context of subject matter progress, nor were any
externally-rooted timelines applicable to any form or aspect of the
learning process. Therefore, educational outcomes, whether in the
area of English grammar or self awareness, held significance only in
terms of the relative meaning it had for the student. The criteria of various goals had little to do with the acquisition of "correct" responses to prepatterned sequences. Rather, behavior in this context represented a filtered lens through which one might better understand the significance of the event in the life of the particular student. Staff attention was not primarily directed at determining how many correct answers a child obtained on a given exam; staff would be concerned with how a child was feeling about her/himself in the process. For instance, it was considered far more important for a child whose self esteem had been devastated as a result of experiencing heartbreak and failure with respect to their schooling to develop a stronger sense of self-confidence than to return to the "appropriate" grade level by the end of the term. The development of a positive self-concept represented, after all, a foundational operating premise of self-actualization.

Another theme which must be included in any meaningful discussion of the conception of psychoeducational goals during the Early Years stage of the program is the notion of a process orientation in learning. Rogers (1969) places a high premium on the establishment of process goals for education. He argued that "The goal of education is the facilitation of change and learning." According to this definition, the individual is truly educated when he/she has learned how to learn. "The most socially useful learning in the modern world is the learning of the process of learning, a continuing openness to experience and incorporation into oneself of
the process of change." (Rogers 1969)

Finally, it is important to make mention of the underlying attitude program planners had with regard to the role of behavioral specificity in the establishment and definition of psychoeducational goals and outcomes. Essentially, the Maple Valley School staff considered humanistic goals of education to be far too broad and complex to be evaluated on the basis of behavioral criteria. Combs (1975) adds that qualities associated with self-actualizing individuals aren't geared to behavioral measurement. He also argued (1975) that "If behavior is symptom and meaning is cause, then if we could somehow assess meaning we would not need to be concerned about measurement of behavior." Basically, behavioral data signified nothing more or less than an indication of ongoing underlying and internal processes. Therefore, the role of behavior was functionally subsumed by the relativistic and individualistic conception of self-actualization.

The following are two accounts taken from Maple Valley School school records of assessments made by staff members regarding student development. Some comments are specific to subject matter areas, while others represent an overall 'sense' of student growth. Regardless of the particular context within which these comments were offered, the underlying orientation with respect to the way growth was construed should be apparent.

A thirteen-year-old girl's ("a child seeking enhancement") progress in an algebra class offered in the fall of 1975, is
described in the following way: (NOTE: the evaluative categories were the actual ones used at the time; and, all names, both staff and student have been altered for the purposes of confidentiality).

**Academic Report**

**Algebra:** Material covered includes Numbers & Sets, The Language of Algebra and Addition and Multiplication of Real Numbers.

Leslie's tremendous degree of self-motivation enables her to continually soak the utmost from the course. She is a gifted student in Algebra, and shows real ease and facility in working through and grasping concepts and skills. She always moves ahead of the class on her own and readily brings questions and problems to me. Her capabilities for her age are very advanced, and at times we go over basic math in order to fill in the gaps.

**Community Interaction:** Leslie's presence at meetings is steady, quiet and listening. She has begun to offer more and more and is growing in that process. Her attentiveness is concentrated.

Leslie is comfortable and well-liked in her social relationships...she is moving into adolescence with a smooth transition.

**General Comments:** Leslie's sense of self--her very real ability to see what she wants and make choices--is phenomenal. Her curiosity and desire to learn is continuous. She is able to structure her days so fully that I don't feel boredom is a word in her vocabulary. Stronger declarations of who she is are also emerging.

In addition to the overall philosophical flavor of the report, several important elements come to the foreground. They are: the qualitative vs. quantitative content, a narrative/subjective form vs. a statistical profile, the poetic phraseology (common to humanistic writing of this era), behavior viewed as symptomatic of
underlying processes (e.g., doing well with numbers is a result of grasping underlying concepts, and a high degree of self-motivation), the emphasis on specific personality dimensions (e.g., Leslie's sense of self--her very real ability...to make choices...") and finally the allusion to process learning ("her curiosity and desire to learn is continuous").

In another math class offered in the spring of 1975, the teacher characterizes the experience of a twelve-year-old boy ("a child in distress") in the following way:

**Activity**: Fundamental Math and Beginning Algebra.

"John's interest in this class was, as in some other academic areas, sporadic and unclear. I am not sure as to his motivation--it certainly didn't seem to me to be rooted in curiosity or Algebra. John was able to let go and finally quit the class toward the end of the year. His lack of genuine interest continually manifested in ways such as not doing homework, losing notebooks, etc. I feel good that he was finally able to say he no longer wanted the class.

John's intellectual capabilities certainly enable him to grasp concepts and develop skills and techniques with enough competency to be able to be well-versed in Algebra. He especially developed his potentials when studying signed numbers, etc. As his interest faded, so did his developing mathematical skills fade. His basic skills are fine.

John did get something out of Algebra class; certainly not nearly as much as were his intellectual potentials not apparently bound by emotional and other considerations. He often seemed to be biding time or wanting to say 'I'm here' by diverting class attention.

Areas covered ranged from number theory, decimals and fractions to signed numbers, number lines and basic algebra theory.

Again, I want to emphasize that I feel it was a
positive step for John to 'own' his lack of interest and quit the class of his own volition."

As in the previous assessment, the underlying ideological context in this account is clearly rooted in the Humanistic/Existential framework. Both reports are quite similar with regard to the nature of those aspects of student development given prominence. This is particularly evident in the case of the teacher's apparent willingness to interpret behavior and to look for the underlying meaning. There exists a basic view that, in this particular instance, John's choice to terminate his placement in their class was in fact a positive movement in the direction of self-definition. It is interesting to point out that in a more conventional system this behavior would likely be regarded as essentially counterproductive, or at the very least questionable.

In summation, the determination of psychoeducational goals during the Early Years remained rooted in the same theoretical frameworks that were utilized in the conception of individual needs; that is, the Humanistic/Existential Framework. The program's goal was the development of self-actualized, fully functioning individuals. This superordinal construct was regarded as universal in nature and was linked to the belief that each individual possessed the innate inner wisdom necessary for the natural unfolding of healthy development. The primacy of regarding each student's journey toward self-actualization as fundamentally unique implied that all goals had meaning only within an individualized and
subjective context; this was the only basis upon which individual goals were differentiated.

Educational outcomes held significance only in terms of the relative meaning they had for the individual student. As the global goal of self-actualization was considered a long-term process, externally-rooted timelines were therefore inapplicable to any form of the learning process. The goal of learning to learn reflected the notion of the process orientation. Finally, behavioral specificity was irrelevant to the definition and establishment of goals; the role of behavior was subsumed by the relativistic and individualistic conception of self-actualization. The examples of school records that report student progress clearly illustrate the above.

The following excerpts from interviews (see: Appendix C) illustrate student perceptions of personal learning outcomes and program goals during the Early Years period:

...Just learning how to deal with people in a group. I learned a lot just about myself and the world --being able to deal with figuring out what I wanted and what I believed in, and acting on that.... (2nd student interview)

...Maple Valley was just a powerful experience in my life. And I know that because I continue to think about it. It continues to be part of me--when I go to make decisions or choices in my life, I think about that place and I think that that was where I learned some of the ropes. And where I gained the confidence to do a lot of what I do. (4th student interview)

...Maple Valley...helped me take a look at myself and to make conscious decisions. I choose to break (or not break) this school rule. (1st student interview)
Maple Valley was by far the best place I'd ever been to academically. I went farther and learned more at Maple Valley in terms of material and in how to approach learning—I learned how to organize—I learned in the one-to-one contact, and I learned in the one-to-four contact. The first time I ever made the association that learning is frustrating was at Maple Valley. So I've kept that in the back of my mind. Every learning that I've had since then—in getting here from there, has been very frustrating. But, knowing that frustration is a big part of the process has helped me get from here to there.

...when I think back to Maple Valley, I think about the tools that I got while I was there. Maple Valley capitalized on the qualities I think I already had. Like the ability to talk, the ability to perceive paradoxes, the ability to take risks, to take stands, to be straight with people. I think I became a lot better at doing those things, and learned a lot of tools from doing those things at Maple Valley....

(5th student interview)

Programmatic Design (the "Environment")

Upon examination of the role of environment, it is important to note that it was those adults connected to Maple Valley in its earliest days that defined and constructed the school program. Hunt and Sullivan (1974) highlight the primacy of environment for the practitioner in B-P-E terms. They suggest that from a practitioner's point of view, the equation would more likely be described as E: P-B. That is, the environment's interaction with an individual produces a behavior. This equation had much validity for program staff during this period. As teachers/facilitators, there seemed to exist a natural inclination to emphasize the ways in which the overall program or specific class was constructed, particularly with
respect to atmosphere and climate. In addition, this environmental orientation appeared consonant with those staff members more interested in living the principles of the Human Potential Movement than in theorizing about them. Being in the "here and now," doing your own thing, being spontaneous and emotionally free were not only axioms well integrated into program design, but also appeared to represent an outline for the staff from which they governed their own personal lives. Suffice to say, concerns regarding program implementation appeared more relevant and poignant than those relating to the more theoretical conception of the person or to the establishment of specific and sequenced goals and outcomes.

In their discussion of educational environment, Hunt and Sullivan (1974) offer a distinction between "climate" and "weather." According to their definition, the climate of an educational environment usually refers to a larger spatial unit, such as school atmosphere, or to a larger temporal unit, such as the pre-vacation class climate. The weather of an educational environment refers to specific minute-by-minute events that occur. For my purposes, I will focus this examination on the psychoeducational climate. This analysis will include the type of documentation that will serve to illuminate life at the school as it was lived at this particular time. The value of this data lies more in offering the reader a flavor of the overall educational climate than it does in establishing a specific "blow-by-blow" account of a particular intervention or method.
Hunt and Sullivan (1974) argue that the bottom line in assessing educational environments is not whether or not one element is more important than another, but rather the necessity of considering various elements at different levels. Towards this end, they have devised an analytic schema or taxonomy. Their paradigm will provide a systematic organizer and vehicle for the examination of the M.V.S. environment. The following table illustrates the framework.
Table V

"Levels of Educational Environments"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Unit</th>
<th>Size of Unit</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural Setting</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Attitude</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hunt & Sullivan, 1974)

**Definition of Levels:**

1. **Cultural Setting:** includes national and community elements and values.

2. **Current School Setting:** includes culture of the school, class values, rural-urban-suburban locale.

3. **School Characteristics:** includes size of school; number, age and sex of students; number, age and sex of teachers; physical characteristics, for example, open architecture.

4. **School Organization:** includes power relations, decision-making patterns, division of labor, communication patterns, relations among school staff, relations among students, peer influence, etc.

5. **Personal Characteristics of Teacher:** includes teacher characteristics specifically oriented toward the teaching function, such as personality structure, religious attitudes, social attitudes, philosophy of life, etc.

6. **Student-oriented Teacher Attitudes:** includes educational goals, concepts about the teacher role, attitude toward teaching, acceptance or rejection of student, etc.

7. **Teacher Behavior:** includes teaching practices, specific teaching techniques, response to student behaviors, changes in teaching strategies, etc.
Hunt and Sullivan (1974) argue that the more remote an element (cultural setting, school setting), the more akin it is to a climatic perspective. Conversely, the more immediate the level of analysis (i.e., teacher behavior), the more appropriate the weather distinction becomes. In addition, they note that, in any event, the level of classroom weather should be viewed in the context of the school's overall cultural climate. Therefore, a climatic perspective will direct the ensuing discussion. (Hunt and Sullivan's environmental schema will provide a general guide for the purposes of outlining the M.V.S. program. It is important to note that several elements that comprise this schema have been examined and developed in other sections of this chapter. Therefore, the emphasis of this segment will be on elaborating those aspects previously unchartered and undefined.)

Cultural Setting

Due to the nature and significance of the cultural context just prior to and during the inception of the M.V.S. program, I previously delineated and discussed this area as a separate sub-section of The Early Years stage (see Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context)

Cultural School Setting

At this level, Hunt's and Sullivan's paradigm represents another step in the direction of immediacy. The notion of the
culture of the school and its immediate surroundings is less abstract than the societal perspective previously outlined. (In a sense, the entire schema may be metaphorically viewed as a funnel whose widest point represents the national culture and whose narrowest is the level of teacher behavior.)

The M.V.S. culture is analogous to societal culture in the same way that Humanistic Psychology is to the "Greening of America." That is, at this particular time, there were many expressions of the "cultural revolution" on political, economic and social levels. Those expressions most relevant in terms of the M.V.S. experience concerned the exciting activity occurring in the fields of education and psychology. The "Human Potential Movement" represented one branch of the larger "revolutionary" tree.

The M.V.S. culture was deeply embedded in the principles of the "Human Potential Movement" with its humanistic and existential underpinnings. This tradition has been defined and outlined in an earlier section of the Early Years stage. However, in simple terms, the school's culture was a culture of personal growth, mental health, self-awareness and personal responsibility.

The school itself is located in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts. Wendell is approximately eighteen miles northeast of the town of Amherst, Massachusetts. It is a rural town and its culture reflects a number of interesting and dynamic polarities. For instance, the town's population was not only characteristic of the Yankee tradition common to small New England towns, with their
deep ancestral ties to the land and history, but it also reflects a relatively newer influx of young, mostly counter-culture types (beginning in the late 1960s and continuing through the 1970s). From an economic point of view, Wendell might be described as a relatively poor town. However, this statement might be misleading without pointing out that there are a number of citizens who have consciously chosen austerity as a way of life. The 'old-timers' group (referring to that segment of the population living in Wendell prior to the 1960s) generally consisted of people from hard-working manual/blue collar backgrounds. The counter-culture group, on the other hand, generally represented individuals from more middle class backgrounds with relatively higher levels of education and opportunity. It was not unusual for members of this group to establish themselves in manual or blue collar occupations. The social and political tenor of the town during these years was quite dynamic. The "newcomers" not only expressed their appreciation for the simple, hard-working life, but also for a myriad of alien (from an old-timer's perspective) philosophies. The social politics outlined in Reich's (1970) "Greening of America" were much in evidence in the town of Wendell. Additionally, the town's physical proximity to the Amherst/Northampton area (the heart of the culturally vibrant Pioneer Valley) provided it with an ongoing source of new ideas, stimulus for change, and visionary connectedness.
School Characteristics

Information concerning the size of the school and the number, age, and sex of students is provided in an earlier section of the Early Years chapter. The following chart will serve to illustrate the number, age, and sex of the teachers during this period.

Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL(N)</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>40-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Plant Characteristics:

Maple Valley School is situated on fifteen acres of land. The land consists of wooded areas, a meadow, pasture lands, and a small pond area. Designated school areas are defined and listed below.

They are:

Main Building

This building is a renovated and converted colonial farmhouse consisting of three inter-connecting units as follows:

A. Main House--This section includes:
1. school kitchen
2. dining room
3. staff living quarters on the first floor
4. administrative/office area and staff living quarters on the second floor.
5. cellar, including food storage areas
6. attic for miscellaneous storage
B. Dormitory Section—This section includes:
   1. six dormitory rooms for 13 residential students
   2. two bathrooms

C. Classroom Section—This area includes:
   1. large arts and crafts area
   2. classroom and seminar room
   3. student lounge
   4. photography dark room
   5. school maintenance room and equipment area

School Organization:

A central aspect of the "new humanism" as interpreted and implemented by the M.V.S. group was its commitment to egalitarianism for both child and adult alike. The issue concerned the establishment of a "living democracy" and not one that existed only in the abstract. The central idea was freedom—freedom as understood by A.S. Neill. It was the staff responsibility to establish the necessary atmosphere and environmental conditions to enable this freedom to allow individuals to flourish by natural and organic means. The credo was: "Do not direct children—allow them to direct themselves; do not teach children—collaborate with them."

The movement was horizontal rather than vertical.

However, there did exist a rather primitive yet important hierarchical arrangement at the staff level. The leadership and direction of the program was quite clear, both on a nominal and functional basis. Policies and operating procedures were generally established on a collaborative and consensual basis. (A more complete and detailed organizational/decision making profile is
offered in the appendix.)

During the first year of M.V.S., the physical and psychological boundaries between staff and student were the most permeable; that is, very little came under the exclusive purview of the staff. Although the obvious and fundamental discrepancy between adult reasoning capabilities and those of a child were understood by the staff, its significance was deliberately minimized as a practical matter. The staff constructed the necessary minimum of health and safety rules; all else was open to group process and participatory democracy.

The community meeting structure, perhaps more than any other programmatic feature, symbolizes and captures the very heart of the Maple Valley experience. This is particularly true with respect to the Early Years. This arena represents a primary forum within which power relations, decision-making patterns, communication patterns and the overall relations between and within the student and staff group may be viewed and understood. However, prior to a discussion involving the school meeting process several terms must be defined for the purposes of clarification and comprehension. Several definitions (as defined by the adults) relevant to the meeting process are provided below:

- **Community/General Meetings**: These are regularly scheduled once a week. They function as a forum in which community business is conducted via democratic process. These issues may include law-making, community responsibilities, general activities, clarification of interpersonal relationships, etc.
Emergency Meetings: These are mandatory gatherings that may be convened by any member of the community. They may be called upon violation of either an individual's rights or a community law. These meetings take absolute priority over any other activity and are designed to examine if not resolve the issues at hand. Simply put, everything stops and everybody gathers whenever it is called by anyone.

Meeting Process: The meeting operates on a parliamentary basis. The majority's decision is binding. A moderator is elected at the beginning of each meeting. It then becomes her/his responsibility to see that a secretary is elected and to maintain order and direction throughout the course of the meeting. Motions are made by any group member regarding the particular discussion at hand. Motions must be seconded to warrant official discussion status with the possibility of being brought to a vote. Anyone can run for the office of moderator or secretary. The secretary records the minutes.

Special Meetings: These may be called by any community member for any reason. These meetings must have one-half plus one member in attendance in order to constitute a quorum necessary for establishing community laws.

Health, Safety and Procedural Rules:
1. All laws of the larger society are always in effect.
2. No smoking in the common room.
3. You must knock and receive permission before entering anyone's private room.
4. No drugs.
5. No Alcohol.
6. No Pets (other than those that can be cared for in small cages, etc.)
7. Main house closed after 10 p.m.
8. Quiet time after 10 p.m.
9. Meal Times: Breakfast 9:00-9:45 a.m. Lunch 12:15-1:00 p.m. Dinner about 5:30 p.m.
10. All students must be on school grounds after 10 p.m., Sunday night through Thursday night (on weekends, individual permission slips and agreed-upon times take effect).
11. Special permission is required in order for a student to leave school grounds during a school
day (Monday—Friday, 10 a.m.—4 p.m.).

12. Emergency meetings are mandatory for everyone.

13. Special meetings must have one-half plus one member of the community in order to establish a quorum necessary for establishing community laws.

These health and safety rules remained relatively consistent throughout the three years comprising the Early Years stage. All other business that fell outside this realm was wide open for community discussion, debate and resolution (or non-resolution). It is interesting to contrast school rules at Maple Valley established by the staff with those that are typically associated with the more traditional approach. They include such items as dress codes, obscenity, bathroom access and procedures and rules for decorum. Again, the staff decided to minimize all externally imposed standards in order to maximize growth and development consonant with their understanding of the previously discussed ideologies.

An interesting tapestry may be woven with regard to Maple Valley's overall climatic condition, particularly in the areas of decision-making and communication patterns which were promoted and sustained by the program. These interpersonal dynamics may be viewed in the context of the community meeting process. It is for this reason that I have chosen to include an extensive description of various meeting transcripts, taken from school records (as recorded by a variety of elected secretaries) in the Appendix. However, elements of specific community meetings will be highlighted in the body of the text for the purpose of elaboration and
definition.

The meetings (general and emergency) were established in order to provide an opportunity for community members to encounter a myriad of issues ranging from affairs of a routine business nature to the most painful and trying interpersonal dilemmas. Thus, these transcript selections provide the reader with a powerful glimpse into the more amorphous areas of roles and relations. Important issues affecting community life were confronted by all community members in the course of the meeting process.

The staff (and more specifically, the staff's leaders) always had a greater responsibility on the fundamental level of maintaining the health and well-being of the community; however, this reality never became the predominant factor in determining the direction of community affairs vis-a-vis adult authority. In fact, these anti-autocratic figures provided a uniquely convenient and safe target for students needing to rebel (as part of their attempts at self-definition). Thus, they were given many opportunities to do just that—rebel. On a number of occasions (as illustrated in the meeting transcripts) a staff member would vehemently and enthusiastically be outvoted and overruled on important school business. In these instances, the developmental task of autonomy was thereby institutionally legitimized in this manner in the school setting.

A good example of this type of interpersonal dynamic and decision-making process can be viewed in a Maple Valley emergency meeting (May, 1975—Appendix A). A staff member convened this
meeting in response to the destruction of school property. The meeting begins with a motion (made by the same staff member) to suspend from school those students (as yet unidentified) responsible for the damage. The motion stimulates much discussion and debate. Of apparent significance to a number of students is their feeling that the proposed sanction is unfair and lacking in proportionality in relation to the act itself. Also, students appeared interested in examining and clarifying notions of community responsibility. The motion is solidly defeated. Following the vote, a student offers another motion providing for the repair of any and all damages by those students responsible for it. The motion also requires that these students take the necessary and appropriate actions immediately. This motion is perceived by many of the students to be far more fair and pragmatic than the original motion. The motion passes by a wide margin despite staff protestations. Thus, the program provided a democratic meeting structure (E) designed to promote increased levels of autonomy (B) for children possessing a natural and inner sense of wisdom and compassion coupled with an innate ability to act independently (P).

The norms regarding authenticity, particularly within the context of the community meeting process, were always very powerful. For instance, there were situations when a staff member would take an artificially extreme or provocative position on a given subject in order to induce or promote student reaction. The students would often "catch wind" of such maneuvers and typically register their
wholehearted displeasure with such ingenuous tactics. This was naturally considered fine and healthy on the part of the staff.

The area of peer relations at Maple Valley during this period was most illuminating. Within this honest, open and democratic climate, children would naturally be confronted with difficult dilemmas regarding community norms, their own values, and the behavior of their peers. As mentioned earlier, it was acceptable and expected that students would engage the staff in an open confrontation regarding a particular issue or decision; after all, this encounter was in keeping with the classic and eternal developmental struggle as understood by Erik Erikson (1963) and others. However, it was quite another thing for students to begin to accept and confront each other as individuals and community members. For some students, this level of interaction represented a most difficult and anxiety-producing prospect. There were many students who readily encountered, disagreed with, celebrated with, rejected, punished and welcomed their peers. This was most fortunate in the sense that it modeled these behaviors for those students having difficulty in this area. The community meeting structure enabled these dynamics to manifest in a most constructive manner. Through this process, children learned a great deal about responsibility, authenticity, feeling and democracy in a dramatic/experiential manner.

A representation of peer relations as they were typically expressed at Maple Valley may be seen in another emergency meeting
(November, 1975--Appendix A). This meeting was convened by a student for the purpose of confronting two other students for allegedly misusing the school's fire extinguishers. The incident took place during the previous evening, resulting in a good deal of property damage. Throughout the meeting, children made motions (which appeared quite stern yet appropriate in nature) and amendments to motions aimed at imposing sanctions for what they felt was unacceptable and destructive behavior. The meeting was directed by students engaged in the process of taking responsibility for their school/community. In this case, several students appeared willing to confront their peers in the service of community well-being. Thus, as a function of the meeting structure, children had the opportunity to encourage each other in an open and direct (albeit difficult) manner.

There was an interesting and fairly typical pattern that emerged regarding what became known (to the staff) as the "democratic honeymoon" period. That is, when students first entered the M.V.S. program, they were generally enthralled with its high degree of freedom and independence. However, it usually did not take too long (typically four to six weeks) before these students began to understand that along with the freedom the program offered, there existed a strong pull for their involvement and responsible participation in the process. This recognition was generally met with mixed reactions from the students. Freedom was obviously more exciting than responsibility.
As mentioned earlier, democratic principles and practices were treated quite seriously by the entire community. It was everyone's (both staff and student) responsibility to respond to the issues impacting community life. This response was institutionalized by the meeting process itself. Issues that many adults might find extraordinarily difficult and complex to manage effectively were squarely confronted and often resolved by children actively participating in the shaping of their own lives and community. As the Early Years stage progressed, the staff became generally more directive as more content areas would come into their exclusive decision-making domain; however, the genuine democratic climate of the program continued to thrive.

Staff Meetings:

Individual staff members were expected to operate on the basis of those principles outlined earlier in this section. The nature of their interaction with students (as illustrated in the meeting transcripts) exemplified Roger's axioms regarding honest communications. Staff were open and honest with students in a positive and appropriate manner. However, there quite naturally existed content areas considered "off limits" for the general community. "Staff business" was restricted to the confines of the staff meeting. The general rule of thumb regarding the definition and determination as to the most appropriate forum (i.e., staff meeting vs. general meeting) concerned staff notions regarding the children's capacity to effectively understand, digest and process the information in a
positive and productive manner.

There were a variety of content areas which comprised the typical staff meeting agenda. They ranged from interpersonal areas to feedback and evaluation, and to those levels of individual and group analysis and development considered inappropriate in terms of the larger community when the above "rules of thumb" were applied.

The staff meetings essentially consisted of two major dimensions. The first one pertained to those issues relating to student needs, program design and maintenance and a myriad of logistical and pragmatic items. The second area concerned the ongoing emphasis placed on the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and group level of development. Attention to this domain was considered an important aspect of the overall programmatic conception. Emphasis on the psychological and emotional life of individuals and the group itself applied to students and staff alike (even though student needs and needs of the larger community were consistently given preeminence). The Maple Valley School leadership and organization placed a high premium on the personal and professional development of staff members. This represented a positive and compelling force for those staff or potential staff involved with the program. Vehicles and strategies employed by this group in its pursuit of these goals included feedback loops, encounter "hot seats" (adapted from the Gestalt technique), individual "dump, vent and discharge time," and sensory awareness exercises. It was not uncommon during this Early Years period to have staff meetings come to an end with the group's
observation of the sunrise and someone remarking, "So, who's cooking breakfast today?" Generally, these sessions were marked by high energy and positive action and appeared most satisfying to staff members.

Personal Characteristics of Teacher:

This particular aspect of the program is described in several different segments of this section. However, the following points are to be highlighted. Staff who came to work and live at Maple Valley (particularly in the Early Years) chose to do so primarily out of a life vision and not on the customary basis upon which one typically makes professional career choices. Most staff members viewed their positions at the school as being consistent with the notion of leading unsegmented personal and professional lives. Basic human values underlying the program's growth and development were ones that extended well into the personal lives of the staff members. Those individuals chosen to join the program as stated in the school's first brochure (1973) were "...selected on the basis of their warmth, their understanding of themselves and others, their ability to wait for the child's own time to learn, and on their knowledge of subject."

During this period of the school's history, the staff group was essentially comprised of individuals who were significantly and deeply entrenched in the burgeoning Human Potential, Alternative Life-Style or Counter-Cultural Movements of the late sixties and
early seventies. They were generally people who viewed alternative education as a positive expression of and consistent with this larger socio/political context. The basic themes of an anti-establishment, non-authoritarian, "do your own thing" libertarian environment represented quite a compelling force for many.

Student-Oriented Teacher Attitudes:

This aspect of the Maple Valley program regarding educational goals, roles of the teacher and basic attitudes toward teaching has been extensively covered in a variety of aspects in several points in the body of this section. (A description and analysis of the Maple Valley program of The Early Years chapter)

Teacher Behavior:

The area of teacher behavior has been addressed in a variety of aspects in several points in preceding sections. There are themes that illuminate the commonality of desired relational behaviors between teacher and student expressed throughout the theoretical context rooted in the work of Neill, Rogers and Perls. It was imperative that Maple Valley staff implement in practice what they believed in theory. Furthermore, teacher/student relationships were not to be differentiated within or without the classroom itself.

Toward this end, the overriding construction of viewing the person as a "wholistic" entity in which the emotional self had at least equal status with the intellectual was central to teacher/student interactions; as all the theories state, the
awareness of and attending to emotions will free a person to grow and develop. Thus, Maple Valley staff were trained to elicit emotional awareness in a variety of ways. Whether in a class or in a community meeting, teachers attempted to discover and make explicit what they felt about their experience.

Additionally, the concept that learning and development occurs as a result of a natural unfolding process from the innate inner wisdom of the individual, was central to both teacher understanding of how they should relate/guide children's behavior as well as to the structure of curricula and activities themselves. Thus, there did not exist predetermined and/or external criteria to measure progress—all was relative and subjective. Teachers did not grade students or evaluate them according to an external standard; they sought to understand and communicate the meaning of their behavior to them.

Finally, all attitudes and behaviors that reflected and promoted an atmosphere of openness, flexibility and spontaneity were valued and strived for. A teacher's ability to change plans, adjust expectations, create new options on the spur of the moment were all viewed as necessary assets toward the establishment of effective and helping relationships. A case in point follows. During the course of a basic psychology class, major theorists including B.F. Skinner were discussed. Upon learning that he was alive and living in Cambridge, the teacher spontaneously suggested that the class give him a call and attempt to arrange a visit. The class disbanded to
the office; the call was made; the teacher was on the phone with B. F. Skinner; the visit was arranged for the following week. The teacher and class viewed this process as making the class "come alive."

Teachers were able to gain specific models of behavior by gleaning key elements that were unique to the work of Neill, Rogers and Perls. The structure of Summerhill emphasized and validated that a child would learn when s/he was ready to learn - and the "river was not to be pushed." Thus, it was not uncommon to eavesdrop on the following dialogue at Maple Valley in the Early Years.

Student: "Teach me something!"
Teacher: "What do you want to learn?"
Student: "I don't know."
Teacher: "I don't know, either, see you later."

As the Summerhill experience suggests, perhaps six months later that student would naturally discover her/his interests and seek out the teacher for specific learning. The teacher viewed her/himself as a facilitator whose non-directiveness and patience allowed for the inner unfolding to occur.

At the center of Carl Rogers' construction of interpersonal relationships is the primacy of the facilitator's responsibility to both experience and communicate her/his unconditional positive regard for the student in order to create the conditions necessary for learning. At Maple Valley, staff would make certain to discriminate their reactions to student behavior by differentiating the
behavior from the person - "I like you, but I don't like what you did." In addition, there was no such thing as failure in the classroom—all academic effort had value because the person created it.

Gestalt emphasizes the use of projection as a means by which an individual attempts to manipulate her/his environment in order to avoid responsibility and thereby inhibit learning. The staff utilized specific methods in order to actively confront projection and attempt to force the student to accept responsibility for her/his thoughts, feelings and actions. For example, the staff refused to accept "you statements"—these were rephrased and fed back to the student as "I statements." Also, a student who might declare boredom because of stating, "There's nothing to do" would find this sentence rephrased by a staff as "I don't know what I want to do." Thus, staff would often promote potential impasse in the service of the assumption of personal responsibility as a necessary prelude to learning. Simply put, staff used Gestalt methods to not allow students to project and therefore deny responsibility for their own lives.

In summary, the above sketch and illustration of certain teacher behaviors highlights both the commonalities of these theorists as well as their unique contributions to the influence of specific teacher behaviors in the Early Years. Perhaps most crucial to understanding this domain was the exceptionally profound commitment of the teachers to modeling the behaviors that these theorists considered vital to growth and development.
The following excerpts from student and staff interview (see: Appendix C) highlight various aspects of program design:

...in its estimation of and identification with the youth of its students. I think that the so-called generation-gap was minimal, and the lack of same contributed to a certain sense of respect that the students had for the staff. They (the staff) were not removed and out of touch with their own youth, and the problems encountered by us as teenagers.

(1st student interview)

...Maple Valley was about making choices and learning to be decisive in our lives. And, it provided a structure for people to do that. It didn't force it on anybody. But, for myself, I think I thrived on the structure and playing around with it, manipulating it and being a voice, being a vote, being someone in the community. I really loved the structure--there was a lot of freedom within it--it allowed people to be heard--allowed us to debate. To me, that was the learning experience--people communicating all over the place, all the time....

(4th student interview)

...I do think that this fostering of personal growth was extremely beneficial for those ready for the opportunity, but for some, allowed freedoms were used in destructive or self-indulgent ways.

(1st student interview)

...We attempted to create a setting and a structure within which kids could get in touch with their own process, learn to communicate, learn to be honest with themselves and each other, have some space from all the criticism and the "shoulds" and the punishments and the constrictions of their families and homes and society. Giving them all the freedom where they could get in touch with themselves and see what it is that motivated them and inspired them, what interested them and to do that in a setting where they were affirmed, hugged, and where the staff provided modeling--and the premise was that that's healing, and that's a setting where learning can really happen and where people can grow healthfully, and where we can keep them safe while doing that--give them a chance to bump around, make mistakes where they won't get hurt too badly, while they learn to gain control.

(Lowell--staff)
...during the emergency meeting era and all that stuff, I would have made it a little bit harder to totally stop everything—to let one isolated little problem, that only affected a few people to totally overtake the entire community—and give actual classless/academics more of a chance.... (2nd student interview)

...I'm not sure what kind of a system we could develop that could really protect individual rights as well, particularly the younger ones, and the angry hurt ones, the ones who'd never really been listened to before who had never had the power to stop the system and say—listen to me, I need this NOW! (Lowell—staff)

Well, I wouldn't trade the fact that I did learn all those personal skills about myself and dealing with other people. But I could have used a little more academics. When I first went back to regular high school I really wished that I had had a more structured base. I had the basis of learning down really well, so I could pretty much attack what I wanted to anyway. But just, you know, taking a real history class that had more continuity to it—that lasted and followed through and everything. There'd be like two classes that were pretty good, and then emergency meetings would take over and that was it. But overall, I still wouldn't change it around—I would keep it the way it was. (2nd student interview)

I've learned plenty. I feel most people spend a lot of time during the school years up until 18—reading books—literature—learning this, learning that—at Maple Valley I didn't learn a lot of that stuff—the traditional academics. But I can't say that I wished I had them, because I was learning the other things—and certainly it hasn't been the case that as a result of not having learned that then, I haven't gone on to learn it since. So I could have spent more time in an academic situation but there's certainly no regrets there that I didn't. I've made up for that since. (6th student interview)

They ended up being underemphasized. I got the feeling that a lot of the staff really wanted to make it a bigger thing. But the way that the school was set up at the time, it wasn't really possible. Plus, a lot of the kids were going through the beginning stages—I remember when I first got there, I had no interest in
going to class at all. I remember Mark literally dragging me out of bed saying—Come on let's do Algebra now. At that point, I didn't really even want to look at an algebra book. (2nd student interview)

...Academics just wasn't emphasized at that point. If I remember the philosophy right, it was that people learn when they want to learn—which was certainly true in my case. I learned when I wanted to learn—and I wanted to learn. So the answers were there. I would say it was a good balance for me. (5th student interview)

"A Day in the Life":

Individual school days at Maple Valley School during this period might be characterized as being very different from each other. The entire concept of a "typical day" was quite antithetical to the operating framework. However, a glimpse of the M.V.S. program which focuses on the "weather" of its educational environment is useful and is provided below.

Each new day offered community members virtually limitless possibilities for learning. A central theme regarding the organization of a given day was the value inherent in "not pushing the river" (Barry Stevens, 1970). Learning is a process that cannot be forced. The direction learning takes must be authentic in that it emerges naturally and is shaped by the learner(s) involved. Continuity and organization were not considered to be nearly as important as authenticity to the learning process. With the exception of emergency meetings (a structure outlined earlier) all classes and activities were optional. Classes were scheduled on a college model and enrollment was based entirely upon student interest. The school climate was fluid, spontaneous and
everchanging.

However, for the purpose of providing the reader with additional information in order to form a picture of daily life, I will describe a Maple Valley School day as it may have been viewed by a visitor at any point during this period.

Breakfast was served from 9:00—9:45 a.m. The school had no alarms or wake-up system. It was understood that children who wanted breakfast would make it their business to be in the dining room on time. On most school mornings there was rarely more than half the student group in attendance. The other half were typically still in bed. Staff and students mingled freely and easily—they prepared and ate their meals together.

After breakfast the day would continue with a range of activities offered by the staff and students as well. Courses had no fixed length of time and/or continuity. Schedules were constructed based on staff and student interest and would operate until such time as the schedule ceased to work. Then the process would begin anew. On any given day these classes may have been offered in the daily schedule: math class, creative writing, drawing, guitar class, group singing, snowball fighting, the history of World War II.

By mid morning (11:20 a.m.) a student calls and convenes an emergency meeting. The issue—"Max and Billy were playing their music too loudly in the dorms, and I asked them to stop—but they wouldn't!" This meeting takes forty-five minutes. Some children
leave the meeting satisfied because Max and Billy have finally been confronted. Others leave while expressing dismay over being interrupted from their previous activity. The meeting ends just in time for lunch amidst the hubbub of individual student-staff processing.

Lunchtime is the busiest time of the school day; almost the entire community is present. Many people are busy making plans and connections for the afternoon. Several people (mostly staff) ask that the noise level be brought down. This lasts approximately five minutes before it is soaring once again. The atmosphere is vibrant. Some students protest that school cooking isn't quite as good as Mom's.

Afternoon activities basically follow a similar format as the morning ones. There might be a range of different activities such as football, music jam session, maple sugaring, children listening to music and talking with one another (several of whom are probably "going steady"), batik in art class.

Throughout the course of the day there are always a few children who seem to float from one activity or one person to another. Staff members are cognizant of who these particular children are and may look to engage the child in order to more fully understand the nature of her/his behavior.

It is now late afternoon (3:20 p.m.). Another emergency meeting is called and convened. This time it is initiated by a staff member who is disturbed about the reckless horseplay in the art room which resulted in significant damage. This meeting lasts
about one hour. Some children feel upset about the fact that their art material was needlessly destroyed but are pleased that the "culprits" have been confronted. Others (including the perpetrators) leave the meeting angry over the staff getting so "heavy" about little things.

The meeting ends during the late afternoon/early evening "limbo" period. Students retreat to their rooms and play, talk and listen to music. This activity is relatively quiet. Staff members use this time to rest, talk with each other, write in their journals, be alone.

Around five-thirty/six o'clock, supper is ready. Most community members are present except for those staff members "off duty," and day school students. This period is less noisy and frenetic than lunchtime. Children and staff help to prepare, serve and clean-up after the meal. People are beginning to discuss the evening's options.

The evening has its own very special atmosphere. It is the time of day when the children seek out staff for hugs and cuddling--they appear most vulnerable at this time. Even the "gangsters" can be seen on the lap of their favorite staff.

Board games and art projects fill the dining room and art room. Storytelling takes place in the small room with the fireplace. The older kids listen to music and talk the kind of talk peculiar to boys and girls in their mid to late adolescence. Some of the older ones go on in this way until late into the night. This
is fine with the staff provided they are quiet.

Quiet time (listed in the health, safety and procedural rules) is at 10 p.m. The children observe the rule most of the time. However, there are some children, who, from time to time, are loud and rambunctious and keep the other children in the dormitories awake until late at night. It was, therefore, not unusual in these circumstances to have the next day's activities begin with an emergency meeting to address this violation of the rules.

Theory Applied to Program Practices: Evaluative Notes

Maple Valley School was a creation that was clearly intended to be and perceived as an experiment in the truest sense of that word. The goal of program planners was to establish a school that was a living/learning community based on theoretical formulations and principles that evoked profound commitment from the founders. This experiment represented a risk that was buttressed by both the real life existence of a model antecedent (i.e., the Summerhill School itself) and a social and cultural milieu that was inspired by the Humanistic/Existential theories of the burgeoning Human Potential Movement. Thus, the school's originators were firmly rooted within a context that provided fertile ground for its potential success.

In recognition of the experimental nature of this venture, program planners established and maintained an ongoing commitment to evaluating both school structures and practices as well as
theoretical guides as to their effectiveness in meeting the defined learning goals and overall purposes of the program. I have presented a comprehensive picture of Maple Valley theory and its applied practice during this period. I will now outline some specific aspects of the ways in which the applied theories aided in successfully achieving the desired outcomes. I will then outline the ways in which these applications resulted in the inhibition of learning goals. Finally, I will note the subsequent implications for the future directions of the school that eventually came to characterize a new and distinct phase of the program's development.

All the Humanistic/Existential theorists, including Neill, Rogers and Perls, described a variety of central and consistent themes in defining their views of human development. These themes include the emphasis on attending to the "whole" person (the integrated intellectual, emotional and physical selves) the unconditional respect and regard for the individual and her/his own experience, the primacy of the interpersonal relationship as the means for growth and development, the recognition of the innate wisdom of the individual, the importance of personal responsibility for one's whole self, and the values of freedom, spontaneity, flexibility, and authenticity as essential ingredients to promote self-actualization. Finally, these theorists redefined the traditional concept of education in such a way as to not simply mean the acquisition of information; education represented a comprehensive process directed at the promotion of total psychological health
and well-being. These overriding constructs formed the basis of the beginnings of the Maple Valley experience.

All the participants in the experiment were primarily reared in educational settings that were antithetical to the above world view. Education was the transmission of information and skills deemed necessary to promote intellectual achievement. Maple Valley was intended to become an alternative to this conventional tradition.

The use of the theoretical constructs of the Humanistic/Existentialists was quite successful in creating such an alternative. The Maple Valley climate and atmosphere was, indeed, markedly abundant with a wide array of dynamics and interactions in which children were respected, validated, allowed to find answers from within, and challenged to be responsible for their thoughts, feelings and behavior. Most of all, the fundamental tone of the school/community centered on the engagement of the interpersonal relationship and the resultant spontaneity and genuineness generated from this human connection. Clearly, as the theorists predicted, not only did the range of learnings broaden to include areas of psychological and life skills; the inherent value of the process itself as being dynamic, exciting and productive was manifest.

A.S. Neill believed that participatory decision-making was a vital component of any environment that attempted to promote growth for children. In the beginning years of the Maple Valley experience democratic meetings clearly served as a primary and productive
vehicle in which the goals of teaching children about freedoms and responsibility as whole people could occur. In addition, Neill believed that learning could only occur when a child expressed a genuine need and desire. Voluntary classes at Maple Valley reflected this premise. Thus, when a teacher did teach a class, students demonstrated the highest form of motivation—self-interest.

Carl Rogers clearly outlined a set of conditions that were imperative in the establishment of any therapeutic relationship. These conditions of psychological contact, authenticity, unconditional positive regard, empathy and the effective communication of the above, were employed by the adults across situations and interactions. As a result children were more able to develop awareness, authenticity, personal responsibility and trust in themselves and others that significantly enhanced their self-concept and, therefore, their overall development. Simply put, they felt cared for and attended to, and thus could internalize their own worth.

Fritz Perls formulated a unique approach in achieving the goals as previously outlined. His emphasis on direct confrontation in a non-detached manner was effectively used to attempt to foster personal responsibility within a short time frame. In addition, his focus on the "here and now" served to teach awareness and aid in decision-making. These practices—both substantively and stylistically—were key ingredients in the creation of an atmosphere of dynamic and powerful spontaneity.
The nature of the Humanistic/Existential theories and their impact on program practices that served to impede the accomplishment of program goals can be delineated into two categories. Firstly, inadequacies and gaps of the theories themselves resulted in programmatic shortcomings. Secondly, program planners began to discover that the very strengths of the theories could also, upon application, result in an inhibitory impact on the living/learning environment.

There was little theoretical emphasis that illuminated the differentiations between adulthood and childhood. The humanists constructed a view that reflected their perceptions and understandings of the human condition and the characteristics, traits, and ingredients common to all humanity. In adhering to these principles, program planners were unable to identify specific notions that could be utilized in better attending to needs that were seen as specific for children that might not be relevant for adults. For example, a child was asked the question, "What do you want to learn?" The child's response was "I don't know." The adult then stated "I don't know either" and then exited from the interaction. The operating assumption was that the adult would wait until the child's inner wisdom would direct her/him to identify her/his interests. Maple Valley program planners began to consider that perhaps the child was not structurally capable of identifying choices at that point in her/his development. The guiding theorists did not adequately provide a functional answer to this question.
The humanists also tended to define goals that were highly
global in nature and lacking in any sequential framework. For
example, to be in touch with one's feelings, to be spontaneous, to
be self-actualized were very global and decidedly non-specific and
discontinuous in their presentation. Thus, program planners were
never able to organize a functional map of strategies that would
allow them to develop school structures, curricula and individualized plans for children. This dilemma resulted in typically
random, "shotgun" and "hit or miss" strategies and interventions
that attended to specific situations as they arose. There was a
lack of theoretical underpinnings of how to develop tools to
identify and differentiate the points at which a given student may
be along the process of attaining those valued goals.

Many of the same elements of these theories that promoted the
effectiveness of the program also were instrumental in inhibiting
that same effectiveness. Maple Valley School was an alternative to
educational systems that fostered intellectual development at the
expense of the emotional self. Humanists spoke of the essentiality
of educating the whole person and, very often, the primacy of the
emotional self within the whole. Clearly, the implicit and some-
times explicit "order of the day" was anti-intellectualism. In
emphasizing the education of the whole person, the Maple Valley
climate and atmosphere was often one of highly charged emotionality
in which raw experience did not always translate into meaningful
learning. While emotional experience felt alive and
dynamic, program planners often experienced a lack of tools to assist the child in making cognitive sense in order to organize the experience. Thus, program planners began to express concern that learning might be transitory and not generalizable and transferable across time and situations.

The Humanistic/Existential emphasis on the "here and now" focus as a means of promoting awareness was highly valuable in teaching about interpersonal relationships and personal responsibility. However, negative aspects in regard to the lack of teaching and learning about past experience and future directions began to surface. In addition, this emphasis inhibited a sense of environmental continuity—especially in regard to academic skill acquisition. Program planners became concerned about the adequacy of the entire academic program in teaching the necessary skills for survival in the contemporary world.

Finally, the implementation of the humanistic values of spontaneity and flexibility often increased the risk of creating an atmosphere of randomness and disorder that became counter-productive in and of itself. At times, this disorder was therapeutically utilized to facilitate learning; at other times, this atmosphere would result in a perceived lack of safety that would inhibit learning. Program planners struggled to attend to these issues.

In the context of the above gaps and inadequacies, program planners began to adopt the notion that there needed to be a more systematic approach to helping children derive the fullest benefit
from experiential learning. This idea of the need for more organized and refined ways of helping children make better use of their experience made contact with another area that was being called into question. This area concerned a specific aspect of the emergency meeting process which began to appear in direct conflict with program goals. The frequency and emotional intensity of emergency meetings seemed to make it more difficult to create the kind of psychological and physical space necessary for children to digest and process raw and powerful data. The preponderance of emergency meetings had begun to dominate the entire school day. In addition to the aforementioned area, there existed another imbalance in the amount of time invested in debating community affairs rather than living them. There were many other types of skills (organizational, writing, reading, etc.) which children needed to at least have the opportunity of learning. This was becoming more and more unlikely within an operating framework whereby, at the point a community member calls an emergency meeting, everything stops and everyone gathers. The overriding problem had little to do with the content and process of the meetings themselves; rather, it concerned the basis upon which these meetings took precedence over all other activity. The emotional atmosphere of a school community after lurching from crisis to crisis became, in and of itself, counter-productive for learning.

Disequilibrium is a term used by developmental theorists to describe a point of transition in the stage sequence. This
transition period is characterized by the existence of a state of imbalance; i.e., when an individual's psychological structures are no longer adequate and new ones have yet to form, s/he negotiates her/his way through a transitional phase. Towards the end of the Early Years period, the Maple Valley program was in a state of disequilibrium with regard to some basic premises and procedures. The program had evolved to a point whereby the staff began to observe the apparent discrepancies between desired and resultant outcomes. Essentially, this tension promoted the type of movement which led to an examination of assumptions and practices for the future.

Chapter Summary:

This chapter has provided a comprehensive description of the Maple Valley program in the period of its Early Years (1973-1976). The discussion has focused on two basic realms: (1) the fundamental theoretical underpinnings relating to both human development in general and Humanistic/Existential theories and models most relevant to program design; and, (2) a detailed description and analysis of the program itself.

Humanistic/Existential theorists—including Maslow, Neill, Rogers and Perls--formulated conceptions of human development that emphasized the recognition of the innate wisdom of the individual, the centrality of attending to the whole person, the primacy of the interpersonal relationship, the importance of personal
responsibility, and the values of spontaneity and authenticity in the service of achieving self-actualization as the ultimate goal of human development.

In linking specific theories and models within the fields of psychology and education that formed the basis of program design, I have utilized a methodology in which three main areas have been differentiated. An individual's behavior (B) is a function of her/his (P) interaction with the environment (E). Maple Valley's definition of individual needs are understood in relation to Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" and Rogers' personality dimensions. The psychoeducational goals of the program were established in the context of Rogers' definitions of the fully-functioning person. The methods and strategies of the program were determined primarily by the work of A.S. Neill at the Summerhill School as well as the specific therapeutic methodologies of Rogers' client-centered therapy and Perls' Gestalt Therapy. Thus, Summerhill, Rogerian psychology and Gestalt Therapy combined to provide a consistent theoretical base in the Early Years of the Maple Valley program.

The Maple Valley program itself was most definitely a living expression of a social and cultural context that existed within a unique period in modern history. The convergence of a "cultural revolution" in which the Human Potential Movement validated a collective search for authentic identity provided alternatives to the perceived oppression of society in general and education in particular. The work of Charles Reich and Theodore Roszak clearly
outline and analyze this context and its concomitant offspring that come to be known as the Alternative Schools Movement.

In this specific description and analysis of the Maple Valley program in its Early Years, I return to the utilization of the Behavior-Person-Environment model as an organizing frame in which to define individual needs, determine psychoeducational goals and understand programmatic design. Again, the underlying assumption is that individual behavior (B) is a function of her/his (P) interaction with the environment (E).

The nature and definition of the student population can be illuminated by noting two case studies representative of typical students. The "child in distress" was very different from the "child seeking enhancement." One's history consisted of past internalized turmoil and failure; the other was forward seeking for an alternative congruent with identified humanistic values. Individual needs were analyzed from a global perspective in which the need for positive self-regard and the recognition of the uniqueness of each individual were predominant. The determination of psychoeducational goals and objectives centered around the development of self-actualized, fully-functioning individuals. The primacy of regarding each student's journey toward self-actualization as fundamentally unique implied that all goals had meaning only within an individualized and subjective context; this was the only basis upon which individual goals were differentiated. In regard to the environmental design, Hunt and Sullivan postulated components that
included cultural setting, school setting, school characteristics, school organization, teacher personality, teacher attitude and teacher behavior. Within these constructs, I have outlined specific Maple Valley methods and structures that were clearly and extensively modeled after the design of the Summerhill School itself.

The final section of this chapter involves a summary examination in which the effects of the theoretical applications to program practices both promoted and inhibited all of the above areas. In general, it is clear that the theoretical underpinnings were instrumental in the creation of a program that was able to enact many of the predictions of those theories. As time progressed and data was generated, the ongoing evaluative process of program planners identified an increasing state of disequilibrium in which there existed structures that were increasingly inadequate. New ones had yet to be formed.

This process resulted in a very clearly emerging stage of transition for the program. The planners again returned to the utilization of the B-P-E paradigm as a means of developing those new structures to better attend to this disequilibrium. Thus, the process of constructing an environment to respond to specific psychoeducational goals based on an understanding of individual needs was reinstated on a more systematic basis than had previously been employed. The stage was now set for a new era of the Maple Valley experience—-The Middle Years.
CHAPTER III
The Middle Years (1976-1979)

In this section I will examine several important areas necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the Maple Valley program during this period. The first major component consists of an analysis of the program's theoretical underpinnings. This discussion will include a profile of the program's underlying conception of human development as well as a more detailed description of those specific theories and models which significantly impacted on program design itself. Emphasis will be placed on determining ways in which individual needs, psychoeducational goals and corresponding methodologies were defined by those models.

Secondly, an extensive examination of the program's design and implementation during this period will be provided. This analysis will highlight the following six areas:

- a profile of the socio-cultural context existing during this period (e.g., the movement from alternative school to human service agency)

- a description of the changing nature and definition of the student population. Particular emphasis will be given to the ways in which student needs were determined.

- a study of the ways in which the program's psychoeducational goals and objectives were established.

- an analysis of the parameters of the program's environmental design with particular emphasis on methods and structures utilized at the time.
an identification of the ways in which original theoretical conceptions were reconsidered in light of ongoing practice and implementation, and, finally,

- a chapter summary which includes a profile of a transitional framework providing linkage to the next programmatic stage: "The Later Years"

The Behavior-Person-Environment model (Lewin, 1936) (see: Overview and Methodology section) will be used as the primary vehicle for the purpose of organizing the aforementioned analysis. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.
Theoretical Underpinnings of the Maple Valley Program

Theoretical Conception of Human Development

In order to provide the reader with a comprehensive view of the Maple Valley program at this stage of its development, it is necessary to profile the program's underlying theoretical orientation regarding human development. As in the previous chapter, (The Early Years), the operating assumption is that this underlying conception of development and change is a central aspect of the program's overall construction. Following this summarization, I will examine those theories and models within the fields of education and psychology which had a significant impact on program design and implementation. The aforementioned discussion will provide a theoretical context within which one may more clearly understand the ways in which program planners formulated their conception of student needs (P) along with corresponding methods (E) and goals (B).

In general terms, the primary theoretical movement delineating the first and second programmatic stages concerns a new and overriding emphasis placed on the meaningful translation of psychological theory and therapeutic practice into educational design. The philosophical tenets regarding human development derived from the Humanistic/Existential tradition continued to represent the program's basic orientation throughout the Middle Years (see: Theoretical Underpinnings--The Early Years). However,
toward the end of the Early Years stage (see: Theory Applied to Practice: Evaluative Notes--The Early Years) the school's staff became increasingly aware of a variety of programmatic gaps and weaknesses; many of these appeared rooted in the limitations of these theories themselves. The work of Carl Rogers, A.S. Neill, Fritz Perls and Abraham Maslow is credited with helping program planners formulate their initial theoretical conception. It is significant that each of these theorists was originally trained in and directed much of his professional work and research within the fields of psychology and psychotherapy. In the case of Carl Rogers and, more notably, A.S. Neill, (founder and director of the Summerhill School) substantial attempts were made to extrapolate what they understood to be cardinal principles of human development and then place these principles within an educational frame. Given the nature of the program's perceived deficiencies, program planners began to search for more direct educational models rooted in the Humanistic/Existential framework that might provide them with the necessary guidance.

It was the field of Humanistic Education (sometimes referred to as Psychological Education or Affective Education), with its emphasis on promoting personal growth and development through curriculum development and innovative educational design, that appeared to offer program planners a rich and varied array of resources. Humanistic Education models such as Gerald Weinstein's and Mario Fantini's (1970) "Curriculum of Affect" and George Brown's
(1971, 1975) "Confluent Education" would ultimately come to exert a significant measure of influence in shaping the Maple Valley program during the Middle Years.

The primary task of Humanistic Education is to bridge the worlds of psychology and education. Alfred Alschuler (1969) states, "At the joint frontier of psychology and education a new movement is emerging that attempts to promote psychological growth directly through education courses. Educators...are beginning to accept these courses along with the unique content and pedagogy as appropriate for schools." It was noted in the Early Years chapter (Theory Applied to Program Practice: Evaluative Notes) that it was simply not enough to inundate children with powerful techniques aimed at eliciting affective and psychological material and then to "hope" they would be able to utilize this data in meaningful ways. Gerald Weinstein and Mario Fantini (1970), in commenting on this phenomenon, argue that as a result of the ease with which affective techniques are becoming available, critical issues are being overlooked in the process. These issues include the determination of an adequate goal framework as well as the necessary level of teacher competency. They further argue for a more disciplined and rigorous approach directed toward the establishment of carefully constructed programs or courses rather then a mere "grab-bag" of techniques. Thus, we see a potential match between programmatic needs and these educators' ideas.

In summary, during the Middle Years stage, the Maple Valley
program began to make a transition away from a preoccupation with
the laissez-faire libertarian approach and toward a more systematic
approach to helping children realize their potentialities. Within
this context, program planners recognized the need to move beyond
what had been an amorphous and free flow approach toward a more
organized, sequenced, focused and perscriptive format. It is for
this reason that planners began to explore and ultimately employ
various humanistic education models in an effort to enhance the
school's psychoeducational program. The collective formulations of
Gerald Weinstein, Mario Fantini, George Brown and others, as
interpreted by program planners, helped to guide the Maple Valley
program through its next developmental stage—The Middle Years.
These models would ultimately have their greatest impact in the
program's definition of the learning environment (E) and learning
outcomes (B); the conception of the person (P) remained relatively
constant.
Theoretical Conceptions: Understanding Individual Needs (the "Person")

This section will be directed at defining the basic ideas of those theories and models which functioned as programmatic cornerstones during this period. The discussion will begin by identifying those aspects of the program's original theoretical conception of individual needs (see: Theoretical Conceptions: The Early Years) which continued to represent its underlying operating premise. Following this discussion, I will examine new theoretical perspectives which began to influence the ways in which program planners construed student needs.

The ideas of Abraham Maslow (1970) and Carl Rogers (1958) regarding their conceptualization of individual needs, (see: Theoretical Conceptions: The Early Years) remain in a superordinal position as the Maple Valley program moves into its Middle Years. Specifically, Maslow's (1970) Hierarchy of Needs and Rogers' (1958) Seven Areas on the Change Process of Client-Centered Therapy continue to represent the theoretical parameters within which student needs were defined. Both Maslow and Rogers view human nature as inherently positive and forward moving. From this perspective human development is understood as a natural striving for increased autonomy, self-direction, self-responsibility and self-awareness.

However, it was during this period that program planners began
to search for educational models rooted in the Humanistic/Existential framework that might provide them with additional guidance. Although the area of individual needs was not the primary thrust of this ongoing investigation (given the staff's relative satisfaction with the current formulation), planners were able to derive some benefit nonetheless. Theorists and practitioners in the field of Humanistic Education were committed to clarifying and translating principles of human development into functional educational curricula. It is within this context that a modified (from the more psychological conception) construction of individual or student needs developed.

Weinstein and Fantini (1970) identify student concerns as the primary basis upon which the educator should develop appropriate goals and strategies. It is their view that these concerns are more stable and meaningful than a student's expressed interest. Interests may be more transitory in nature, and not necessarily representative of underlying concerns. In this sense, concerns are more fundamental and reflective of the individual's real needs. Therefore, it becomes essential that the educator accurately assess the individual's or groups' concerns, taking into account whatever factors or variables (i.e., socio-economic background) are necessary for a comprehensive understanding. From this perspective, the value of a proper diagnosis cannot be overemphasized. A case in point may be found in Weinstein's and Fantini's description of a lively discussion occurring in a science class regarding the subject of
evaporation. The point is made that, at a surface level, the
teacher might be inclined to misinterpret the high level of interest
as an expression of interest in the subject matter itself. However,
in this particular instance, the class's interest in the notion of
evaporation more accurately reflects their concerns or fears
regarding the whole concept of change and permanence. Simply, the
children were anxious and wondered "If water can disappear--can't
I." At the point concerns are accurately diagnosed, they may then
be used as the functional basis in merging affect and cognition
within a curriculum aimed at helping children to more effectively
manage their concerns.

The results of Weinstein's and Fantini's study indicate that
childrens' concerns may be broken down into three primary areas
identity, connectedness and power. Identity concerns relate to the
child's self-image. The area of connectedness regards the nature of
the child's world of social relationships, "where one fits in the
scheme of things." Power concerns pertain to the child's perception
of control over her/his life.

In a fundamental sense, Weinstein's and Fantini's formulation
appears to be a repackaging of basic tenets of individual needs as
expoused by Maslow and Rogers. However, this should by no means be
construed as a diminishment of the value of their conceptualization.
Weinstein's and Fantini's formulation is important in that it
provides the educator with an operational framework within which
children's needs are outlined in such a way as to facilitate the
construction of well-conceived curricula. It was on this basis that their formulation positively contributed to a redefinition of Maple Valley's approach during the Middle Years (see: The Middle Years--A Description and Analysis of the Maple Valley Program).

In theory (as opposed to practice), Weinstein's and Fantini's conception of children's needs is related to the formulations proposed by Maslow and Rogers in a number of ways. For instance, in Maslow's (1970) Hierarchy of Needs, esteem needs are defined as the individual's striving for an increased sense of adequacy, mastery, competence, self-respect, recognition and achievement. This view is quite similar to Weinstein's and Fantini's notion of identity concerns. In addition, esteem needs (particularly in the areas of mastery and competence) also appear related to power concerns in that they reflect the individual's striving for a measure of control over her/his life. Maslow's recognition of the individual's need for belongingness, affection and love seems to subsume Weinstein's and Fantini's notion of children's need and concern for connectedness. Maslow defines these needs as the individual's relationship to family, roots and community. Particular emphasis is given to the individual's sense of connection with her/his peer group. Finally, Maslow's characterization of safety needs pertains to the individual's pursuit of stability, order and structure in her/his environment. This view appears related to Weinstein's and Fantini's conception of power concerns. However, as stated earlier, Weinstein's and Fantini's notion of the child's concern with power
and control may also be related to Maslow's view of mastery needs.

Carl Rogers (1959) places great emphasis on the individual's self-image and the centrality of the role positive regard plays in facilitating the individual's development of a healthy self-structure as a primary component of personality development. From a Rogerian point of view, self-image represents a foundational cornerstone. For instance, aspects of the individual's self-image may be found in each of Roger's Seven Areas in the Change Process of Client-Centered Therapy (1958) (see: The Early Years--Theoretical Conceptions: Individual Needs). In this sense, Weinstein's and Fantini's notion of identity concerns is interwoven throughout much of Roger's work. Furthermore, in the Seven Areas in the Change Process of Client-Centered Therapy (1958) those aspects of personality development that are given prominence in Rogers' overall schema are highlighted. Several areas or "strands" are fundamentally related to Weinstein's and Fantini's construction of children's concerns. Specifically, strands four and seven may be correlated with Weinstein's and Fantini's view of the child's concern with connectedness. Strand four regards the individual's ability to effectively communicate her/his experience to others, while strand seven refers to the individual's ability to form intimate relationships. Strands five and six are similar to Weinstein's and Fantini's conception of the child's concern with having a sense of power or control over her/his life. Strand five focuses on the individual's capacity for flexibility and openness to new
experience while recognizing the full range of options and choices before her/him. Strand six pertains to the individual's ability to "own" or take responsibility for her/his own problems and life while seeking to cope as effectively as possible.

Similarly, other theorists in attempting to translate psychological theory into educational practice, have defined individual needs in related terms. Glasser (1965), in an effort to apply his Reality Therapy model to the schools, has isolated two basic human needs that must be addressed in any effective program; they are love and self-worth. Bessell and Palomares (1970) have extensive experience in the areas of psychotherapy and human development. They argue that in order for any educational program to achieve maximum results in promoting mental health, it must attend to three basic needs of the child. They are: the child's need for increased awareness of how s/he truly feels and behaves; the child's need for a sense of mastery regarding her/his overall perception of competence and self-confidence; and, her/his need to develop an expanded repertoire of skills in the area of social interaction. Schutz's (1973) work in the area of group dynamics and group encounter resulted in his view that individuals have three basic interpersonal needs which must be addressed in order for growth and development to progress. The need for inclusion concerns the nature of the individual's relationship to others. Control needs refer to the individual's perception of power and influence over the course of her/his life. Affection needs are primarily a reflection of the
individual's ability to give and receive genuine caring.

In summary, the conception of student needs/concerns proposed by Weinstein, Fantini and others, while not substantially different from the views espoused by Maslow and Rogers, does in fact offer the psychoeducator a more functional road map. The models proposed by the theorists cited in this section directly and specifically address the needs of children in such a way as to facilitate the development of well-conceived curricula. For the Maple Valley staff, this additional refinement of individual needs played a positive role in helping to guide the program through its Middle Years.

The Definition of Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

In this section I will examine the theoretical basis upon which psychoeducational goals and outcomes were established at Maple Valley during the Middle Years. While the central aim continued to be the promotion of fully-functioning, self-actualized individuals, program planners began to reinterpret this umbrella construct in such a way as to allow for a more organized and sequenced differentiation of learning outcomes. Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) Curriculum of Affect and George Brown's (1971) Confluent Education functioned as primary resources for program planners in this regard.

As was the case in the previous chapter, psychoeducational goals may be viewed as a mirror reflection of the ways in which
individual needs are understood. Therefore, as the Maple Valley view of individual needs began to shift in terms of the tendency to construe student needs in an educational context, the definition of learning outcomes also began to accrue a more educational character.

Weinstein and Fantini (1970) have developed an educational model that attempts to address student needs/concerns in ways that ultimately increase the child's ability to effectively manage her/his concerns and conflicts. This paradigm provides the basis of a well-organized psychoeducational framework which places greater emphasis on expanding the child's behavioral repertoire than on attempting to alter the nature of the concerns themselves. Along the same lines, Weinstein and Fantini argue that it is more important to deal with the behavioral manifestations of childrens' concerns than to place great emphasis on accurately labeling them. It is the teacher's role to help a child who may be dealing with her/his concerns in a dysfunctional and irrational manner to learn a more productive approach. At the point that a child has mastered various strategies for more effectively managing her/his concerns, it may then be appropriate for the teacher to directly examine the nature of the concerns themselves. A basic premise of this educational paradigm is that a curriculum or program should not simply reflect the teacher's awareness of student concerns without directly addressing, in a deliberate and systematic manner, the child's ability to more effectively negotiate these concerns.
In addition, Weinstein and Fantini maintain that positive development of children's skills in managing their concerns (power, identity, and connectedness) can and should lead to discernable behavioral changes. These behavioral changes, directly reflective of the individual's underlying concerns, are primarily expressed in a child's statements. Thus, outcomes may be stated in behavioral terms indicating that learning has occurred. Weinstein and Fantini (1970) cite as an example a case wherein a teacher is working with a group of poor, inner-city children who possess a collective and all-pervasive sense of powerlessness. These children experience little, if any, degree of control over their overall condition. It is clear that the teacher cannot "teach" these children power in any direct sense. Rather, if the teacher is to establish meaningful goals, s/he must determine what a child would do or say that would indicate an increase in the child's own sense of power. This would make it possible for the teacher to then cite instances of the child's emerging sense of control over her/his life. Thus, instances in which a child demonstrated an ability to conceive of new strategies for overcoming obstacles, identify beneficial resources or manipulate things in order to arrive at a particular goal would all be examples of learning outcomes stated in behavioral terms. Statements such as "Why don't we try out this idea" rather than "Why don't we just give up, we'll never be able to do it anyway," may be indicative of a child's increased sense of control over her/his life. Below is a chart depicting positive movement
in a child's perception of power (Weinstein and Fantini, 1970)

Table VII

Positive Change in Self-Concept Reflected in a Child's Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Point</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- statements and/or behavior which reflect a child's poor self-image</td>
<td>- statements and/or behavior which reflect a positive quality regarding a child's self-image.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Example:
- "We're dumb"
- "You have to be stupid or crazy to be in this class:

For Example:
- "I am special"
- "My eyes are special"
- "I feel special"
- "I was made special"

Weinstein and Fantini (1970) make the point that in the example cited above, both the classroom teacher and the field staff conducting the study regarded the poem ("I am special") as a genuine expression of feeling. This point is critical because in some instances the child may simply be offering a cliched response in attempting to tell the teacher what s/he believes s/he wants to hear. Therefore, they warn against automatically ascribing real learning based on the verbalized statements of students. Clearly, it is essential that the teacher accurately assess the authenticity of these expressions. In attempting to discern a child's progress by specifying behavioral outcomes, humanistic education programs
(such as the one proposed by Weinstein and Fantini, 1970) will naturally move toward a more carefully sequenced and evaluated format, and away from an "affective grab-bag" or "go with the flow" approach. Finally, Weinstein and Fantini (1970) emphasize the necessity of differentiating learning goals based on the varying needs of a particular group. On that basis, learning goals may appear entirely different from group to group.

In George Brown's (1971, 1975) "Confluent Education" model, the overriding emphasis is placed on "merging affective experience with cognitive curriculum material" in order to make the subject matter more relevant and generally meaningful to students. In his first work, Human Teaching for Human Learning (1971), Brown outlines five pilot units geared for the classroom and developed by the Ford-Esalen staff. These units are in the areas of English and Social Studies at the secondary school level. It is interesting that several of the units do not delineate learning goals and objectives. This practice was not uncommon in much of the humanistic education literature of that period. The underlying (if somewhat amorphous) aim was to facilitate the development of fully-functioning, self-actualized individuals. However, in one particular unit, geared for a tenth grade English class for "slow learners," general course objectives are defined as follows (Brown, 1971):
1- To gain an understanding of the novel.
2- To gain a further understanding of human beings.
3- To see ourselves in the lives of others.
4- To further skills in communication and critical thinking.
5- To further skills in the use of language, verbal and non-verbal means.

In the lesson cited above, a clear attempt is made to target specific course objectives. Several learning outcomes appear more global and amorphous in nature (e.g., "To see ourselves in the lives of others."); others are more distinguished by their potential for behavioral definition (e.g., "To further skills in the use of language, verbal and non-verbal means."). It is clear that at this stage of the development of the Confluent Education model great emphasis was not placed on delineating learning outcomes in behavioral terms. However, given the unique nature of the model (the integration of subject matter learning with personal awareness), the definition of goals and outcomes is generally more concrete and tangible than was the case with many of the purely intrapersonal or interpersonal models.

In a later work, The Live Classroom (1975), Brown reports the findings of the D.R.I.C.E. (Development and Research in Confluent Education) project, sponsored by the Ford Foundation. The results of this investigation included a more refined definition and conception of the "essential ingredients of confluent education" (Brown, 1975). According to the report, confluent education represents a systematic and deliberate effort to promote the "...knowledge, skills, and feelings which tend to produce increased
integration in the individual and society (differentiated unity)” (Sharipo, 1975). The model aims at providing an intentional yet flexible framework whereby personal responsibility and spontaneity of the whole individual is facilitated.

Confluent education is linked to and subsumed by the general area of humanistic education in that it shares a common and unifying philosophical basis. Both Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) Curriculum of Affect and Brown's (1971, 1975) Confluent Education are designed to translate the fundamental precepts of Humanistic/Existential psychology into educational paradigms in a deliberate and systematic manner. The two models differ in that one schema, (Curriculum of Affect), concerns itself primarily with children's intrapersonal and interpersonal needs/concerns and promotes the establishment of learning goals that indicate the degree to which children are better able to manage their concerns. The other paradigm (Confluent Education) is rooted in the integration of subject matter type of learning and the development of personal awareness and established the type of learning goals that are indicative of the child's progress along both dimensions.

In summation, Maple Valley's conception of psychoeducational goals remained firmly rooted in the Humanistic/Existential theoretical framework. The superordinal aim continued to be the development of fully-functioning, self-actualized individuals. However, through the integration of two humanistic education models, as interpreted by program planners, the Maple Valley program began
to differentiate learning goals in a more systematic and deliberate manner. In addition, the entire notion of delineating learning outcomes in behavioral terms, which was dismissed by program planners during the Early Years as being largely antithetical to the overall programmatic thrust (see: The Early Years—The Definition of Goals and Objectives), was reexamined and ultimately afforded significant value, particularly within a more defined educational arena (see: The Middle Years—Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives).

Defining Methods and Strategies (the "Environment")

This section will examine the theoretical models used by Maple Valley program planners in the design and implementation of psychoeducational methods and strategies during the Middle Years. Particular attention will be given to those environmental ingredients principally drawn from the areas of Humanistic Education and Group Dynamics which impacted most significantly on program design.

The program's trend toward a more organized, sequenced and focused learning environment represented the central movement during the Middle Years. As noted earlier, (The Early Years—Theory Applied to Program Practices: Evaluative Notes) program planners were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the laissez-faire/libertarian approach employed throughout the Early Years. During the program's earliest years, great emphasis was given to making certain that children's "rights" were protected above all else. It
was the emerging view of program planners that the enormous emphasis placed on "rights" was, in fact, becoming an impediment in terms of providing children with the necessary types of learning opportunities. It was becoming increasingly clear that children required systematic opportunities to develop critical intrapersonal and interpersonal skills; these skills would enable them to translate experiential data into meaningful learning which is generalizable across time and situations. Thus, program planners began to examine a variety of models that offered the potential of facilitating the development of a more differentiated learning environment.

Rozak (1978) offers a distinction between the libertarian and affective "streams" of educational reform. This delineation helps to illuminate Maple Valley's progression from the Early Years to the Middle Years. According to this view, (see: The Early Years—A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context: the Alternative Schools Movement) the libertarian approach is primarily concerned with providing individuals opportunities to grow freely and openly and does not seek to prescribe or direct the learning experience. During its Early Years, the Maple Valley program clearly reflected a libertarian orientation. In this respect its approach was quite similar to other "Free" or alternative schools in that they were rooted in a basic libertarian ideology.

The affective educational "stream" emphasizes the systematic establishment of learning opportunities that promote human development. The overriding aim is to help individuals to fully realize
their potentialities. This position represents a subtle yet significant shift away from the notion of children's "rights" per se toward a more deliberate attempt to facilitate personal growth. On a more philosophical level, both the libertarian and affective perspectives share a common romantic basis. Both view the individual as inherently positive and forward moving. Also both approach the learning process from a fundamentally non-authoritarian, client-centered position. From Roszak's (1978) point of view, a key distinction between these two "streams" centers on the institutional challenge represented by the libertarian view as contrasted with the theoretical redefinition posed by the affective school. The libertarian orientation is primarily concerned with counteracting what is regarded as the deadening and dehumanizing nature of the educational system while the affective approach is directed toward the establishment of learning opportunities that foster psychological development.

Mario Fantini (1974), in outlining the relationship between the Alternative School Movement and the Humanistic Education Movement, highlights several commonalities rooted in a romantic theoretical underpinning. Characteristic of this relationship is a commitment to offering students the opportunity to have a substantial voice in charting their own destiny and environment, valuing the uniqueness of each individual, emphasizing an honest and open communication between all school members, focusing on the promotion of emotional or affective development, fostering a high
level of intimacy between school members, offering "humanistic consideration" to staff members as well as students, and providing children with opportunities to make real choices in expressing their own interests. In a similar vein, Sprinthall (1975) argues that much of the impetus for the ongoing development of affective or psychological education programs came from the experiments in alternative education of the late 1960s and early 1970s particularly those occurring outside the "system." These innovative programs represented a redefinition of conventional counseling practices in that it placed the entire conception of counseling into the very center of school life. From this perspective, counseling was no longer regarded as an isolated activity (on an individual or group basis) separated from either the specific classroom or the overall school environment. Sprinthall (1975) maintains that those traditional formulations perpetuated by those in the counseling or counselor education "field" were proving no longer viable. "Slowly but surely the evidence and the intuition grew that counseling activities apart from the classroom were unsuccessful" (Sprinthall, 1975). Many traditionalists in the field found this position quite difficult to accept. Through the living example of those early alternative school programs, it became increasingly clear that conventional paradigms could not succeed and that the type of programmatic redefinition proposed by the Humanistic/Psychological Education movement offered great promise.

Ivey and Alschuler (1973a) offer a definition of
psychological education that speaks directly to the issue regarding the role of counseling in the school situation. It is their view that the thrust of psychological education is directed toward the educational and preventive nature of counseling rather than emphasizing remedial aspects. Counseling's primary function from this perspective is the teaching of mental health to individuals and larger groups in such a way as to facilitate the individual's capacity for "intentionality" i.e., the ability to access a range of alternative behaviors to a variety of constantly changing situations. Ivey and Alschuler (1973b) stress the need to "demystify" the entire helping process so that parents as well as children can function as active participants. In addition, it is their view that the area of school norms should also undergo a process of demystification to allow for a more open and meaningful treatment of key adolescent concerns, such as the areas of human sexuality and drugs. In this context, the counselor is recast as psychoeducator whose primary aim is to help individuals clarify and define their own goals and helps to facilitate development of realistic strategies to enable the student to reach their desired ends. Ivey and Alschuler (1973b) caution the psychoeducator to direct her/his energy to the development of programs that promote "long-term internalization and integration" of learning rather than opting for a "quick fix" or short-term "high." Internalization is understood as having been achieved "...when a skill, idea, value or motive has been voluntarily incorporated into the person's repertoire to such an
extent that the behavior has become the person's own" (Ivey and Alschuler, 1973). From this point of view, internalization is regarded as the primary goal of any well-designed psychological education program.

In *Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect*, Weinstein and Fantini (1970) propose a model to be utilized by psychoeducators in the design of curricula for personal growth. The model consists of a functional outline for linking affect with cognition in such a way as to promote the student's capacity for long-term internalization and integration of learning experiences. The central aim is to help students to develop an array of strategies which increase her/his behavioral repertoire in more effectively managing her/his underlying concerns. Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) "curriculum of affect" consists of several key steps that must be considered in designing an effective curriculum for personal growth. The first consideration regards the identification of the unique nature of the learning group (i.e., the socio-economic background). Following group identification, it is important that the educator accurately assess the level of group concerns/needs (see: *The Middle Years--Understanding Individual Needs*). It is important that the teacher bear in mind that although children's concerns may appear similar in nature from group to group, they may indeed need to be approached quite differently depending on the unique idiosyncratic composition of a particular group. For instance, an upper-middle class group of white
adolescents concerned with acquiring more control over their lives would need to be approached quite differently from similar needs expressed by a group of poor, inner-city black teenagers. Following the necessary diagnostic activities is the determination of learning outcomes which, by their very nature, seek to ascertain the student's increased ability to more effectively manage her/his concerns. The next step involves the selection of an organizing idea which functions as a "cognitive hook" enabling the student to begin conceptualizing the content material. This conceptualization provides a "bridge" for the student in that it connects experiential data with cognitive learning and also provides a basis upon which the teacher may continue to develop the curriculum. Once the organizing idea has been selected, a content vehicle must be chosen that best bridges student concerns with the organizing idea and specific learning outcomes. The content vehicles may include traditional academic areas such as literature or civics, or may involve a range of non-traditional areas such as a community-based project. An important consideration in selecting an appropriate content vehicle is that it facilitates the children's grasp of the organizing idea and thereby promotes movement toward desired outcomes. Upon selection of the content vehicle, the practitioner must determine what types of learning skills are necessary in order for the students to utilize the content vehicle and achieve the specified goals. These skills may include basic skills as well as "learning-how-to-learn" or problem-solving skills. The next step
involves the selection of specific teaching procedures that are best suited to helping students learn the essential learning skills. Weinstein and Fantini (1970) point out that in choosing a particular teaching procedure, the teacher must be cognizant of both the learning style of the students as well as the necessity of choosing techniques that are likely to elicit the greatest affective material. Finally, any well-conceived curriculum must include a built-in process of ongoing evaluation which not only highlights the degree to which curriculum goals are being met, but also provides a mechanism in which to assess new areas of student concern. Below is a graphic representation of Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) model for curriculum development.

Table VIII
A Model For Psychological Curriculum Development
In the same work, Weinstein and Fantini (1970) developed another design model they called the "trumpet." This model was first conceived of and utilized as a means of refining and clarifying the processes described above. It was viewed as an economical way to sequence both the content and procedures of a design format. The trumpet defines the process of personal integration as having three distinct phases: awareness, abstract thinking and conscious action. As a psychoeducational tool, the trumpet has evolved over time. As mentioned earlier, its original use had been to aid the practitioner in the construction of well-conceived curricula. However, over time it became increasingly clear that the trumpet was also effective when used in a direct way as a tool for personal growth. In a later work, Weinstein (1976) describes his efforts in utilizing the trumpet as an instrument to be employed by students in their role as "self-scientists." Weinstein (1976) defines the function of self-science as a program designed to aid students in developing "...skills, concepts and attitudes that will expand their self-knowledge concerning their own unique style for being in this world." According to Weinstein, the primary aim of this endeavor is to increase the learners ability to more accurately perceive their internal and external condition and to be more "intentional" regarding their decision-making processes. At a more basic level, the trumpet attempts to apply principles of the scientific method to the area of personal development. In this sense, the model may be viewed as a systematic means of helping
individuals examine personal content data on both experiential and cognitive levels. Below is a graphic illustration of the trumpet (Weinstein, 1976).

Weinstein proposes that the trumpet may be effectively utilized as a personal "processing guide" in helping the student through her/his own personal inquiry. Upon identification of a particular concern, the self-scientist then begins to process
her/his personal data. Below is a brief outline of possible processing questions (Weinstein, 1976) to be used at different stages of the inquiry.

Confrontation and Inventorying Responses
- What actually happened? Explain your actions.
- What were the feelings you had?
- What were your reactions to others like?
- Can you remember any physical reactions?

Recognizing and Clarifying Patterns
- Are your reactions typical of the way you respond? How?
- Under what specific conditions might you respond in a similar fashion?
- Complete the following sentences:
  "Whenever I'm in a situation where _______, I usually experience feelings of _______. I tell myself _______ and what I do is _______."

Owning Pattern by Clarifying Function
- How does your pattern benefit or work for you?
- If you were to train an actor to portray you in your pattern, what would s/he have to do?

Considering Consequences
- Is your pattern doing a good job for you?
- What price does your pattern exact from you each time you use it?
- Is using it worth paying the price?

Alternatives
- In an ideal sense, what would a new and better response be to similar situations?
- How would you be behaving?
- Would you be feeling anything new?
- What are some possible behavioral experiments you might try in the future?
- Choose one or two experiments that have the greatest potential for success.
- What might impede or sabotage your success?
- What is there about you that will help you to succeed?
Note: Try out these new behaviors in similar and appropriate conditions. Then, check-in with another individual as to the nature of the outcomes of your experiments.

Making Evaluations
- What were the results of your experiment?
- What were some of your thoughts and feelings during and after your experiment?
- Did you end up changing any of your methods?

Choosing
- What conclusions are you now able to make about old and new behaviors?
- What are some of your feelings about the entire "trumpet" process?

Weinstein (1976) suggests that an individual's meaningful integration of the trumpet process may be evidenced by her/his ability to successfully complete the following sentences.

"Whenever I ______ (confrontation), I anticipate that ______ (thought), so I usually ______ (feelings, behaviors, typical reactions). I react that way in order to get and/or avoid ______ (function). But in the process ______ (consequences, price paid). So what I would really prefer is ______ (ideal end state). The last time I found myself in that situation I tried ______, ______, and ______ (experiments). I liked what happened when I tried ______ (specific experiment), so from now on I am going to ______ (choice).

In a later work, Weinstein (1976) once again utilizes the trumpet in the design and implementation of a curriculum for personal growth as well as an intrapersonal processing guide. The dual value of the trumpet as both a curriculum organizer as well as an instrument for self-inquiry is thereby reaffirmed. As a curriculum organizer, the trumpet outline promotes the selection of learning opportunities that enable students to move beyond mere
"awareness" and toward the meaningful translation of awareness into ongoing life experience. Weinstein (1976) argues that in the absence of this type of attention, there exists a potential for personal growth-oriented activities to end up as segmented, disparate experiences that are thematically unrelated to one another and ultimately of little value in any real long-term sense.

George Brown's (1971, 1975) "Confluent Education" model represents a well-conceived effort aimed at integrating academic instruction with personal growth and development. According to Brown (1971b), the fundamental question is "Is there any way to establish a relationship between this content and the student's life?" The primary goal from this perspective is to attempt to blend cognitive with affective learning in a course curriculum. To illustrate this point Brown (1975) describes a lesson in a high school literature class wherein the group is studying a particular novel. As part of the lesson plan the teacher utilizes the characters' experience in the novel as a means of encouraging the students to examine what their own feelings and reactions might be in a similar situation. If, for instance, the protagonist in the story is one who is striving for success against great odds, the students might be asked to recall instances in which they encountered a similar dilemma. This approach would not only enable students to gain greater insight into the characters and story, but would also create a golden opportunity for students to encounter self.
Gestalt Therapy underlies much of the confluent model in that it consists of a process which characterizes learning as an individual's movement "...from experiencing to conceptualization to integrating and experiencing... It applies both to learning about the self and learning about the world" (McCarthy, 1975). This view is easily transferable to the area of curriculum development in that it provides a basis for linking subject matter learning with personal development. Along these lines, Alschuler and Ivey (1973) argue that "Gestalt may be even more important as a teaching tool than as a therapeutic alternative" (see: The Early Years--Defining Methods and Strategies).

Stewart Shapiro (1975) outlines a model originally developed by the D.R.I.C.E. (Development and Research in Confluent Education) staff for use by teachers in formulating a confluent-based curriculum. He begins by defining confluent education as "...a deliberate purposeful evocation by responsible, identifiable agents of knowledge, skills, attitudes and feelings which flow together to produce wholeness in the person and society." He then outlines several key ingredients which must be present in the confluent approach. The first essential component of any confluent plan requires that both students and staff approach learning in a climate of mutuality and respect in which each participant accepts responsibility for the learning process. Furthermore, learning must involve the interaction and interpretation of thoughts, feelings and behavior. Academic subject matter must be relevant to students'
lives and should in some way speak to the students' underlying concerns/needs. The study of self must be regarded as meaningful and legitimate subject matter. Finally, the primary intrapersonal and interpersonal goal must be the development of the "whole person within a humane society" (Shapiro, 1975).

With the aim of providing teachers with a functional "map" in order to help them plan a confluent lesson, John Shiflett (1975) developed a model somewhat more specific than Shapiro's (1975) which incorporates many of the same elements as Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) curriculum paradigm. Shiflett's (1975) model begins with the teacher's task of clearly identifying the unique group of learners. Following this identification process, the teacher must carefully assess the learners' concerns or "blockages" which play a key role in the development of the curriculum. An instructional design format including learning outcomes is then constructed which attempts to merge the particular subject matter with the personal development of the learners. Shiflett (1975) uses the term "loadings" to describe units of study which may vary but continue to remain rooted in the overall confluent framework.

Finally, George Brown (1975) emphasizes the need for psychoeducators to view confluent education as not merely another effective technique or opportunity to make academics more palatable to children. To the contrary, Brown regards his schema as inexorably linked to a view of human development and learning which must be fully integrated into the practitioner's fundamental vision.
The field of group dynamics and, more specifically, the area of sensitivity training, represents another major theoretical influence on the Maple Valley program during the Middle Years. Of the many theories and schemata relating to group process prevalent during this period, the model developed by William Schutz (1973) provided the greatest resource to program planners. Staff interest in Schutz's model (as was the case with the psychological education models described above) was indicative of programmatic movement in the direction of a paradigm which outlined a more deliberate means of assessing and intervening in group process and development. The area of group work began to be construed by staff as an additional opportunity to systematically teach a range of interpersonal skills that included issues of leadership and control, interpersonal perceptions and feedback processes, decision-making and scapegoating mechanisms.

At the heart of Schutz's (1973) model lies the premise that individuals, or group members, have three primary interpersonal needs: inclusion, control and affection. These interpersonal needs are not only significant in terms of individual dynamics but also are characteristic of a developmental sequence for group process. This developmental progression is not rigid in nature, although a fairly typical pattern of group life may be charted. Inclusion needs generally occur first. Questions such as, "Do I want to be part of the group?" are typical of this stage. Following inclusion themes are control issues manifested in such questions as, "What
role do I want to play in this group?" Affection needs represent the next major movement and are reflected in questions such as, "How close to others do I get?" Additionally, in each of these phases, group members typically focus their attention initially on the leader before focusing on members.

Inclusion refers to a member's need to know where s/he fits in the group and whether or not s/he is in the group or relegated to the role of outsider. The notion regarding to what extent an individual will make an investment in and commitment to the group represents a central theme. In making this decision, a group member initially pays great attention to the leader's behavior while considering to what extent the leader is expressing concern for her/him. Upon reconciliation of this issue, the individual begins to focus on the behavior of other group members and generally places emphasis on issues relating to attendance and punctuality as signals of the member's level of commitment.

The next interpersonal factor to come into play upon resolution of inclusion issues concerns the individual's need for control. Involved in this area are issues relating to decision-making, sharing responsibility and distribution of power. These issues typically manifest themselves in a struggle for leadership and increased competition. The individual is greatly concerned with her/his level of responsibility, albeit too much or too little. Once again, the initial struggle revolves around the the member's relationship to the leader and generally manifests itself in one
of two ways. Either the member attempts to seize power from the leader and take all responsibility for the group's activities or s/he expresses a measure of hostility toward the leader and serious disappointment with the way things are going, and questions the leader's competency. Upon resolution of this theme, the individual may enter into a sibling-like rivalry with other members for the leader's attention and approval. In a sense, this struggle may be characterized as a struggle for control of the group minus the leader; thus we see a struggle for the informal leadership of the group.

Once inclusion and control issues have been worked out, group-level affection themes become predominant. It is at this point that it becomes clear to members that a group does, in fact, exist. It is upon recognition of this unity that the area of emotional connectedness between members takes "center stage." Members strive to reach a level of equilibrium regarding the giving and receiving of affection. Typically, there exists much anxiety regarding the nature of members' level of intimacy with each other. This anxiety may manifest itself in heightened group-level emotional exchanges. As in the previous two instances, affection issues are initially directed toward the leader. Questions such as, "Does the leader like me?" and, "Do I like him?" become central. Also, feelings of jealousy regarding the leader's affection behavior toward other members begin to dominate the intrapersonal and interpersonal agenda. Once the issues concerning affection toward the leader have
been worked out, feelings that members have for each other tend to permeate group life. Interpersonal relations formed in the group begin to come to fruition. Members typically experience a more meaningful level of communication which feels more comfortable and more effective.

The central idea in Schutz's (1973) model is the assertion that specific group-level developmental stages are more pervasive at different points in the group's life. However, all the issues which comprise a given stage description are present all the time. It is, therefore, conceivable that a particular individual's experience may not be synchronized with the group's process. On a final note, Schutz (1973) argues that termination issues within the group tend to play themselves out in the opposite developmental progression. That is, affection, control and then inclusion. An individual's termination process may manifest itself in the withdrawal of investment, or reducing her/his level of participation. If the individual is experiencing a particularly difficult time with separating from the group, s/he may attempt to shift the responsibility to others by forcing them to reject her/him. For some individuals, termination and separation issues may be so painful that, in fact, they may seek to establish and maintain an emotional distance from the group right from the outset.

Of course, the specific relevance of this model is directly applicable to program design in a number of ways. Groups exist in a school in a variety of forms--ranging from formal classroom
situations and staff work groups to informal social groupings amongst both students and staff. In addition at Maple Valley, the entire school functioned as a group via the community meeting process. Thus, Schutz's model provided an important generic tool to address issues related to environmental design.

In summation, the work of Weinstein and Fantini and George Brown in the field of Humanistic/Psychological Education and William Schutz in the area of group development elaborated the theoretical basis underlying the Maple Valley program during its Middle Years. During this period, the program's design began to shift away from a libertarian orientation and toward a more organized, prescriptive and deliberate format. Gerald Weinstein's and Mario Fantini's models for curriculum organization and personal inquiry, provided the program's staff with new tools for the promotion of personal growth. George Brown's confluent education model offered the staff a functional paradigm in their efforts to merge subject matter learning with personal development. Finally, the work of William Schutz in the area of group development enabled the staff to more systematically and effectively diagnose and intervene in group process. Thus, we can see that each model provides a rather sequential perspective regarding human development and is able, on this basis to make a positive contribution to Maple Valley's program during the Middle Years.
A Description and Analysis of the Maple Valley Program

A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context

"After the Greening". When Maple Valley opened its doors in September 1973, society appeared fully consumed in a cultural metamorphosis referred to by Reich (1970) as the "Greening of America." This movement, (see the Early Years—A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context) was comprehensive in nature and was directed at combating societal ills on a number of levels. Theorists such as Reich and Roszak both recognized the underlying political and economic thrust of this new "movement"; however, they both regarded the reclamation of selfhood, personal identity and self-discovery as the central ingredient.

Roszak (1978) described this cultural activity as a "counter-culture" movement which consisted primarily of white, middle class youth rebelling at the war in Vietnam, large-scale corruption, hypocrisy, poverty, technology "out of control", the emptiness and artificiality of culture, but most of all the "loss of self."

Throughout this era, there appeared to be a significant interplay between social/political activism and a search for selfhood. Many individuals subscribed to a view that placed the drive for self-discovery as a first step in the establishment of all other social allegiances. This collective view came to be known as the
"Human Potential Movement." The central idea was to legitimize the basic human need for personal development. The emphasis on self-discovery and personal growth found a natural philosophical "home" in the context of "third force" (Maslow, 1968) psychology. Third force or Humanistic/Existential psychology emphasized the individual's capacity for goodness, creativity and freedom. This underlying view of human nature may be juxtaposed with the determinism of Freudian psychoanalysis and the mechanism of contemporary behaviorism. At the height of the Human Potential Movement there existed a number of new therapies rooted in this optimistic forward-moving psychology of personal growth. During the Early Years, many staff, including the original founding group, personally identified with and regarded the Maple Valley vision as consistent with the basic tenets of the Human Potential Movement. Maple Valley was originally conceived of as a therapeutic community where each and every person's development—child and adult alike—was regarded as primary.

Thus, we come to mid-decade. By this time, the war in Viet Nam had ended as did an era of protest. The dynamic interplay between the personal consciousness-raising of the Human Potential Movement, and the social/political activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s appeared to disintegrate. The social upheaval which had been channeled into activism aimed at rectifying economic and political injustice appeared to come to a "screeching halt."

Virginia Helm (1979) states that by the late 1970s the
alternative education movement had undergone a profound metamorphosis as well. The alternative schools of the early 1970s were characterized by a rebellion against the dehumanization of the public system, a defiance against the perceived destructiveness and arbitrariness of authority, rules and regulations, an idealized or romantic view of the student and the learning process itself. These origins stand in sharp contrast to the alternative schools of the late 1970s which are characterized by their emphasis on working within the public school system. This shift ultimately had an impact in transforming or "mainstreaming" many of the attributes of the earlier private experiments; many of the more radical principles and procedures were discarded or diluted upon integration into the public domain.

The cultural activity, which for a number of years had held the promise of transforming society into a more just and humane world, had undergone a profound alteration. A number of theorists (Marin, 1975; Schur, 1976; Lasch, 1979) describe the expression of this cultural metamorphosis, as a collective flight into self-absorption or widespread narcissism which would ultimately come to be known as the "Me Generation." Edwin Schur (1976), in outlining the dangers of this collective escape into self-absorption, argues that self-awareness had come to represent the new panacea. "Across the country, Americans are frantically trying to 'get in touch' with themselves to learn how to 'relate' better, and to stave off outer turmoil by achieving inner peace" (Schur, 1976). He believed that
this "awareness trap" was quite compelling for many and posed grave social consequences. A fundamental flaw in this "awareness game" is the assumption that increased personal awareness will ultimately express itself in a healthier world. From this point of view, of course, "openness and honesty" most certainly do not result in the eradication of poverty and social injustice. Therein lies the central problem in approaching serious societal dilemmas in self-awareness terms. Schur argues that by the mid 1970s the awareness movement had reached its destructive height in that it encourages "...people to withdraw from the political and social actions that are needed" (Schur, 1976). He does suggest, however, that this manifestation was clearly not what "...early awareness enthusiasts had in mind." The underlying view here is that during the latter part of the 1970s the personal growth movement had gotten off track. It had not only become disassociated from social/political activism; it had, in fact, come to represent an impediment for social change. Schur tragically outlines the juxtaposition of white middle class individuals engaging in sensory relaxation exercises while seeming to ignore the real suffering of so many disenfranchised Americans. According to him, "We are...in peril of being 'facilitated' out of whatever glimmerings of social conscience now inform our behavior" (Schur, 1976).

Christopher Lasch (1979) wrote an even more scathing indictment of the "Me Generation." He declares that the once vital period of political and cultural activism of the late 1960s and
early 1970s had degenerated by the mid-1970s into a full "...retreat from politics and a repudiation of the recent past" (Lasch, 1979). Lasch argues that the collective preoccupation with the self had manifested in a narcissistic moral climate. In a similar vein, Marin (1975) uses the EST therapeutic movement to illustrate the deterioration of meaningful social activism. It is his view that EST training may be the unfortunate distortion but natural extension of the Human Potential Movement of the past decade in its "...refusal to consider moral complexities, the denial of history and a larger community, the disappearance of the other, ...and the reduction of all experience to a set of platitudes" (Marin, 1975). Each of the theorists cited above view the effect of the "Me Generation" as the denial and avoidance of meaningful social responsibility.

The mid-1970s marked a critical juncture in the life of the Maple Valley program. The program's leadership was confronted with the necessity of redefining the school's underlying purposes and direction from an internal perspective as well as reassessing its relationship to the larger society. In sharp contrast to the collective narcissism described by those theorists cited above, Maple Valley program planners and staff underwent a period of reassessment which ultimately led to a firm resolve to utilize what was known about the promotion of human development and reach out to those disenfranchised segments of society which had previously been untouched by either the Human Potential Movement in general or the
Maple Valley program in particular. In simple terms, Maple Valley staff, unlike many whose roots lie in the Human Potential Movement and Alternative School Movements, came out of the late 1960s and early 1970s with a strengthened sense of social responsibility. Many alternative schools were unable to make the necessary internal alignments to enable them to redefine their mission in a socially relevant context. Maple Valley's redirection in terms of its growing relationship with those segments of society which it had been previously "out-of-touch" with was spurred on by significant changes occurring within the public domain.

In 1972, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed a highly progressive piece of legislation in the area of education termed "Chapter 766." This "Comprehensive Special Education Law" was considered at the time to be the most daring piece of legislation in the nation. This special education act conceived of in 1972 was first implemented on a statewide basis during the 1975-1976 school year. The act was intended to address historical inadequacies and inequities by defining the needs of children requiring special education in a broad and flexible manner. Implicit in this notion was the recognition that children manifest a variety of characteristics and needs, all of which ought to be considered if the educational potential of each child is to be realized. Furthermore, it was the view of those individuals responsible for the conception of this legislation that historical practices in the area of special education, such as the
psychoeducational labeling of children's needs (which all too often resulted in unnecessarily stigmatizing children), and the rigidity and narrowness with which many special education programs had been administered, needed to be rectified.

During the 1975-1976 school year a local school superintendent advised and encouraged Maple Valley to seek out licensure and formal approval as a special needs school. Maple Valley was thus approved. It was the view of this public official and ultimately the Maple Valley leadership that the program offered a therapeutic environment which provided potential benefit to many children who for a variety of reasons (ranging from school-related problems to difficulties of a familial nature) were "failing" in the public system. These were children who, for the most part, either as a result of a de facto exclusion based on social class or simply as a matter of a lack of exposure, would not have naturally found their way to a program such as Maple Valley.

By the beginning of the 1976-1977 school year, Maple Valley had firmly established a partnership with the public sector which not only concretized the staff's desire to develop and broaden the program's social/political impact but also enabled many children who were having serious difficulties in a traditional set-up to enroll in the Maple Valley program. This marked the beginning of a new era of social responsibility and involvement for the Maple Valley School.

From this historical perspective, the central task of the
development of the Maple Valley School required the navigation of a course among several competing forces. As the social context reversed its outlook from an outer-directed focus (political/social activism) to an inner-directed absorption (the "Me Generation") program planners were determined to enhance the school's social commitment to the disenfranchised. In this vein, Maple Valley risked the fate of other alternative schools who either disbanded or saw its vision diluted via integration into the public arena. The challenge of the school was to remain private and affiliate with the public sector in a way that would not significantly encroach upon its self-defined mission.

Using the Behavior--Person--Environment Model: An Introduction

As initially stated in the Overview and Methodology section, the B-P-E model will be used as the primary vehicle for the purposes of defining individual needs, determining psychoeducational goals and understanding programmatic design. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.
The Nature and Definition of the Student Population (the "Person")

At the beginning of the 1976-1977 school year, there were twenty residential students and six day school students enrolled in the program. The students ranged in age from thirteen-years-old to nineteen-years-old (a demographic profile of the student population will be provided at the end of this section). Toward the latter part of the Early Years stage, the composition of the student population began to shift in significant ways. For example, it was no longer possible for program planners to automatically make assumptions—assumptions previously regarded as basic—concerning the nature of a child's psycho-social and familial background. Program staff were beginning to encounter adolescents (referred to the program by a myriad of educational and social service agencies) who, in many instances, had lost all contact with any member of their family of origin. These were children who were truly caught in the social service "treadmill" of moving from residential program to foster home to group home and around again. They had, in effect, been "institutionalized." Thus, at the outset of the Middle Years, the profile of the student group was beginning to accrue a significantly different psycho-social character. A case study presentation follows which offers specific information regarding a range of idiosyncratic characteristics. This will provide a basis upon which inferences can be drawn to clearly illuminate the nature of the student population during this period.
The Typical Student: A Case Study

In order to provide a functional context for understanding the ways in which program planners conceived of the Person (in psychological terms), I will offer profiles of representational types of students attending the Maple Valley program during this period. In addition to student groups previously characterized as "the child seeking enhancement" and "the child in distress" (see: The Early Years—The Nature and Definition of the Student Population), we now add "the disenfranchised child." By the year 1976 (the beginning of the Middle Years stage) a number of socio-cultural as well as intra-program factors converged in such a way as to dramatically impact on the changing nature of the student group (see: The Middle Years—A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context). For instance, as a result of the demise of the "counter culture" movement, there were fewer and fewer children from families who were either committed to or interested in making the types of educational choices that placed their children outside the "system." This type of child ("the child seeking enhancement") in most cases had been clearly capable of "success" within mainstream parameters. As Helm (1979) points out, this was particularly true as a result of the adoption and integration of many of the attributes of earlier private experiments into the public system. Thus, at the beginning of the Middle Years stage, there were but a few of these children attending the program, and by the end of this period, there were none.

During the Middle Years stage, "the child in distress" (see:
the Early Years--The Nature and Definition of the Student Population) continued to represent a fairly substantial segment of the student group. As exemplified by the case of "Aaron Feldman," the composite profile of this type of child remained generally consistent. These children typically came from middle class families in which they were generally regarded as "problem children." In most cases, this designation was synonymous with a rather lengthy history of family turmoil, characterized by profound anguish and frustration which typically manifested in a pervasive sense of dissolution and despair. Parents of these children appeared desperate to consider any educational approach that offered the slightest hope. These children typically entered Maple Valley with feelings of anger and confusion and poor self-concept along with a formidable history of failure and rejection. Many had encountered the painful stigmatization associated with academic under-achievement. Most were well behind grade levels in academic subject matter areas. By the time these children reached the latter primary grades, they had begun to act out their pain with behavior that was clearly inappropriate and unacceptable within a traditional classroom situation. They either were unable or unwilling to conform to familial and school expectations. Upon initial interview and examination of the school, both parents and their children were willing to make the necessary commitment to and investment in the program.
The Disenfranchised Child:

The disenfranchised child can be identified within a very specific socio-cultural context. During this stage of the school's development (1976-1979) the program had established a vital relationship with a myriad of public sector human service and educational agencies charged with the education, care and protection of children (see: The Middle Years--The Socio-Cultural Context). For the very first time, program staff were encountering adolescents quite different from any they had previously known. These were children who all too often (with good reason) experienced the world as a painful, hostile and unpredictable place; many had been seriously neglected and abused. In some cases there existed the threads of family connection; in others, all ties to the family of origin had been completely severed. Many of these children were placed in the custody of the state child welfare system. In contrast to the "child in distress," the "disenfranchised child" had been either seriously neglected or completely abandoned by parents; s/he was also of significantly lower socio-economic status. In practice, a child would be referred to Maple Valley via a social worker or social psychologist. Upon examination of referral materials, a program director would determine the appropriateness of arranging for a personal interview based on the extent to which the child's needs and program design appeared to be a "good match." The interview format consisted of the child, program director, parent (if at all possible) and a social worker or school psychologist.
Once the interview was completed, a pre-placement visit was arranged provided that all parties involved were in agreement. This visit generally lasted from three to five days; at the end of such time the child and program director would meet to determine if a mutual commitment would be made to work together. Once this commitment had been established, the child was admitted into the program. It is important to note that these children generally appeared quite stricken with the level of intimacy and informality of the Maple Valley atmosphere. In many cases, this represented a most attractive feature for children yearning for a caring community of which they could be a part.

Sonny enrolled in the Maple Valley program in June, 1978; he was fifteen years old. Sonny was referred to Maple Valley by the Group Care Unit of the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. Following is a composite sketch of Sonny's psycho-history taken from his original referral materials. Sonny's biological father deserted him, his mother and two younger brothers when he was just a few years old. His mother was left with all the child-rearing responsibilities. Sonny's mother remarried when he was nine years old. She stated in an official report that Sonny had always been a difficult child who would not obey her or her new husband. It was on this basis that they petitioned the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to have Sonny removed from the family and placed in a residential treatment/school setting. The original plan called for Sonny to remain in a residential setting for at least two years;
upon successful completion, he was to be returned home. After a little more than a year in that program (a positive and happy year for Sonny), Sonny's tenure was abruptly terminated. Social workers involved in Sonny's case were growing more and more concerned that his parents might abandon him and move to Florida. They hoped to force his parents to assume parental responsibility by removing Sonny from the residential program and return him home. Once again, Sonny was thrust into a most unpredictable and psychologically-jolting and unstable situation. Soon after being reunited with his family, Sonny's mother deserted him, his two younger brothers and his stepfather. According to official transcripts, Sonny's mother never explained why she left. Sonny (now age fourteen) expressed complete surprise regarding his mother's desertion. He said that while he had had no idea that his mother might leave, he did recall her "often crying in her room." At the time of her departure, the mother ruled out any possibility of maintaining any type of relationship with her children. Furthermore, she fully consented to relinquishing all forms of legal guardianship of her three children, and formally rejected any further involvement in their lives.

In the aftermath of this tragedy, Sonny's stepfather placed the blame for his wife's departure squarely on the children, often-times singling out Sonny as the primary target. It was not long after the schism that Sonny's stepfather's behavior began to rapidly deteriorate--manifesting itself in heavy bouts with alcohol. He often left the children unattended to for rather lengthy periods.
Within a period of five months after separating from his wife, Sonny's stepfather rejected all three children and formally assented to giving up any interest in legal guardianship. As in the case of Sonny's mother, his father severed all contact with the children with no visitation under consideration. He is alleged to have physically abused all the children, oftentimes targeting Sonny for the worst treatment.

At fifteen, Sonny was quite slender and frail with dark curly hair. He presented himself in a quiet and rather passive and polite manner. Sonny's numerous educational and psychological assessments indicated that while he had considerable intellectual potential, his destructive familial history caused him to fall significantly behind in his school subjects. After being abandoned by his natural father and rejected by mother and stepfather, Sonny was devastated; he trusted no one and kept his distance from people, particularly adults. It was, at this point, in the wake of complete disintegration of Sonny's family, that he was invited to join (without his two brothers) a neighbor's family with the expressed hope of establishing formal legal bonds. After a three-month period, Sonny's new "foster mother" contacted the Department of Public Welfare and stated that Sonny must leave their home because his problems were "too severe for her to handle" along with her own two children. It was the opinion of social workers involved in his case that Sonny was not at all ready to accept another family situation upon experiencing yet another rejection; the commonly held view was that
his placement into the foster family had apparently been a grievous error. Sonny's all too fragile self-concept was dealt another devastating blow. A new plan was constructed (with Sonny's input and consent) to place Sonny in another residential school setting. It was everyone's hope that through providing Sonny with a therapeutic school program he might at some future point be more able to accept another family situation that might offer him stability and also be willing to make a long-term commitment to him.

In the late spring of 1978, after an engaging and positive interview, Sonny came to Maple Valley for his pre-placement visit. During his visit, he made friends quickly with several staff members and other students. Sonny was most resistant to participating in regular classes since he viewed them as yet another potential arena for failure and resultant pain. Maple Valley appeared to offer Sonny just the "right blend" of intimacy; i.e., an environment in which he might develop genuine relationships with both peers and adults without being thrust into and confronted with the more intense level of intimacy generally reserved for families. Sonny's initial visit to Maple Valley was a most positive experience. He liked the program very much and wanted to become a member of the school/community. Sonny enrolled in the program with hopes that it might be a place where he could settle down and "get off the roller coaster."
Analyzing Individual Needs:

It was during the Middle Years that program staff were confronted with integrating the realities of a different "type" of student (as outlined in the previous case study) with the broader theoretical underpinnings of defining the "person." During this period, the Maple Valley perspective regarding the nature of the individual remained firmly anchored in a Humanistic/Existential theoretical framework. Individual development continued to be viewed as a process fueled by a natural and positive striving for self-direction, self-awareness and self-responsibility. However, it was at this time that program planners began to search for educational models--rooted in romantic ideology--which defined student needs in more functional ways. For instance, in Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) model, the areas of identity, connectedness, and power are at the core of their conception of individual needs (see: The Middle Years--Analyzing Individual Needs). This formulation in a fundamental sense represents a "repackaging" of theoretical notions outlined by prominent Humanistic/Existential authors such as Maslow and Rogers. However, this point should in no way be construed as a diminishment of the value of Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) conceptualization. Their paradigm was particularly helpful to program planners in that it provided an operational framework for defining student needs that facilitated the development of well-conceived psychoeducational planning. Thus, for Maple Valley staff, this represented an additional refinement of their conceptualization
of individual needs. In addition to program design this model impacted most significantly on the establishment of short and long term goals.

The "disenfranchised child" typically entered the Maple Valley program in a state of psychological devastation. These were children whose very self-structure had been decimated by years of environmental neglect, abuse and deprivation—particularly from those closest to them. From a Maslowian perspective, the most basic need for many of these children reflected the degree to which they experienced the world as unsafe and others as untrustworthy. The first major task for Maple Valley staff was to provide these children with a safe environment consisting of real caring and stability. This reality characterized the essential distinction between the "child in distress" and the "disenfranchised child." It is true that both types shared deep psychological turmoil. Both possessed extremely poor self-images, dysfunctional and destructive behavior patterns and little or no ability for taking responsibility for their feelings, thoughts or behavior. However, unlike the "child in distress", the "disenfranchised child" had suffered protracted periods of severe environmental deprivation (ranging from unfulfillment of basic physiological needs to parental abandonment). The scope and depth of this deprivation resulted in qualitatively different psychological needs.

The following excerpt from a staff interview (see: Appendix C) illustrates her understanding of the ways in which individual needs
were programmatically conceptualized during the Middle Years:

...As the school grew and changed towards a population which was not so mature, and was not there out of a philosophical choice, I think that we needed to change in order to accommodate their changing needs. They needed clearer lines and different kinds of therapeutic activities. It's real difficult dealing with adolescents who have been through the kinds of trauma that those kids had. It challenged us. We didn't want to be "heavies" and draw lines that would restrict their freedom and limit their responsibility. We learned that freedom does not always heal.

(Lowell--staff)

Weinstein and Fantini (1970) substantiate the necessity of clarifying the unique nature of the client population as the very first step of any effective psychoeducational approach. It is their view that although children share primary concerns regarding identity, power, and connectedness, groups may need to be approached quite differently depending on their unique idiosyncratic composition. For instance, a "child in distress" from a middle class background has a very different perception of issues relating to power than might the "disenfranchised child" from the working class simply as a result of their socio-economic status. Similarly, careful consideration of the unique attributes comprising the psycho-historical profile of this new "type" of child was also extended into the examination of their individual needs in the areas of identity and connectedness. This differentiation was an essential factor in the staff's ability to "contact" these children and help them to design meaningful psychoeducational plans.
From a Rogerian perspective, these "disenfranchised children" were engaged in a desperate struggle to preserve what existed of a sense of self-worth. Often this difficult process would translate into the denial of a great deal of experience from the child's developing awareness. Thus, the more estranged these children became from their experience, the more "blocked" and arrested was their development. In terms of Rogers' personality dimensions, these children evidenced the following characteristics: general inability to recognize and/or express their feelings, disengagement or distance from their immediate experience and inability to utilize the self as an inner referent, typical unawareness of contradictory statements regarding themselves, a desire to avoid self-disclosure, being "locked" into a fairly rigid system of personal constructs which they would regard as a matter of fact, fear of and closed to change and a tendency to disregard personal problems or keep them external and apart from the self, and an overall view of themselves as tentative and quite risky.

Thus, it may be said that "the disenfranchised child," primarily as a result of the severity of environmental deprivation, entered the Maple Valley program in a psychologically damaged state that often manifested itself in a desperate struggle for self-esteem. These children may be characterized in terms of the lower ends of both the Maslowian and Rogerian paradigms (see: The Early Years—Understanding Individual Needs). Program staff placed a great deal of emphasis on these factors when attending to
children's concerns in the areas of identity, power and connectedness (Weinstein and Fantini, 1970) in a new and more differentiated manner.

Table X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17/9</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>85% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16/11</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>80% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16/11</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>70% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

In outlining Maple Valley's psychoeducational goals during this stage of its development, it is important to reemphasize the fundamental relationship that these goals had to the underlying conceptualization of student needs. While the program's primary aim continued to be the facilitation of fully-functioning, self-actualized individuals, program planners were beginning to reinterpret this very broad theoretical construct in such a way as to allow for a more organized and sequenced differentiation of learning outcomes. Program staff were becoming a good deal clearer in terms of the nature of the "...desired changes in thoughts, actions, or feelings of students that a particular course..."
(Bloom, 1963) or overall program should effect. Program planners began to utilize educational models in an attempt to clarify student needs in such a way as to enable the focused development of more educationally-oriented goals and methods. The essential programmatic thrust was to establish educationally-oriented goals within functional mental health parameters. Thus, from a staff perspective it remained more important for a student whose self-esteem had been devastated as a result of years of "failure" with respect to their schooling to develop a stronger sense of self-confidence than to return to the "appropriate" grade level by the end of the term. The shift in programmatic emphasis was evidenced by the increased significance given to the development of children's processing skills—the types of skills that would enable them to manage their internal and external lives more effectively. The goal of helping children to expand their behavioral repertoire took on an equal status with the program's prior emphasis on facilitating a process whereby dysfunctional or destructive aspects of a student's personality would be reworked or reeducated. Simply, behavioral skills for self-management were highlighted as an important programmatic aspect.

During the Middle Years, the programmatic commitment to viewing each student's journey as fundamentally unique continued to manifest in an individualistic and student-centered approach. In the Early Years, this framework was interpreted in such a way as to systematically exclude the establishment of any goals for subject
matter areas to avoid externally-rooted timelines applicable to any aspect of the learning process, and to completely reject all attempts to utilize the role of behavioral specificity in the establishment and definition of psychoeducational goals and outcomes. It was the staff's view that meaningful goals associated with human development were far too broad and complex to be evaluated on the basis of behavioral criteria. This notion is consistent with Combs' (1975) view that qualities associated with self-actualizing individuals are not geared to behavioral measurement. The psychoeducational models developed by Weinstein and Fantini (1970) and George Brown (1971, 1975) inspired program planners during the Middle Years stage to initially reassess and ultimately redefine their approach to the establishment of learning outcomes.

Program planners were influenced by the ideas of Weinstein and Fantini (1970) with regard to behavioral specificity in the area of personal growth. This specificity might be employed as an additional tool in helping to determine to what extent learning has occurred. Program staff began to reexamine the notion that growth, or learning, was inherently far too ethereal to be behaviorally discernable. Furthermore, program staff began to systematically utilize students' expressed statements as a functional barometer or indicator of discernable behavioral change. Accordingly, Brown's (1971, 1975) Confluent Education model, particularly in its more advanced stages, also utilizes specific short-term and behavioral
learning outcomes in the context of integrating subject matter learning with the development of personal awareness. This model provided program staff with an example of a set of learning goals indicative of a child's progress along both continua.

Following are several accounts taken from Maple Valley School records of assessments made by staff regarding student development. Certain reports pertain to a student's overall developmental progress; others are specific to subject matter areas. Regardless of the particular context within which the assessments were made, the underlying orientation in terms of the way learning progress was construed (by staff and students) is evident.

A fifteen-year-old girl's ("a child in distress") overall progress is outlined in an "Evaluation Team Progress Report" of December, 1977. The report covers a period of three months. (Note: the evaluation categories were the actual ones used at the time and all names, both staff and student, have been altered for the purpose of confidentiality.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Team Progress Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student - Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Psychoemotional Development**

Mary has made extraordinary strides in her emotional growth. Her self-esteem, as evidenced by her confidence, openness in communication, and willingness to risk involvements, seems to expand almost daily. This personal progress pervades all of her activities and efforts at Maple Valley.

Increasing self-awareness has been a central part of Mary's development. She is more able than ever before to identify and describe her inner processs--her
feelings, her thoughts, her likes and dislikes, and her personal values. This is linked to her heightened perceptual skills, enabling her to communicate clearly to students and staff alike the impact of their behavior on her. In times of difficulty and tension, she actively seeks the support of friends and close staff members rather than sinking into a more isolated posture. Mary is still subject to rapid and extreme shifts in mood, but her time perspective is lengthening so that she is less afraid of the permanence of any given emotional state.

As a result of Mary's growing confidence and personal clarity, she is also remarkably more decisive and assertive. She is much more willing to make her needs and wants known. This has been particularly evident in community meetings; in the summer, Mary's most characteristic contributions were statements of indecision and ambivalence, "I see both sides of this issue and I don't know how I'm going to vote." Such a statement from Mary is rare now--she participates and lets people know where she stands and why.

Mary is now showing the first glimmers of initiative and creative self-direction which are the next developmental steps for her. As her self-concept continues to improve, she will exert more control over her internal states and assert herself more effectively on her environment.

Social Development

Mary's individual growth has been apparent in and supported by her social development. She has made a number of close friends and these relationships have enabled her to test her changing self-image with her peers. Her principal bonds are with girls of approximately her own age and there has been a mutually supportive identification in femaleness and in school interests. This has been encouraged by her participation in Person Class and Women's Studies. Mary has grown in her capacity to lead as well as follow and to differentiate her own values from those of her friends. In maintaining her appearance and personal hygiene, Mary is directly translating her new confidence into a more successful and broader social repertoire.

With adults, Mary has established a number of close relationships. These carry over from classes and
activities into frequent personal contact. She seeks out support and guidance as well as nurturance and is more able to accept positive feelings from significant adults.

Community Involvement

Mary is one of the most dedicated and involved participants in community meetings. She uses the meetings as a forum for issue clarification and conflict resolution: she contributes her own ideas and feelings. When her rights have been violated, she has shown herself capable of staunch commitment in settling the dispute or dealing with responsible parties. As indicated earlier, Mary has really changed in her willingness and ability to take firm stands and make clear public statements.

Outside of meetings, Mary is a frequent participant in a variety of activities. Field trips, whether during school hours or at night, are a favorite activity and she enthusiastically promotes them. She is a recognized authority on movies and television and her room is usually a center for "hanging out" in the evening.

Academically, Mary's participation has been mixed. In the self-oriented Person Class and Women's Studies, she has been a steady and active member. Otherwise, her main involvement has been in math where classes are almost entirely individualized. Language arts and social studies have not been active areas for Mary except informally, where she has read and discussed stories with staff members. She is taking more classes all the time now and we see her as increasingly able both to risk academic effort and to channel her efforts productively.

The overall philosophical tenor of this assessment is naturally linked to progress reports written during the Early Years (see: The Early Years—Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives) and can also be distinguished by several key elements. Firstly, there exists an abundance of behavioral data upon which interpretations are based, such as, "Her self-esteem, as evidenced
by her confidence, openness in communication, and willingness to
risk involvements, seems to expand almost daily." In another
example, the assertion regarding Mary's increasing self-awareness is
substantiated by her increased ability to "...describe her inner
processes—her feelings, her thoughts, her likes and dislikes, and
her personal values." In addition, there is a marked emphasis on
the expansion of Mary's intrapersonal and interpersonal behavioral
repertoire. This growth is reflected by her progress in the areas
of conflict resolution (i.e., "In times of difficulty and tension,
she actively seeks the support of friends and close staff members
rather than sinking into a more isolated posture.") and asser-
tiveness (i.e., "She is much more willing to make her wants and
needs known."). Mary's "new found" assertiveness is contrasted
with a typical statement from her of an earlier period—"I see both
sides of this issue and I don't know how I'm going to vote." Under
the "Social Development" section of the report, Mary's progress in
developing mutually supportive female relationships is supported by
her involvement in "Women's Studies." This is an important factor
in that it not only provides behavioral data supportive of a central
hypothesis but also describes a class activity—confluent in nature,
where both personal awareness and informational learning are
occurring (see: follow-up report on Mary's involvement in Women's
Studies). Finally, Mary's high level of participation in community
meetings (under the "Community Involvement" section of the report)
illuminates her progress in several of the areas outlined above.
Following is a brief report regarding Mary's involvement in a "Women's Studies" class which took place during the same period.

**Evaluative Report**

**Name of Student** - Mary  
**Class/Activity** - Women's Studies

Mary attended Women's Studies regularly and her commitment to the group was high. She used the class well—as a special, safe environment for sharing personal feelings, questions and ideas. She was determined in having the group remain exclusively women as she is not secure in her interactions with men.

During this segment, we discussed our mothers and fathers—who they are in our lives, what qualities in them we choose to model, how are relationships with them have grown and changed, where we would like to see those relationships go in the future--; dealing with aggressive men; grooming styles, and femininity. We played group games reflecting our friendship and the goodness of having fun together. We also focused on positive new things in our lives and shared dreams as a way to question and gain insight into ourselves.

Mary also had energy for theater—beyond what was available to her at the school this term. She is talented in drama and her love of dramatic play resulted in a talent show organized by her and another student. I was excited that she could make this happen for herself, as well as the school.

This report is particularly informative in that it highlights the overall course goal of merging subject matter learning with the development of personal awareness. Learning about "grooming styles" and "femininity" is blended with the disclosure of "...positive new things in our lives, and shared dreams as a way to question and gain insight into ourselves"--in order to make the educational process that much more meaningful.

The following evaluative report, written August, 1979,
concerns the initial progress of a fifteen-year-old boy—a "disenfranchised child."

Assessment and Planning Conference
Six-Month Period

Student Name - Dick  Date - August, 1979

I. Review of Goals:

A. Child
   Goals set forth in Dick's six-week report included increased self-esteem and self-confidence, developing appropriate peer and community interaction, and academic/vocational preparation. Dick has made progress in all of these areas.

B. Family
   Family goals included assisting Dick in managing conflict with his foster family, and in resolving issues with his mother. These have been partially met.

C. Program
   No special program modifications have been made for Dick. It was felt that our small size and frequent opportunities for counseling on every level would be effective in meeting the above goals.

II. Assessment:

A. Child
   Dick's first weeks here were quiet and successful. However, this "honeymoon" period soon gave way to a vigorous round of testing the limits and authority. Dick's pre-placement history mentions several cases of problems with authority figures, and this certainly became the case here. Dick seemed suspicious of both individual authority figures and institutional authority (rules, structures, etc.), and took a very negative view of all of these. He seemed to want to test, to beat the system and people, and consequently assert his own power over the situation. His behavior at this time was characterized by rule-breaking, manipulation and deceit.

   Nowhere were these attitudes and patterns more
evident than in Dick's relationship with the program's director, and it was largely in the context of this relationship that they were met and eventually reversed. Through this individual, and other staff members, Dick was confronted with his manipulations, his power struggles. He was consistently held accountable for his actions. At the same time he was offered a new, different model for adults and adult relationships. Again, largely through this director, Dick was shown adults that could be trusted, could care about him and could help him. Dick responded well to this director, and to other staff members, and eventually progress was made.

As Dick developed trusting relationships with adults here, he began to let go of the authority battles. Perhaps as he learned to trust those in power he could relax his need to control and assert his power. The testing has stopped and is now limited to genuine, legitimate questioning of things he does not understand or agree with. Dick is by and large respectful of the rules and has shown his ability, especially in situations where he has been granted extra privileges, to behave responsibly within the context of these rules. Also, as Dick learns to trust adults, he seems more willing to reveal more of himself and his true feelings (no longer using power struggles to hold people off and remain invulnerable). Dick is better able to express his feelings clearly, and to make realistic choices based upon them. He is learning to deal with anger and frustration in ways that allow him to be heard and get what he needs openly, and in a way that does not alienate him from others.

Dick's self-image is greatly improved. He is very proud of his achievements: He has kept his room in excellent condition, held a job for much of the summer, and has respected school rules. In marked contrast to his earlier negative attitudes, Dick seems truly invested here. He wants to be here, and has defended the program to outside acquaintances.

Dick's peer relations have also improved. He gets along well with most of the students. His closest friend seems to be his roommate. The most dramatic improvement in this area has been in Dick's
ability to manage conflict. His style in peer conflicts when he was first here was marked by manipulation, backbiting and behind the scenes maneuvering. Now, Dick is looking for and finding alternatives to this pattern. He is learning to deal and confront more openly, and in ways that, again, maximize effectiveness and minimize alienation.

Dick has developed trusting, caring relationships with adults here. He is particularly close to the director. He is able to draw on these relationships for support, affection, and counseling. His relationships with other staff members are, in general, good, and based on mutual respect.

Dick's academic progress has been limited. During the spring he was still in the early stages of his development here. This summer, Dick has held an N.Y.C. job, and participated in an activity program at the school. We expect Dick's academic involvement to increase in the fall.

B. Family
Dick went through a difficult period this spring in his relationship with his foster parents. There was an incident where Dick apparently stayed in their house unsupervised without their permission. Dick's foster parents were quite upset with him. This seemed to recall rejection themes for Dick, as he reacted way out of proportion to the incident. He refused for weeks to speak with them or consider returning there. It was very difficult for Dick even to talk about what had happened, and it is another sign of growth that he was finally able to do so with a staff member. A conference was eventually set up between Dick and his foster parents. The conference went very well and Dick returned to their home for a two-week vacation. The vacation also went very well, and Dick now thinks of his foster home not as just a temporary place where they put up with him for a while, but as a home where he is truly cared about.

Dick has had very little contact with his natural mother.
III. Planning

A. Child

1. Short-term Goals
   a) Dick will continue to improve his ability to talk about difficult issues and feelings.
   b) Dick will continue to develop effective conflict-management skills.
   c) Dick will continue to deal openly and honestly with others.
   d) Dick will continue to form trusting bonds with others.
   e) Dick will make progress in basic skill areas.
   f) Dick will begin to consider career/vocational options.

2. Long-term Goals
   Dick will achieve a competency-based high school diploma.

B. Family

1. Short-term Goals
   Dick will continue to build a solid, caring relationship with his foster family.

2. Long-term Goals
   Dick will resolve lingering issues with his mother.

IV. Planning: Discharge

There is certainly more Dick can gain from the Maple Valley program both emotionally and academically. A competency-based high school diploma program which would not penalize him for time missed in other schools is available here. However, should Dick express a desire to leave and live with his foster parents, we would certainly explore that option with him.

The above assessment not only appears to reinforce several key
points made earlier (i.e., the utilization of behavioral data in support of various psycho-social interpretations as well as the emphasis given to the expansion of children's behavioral repertoire) but also illuminates a number of newer evaluative aspects as well. They are: the perceived relationship between this child's "power struggle" with a director and his capacity to form intimate relationships (Schutz, 1973)--"Through the director and other staff members, Dick was confronted with his manipulations and power struggles. He was consistently held accountable for his actions... As Dick developed trusting relationships with adults here, he began to let go of the authority battles." Another noteworthy factor relates to the significance afforded this student's progress in the pre-vocational and job training areas. Finally, it is important to note the increased utilization (as contrasted with reports written during the Early Years) of a short-term and specific-goal framework--"Dick will continue to develop effective conflict-management skills."

The following evaluative report regards the progress of a sixteen-year-old boy in a "social problems" course offered in the spring of 1979.

**Evaluative Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Tony</th>
<th>Class/Activity</th>
<th>Special Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In Social Problems, Tony completed units on reading for content and advertising. He began a unit on propaganda and a final project comparing Maple Valley to Summerhill. Tony's attendance was generally good. However, a combination of personal and school problems
kept him out of class often enough that he fell behind. Tony's attention span is good; he is fully capable of working for a full forty-minute period. He can work independently both in and out of class, with minimal supervision. Tony takes notes slowly but well, and is able to use them for recall of information. Tony is also very responsible about homework assignments. He keeps these, and other important papers, and brings them to class. Tony's reading has improved a great deal, and he still asks for help in this area when he needs it. Tony is still more comfortable with oral than written presentations.

Tony has shown his comfort and ability in many learning situations. He listens well to oral presentations, and asks questions when necessary. In class discussions Tony listens to others, and also volunteers his own ideas. Tony is capable of learning from in-class exercises, but he has a tendency to rush through them, and gets confused. He needs help at these times.

Tony has shown a good grasp of the skills and concepts we have covered. He can outline an article, showing main and subordinate points. In our advertising unit, Tony learned to understand and recognize advertising techniques and pitfalls. Tony is working on a unit on propaganda.

Tony has begun his final project, comparing Maple Valley to Summerhill. With my assistance, he broke this large topic down into specific, manageable issues. He generated ideas about the kind of information he would need and where to get it, and is in the process of gathering that information.

The above assessment highlights a number of noteworthy elements. They are: a very specific breakdown of the content units covered along with a profile of the student's mastery on those areas; a description of the development of the student's "learning-how-to-learn" or process skills (i.e., "He can outline an article, showing main and subordinate points") and a portrait of the student's learning style ("Tony's attention span is good, he is
fully capable of working for a full forty-minute period. He can
work independently both in and out of class""). Finally, the report
ends with a picture of future directions and goals in the particular
subject matter area.

The following excerpts are taken from two separate self-
evaluations written by students in the spring of 1980 covering the
1979-1980 school year.

**Self-Evaluation**

I have worked on my problems to some extent. I've
been more of a help to the staff. I became more
involved in the school and the happenings around Maple
Valley. I've been talking to them (staff) more often
and getting to know them a lot more. I had problems
with adults when I first got here, but I've improved a
great deal. I've gotten better with a lot of the staff,
but not all of them. I still have to work on it. Some
of them haven't got the time to talk. They make
appointments and then they forget about them sometimes.
I don't like that at all.

I've worked on learning to do positive things in
order to get attention, instead of doing negative
things. I used to do things that would get me into
trouble and I would get the attention that I wanted.
Instead, I am doing things that help me as well as help
other people. This way, out of one positive thing two
or more people can or could benefit from it. There
would not be any trouble which is always good. I also
had a negative attitude when I came here that I changed
from bad to good. I came here thinking that I couldn't
trust anyone and that they couldn't help me only hurt me
or foul me up. I was very defiant when I got here.
Then I realized that I could trust some of the people
here and they were willing to help me whenever they
could. They did help me a lot once. I showed them that
I wanted to help. I learned to work with them and then
gain their trust and respect. I am doing really good
for the past four months and I already knew I could do
it. It was just a matter of whether or not I wanted to.
And I did.
Self-Evaluation

Before I came to Maple Valley I was very angry with myself and with anyone who had any authority over me. I would act out my anger by telling people off, getting in hassles in school, running away from home, etc.

I have changed since I came to Maple Valley because I've learned to control my anger, not run from it, but talk about it. I've been able to respect people, even when I'm angry. Maple Valley has helped me because I know people here love and care for me. I have learned how to control my anger by talking with certain staff. I really wanted to change my behavior. My anger was making me unhappy and made me feel bad about myself.

Maple Valley has helped me improve my relationship with my home situation. I have been able to communicate better at home, because I have talked to some staff about my feelings and discovered how I really felt about situations.

I have changed my attitude about authority figures. I now feel that just because they have authority, they still are people. I've also contributed by helping other students when they have had rough times. I can also be trusted.

The above accounts are noteworthy for several reasons. Firstly, they are indicative of the program's self-evaluative format during this period that required attention to self and goals. This process was regarded as having a dual benefit. It was considered therapeutic in and of itself for children to engage in an exercise in self-scrutiny. Additionally, both students and staff could possess a meaningful measure of student progress in areas of student-defined importance that might also be a useful diagnostic instrument for the staff.

The following excerpts from interviews (see: Appendix C) illustrate student perceptions of personal learning outcomes and
program goals during the Middle Years period:

I'm not sure what they were trying to accomplish when I first got there. But later on they were trying to help kids learn a lot more responsibility--and to get stronger emotionally and stuff--and just get kids back on the right track--because I know kids that were there needed that kind of help.

(9th student interview)

Well, I've stayed out of trouble pretty much. I learned a lot from people up there about how to deal with people, even people I hate. And, I suppose about how to get along in life in general, a better understanding of things. I can have more of a relationship with a person. I didn't know that before I came up there.

...The school helped me get my head screwed on straight and it helped me get along with people better. I learned how to have a relationship with someone--to be more open with people, to get a general knowledge or understanding of a person....

(7th student interview)

Finally, the following represents an outline of Maple Valley's overall program goals and objectives as submitted to the Department of Education in the spring of 1978.

Program Goals and Objectives

The two general goals of the Maple Valley School program are the total psychological development of the child, including the cognitive and affective, and preparation for successful reintegration into the family and local school system or for independent living. Specific behavioral goals fall under one or both of these goals.

I. Total Psychological Development

A. Psychoemotional/Affective Development
   1. Students will increasingly express feelings in words or in constructive physical acts.
   2. Students will increasingly identify pressures, experiences both internally or
externally, which affect behavior.

3. Students will increasingly identify behaviors which lead to personally desirable outcomes.

4. Students will increasingly identify behaviors which lead to personally undesirable outcomes.

5. Students will increasingly demonstrate awareness of the impact of their behavior on others.

6. Students will increasingly interact with adults and peers in constructive ways.

7. Students will increasingly initiate interaction with adults seeking support, assistance, or clarification.

8. Students will increasingly demonstrate awareness of choices they make, decisions to act one way instead of other, alternative ways.

9. Students will increasingly accept consequences to their actions without displaced anger or blaming.

10. Students will increasingly engage in activities which have uncertain outcomes and are not necessarily congruent with a restricted self-image.

11. Students will increasingly evaluate their own and others' behavior/performance in non-punitive ways.

B. Cognitive-Academic Area
1. Students will attend classes designed to improve academic skills.

2. Students will demonstrate awareness of time and its relationship to behavior and consequences.

3. Students will increasingly identify realistic interests and goals.
4. Students will identify and communicate circumstances which are conducive to skill and knowledge acquisition.

5. Students will increasingly articulate questions.

6. Students will increasingly identify personal deficits in skills and knowledge which can be addressed in classes or activities.

7. Students will increasingly choose classes and activities based on personal interest and on desire to achieve specific, realistic goals.

II. Preparation for Successful Reintegration into Family and School System and for Independent Living

A. Reintegration
1. Student will demonstrate age-appropriate academic skills.

2. Student will demonstrate ability to satisfactorily reenter family as verified by student and parental assessments of vacation periods.

3. Student will realistically assess educational alternatives available in their school system and make choices cooperatively with all necessary authorities.

4. Student will, verbally and behaviorally, at home and at Maple Valley, demonstrate sufficient self-control and responsibility to reenter their home environment.

B. Independent Life
1. Student will demonstrate sufficient reading, computational and survival skills in a variety of situations, both in Maple Valley and away, to effectively cope with independent living.
2. Student will participate in pre-vocational training experiences, likely including both paid employment and some Apprenticeship Program activities.

3. Student will demonstrate the capacity for realistic life planning.

4. Student will demonstrate the ability to establish and maintain a network of relationships sufficient to satisfy social and emotional needs.

In summation, the program's conception of psychoeducational goals was redefined during the Middle Years. Learning outcomes, while remaining theoretically grounded in a Humanistic/Existential framework, began to reflect a more systematized and differentiated orientation as part of the program's movement toward a more deliberate educational format. Various humanistic/psychological educational models were employed by program planners in an effort to establish a goal framework to be utilized as an effective measure of student progress in both subject matter and personal growth oriented activities. Furthermore, the role of behavioral specificity in the determination of student progress—which had previously been dismissed by program planners during the Early Years as being antithetical to programmatic goals—was reexamined and ultimately afforded significant value. Several examples, taken from school transcripts which report student progress, clearly illustrate the above points.
Programmatic Design (the "Environment")

This section will examine the theoretical models used by Maple Valley program planners in the design and implementation of psychoeducational methods and strategies during the Middle Years. Particular attention will be given to those environmental ingredients which impacted most significantly on program design.

The program's trend toward a more organized, sequenced and focused learning environment represented the central movement during the Middle Years. As noted earlier, (The Early Years--Theory Applied to Program Practices: Evaluative Notes) it was the staff's perception that the laissez-faire/libertarian approach employed throughout the Early Years had not provided children with enough of the necessary tools to assist them in their need to translate experience into meaningful learning. Thus, program planners began to shift the program's emphasis away from a preoccupation with children's "rights" toward providing students with more systematic opportunities for total psychological development. This activity occurred in non-academic as well as academic areas.

As in the Early Years (see: Programmatic Design--the "Environment"), the area of environment, or program climate, was (from a staff perspective), the primary area of interest. For Maple Valley staff, there continued to exist a natural inclination to emphasize the ways in which the overall program, or a given class, was constructed. Hunt and Sullivan (1974) stress the primacy of the environmental domain for the practitioner through the use of the
B-P-E paradigm. They suggest that from this perspective, the equation would likely be described as E:P→B. That is, the environment's interaction with an individual produces a behavior. In addition, the overall environmental thrust during the Middle Years continued to represent an opportunity for staff to live in an atmosphere conducive to personal and professional growth.

As in the Early Years chapter (see: Programmatic Design—the "Environment") I will focus the ensuing examination on Maple Valley's psychoeducational climate (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974). This analysis will include the type of documentation that will serve to illuminate life at the school as it was lived at this particular time. This data is designed to provide the reader with an overview of programmatic functioning rather than to establish an elaborately detailed account of a particular intervention or method.

Hunt and Sullivan (1974) argue that the most meaningful way of assessing educational environments is not whether or not one element is more important than another, it is the consideration of various elements at different levels of analysis. Toward this end, they have devised an analytic schema or taxonomy. Their model will provide a means of organizing the Maple Valley School environment. The table "Levels of Educational Environments" (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974) on page 96 in the Early Years chapter—Programmatic Design—the "Environment," illustrates the framework.
NOTE: The environmental paradigm provides a general guide for the purpose of outlining the Maple Valley program. It is important to point out that several elements that comprise this schema have been examined and developed in other sections of this chapter or previous chapters. Therefore, the emphasis in this segment will be on elaborating those aspects previously unchartered and undefined.

Cultural Setting

Due to the nature and significance of the cultural context during this stage of the school's development, I have previously delineated and discussed this area as a separate sub-section of the Middle Years (see: Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context).

Cultural School Setting

During this period, the Maple Valley School culture remained rooted in the basic tenets of the Human Potential Movement. The ideological parameters peculiar to this framework have been extensively described in the Early Years chapter. In simple terms, the school's culture continued to be a culture of personal growth, mental health, self-awareness and personal responsibility.

The school remained located in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts. Wendell, a rural town northeast of Amherst, Massachusetts, consisted of a number of interesting and dynamic polarities. The town's citizenry was comprised of a mixture of "old timers" (referring to that segment of the population living in Wendell prior to the 1960s) who generally consisted of individuals from manual/blue collar backgrounds, and a newer group--largely
consisting of counter-culture types—from more middle class backgrounds with generally higher levels of education and opportunity. In a sense the socio-cultural dynamics described in Reich's (1970) *Greening of America*, reflected the tenor of the town. These dynamics manifested in a vibrant and quite fertile climate for the development of the Maple Valley program (see: The Early Years—Defining Methods and Strategies—the "Environment").

School Characteristics

Information regarding the size of the school and the number, age and sex of students is provided in an earlier section of the Middle Years chapter. The following chart will serve to illustrate the number, age and sex of the teachers/counselors during this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL (N)</th>
<th>SEX M/F</th>
<th>22-25</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>35-40</th>
<th>40-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9/6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Plant Characteristics

During this stage of the school's development the physical plant was expanded in order to accommodate an increasing student
enrollment as well as a range of programmatic enhancements.

Designated school areas are defined and listed below. They are:

I. Main Building
   This building is a renovated and converted colonial farmhouse consisting of three inter¬
   connecting units as follows:

   A. Main House--This section includes:
      1. School kitchen
      2. Dining room
      3. Administrative office/staff workroom
      4. Residential staff apartment on the second floor
      5. Cellar, including food storage
      6. Attic for miscellaneous storage

   B. Dormitory Section--This unit includes:
      1. Six dormitory rooms for 13 residential students
      2. Two bathrooms

   C. Classroom Section--This is a converted barn that includes the following:
      1. Large arts and crafts area
      2. Classroom/seminar room
      3. Student lounge
      4. Photography dark room
      5. School maintenance room and equipment area

II. Classroom/Dormitory Building
   This uniquely-designed building was completed in September, 1976 and consists of the following:
   1. Large multi-purpose room (classroom, meeting room, etc.)
   2. Library loft
   3. Science room area
   4. Two bedrooms
   5. Two bathrooms
   6. Maintenance/utility room
III. Director's Office

This small office module is a separate unit used by the director for general school purposes, including administration, meetings, conferences, counseling sessions, etc.

IV. Staff Residential Trailer

This trailer provides living quarters for residential staff and is situated adjacent to the classroom/dormitory building to provide staff supervision of the building.

Maple Valley is situated on 15 acres of both wooded and open meadow land.

School Organization:

During the Middle Years stage, Maple Valley staff began to redefine their central mission as the establishment of an environment designed to promote the total psychological development of adolescents. This new emphasis may be contrasted with the centrality afforded the establishment of egalitarianism during the Early Years. A key programmatic component during this period concerned the new emphasis placed on the concept of "community"; implicit in this construct was the creation of a psychological atmosphere or climate which is in and of itself therapeutic. The foundation of this milieu approach is relationships with adults in which respect, caring, genuineness, listening and choice are emphasized. Concrete behavioral feedback and limits were built into these relationships in a sensitive and consistent way. An overriding atmosphere of informality and warmth was intentionally maintained in support of this network of individual relationships.
Within this context of emotional connectedness and involvement, there existed a dual thrust of helping students learn to live with reasonable and constructive limits and to build a sense of personal responsibility for the consequences of their actions. This goal of promoting in students an active sense of responsibility was approached both by presenting them with important choices in their own lives as well as by tailoring interventions to the awareness of the individual student in terms of causal relationships between choice-making, behavior and consequences.

A student's demonstrated ability to negotiate the triadic process of internal awareness, realistic choice-making, and acceptance of responsibility was regarded by staff as a key indicator of psychoemotional growth. Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) "trumpet" (see: The Middle Years—Defining Methods and Strategies the "Environment") was effectively utilized by program staff as an instrument in helping to facilitate a student's process of personal awareness and self-responsibility. Staff would use the "trumpet" in a range of counseling activities in order to provide students with a personal "processing guide" in their effort to more accurately perceive their internal and external condition and to be more intentional in their decision-making process.

The range of programmatic choices for a child was defined by the staff's assessment of her/his psychological readiness to manage these choices. A primary educational goal of this entire process was to help children to become more effective and competent
individuals able to take control of their own lives via confronting and resolving life's issues.

As much as possible the cognitive-academic programming was integrated with the more affective goals so that a student at Maple Valley would be simultaneously encouraged to move healthfully along all dimensions of development. Underlying this programmatic overview was a psychologically sophisticated recreation of a healthy family life, complete with nurturing love and consistent limits as well as a total educational program geared to adolescent development. The community meeting structure continued to represent a central programmatic feature. During this stage, the program underwent a shift in terms of its decision-making patterns. At the beginning of this period, the meeting process reflected a true democratic structure; toward the latter part of this era, the decision-making structure had moved away from a rudimentary-parliamentary system to a more Socratic-type format with staff members reserving for themselves the ultimate decision-making privilege on many key issues. It is important to note that this shift in structure and power relations was indicative of program planners' fundamental redefinition of the program's purposes and objectives. As described in several prior sections of this chapter, this programmatic reformulation consisted of several key elements. In summary, they may be described as follows: the movement away from libertarianism toward a more deliberate and intentional basis upon which to design a psychoeducational format, a changing student
population, a more differentiated and educationally-oriented assessment of student needs, a more sequenced and focused formulation of learning goals, and, a more careful assessment and implementation of a "matching" paradigm in the selection of environmental (counseling methodology and curricula) strategies. Simply, it was the staff's view that given all of the factors outlined above, the most appropriate community meeting structure would be one in which the opportunity for students to continue to encounter a myriad of interpersonal and community-wide issues would continue while the ultimate decision-making mechanisms would reside with the staff. Except for a brief transitional period (involving those students attending the program during these changes) this programmatic restructuring did not appear to significantly alter the interpersonal climate in any fundamental sense. The norms regarding authenticity, particularly within the context of the community meeting process, remained quite powerful. Within this appropriately honest and open climate, children continued to be confronted with difficult dilemmas regarding community life, their own values, and the behavior of their peers. Students continued to utilize the community meeting forum as a "golden" opportunity in which to confront both staff and their peers in an open encounter regarding particular issues or decisions. Also, in keeping with the program's overall educational thrust, the community meeting was utilized as an effective "fishbowl" or laboratory for the purpose of teaching the principles of group dynamics. This teaching occurred on both an
experiential and didactic basis. Issues relating to an individual's place in the group, power and control dynamics between community members, and opportunities to publicly express feelings were all utilized as meaningful data for group and individual development. Toward the latter part of the Middle Years, although program staff had become increasingly more directive in their approach to children—reflected in part by the movement away from democratic processes at community meetings—the overall climate continued to be one where students remained active participants in shaping their own lives and community.

Following is a description of several program characteristics. This information is taken directly from a submission to the Department of Education in the spring of 1978.

I. General Community Laws:
These rules are established to provide the baseline of limits for the program. These include:

1. No individual has the right to infringe on the rights of others

2. General health and safety considerations as defined by the staff

3. No possession of drugs or drug paraphernalia within one mile of the school boundaries

4. No one is to leave the school grounds during the school day unless granted special permission

5. Residential curfews are as follows:
   Weekdays: (Sunday - Thurs) 11 p.m.
   Weekends: (Friday - Saturday) to be arranged, but no later than 1 a.m.

6. Quiet time in dormitories begins at 10 p.m.
7. Kitchen and dining areas closed after 10 p.m.

8. Meal times are as follows:
   - Breakfast: 9:00-9:30 a.m.
   - Lunch: 12:30-1:15 p.m.
   - Dinner: 5:30-6:30 p.m.

II. Responsibility Meetings:
When a student violates another's rights or a school law, the student is held accountable via a responsibility meeting. Participants include the involved parties, including appropriate staff, the Director, and, at times students who want to offer constructive help. These meetings serve disciplinary, counseling and educative functions in the context of helping students learn to take responsibility for their actions. The Director serves as facilitator, mediator, and when necessary, arbitrator. Students usually demonstrate responsibility via a written contract of a behavioral sanction or agreed-upon action. When appropriate, students are encouraged to solve problems and resolve interpersonal conflicts in one-to-one and small group meetings led by staff without coming to the Director for a responsibility meeting. These meetings are scheduled as soon as possible after a given incident and during the school day so as not to conflict with scheduled and required activities.

III. School Day Schedule:
All classes are regularly scheduled Monday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Significance is placed on minimizing student conflicts, maximizing offerings and the full development of curriculum continuity. Students are required to choose classes from a range of options provided by the staff and based on affective and cognitive needs.

IV. Assigned Staff Member:
Each student is assigned a staff member for the purpose of monitoring educational programs, medical care, sign-out permission, general counseling, etc.
V. **Sign-Out Permission:**
With written consent of parent or guardian and staff consent, students are permitted to sign-out off school grounds from 4 p.m. until curfew on weekdays and on weekends. This policy allows for social/psychological growth, demonstration of responsibility, etc.

VI. **Diploma Program:**
A competency-based High School Diploma program, is designed to meet state requirements in addition to Maple Valley requirements.

VII. **Community Responsibilities:**
Students are expected to participate in daily execution of community chores. This involves routine cleaning and rotating evening kitchen responsibilities.

VIII. **Apprenticeship Program:**
A program designed to provide students with job experience and an opportunity to develop marketable skills and attitudes.

IX. **Parent/Family Conferences:**
Meetings are scheduled on a regular basis as needed or desired by parents and child. The focus in these meetings varies from information sharing to a consciously therapeutic effort. Particularly when reintegration into the family is a goal, family contact or assistance is an important aspect of a child's overall program. Each year a Parent Day is held in the fall when all parents are invited to the school and given an opportunity to ask general questions as well as to meet staff members and discuss their child's progress.
X. Field Trip Program:
Maple Valley maintains and operates a field trip program that is extensive and varied in scope. Trips may include both educational and recreational activities and vary in length from brief afternoon trips to overnight excursions.

In an attempt to illustrate the program's movement toward providing children with more systematic opportunities for the acquisition of a range of skills in academic (on content and process levels) areas, I have included course outlines in four subject areas. These areas include: Diploma Program, Social Studies, Arts and Crafts and English. These course descriptions are taken from Maple Valley School transcripts and are included in Appendix B. There are a number of elements worthy of distinction. In each of these curriculum areas course content is approached in a carefully designed and systematic manner. Evidence of this includes: Diploma Class—"students will be able to complete a job application," Social Studies Class—"students will be able to use footnotes and other methods to check the accuracy of materials," Arts and Crafts—"to assist the student in acquiring the tactile sense of hand/eye coordination," and, English Class—"to aid students in the development of effectiveness of expression through writing skills with an emphasis on outline and composition in the form of the letter, the written report and the essay."

Additionally, these same curricula materials were designed to promote "learning-how-to-learn" or process skills as well as problem solving skills. Evidence of this includes: Diploma Class—
"students will be able to speculate about their future and to give and receive help in planning their future lives," Social Studies Class--"students will be able to develop and use study questions," Arts and Crafts--"to provide students with means of self-expression through the experiential studio activities in the visual arts," English Class--"to help students develop a sense of personal identity through the development of skills and individual perceptual, emotional and imaginative responses." Finally, it should be noted that these course descriptions illustrate the program's attempt to not only sequence subject matter content in a carefully conceived manner but also to blend informational learning with the promotion of personal awareness.

Staff Meetings:

Individual staff members were expected to operate on the basis of those principles outlined in this chapter. During the Middle Years, program staff expressed a desire to schedule meetings on a more systematic and structured basis--as contrasted with meetings held during the Early Years. Not only had the size of the staff group significantly grown, but new areas were added to the meeting agenda that either had not been included in earlier days or had been given minimal attention.

The entire area of program design--including a more careful assessment of student needs and learning goals as well as implementation strategies--was given significantly more emphasis than during
the Early Years. A separate and distinct section of each staff meeting was protected and devoted to these areas. In fact, toward the latter part of the Middle Years and upon the recommendation of the teaching staff, special staff meetings were arranged solely for the purpose of reviewing and refining curricula areas.

As was the case during the Early Years, great emphasis continued to be given to the personal/professional development of individual staff members. The increased activity on behalf of the staff group toward the careful evaluation and implementation of program design in no way diminished the group’s commitment to the psychoemotional life of its members.

Another significant change in the structure of the staff meetings during this period regarded the movement away from a "go-with-the-flow" approach to the establishment of their meeting agenda toward a more focused and structural format. In addition, staff members were beginning to stress the need to economize the discussion at meetings and time-bound meetings in order to conserve and protect their own energy. Therefore, it was atypical during this period for staff members to end with the group's observation of the sunrise. These sessions continued to be marked by a high level of energy and generally appeared most satisfying to staff members.

Personal Characteristics of Teacher:

Those essential personal/professional qualities characteristic of a staff member at Maple Valley during this period may be found in
a number of segments throughout this chapter. However, there are a number of points worthy of distinction. As in the early Years, staff members who came to work and live at Maple Valley typically did so on the basis of a life vision and not on the customary level upon which one makes career/employment decisions. The notion of joining a living/learning community that valued personal development for all its members appeared to represent a compelling force for many staff. As was true during the Early Years, program staff generally consisted of individuals who were inspired and motivated by a vision of human development expressed in the Human Potential and Alternative Life-Style Movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s. There did, however, appear to be an important difference in the nature of the staff groups between the Early and Middle Years. The anti-establishment, anti-authority, "do-your-own thing" libertarian environment of the Early Years appeared to attract a number of adults who seemed (from a psychological perspective) deeply invested in the ongoing maintenance of this posture and world view. In the beginning, Maple Valley clearly represented a radical experiment in community living/learning and, as such, attracted an assortment of radicals and rebels. However, as the school began to redefine its mission and purpose in the direction of adults assuming a more responsible, accountable and prescriptive posture with regard to community life and program design, those adults who remained with the program did so out of a shared vision of what was most important for children; working at the school no longer appeared viable for
those more exclusively invested in the school's political statement. It was at this point in time that the school ceased to represent a comfortable haven for those wishing to maintain a counter-culture life-style. Rather, the program began to attract individuals who were seeking an opportunity to work in an atmosphere in which personal development was the unifying aim. As the Middle Years progressed, the staff appeared to regard themselves more and more as a sophisticated group of mental health professionals.

**Student-Oriented Teacher Attitudes:**

This aspect of the Maple Valley program regarding educational goals, roles of the teacher and basic attitudes toward teaching has been extensively covered in a variety of aspects in several points in the body of this section (A Description and Analysis of the Maple Valley Program) of the Middle Years chapter.

**Teacher Behavior:**

As in the previous section, the area of teacher behavior has been addressed in a variety of ways in preceding sections. There are, however, a number of themes which effectively characterize the relational behaviors between staff and student which are rooted in the theoretical context underlying the program's stage of development. During the Middle Years, classes no longer functioned on a "hit-or-miss" basis. To the contrary, it became increasingly clear to all community members that the program was approaching the area
of curriculum development in a consistent and quite serious manner. This shift in program structure manifested in the staff's assumption of a more pro-active and directive posture. However, as was the case in the earlier period, the texture of teacher/student relationships was not differentiated within or without the classroom itself.

Staff continued to relate to students in a wholistic manner giving recognition to both the emotional and intellectual self. Throughout this period, staff remained especially attentive to and evocative of the type of psychological data which would indicate a child's underlying needs/concerns.

The notion that learning and development occurs as a function of a natural unfolding process emanating from the inner wisdom of the individual was no longer interpreted in such a way as to encourage staff to relate to students in a more passive "guide-like like" manner. To the contrary, this underlying view of human development cited above was redefined and reinterpreted to enable staff to employ a more differentiated response to student needs/behavior. Thus, being "humanistic" was no longer regarded as synonymous with being non-directive and/or passive; rather, this concept was redefined in such a way as to encourage staff to "meet children where they truly are," not where you as the staff would like them to be. During this period, teacher behavior may be understood in terms of a continuum of responses defined by the needs of a particular student and coupled with a specific goal or set of goals. In addition, staff were considerably more inclined to hold
students accountable for their behavior in terms of acceptable community norms.

In a fundamental sense, the tone of staff/student relationships remained consistent between the Early and Middle Years. Staff valued and attempted to establish a relational atmosphere with students which was open, flexible and spontaneous. A teacher's ability to change plans, adjust expectations, create new options on the spur of the moment were all viewed as necessary assets toward the establishment of effective helping relationships.

The Summerhillian axiom that assumed that a child would learn when s/he was ready to learn—employed throughout the Early Years—took on new meaning during the Middle Years. Although staff continued to regard this position as fundamentally correct, their approach to students was more differentiated. Depending on the parameters of a given situation, a staff might choose from a range of appropriate responses. To illustrate this point, I will refer to the hypothetical staff/student dialogue utilized in the Early Years chapter.

Student: "Teach me something."
Teacher: "What do you want to learn?"
Student: "I don't know."
Teacher: "I don't know either. See you later."

In the Early Years the teacher viewed her/himself as a non-directive facilitator exercising a great deal of patience in waiting for the student's natural direction to emerge. This type of interaction, although still entirely possible during the Middle Years, would most
certainly not be representative of "standard-fare." For instance, if this discussion were to occur prior to a scheduled class, the teacher would be more likely to respond to the student's query by saying, "I don't know; let's discuss it further after class." The central point is that there were more clearly defined parameters and expectations which shaped the nature of these interactions.

At the very core of this relationship was a reverence for what Carl Rogers referred to as the teacher's responsibility to both experience and communicate her/his unconditional positive regard for the student in order to create the conditions necessary for learning. This factor was particularly critical for the "new" types of student attending the program whose histories of deprivation were unlike anything staff had previously encountered (see: The Middle Years—The Nature and Definition of the Early Years the "Person"). Maple Valley staff would make certain to differentiate their responses to student behavior by making the distinction between the behavior and the person—"I like you, but I don't like what you did."

In summary, during this period, Maple Valley Staff, while continuing to utilize a full range of therapeutic interventions rooted in several Humanistic/Existential modalities (see: The Early Years—Programmatic Design), did so in a more differentiated manner. As in the Early Years, the staff continued to place a premium on the necessity of modeling healthy relationships for students. In other words, every attempt was made by staff to "practice what they preached."
The following excerpts from student and staff interviews (see: Appendix C) highlight various aspects of program design:

We did away with the emergency meetings and instituted morning meeting which was much shorter and to the point and run by adults. We began to enforce time limits and boundaries that were meaningful and gave kids a sense of where they stood in the course of a day. We instituted all kinds of specific rules about personal hygiene and systems for enforcing that. We just moved the whole program in the direction of more structure and more accountability for kids. Well, the key thing here, is that we shifted from a program where the kids defined the agenda to one where adults defined what was appropriate. And that was a gradual evolution.

(Will--staff)

I remember once when I came back after a vacation we had started those levels--I started on level one. I figured that, oh yeah, I'll get level four, right? Now, I couldn't go out past 8 o'clock. The whole thing changed changed to where if you didn't want to get up and go to school, you ain't going to have these privileges. You're just not going to have the choice if you don't want to do what you're supposed to do. Which I guess was a lot better, although I didn't think so at the time.

(8th student interview)

...we moved the program in the direction where there was more behavioral accountability for kids, where there were more and clearer limits and boundaries for kids, where responsibility was taught not simply in an abstract sense but in behavioral and earning-your-way sense by demonstrating that you can effectively manage your own life.

(Will--staff)

I would say that we as kids were given rights too. We had a say on what went on in our lives and, really that was it--we were people too. The school tried to help us on that level. The school didn't deal with you like O.K., you're a child and you have no right to say this. At Maple Valley you felt that you did have a right to say what happened to your life. If you wanted to take other roads or whatever, it was on you....

(8th student interview)
One of the wonderful things about being at Maple Valley for me was that Maple Valley was trying to design a program and live a life and make a way for dealing with kids that was rooted in our own personal ideas and ideals about what being a human being was about, in terms of taking responsibility, in terms of being open and available, and in terms of being real with each other as people and teaching the kids the value of being real with themselves. We were looking to have a program that could be transferred to other places and that could be built into educational theories; it was an exciting time for all of us.

(Will--staff)

...I think the kids had almost equal say. We sat through those emergency meetings day after day, I remember. And things that I would have never have copped to, I eventually did because of peer pressure. It wasn't like the staff or your mother looking down at you. They would say, "Hey, you shithead, what are you doing?" I mean they put the pressure on--they had to live with the bullshit. And I think that was good--they had a right to be really mad at you....

(8th student interview)

Learning to speak out and say how you feel. Those emergency meetings did it for me, because normally I don't think I would have spoken out but I was so angered or thrilled with something someone else said that I did speak out almost without even wanting to, it just blurted out. And then when I got the report back--the report card that you made up, and I looked and I'd gotten credit for something that you called public speaking--that made me feel so good, and even now I have some trouble with speaking up in classes where I don't know anyone--but I'm so much better than I used to be--and that means a lot. Just learning to speak publicly.

(11th student interview)

Maple Valley tried to provide an alternative for adolescents. Early on this meant an alternative to the public school system and family structures which did not provide the psychological space, freedom, and safety for them to reach their creative potential. Soon, it meant an alternative for children whose special needs could not be met within the traditional school system and whose families, when they were intact, were unable to meet their needs in the home setting. For what has
become most of the life span of Maple Valley, we have tried to provide adolescents with an alternative to being bounced around in an all too often sterile, uncaring and dysfunctional system. We've tried to provide an education in psychoemotional and social survival for kids who would otherwise become more cut adrift and alienated.

(Annie--staff)

I can remember a real sense of community and I didn't know if that was typical or not for the human service field, but it was definitely unusual from my previous experience. I came to Maple Valley and there were six of us that did everything. And, there was never really any question about how much we got paid or if it was overtime or whether it was on the schedule or not. None of those questions seemed to apply. The issue was, what needed to be done and what was the best way that we could do it. Everything seemed to revolve around the needs of the students. It involved things like who was going to cook breakfast in the morning, to who was going to drive the kids to work, to who was going to cover during staff meetings. We, as a group, just understood that we had a 24-hour operation and that meant we had to cover the needs of the population. So, I can remember my coming on here at a time when the demands were great but so was the sense of comradery I felt with the other staff people.

(Jerry--staff)

"A Day in the Life":

Unlike the situation in the Early Years, the notion of a "typical" school day during the Middle Years had more of a basis in reality. In the Early Years, the very idea of a patterned, more routinized daily schedule appeared anathema to overall programmatic functioning. During the Middle Years, however, the programmatic shift toward sequencing, differentiation and structure rendered the notion of a "typical" day more plausible.

During this period, school days provided a mixture of
predictable, consistent scheduling as well as considerable space for unplanned spontaneous activity. It must be noted that in the context of scheduled classes children continued to be given a full array of choices except in the basic skill areas. The central issue from a staff perspective was that children choose activities in which they were genuinely interested and that they be prepared to "stick it out" and make a commitment to the process. Thus, the content of the activity (ranging from photography to storytelling) was considered far less important than the process of children making choices and committing themselves to see a project through to completion. In contrast to the Early Years period, the notion of authenticity in the learning process did not translate into a student's "right" to choose for himself to have no structured activity for the entire school day. The value of continuity and organization in the learning process was viewed as a means by which children would learn to develop the necessary skills to enable them to order their experience more effectively. From the beginning, program planners understood that choice occurred within adult-defined parameters. Children, for example, were never "free" to choose to leave school grounds and spend the day riding the Boston Transit System. Based on the experience of the Early Years, program staff perceived a need to more carefully and narrowly define the limits within which children were able to structure their daily lives. Children were always provided legitimate mechanisms whereby they could propose changes in activities in which they were
enrolled; they were never subjected to arbitrary boundaries and timelines. In the event a student would request an activity change, he would be required to approach the process with an attitude of respect and a willingness to examine all the issues—ranging from self-scrutiny to areas relating to course content.

For the purpose of providing the reader with additional information in order to form a picture of daily life, I will describe a Maple Valley School day as it may have been viewed by a visitor at any point during this period.

Morning staff meeting began at 8:30 a.m. and continued until 9 a.m. These meetings provided an opportunity for houseparents to update the staff group regarding the overnight situation and for the staff group to begin to organize and coordinate the day's activities.

Breakfast was served from 9-9:30 a.m. Staff members would move through the dormitories waking up children who were still asleep to give them the chance to "make it" to breakfast. Children, although not required to attend breakfast, were reminded that the kitchen would absolutely close at 9:30, and not reopen until lunchtime. On most school mornings there was generally a majority of students in attendance. Meals were prepared by the kitchen staff, and staff and students ate their meals together.

After breakfast, a morning community meeting was held—and student attendance was mandatory. These meetings consisted of a discussion of the previous evening's activities and included
recognizing those students who had made a positive contribution as well as confronting those students who had impacted negatively on the evening's events. In addition, these morning meetings functioned as an opportunity for the group to plan the day's upcoming activities. This included the organization of special events and school field trips.

After morning meeting, children were required to return to their rooms for clean-up. Staff would make themselves available in the dormitory areas to help students in this effort. In addition, staff utilized this time to "touch base" with those students who appeared to be having difficulties in beginning their day.

Classes began at 10 a.m. Three forty-minute class periods were scheduled before lunchtime. These classes generally focused on the basic skill areas. Students were required to participate in these classes based on a prearranged "contract" worked out with their "assigned" staff member. All students were not involved in each of these three sections. Therefore, a number of children at any given time were faced with "free" periods during which time they were entitled to engage in almost any enterprise provided it did not infringe on another's right to do the same.

During the morning hours, the school climate reflected a mixture of those students and staff who were task oriented and those students who might be simply "hanging out." Staff who were not teaching class during a given period sought out those "stragglers" for either counseling time or more spontaneous activity such as
a music "jam session."

Lunchtime is the busiest time of the school day; almost the entire community is present. For many, this part of the day provides a time to make contact with others and to discuss the afternoon's activities. The atmosphere is generally "electric" and somewhat chaotic in either positive or negative directions.

Afternoon activities follow a similar format as the morning ones. However, these activities are typically outside the basic skill areas. They encompass a range of activities including arts and crafts, cross-country skiing and improvisational theatre.

It is now late afternoon—children are once again required to return to their rooms for afternoon clean-up. Day school students spend this time helping to straighten up community areas. Clean-up time takes place from 3:30 to 4 p.m.—at which time the school day "officially" ends.

At any point during the school day, a child has the right to call a responsibility meeting if s/he believes that her/his rights have been violated or that a community/school law has been broken. Participants in these meetings include the involved parties, appropriate staff, the program director and, at times, those students wanting to offer constructive help. When appropriate, students were encouraged to solve problems and resolve disputes or interpersonal conflicts in one-to-one and small group meetings led by staff without coming to the program director for a responsibility meeting. These meetings were scheduled as soon as possible after a
given incident and during the school day so as not to interfere with scheduled and required activities.

Supper is served between 5:30 and 6 p.m. Most community members are present except for those staff members "off duty" and day school students. This mealtime is generally less frenetic than lunchtime. Kitchen staff prepare the meal and both students and staff clean up. Community members begin to "map-out" the evening's activities.

The evening—as in the Early Years—has its own very special atmosphere. It is the time of day where children appear the most vulnerable and seek out staff for nurture and support.

In addition to the typical "run" on board games and spontaneous arts and crafts projects, there was an increasing emphasis during this period on evening field trips. These field trips included such activities as roller skating, movie trips and, of course, trips to the nearest pizza palace. The older students use the late night hours to listen to music and socialize. Quiet time is at 10 p.m. Some of the students talk with each other until far into the night. This is generally fine with the evening staff and houseparents provided they are quiet.

NOTE: It is imperative to note that the above illustration is decidedly skewed in that it presents the picture of a "positive" day. While the form of the day remains constant, its content could be markedly different than the above description. Thus, community and/or individual issues dealing with inappropriate behaviors
ranging from stealing to drug use to destruction of property to fighting might dominate a "typical" day.

**Theory Applied to Program Practices: Evaluative Notes**

The Middle Years of the Maple Valley existence witnessed major changes in the attempt of the program to more effectively meet its responsibilities and expand its repertoire in being able to provide a total psychoeducational environment (E) for children. Program planners identified a state of disequilibrium that existed toward the end of the Early Years period. There was a state of imbalance between desired and resultant outcomes in learning—prior assumptions and premises that reflected in established procedures no longer seemed to be maximally useful. This situation itself defines the transition from the Early Years to the Middle Years.

It became apparent that the need to create more order and organization of experience could best be attended to by the utilization of educationally-oriented models. These models needed to be rooted in the same theoretical perspectives as in the Early Years. Thus, the work of Weinstein and Fantini and George Brown and William Schutz were integrated into the fabric of a newly defined program design.

In the environmental arena, Weinstein's and Fantini's work was helpful in providing a systematic approach to curriculum development that placed primacy on student concerns/needs; in addition, methodologies such as the "trumpet" allowed for a sequenced map or
personal "processing guide" for more effective counseling. George Brown's "Confluent Education" served as a vehicle to enable program staff to blend content or subject matter learning with the development of personal awareness. Will Schutz's theory of group development gave staff additional tools in which to view the group life of the school/community—and therefore make more appropriate interventions—as well as to utilize the experience for didactic purposes. Thus, we see a shift from a "grab-bag" "here and now" approach to living and learning, to a more sequenced, formalized structure in which to organize the Maple Valley experience. These theories proved to be instrumental in negotiating this transitional phase. In summary, program planners utilized these models as a "blue print" in the construction of a more carefully designed and structured school program.

No longer was the central question, "Where are we now?"; the context was expanded to include, "Where have we been?", "Where are we going?", and "What do we need to get there?". In this vein, adults were more able to comfortably define limits more clearly and narrowly. The atmosphere more effectively blended the didactic with the experiential.

Obviously, any discussion of new methods is inextricably linked to changing definitions of desired goals and outcomes. Thus, we clearly and powerfully see the utilization of both past experience (see: The Early Years—Theory Applied to Program Practices: Evaluative Notes) and new information generated by these
theorists to assist the staff in this redefinition of what the program hoped to accomplish for children. Goals were no longer to be exclusively global and generic in nature; they must be tailored more discretely to given individuals in this particular setting. Most importantly, these theorists enabled the staff to see that this definition did not conflict or impede the original and underlying premises of the broad goals of Self-Actualization; to the contrary, they could enhance progress. As a result, goals became more behaviorally specific, better defined, more differentiated, more carefully sequenced and expanded to include a skills orientation in academic and non-academic areas. The prior disequilibrium that often had the impact of diminishing perceived stability from a student point of view, and thereby limiting personal growth was more effectively addressed by these changes. Maple Valley became more organized and structured in its educational approach to its stated purpose.

I have identified substantial changes in the areas of program design and the definition of learning outcomes. The Middle Years saw the least change in the area of the underlying conceptualization of individual needs. The static nature of this domain would come to represent a major gap or weakness during this period. In spite of the success in applying these models into ongoing program practices, staff encountered significant difficulties and weaknesses in key areas of the program. The "disenfranchised child" was becoming the predominant population. The redefinition of methods and goals did
not satisfactorily translate into the continuous progress that program planners expected to see. The underlying premises regarding human development were highly appropriate to the goals and strategies that were implemented; however, the nature of the population did not seem to accurately reflect these premises. For example, a child's capacity for empathy and capacity to gain insight and use it for behavioral change was assumed to be a given. The ongoing experiential data increasingly began to contraindicate these basic assumptions. Goals were defined and strategies employed—with the aid of the above theorists—that specifically were intended to either elicit or build on these individual abilities. Very often, even with highly powerful and skilled therapeutic engagement toward this end, learning would seem transitory at best. As a result, program planners began to question the very existence of these "innate" capacities in a generic sense. Some children appeared genuinely unable to understand cause and effect relationships; others seemed unable to reason abstractly and therefore were unable to gain and utilize "insight." Program staff began to believe that socio-cultural factors alone in the identification of student concerns was simply not enough. Individual personal histories, with particular focus on the most serious level of environmental deprivation became more predominant in the recognition of a further need to better the program. Thus, Maple Valley was arriving at a new juncture. Life was, indeed, more systematized, organized and focused in its ongoing task of educating children in a
psychologically healthy atmosphere. Weinstein and Fantini, Brown and Schutz were instrumental aids at this stage. Concomitant with a gradual and yet major shift in the nature of the population was a fixed formulation of individual needs. These realities forced a reassessment in this area. Program planners began to explore for new and better ways to understand individual development. The interactive system of the B-P-E model would then indicate a further realignment along all the dimensions. Thus, we define and enter the Later Years.

Chapter Summary:

This chapter has provided a comprehensive description of the Maple Valley program in the period of its Middle Years (1976-1979). The discussion is focused on two basic realms: 1. The fundamental theoretical underpinnings relating to human development in general and theories and models most relevant to program design; and 2. A detailed description and analysis of the program itself.

The Maple Valley program began to make a transition away from a preoccupation with the concern for the "rights" of children toward a more systematic approach to helping children realize their potentialities. Within this context program planners recognized the need to move beyond what had been an amorphous and "free-flowing" approach toward a more organized, sequenced, focused and prescriptive format. The collective formulations of Weinstein, Fantini, Brown and Schutz helped to guide the Maple Valley
The conception of student needs/concerns as proposed by Weinstein and Fantini although not substantially different from the views espoused by Maslow and Rogers, did offer a means for the development of well-conceived curricula. Weinstein and Fantini distinguished children's concerns into three primary areas: identity, connectedness and power. Identity concerns relate to the child's self-image. The area of connectedness regards the nature of the child's world of social relationships. Power concerns pertain to the child's perception of control over her/his life.

Maple Valley's conception of psychoeducational goals remained firmly rooted in the Humanistic/Existential framework and these goals continued to be viewed as a mirror reflection of the ways individual needs were understood. Thus, as student needs were seen in a more educational context, the definition of learning outcomes also took on a more educational character as well. These outcomes were differentiated in a more systematic and deliberate manner in order to increase the child's ability to manage her/his concerns and conflicts. Thus, we see goals stated and utilized in behavioral terms that included discrete and measurable criteria in both short- and long-term contexts. In short, the global term self-actualization increasingly came to be seen as non-functional in practice; intrapersonal and interpersonal behavioral change became the operational focus.

Significant program changes were seen in the area of defining
methods and strategies. Weinstein's and Fantini's models for curriculum organization and personal inquiry (the "trumpet") and Brown's Confluent Education model, provided program planners with a functional paradigm in their efforts to merge subject matter learning with personal awareness. In addition, Schutz's model of group development that emphasized issues of inclusion, control and affection enabled the staff to more effectively diagnose and intervene on group levels. These models provided the necessary sequential perspective regarding group development.

As the Maple Valley program was shifting, so too was the socio-cultural tapestry in which it existed. The social/political activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s began to give way to a cultural context linked to the public sector and the legislative thrusts of the early 1970s that were just beginning to be implemented. Thus, Maple Valley no longer represented an extension of the larger socio-cultural trends. In fact, Maple Valley desired to adapt to those existing elements of the larger society that would allow it to promote and enact the visions rooted in an earlier time.

The nature and definition of the student population also changed during this period. We begin to see a new "type" of child--the "disenfranchised child." These were children whose very self-structure had been decimated by years of neglect, abuse and deprivation. They were typically from lower socio-economic backgrounds and were referred to Maple Valley by a variety of public
agencies after extended periods of time in the social service "treadmill." These children entered the Maple Valley program in a psychologically damaged state that often manifested itself in a struggle for self-esteem. The implications of this changing population for future program planning began to germinate during this period and eventually became far-reaching in its impact.

The determination of psychoeducational goals and objectives centered around an increasing behavioral specificity and differentiation. The elements of environmental design are discussed within the same format as previously identified by Hunt and Sullivan (see: The Early Years—Programmatic Design). Maple Valley consistently moved in the direction of a more formalized and structured program as evidenced by a more organized curriculum design, more predictable school-day structure and activities and more clearly defined evaluative mechanisms concerning student progress and development.

The final section of this chapter involves a summary examination in which the effects of theoretical applications to program practices both promoted and inhibited all of the above areas. Again, the work of Weinstein and Fantini, Brown and Schutz was instrumental in redefining and redirecting emphases in the areas of determining goals and objectives and program design itself. The original conceptions regarding individual needs remained relatively constant and were not significantly impacted on by these theories. This constancy was in conflict with the data generated by
the changing nature of the population of students. As program staff began to encounter increasing difficulties in this area, this weakness stimulated the challenges to be identified with the next stage—The Later Years.
CHAPTER IV
The Later Years (1979-1981)

In this section, several important areas necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the Maple Valley program during this period will be examined. The first major component will consist of an analysis of the program's theoretical underpinnings. This discussion will include a profile of the program's underlying conception of human development as well as a more detailed description of those specific theories and models which significantly impacted on the program design itself. Emphasis will be placed on determining the ways in which individual needs, psychoeducational goals and corresponding methodologies were defined by these models.

Secondly, an extensive examination of the program's design and its implementation during this period will be provided. This analysis will highlight the following six areas:

- a profile of the socio-cultural context existing during this period (e.g., the movement from alternative school to established human service agency).

- an in-depth analysis of the nature of the student population. Particular attention will be given to the ways in which student needs were determined.

- a study of the ways in which the program's psychoeducational goals and objectives were established.

- an analysis of the parameters of the program's environmental design with particular emphasis on methods and structures utilized at the time.
- an identification of the ways in which original theoretical conceptions were reconsidered in light of ongoing practice and implementation, and finally,

- a chapter summary which includes a profile of a transitional framework with implications for ongoing programmatic development.

The Behavior-Person-Environment model (Lewin, 1936) (see: Overview and Methodology section) will be used as the primary vehicle for the purpose of organizing the aforementioned analysis. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.
Theoretical Underpinnings of the Maple Valley Program

Theoretical Conception of Human Development

In order to provide the reader with a comprehensive view of the Maple Valley program at this stage of its development, it is necessary to profile the program's underlying theoretical orientation regarding human development. As in the previous stages, the operating assumption is that this underlying conception of development and change is a central aspect of the program's overall construction. Following this summarization, I will examine those theories and models within the fields of psychology and education which had a significant impact on programmatic design and implementation during this period. This aforementioned discussion will provide a theoretical context within which one may more clearly understand the ways in which program planners formulated their conception of student needs (P) along with corresponding methods (E) and goals (B).

The programmatic movement to the Later Years represented a fundamental and comprehensive redefinition of the underlying conception of human development. During the first two programmatic stages, the romantic or maturational (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972) conception, with its view of development occurring as a result of an organic or unfolding process, continued to represent the central operating premise. It is important to note that the ways in which this basic orientation were operationalized during the Middle Years
had significantly changed when contrasted with the Early Years. However, these important changes continued to be rooted in a theoretical view that held the existence of self as the primary fact. This romantic perspective emphasized a psychology of mental health with a view of individual development as essentially a natural, positive and forward-moving process. These tenets are rooted in the romantic/maturational orientation and are clearly expressed in the Humanistic/Existential tradition (see The Early Years—Theoretical Conception). This general view of human development, along with those specific theories and models that comprise it, functioned as programmatic cornerstones during the first and second stages.

As stated earlier, (see: The Middle Years—Theoretical Conception of Human Development), the major programmatic thrust during the Middle Years expressed itself in an increased emphasis on the meaningful translation of psychological theory and therapeutic practice into educational design. The "lessons" of the Early Years (see: The Early Years—Theory Applied to Program Practices) indicated that it was simply not enough to inundate children with powerful techniques aimed at eliciting effective and psychological material and then to "hope" they would be able to utilize this data in meaningful ways. Within this context, program planners recognized the need to steer the program beyond what had been a laissez-faire approach to program design and implementation to a more organized, sequenced, focused, and prescriptive format. In the
process of refining and specifying learning goals, methods and strategies and individual differences, program planners and staff began to become more sensitized to the differential nature of psychoeducational programming. By the end of the Middle Years stage (see: The Middle Years--Theory Applied to Program Practices), it was becoming increasingly clear to the staff that while the program was on the "right track" with its more disciplined and rigorous approach to programming, there still remained significant gaps in meeting the needs of a changing client population.

In the Middle Years chapter, I identified substantial changes in the areas of program design and the definition of learning outcomes. The Middle Years saw the least change in the area of the formulation of individual needs. Program planners recognized that the differential process employed during this stage whereby individual needs (P) were more systematically "matched" with appropriate methods (E) and learning goals (B) was generally a positive movement in the program's attempt to promote individual development. However, this redefinition of methods and goals did not satisfactorily translate into the kind of progress planners had hoped to see. It was within this "matching" context that program staff began to encounter serious difficulties in selecting the most appropriate methods and goals for a given student(s). In other words, there appeared too weak a basis upon which to establish and defend "what was best for whom, when and why." As mentioned earlier, the formulation of individual needs between the Early and
Middle Years had remained relatively stable and fixed. Program planners began to search for new and better ways to understand individual development; the underlying assumption was that the more that was known about the idiosyncratic nature of the individual (P), the more appropriate the methods (E) and goals (B) might be.

During the Later Years, program planners began to look toward the field of Structural Developmental Psychology in their ongoing search for a theoretical body of knowledge that might provide them with guidance in the construction of a more sophisticated and "scientific" context. Such a context would allow individual needs (P) to be more clearly determined in order to develop more effective methods (E) and goals (B). The assumption was that increased knowledge regarding individual differences would help planners in establishing meaningful and functional categories in which to view the person (P) component of the B-P-E paradigm. Thus, it appeared possible to add an individual's "stage" of development in utilizing the B-P-E model. The practitioner would then be more able to select the most appropriate environmental response for an individual at a given developmental stage in order to promote movement toward a particular goal, such as increased self-responsibility.

\[
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Conversely, it would also be possible for a staff member to assess an individual's developmental stage (P), select the most appropriate goal (B) and then determine which strategy or intervention (E) might
be most effective.

A common feature of all structural developmental approaches is the notion that development occurs through a movement of invariant, non-reversible and hierarchical stages. In addition, development or maturity is regarded as a process that results from organism-environment interactions. This position contrasts sharply with those of the romantic/maturationists (who subscribe to an organic/unfolding process or direct biological maturation) and the cultural transmission/behavioral position (that views development as simply a matter of direct learning) (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972). Several theories that emanate from this tradition focus on cognitive development (Piaget, 1960), ego development (Loevinger, 1966), moral development (Kohlberg, 1969), and self-knowledge development (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1977).

Many interactive theories of development are stage theories. These theories often specify which type of environment is most appropriate for individuals at a particular stage of development. Program planners were most interested in the type of structural stage theory that might provide an economical and scientific way of defining and understanding individual needs (P), then determining outcomes (B) that would be appropriate and realistic, and finally selecting the nature and type of environmental prescription (E). Hunt and Sullivan (1974) state, "A comprehensive theory of development should specify the sequence of the stages of development as well as the transition rules (that is, stage-specific environmental
prescriptions) providing developmental growth." It is important to note that only an interactive theory specifies the environment necessary to developmental progression.

These structural developmental guidelines had a profound and comprehensive impact on the overall psychoeducational programming. Program planners, as part of the already historical movement toward greater specificity and differentiation, were now better equipped to more effectively determine student needs as well as select the most appropriate goals. In terms of the definition of psychoeducational goals themselves, the movement was away from what Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) refer to as the "bag of virtues" approach with its emphasis on the acquisition of particular personality traits (such as self-confidence and spontaneity) and toward a greater degree of differentiation, integration, and adaptation (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972) "Cognitive-developmental psychological theory postulates that movement through a sequential progression represents movement from a less adequate psychological state to a more adequate state" (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972). Thus, development is the aim of education.

In summary, the structural developmental school of psychology as interpreted by program planners helped to guide the Maple Valley program through its next developmental stage--The Later Years. This psychological and philosophical perspective would exert a profound influence on the program's definition of individual needs (P), learning outcomes (B), and overall learning environment (E).
Dewey (1964) believed that Rousseau's notion of the organic or natural unfolding metaphor (humans are analogous to seeds in that they will naturally flower and bear fruit) was fundamentally fallacious. His view of people was significantly more complex than his view of plant life; development occurs as a function of an interaction between the individual and the environment.

Every mind, even the youngest, is naturally or inherently seeking for those modes of active operation that are within the limits of its capacity...The problem, a difficult and delicate one, is to discover what tendencies are especially seeking expression at a particular time and just what materials and methods will serve to evoke and direct a truly educative development. (Dewey, 1964)
Theoretical Conceptions:
Understanding Individual Needs (the "Person")

This section will provide an examination of those theories and models which functioned as programmatic cornerstones during this period. Particular attention will be given to identifying those theoretical aspects which began to transform the ways in which program planners understood student needs.

During the Early and Middle Years, program planners' fundamental understanding of the individual was rooted in the belief that children have within them a natural and inner sense of truth and wisdom. The underlying assumption, universal in nature, was that all people are basically positive and always moving in the direction of self-actualization.

During the Later Years, the structural developmental perspective provided program planners with an entirely new way of approaching individual differences/needs. This theoretical orientation regarding human development posited that individual differences (P) do exist and these differences must also be effectively utilized in the construction of psychoeducational methods (E) and goals (B). The program's construction of individual differences had historically been rooted in a personality trait (style of learning, relationship to intimacy), student concerns, and basic demographic orientation (sex, age, race). It was during this period that planners added the structural or cognitive developmental
paradigm as one more essential factor in identifying individual differences/needs. The merging of contemporaneous notions of individual differences with developmental distinction began to offer program planners a more economical and scientific basis upon which the selection of environmental strategies might be made.

In addition, the use of the structural developmental paradigm as a "road map" made it possible to construe the matching process in such a way as to assess the individual's "stage" and then determine which goals are most appropriate for her/him at this level of development. In this case, both the individual's level of development (P) coupled with the most appropriate and desirable learning outcome (B) can be simultaneously considered in determining the most effective method or strategy (E).

Structural developmental theory emphasizes the movement or stages through which individuals progress regarding their capacity to integrate and reason about their experience. Individuals at various stages of development reason and organize life's issues in substantially different ways which translate into particular behavioral expressions. Rather than viewing growth in terms of individual changes that are inevitable, given a unidimensional environmental response (i.e., a self-directed approach), program planners began to integrate the developmental perspective in arriving at a new formulation. Thus, growth was now understood as an interactive process consisting of the individual acting on and reacting to her/his environment. Through the utilization of a
developmental model, program staff began to inquire; 1. How does a
student reason about her/his experience? and 2. What methods and
strategies might be employed to promote a student's reasoning
capability?

The tenets of the progressive education movement as formulated
by John Dewey (1964) (which espoused an ideology rooted in the
essentiality of the child's natural interaction with her/his
environment), combined with the cognitive developmental theory of
Jean Piaget (1967) (which proposed that reorganizations of
psychological structures result from these organism-environment
interactions) provided the basis for a number of new theoretical
developments. Several of these theories attempt to move beyond the
cognitive thrust of the Piagetian model. Among the most commonly
cited theories emanating from this tradition are Kohlberg's Moral
Development Theory (1963), Loevinger's Ego Development Theory
(1966), Selman's Interpersonal Perspective-Taking (1974),
Alschuler's, Evans's, Tamashiro's and Weinstein's Self-Knowledge
Theory (1977) and Hunt's Conceptual Level Development Theory
(1977-78). Each of the theories cited above share in common a view
that development in its most basic form represents a sequence of
stages which are qualitatively distinct modes of reasoning about
one's experience, which constitute an invariant sequence, and which
are hierarchical in nature. Individual development may come to a
halt at a given stage. However, if forward movement resumes, it
must do so in accordance with this sequence.
Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory (1963) and Self-Knowledge Development Theory (1977) represent two theoretical models which had a significant impact on shaping the Maple Valley program during the Later Years. I will now outline these developmental paradigms with particular emphasis on the formulation of individual differences/needs. It was these two models more than any others that played a central role in influencing Maple Valley's redefinition of the "person" during this period.

**Moral Development Theory**

Kohlberg (1969) defines his moral development theory as consisting of a series of six stages that are each qualitatively distinct from the previous stage. These stages, as is the case with other development models rooted in the Piagetian framework, represent an invariant and hierarchical sequence. An underlying premise of this schema is that morality may be viewed as a person's fundamental stance regarding the respect and dignity afforded the individual, the valuing of people over property, the belief in the equality of individuals and the conviction that all people have a right to pursue happiness. Along these lines, individuals at each stage of development would have a characteristic posture toward these aspects of morality. Kohlberg (1969) suggests that moral reasoning is a prerequisite of moral behavior. However, it is important not to confuse this position with the assumption that one's level of moral reasoning will automatically or inevitably lead
to a particular action. Rather, it should be understood in terms of more accurately understanding an individual's underlying reasons for engaging in a particular act. In other words, the act itself does not necessarily define the level of morality. For instance, an individual may rescue another from peril because s/he may hope to receive some monetary compensation, not because of any "higher order" regard for the preservation of human life. It is for this reason that morality is best understood on the basis of one's underlying reasoning rather than on affording primacy to the behavior itself. Kohlberg (1969) points out, however, that in most instances a higher level of moral reasoning will translate into behavior that is congruent. In expanding on Piaget's (1964) work in the area of moral judgment, Kohlberg utilized hypothetical "moral dilemmas" in order to examine the ways in which individuals reasoned. These contrived dilemmas were used as a diagnostic tool for determining an individual's stage of development. The most famous of these Kohlbergian dilemmas concerns the case of "Heinz." Heinz is portrayed as a man who steals a drug he cannot afford in an effort to save the life of his dying wife. Upon hearing the story, participants are asked to state whether or not it was acceptable for Heinz to steal the drug and to fully explain their reasoning. The examiner then codes the responses, highlighting the central criteria utilized by participants in arriving at their judgments. Below is an outline of the moral developmental model (Kohlberg, 1969, 1972). Each of the six stages assumes a more complex cognitive capacity than the prior one.
Moral Development Theory

I. The first two stages are defined as the "preconventional" developmental level. The central theme here is on physical punishment, the avoidance of punishment, the gratification of one's needs (physical in nature) rather than on any "real" concern for others or for any acceptable standards of behavior.

Stage I. At this stage the individual is oriented towards punishment and obedience as the primary moral forces. These constructs exist only in the context of rules or standards imposed by external powers. This "power dynamic" is impersonal in nature. Authority is perceived as arbitrary in which those who exercise it are not bound to any rules. Authority is also viewed in terms of age and power. Respect for authority typically translates into obedience. The value of human life is often confused with the perceived status of an individual or with the worth of material possessions.

Stage II. At this stage the individual is oriented towards what is referred to as "instrumental hedonism." That is, rules are obeyed on the basis of anticipated rewards. The notion of individual "rights" is rooted in the concept of ownership. The individual does not meaningfully consider the impact the exercise of these "rights" may have on another. Relational reciprocity begins to form at this stage, but only on a quid pro quo basis.

II. Stages three and four are referred to as the "conventional" developmental level. Conventional thought typically manifests itself in a strong concern for the maintenance of the social order. The individual is oriented towards the fulfillment of others expectations and performing well in that context.

Stage III. At this stage of moral reasoning the individual is motivated by a strong desire to conform to the expectations of others. Concern with approval or fear of disapproval plays a central role in one's reasoning process. The beginning of genuine mutuality occurs at this stage in the sense that one is now capable of real caring and liking
for others. Thus, the quid pro quo arrangement of the prior stage is discarded for more authentic feelings such as gratitude for another. The notion of loyalty, for instance, becomes a meaningful construct at this stage in that rules and standards may be disavowed in the pursuit of maintaining one's loyalty to another.

Stage IV. At this stage, maintaining one's place in the social order and "doing what is right," and thereby avoiding censure from authorities, becomes a central factor in one's moral reasoning. The "rules are the rules" and any deviation from this position is met with resistance. Expressions like, "What if everybody broke this rule?" are characteristic of one's reasoning. Punishment is viewed in terms of paying one's debt to society.

III. Stages five and six are associated with "post-conventional" moral reasoning. Characteristic of this level is the individual's concern for universal ethical principles. Moral judgements are based on the acceptance of mutually-decided societal standards.

Stage V. At this stage an individual's moral reasoning reflects her/his orientation to conform to rules out of deeply held convictions that are regarded as products of righteous and democratic processes. It is on this basis that rules and laws must be respected. Respect for others is given out of a perceived sense of worth rooted in the personal qualities of an individual rather than one's position or status.

Stage VI. At this stage an individual's level of moral reasoning is characterized by her/his orientation to universal moral principles which underlie all rules, laws and standards. For instance, the value of human life is considered sacred above all else. Relational reciprocity emanates entirely from genuine interpersonal factors such as trust and respect and has less to do with "conventional" obligations. The individual regards her/himself as fully responsible for her/his behavior. It is on this basis that an individual may elect to conform to avoid self-condemnation.
Self-Knowledge Development Theory

Self-Knowledge Theory (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1977) is a structural developmental theory which describes how an individual construes and ascribes meaning to and reports on her/his experience. This model was particularly enticing to program planners during this period as a result of the program's historical emphasis on self-awareness and self-knowledge. This developmental schema, similar to the model described above, suggests that an individual's capacity for self-knowledge occurs within the confines of the cognitive level of processing available to her/him. For instance, a child who is unable to connect various components of a given task into a meaningful whole would similarly be unable to connect seemingly disparate responses to a range of situations into a meaningful tapestry or personality trait.

A key assumption made by program planners during the first two programmatic stages was that children had within them the capacity to organize and make meaning out of life's experience. During the Middle Years, staff made systematic attempts to help students to more effectively organize their experience. However, these efforts were not informed by developmental guidelines. Rather, this approach was rooted in a romantic view of the "person" that underscored the belief that individuals have an innate capacity for self-insight and that self-awareness naturally leads to healthier functioning. This often translated into helping students to "see" the inconsistencies between their behavior and their verbal
expressions.

In contrast to the view cited above, Self-Knowledge Theory (1977) postulates that individuals at higher levels have increased capacity in terms of seeing various possibilities as to the nature and origins of their feelings. Accordingly, people at higher levels are able to meaningfully connect life's situations and experiences in such a way as to enable them to see patterns and separate their internal responses from external realities. This developmental movement has a direct bearing on an individual's ability to assume a measure of personal responsibility for her/his life.

Self-knowledge developmental stages reflect how people describe their experiences about themselves and their knowledge of themselves. The idea of self-knowledge (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1977) in this context is viewed as comprising three discrete and inter-related aspects: 1) direct experiences of a private/internal nature such as feelings and thoughts, 2) the mental processes individuals utilize in order to translate life experience into descriptive theories, and 3) the processes or ways in which people describe their experience. There are four stages, fairly broad in nature, which are similar to moral developmental theory in that they are invariant and hierarchical. These stages are defined as follows. They are:
Self-Knowledge Development Theory

Elemental Stage—At this stage an individual describes her/his experience in terms of a single event. This description highlights concrete elements of that experience which are expressed in a rather isolated and segmented manner. Events appear juxtaposed rather than connected in any causal way.

Characteristic of reports made at the elemental stage are the following:

"I was wearing blue shoes."
"My sister was running."
"I have a nice house."

Situational Stage—At this stage the individual describes her/his experience in terms of a complete single situation. This description, unlike those representative of the prior stage, consists of causally-connected elements as well as internal feelings and thoughts.

Characteristic of reports made at the situational stage are the following:

"I was really confused about the entire encounter."
"I was so anxious during the ceremony."
"The best part of the weekend was when my wife and I finally had a chance to let each other know how proud we were of each other and how much we believed in each other."

Internal-Patterned Stage—At this stage an individual describes her/his experience in terms of internal characteristics which s/he is able to generalize across situations over time. An individual is now able to hypothesize what her/his internal response might be to a particular "type" of situation. In other words, s/he is able to generalize about what is regarded as typical of their response system.

Characteristic of reports made at the internal-patterned stage are the following:
"When I'm faced with a public speaking situation, I tend to get quite nervous and begin doubting my own abilities."
"I'm not the kind of person who gets really excited about meeting new people; I prefer the security of stable ongoing relationships."

Process Stage—At this stage an individual begins to describe her/his experience in terms of her/his capacity for taking control, influencing or altering their own internal states. It is at this stage that we see for the first time a deliberate attempt on behalf of an individual to act on her/his internal responses to situations and across situations. At this stage individuals are capable of providing very elaborate descriptions regarding the ways in which they've been able or unable to manage their internal life.

Characteristic of reports made at the process stage are the following:

"When I begin to "work myself over" for failing to live up to my own expectations, I'm now better able to take a "step back," recognize what I'm doing to myself, and take the pressure off."
"For the first time I'm truly able to allow myself to fully receive compliments about a positive contribution I've made and feel like I deserve it."

NOTE: The self-knowledge stages outlined above do not represent a direct correlation with age groupings. However, because the theory follows an invariant hierarchical order, most children typically fall into the elemental area while most adolescents and adults tend to be situational.

The Definition of Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

In this section I will examine the theoretical basis upon which psychoeducational goals and outcomes were established at Maple Valley during the Later Years. Throughout the Early and Middle Years the primary aim was the promotion of the fully-functioning, self-actualized individual. A central distinction between these
first two periods concerns the increased value and weight placed on the sequencing and differentiation of learning outcomes that resulted in an increased emphasis on behavioral specificity. These changes represented refinements of a process rooted in a basic underlying assumption of human development rather than a substantially different conception of maturation itself.

However, during the Later Years the structural developmental perspective as interpreted by program planners began to represent an entirely new theoretical basis upon which the establishment of psychoeducational goals would come to be redefined. The very nature of the structural development position really lends itself to an operational definition; that is, the central constructs regarding the structure and sequence of stages have explicit connotations. This clear definition makes possible the identification of various phenomena in terms of their relationship to structure and/or stages. Furthermore, upon identification of these phenomena, the meaningful translation of stage characteristics into psychoeducational learning objectives may occur. A primary learning objective from this perspective is the promotion of an individual's movement toward and attainment of the next developmental stage. These stages represent hierarchical reorganizations. Movement toward a higher stage assumes that the individual has fully integrated the prior stage with its implicit reorganization (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972).

A fundamental distinction exists between the Humanistic/Existential orientation (which is rooted in a romantic ideology) and
the structural developmental position with respect to psychoeducational objectives. Whereas the humanists tend to define learning goals in terms of a "bag of virtues" or "desirable traits" (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972) from a perspective which outlines a variety of personality characteristics representative of the healthy or fully-functioning individual (see: The Early Years—The Definition of Goals and Objectives), the structural developmental mentalists suggest that the essence of psychoeducational goals are rooted in an individual's progression from a "less adequate of psychological state" (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). Implicit in this notion of adequacy is the premise that development indicates an individual's movement toward greater "differentiation, integration, and adaptation" (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972) and is not merely represented by behavioral changes which might appear significant. However, as Kohlberg points out, the developmental educator must take precautions to avoid the trap of "stage-acceleration." It is vital that there be a dual emphasis placed on intervention learning strategies which promote horizontal growth within a stage as well as vertical movement to the next highest stage. This stress on horizontal stage movement helps the child to maintain cognitive structures permeable enough to allow for appropriate stage change at a later time (Rest, 1974). In this context, the primary goal of the practitioner is not stage-acceleration per se, but rather the eventual adult attainments of the highest stage. The avoidance of stage-retardation as opposed to stage-acceleration becomes a key
theme. Along these lines Kohlberg & Mayer (1972) stress the relevance of "horizontal decalage" as a central theme from the practitioner's perspective. They point out that the notion of horizontal decalage (or horizontal stage movement) is in a basic way related to the romantic theorist's emphasis on healthy development. There is, in fact, "no rush." The child must be allowed to "stabilize" at a given stage; the practitioner should focus on helping the child to elaborate stage-specific movement.

Phillips (1980) suggests that "the goal of most applications of developmental theory has been the development through and of the stages of cognitive structures." In addition, the utilization of a developmental approach has also been effective in promoting more contemporaneous or intermediate goals which are non-developmental in nature. The utilization of the approach cited above is reflected in attempts made to match interventions to the developmental level of a particular group. The goal in these cases was to teach a particular skill and/or reduce the rate of recidivism for a delinquent population. These studies appeared promising. (Hunt, 1977-78; Warren, 1969, 1976). Thus, while utilization of development guidelines can facilitate the attainment of learning goals, the practitioner should take precautions not to confuse behavioral changes which are non-developmental in nature with those that are developmental.

Kohlberg & Mayer (1972) argue that "...the cognitive developmental position claims that developmental behavior change is irreversible, general over a field of responses, sequential and
hierarchical." Accordingly, a behavior change that met these criteria would represent a structural reorganization or stage change (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). Furthermore, they point out that while developmental change may occur in a natural or unplanned way, only half of the American adult population reaches Piaget's stage of formal operations and only five percent attain the highest moral developmental stage. Thus, it appears clear that while development occurs naturally, this does not mean that it will occur inevitably—many individuals will in fact fail to reach the highest stage. Therefore, natural experience simply may not be enough.

It is the developmental educator's primary task, given the realities cited above, to help to establish the necessary conditions enabling individuals to progress through the stage sequence. The underlying assumption here is that a higher stage is more adequate or better than the previous one. It was Dewey's (1964) view that an individual's attainment of higher stages translates into "the development of a free and powerful character," qualities he believed were essential for the maintenance of a democratic society. It was Dewey's (1964) position that a developmentally-oriented education would emphasize the development of principled reasoning and would be democratic and nonindoctrinative in nature. This educational approach would be based on "...open methods of stimulation through a sequence of stages, in a direction of movement which is universal for all children" (Dewey, 1964).

Different developmental stages imply different programmatic
goals. Mosher and Sprinthall (1971) argue that the lack of an adequate goal framework is the root cause of many difficulties associated with programs designed to promote psychological development. Along these lines, Schiller (1983) points out that all too often these types of programs have been highly susceptible to and guilty of developmental "mismatching." It is clear that the staff of a given program, in incorporating a developmental perspective, should ask themselves the following questions: (1) What should the student be able to feel? (2) What should the student be able to know? and (3) What should the student be able to do? Within this framework, program staff have a full range of options to emphasize a particular perspective in a given activity, class or group meeting. A teacher may elect to focus on alternative perspectives and student responses to a particular issue or theme by highlighting a range of elements rather than emphasizing one particular conclusion. This approach is consistent with the underlying developmental thrust aimed at assessing and stimulating a student's level of thought processing and not the content or correctness of the response itself. In a sense, this orientation bears a large resemblance to the process/content continuum prominent during the program's Early and Middle Years stages. Developmental theorists typically refer to this phenomena as a competence/performance issue. From this perspective an individual's underlying reasoning process is more revealing than the nature of the conclusion itself. A practitioner operating within a developmental
framework places great emphasis on the ways in which an individual continues her/his experience. In this vein, Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) state that "education is concerned not so much with the age of onset of a child's capacity for concrete logical thought, but with the possession of a logical mind--the degree to which he has organized his experience or his world in a logical fashion."

A number of theorists suggest that the employment of a developmentally-based goal framework program designed to promote human development should operate out of a theoretically clear set of criteria for selecting meaningful and appropriate goals and outcomes (Alschuler, A., Phillips, K., Weinstein, G., 1977; Mosher and Sprinthall, 1971; Rest, 1974). This would eliminate the unsystematic selection of goals for a particular program or curriculum (Alschuler, Phillips, Weinstein, 1977; Phillips, 1980). If a program structure or methodology requires that the student utilize reasoning capabilities beyond which s/he is currently functioning, s/he would not be able to appropriately respond and, therefore, would be unable to attain the desired learning outcome (Ziff, 1979). If, on the other hand, a particular methodology were developmentally matched to the student's stage, the prospect of her/his reaching the desired goal is far greater (Ziff, 1979).

Higgins (1980), in the context of examining the ways in which moral development theory might be effectively utilized, argues that "...interventions for stimulating moral change are those that involve discussion of real problems and situations occurring in
natural groups...in which all participants are empowered to a say in the discussion." Along these lines, Wasserman (1980) discusses the effectiveness in utilizing the "+1 modeling" approach as a viable strategy in "reaching" students at varying developmental levels in promoting an array of appropriate learning outcomes.

Several theorists (Weinstein, 1976; Ziff, 1979; Phillips, 1980; Schiller, 1983) examine the various applications of self-knowledge theory and suggest that an individual's stage of self-knowledge is directly related to her/his ability to significantly benefit from a given psychological education program. Accordingly, Schiller (1983) suggests that in determining the appropriateness of a specific goal for a human development program the utilization of stage-specific criteria may be helpful in distinguishing learning outcomes. "For example, for subjects at the situational stage, program goals defined according to stage criteria might include learning to describe more completely internal states and consequences of actions. For participants at the patterns stage, ...programs could be designed to enhance individual's abilities to describe their internal patterns with increasing detail and sophistication" (Schiller, 1983). Schiller (1983) also points out the positive potential of designing programs by targeting a particular developmental group. The various "matching" procedures cited above are all conceived in order that programs committed to the psychological development of its participants be this much more successful. Sprinthall (19756) argues that "...developmental
constructs are powerful explanatory concepts providing a map of goals and objectives and, indeed, a definition of the aims of education. Thus, we can avoid a theoretical meandering in our search for ideas and theories to guide practice."

In summary, during the Later Years program planners began to utilize structural developmental theory as a primary theoretical basis for the establishment and implementation of the program's psychoeducational goal framework. Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory (1969) and Self-Knowledge Development Theory (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro & Weinstein, 1977) were the two models that had the greatest impact on program design during this period.

Defining Methods and Strategies (the "Environment")

This section will examine the theoretical models used by Maple Valley program planners in the design and implementation of psychoeducational methods and strategies during the Later Years. Central to this discussion will be an examination of the applications of two structural developmental theories concerning the definition of psychoeducational methodology. Particular attention will be given to the analysis of those aspects of Moral Development Theory (Kohlberg, 1969) and Self-Knowledge Theory (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1977) which impacted most significantly on the program's psychoeducational environment.

During the Middle Years, program planners directed the program toward a more organized, sequenced and focused learning environment.
Program staff were generally more intentional and prescriptive in their approach to promoting student development. This new emphasis manifested itself in both counseling and curricula areas. In the counseling domain, program staff had begun to integrate methods aimed at helping students to systematically examine personal content data on both experiential and cognitive levels. In their attempt to integrate academic instruction with personal growth and development, staff found significant value in Brown's (1971, 1975) "Confluent Education" model. In addition, the community meeting forum had begun to be viewed as a "golden" opportunity to more carefully analyze and intervene in group/interpersonal development. The central idea was to more systematically teach a range of interpersonal skills (see: The Middle Years—Defining Methods and Strategies). Theoretical models utilized during the Middle Years were those that provided planners with a more sequential perspective regarding human development and, on that basis, made a positive contribution to the program during this period.

The process cited above impacted on program staff in such a way as to sensitize them to the differential nature of psychoeducational programming. It was becoming increasingly clear that toward the latter part of the Middle Years stage, although the overall movement consisting of a more rigorous and disciplined approach to programming was quite positive, there continued to remain significant gaps in adequately responding to the needs of the client population. During the Middle Years the central foundation
upon which methods and goals were selected and framed now appeared theoretically vague and amorphous. During the Later Years, program planners began to look toward the field of structural developmental psychology in an effort to strengthen these foundations and provide a context within which the selection of more appropriate methods (E) and goals (B) could be derived. In the context of the previously mentioned B-P-E paradigm, the more that was known about the idiosyncratic nature of the individual (P), the more appropriate the methods (E) and goals (B) might be. Thus, the lack of a more refined goal framework appeared to be contributing to many of the problems cited above (Mosher and Sprinthall, 1971). Also, the lack of developmentally-appropriate goals often led to mismatches between the methodology and the learner, often causing her/him unnecessary anxiety and frustration and limiting the potential for learning (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972).

As was the case in prior programmatic transitions, it was vital for program planners to recognize the value and worth of theoretical and/or practical features which had historically represented effectiveness and "success." From the beginning in 1973, program staff placed great emphasis on approaching children in such a way as to enable them to identify the "choices" they make along with the resultant consequences. This "here and now" methodology represented a key environmental ingredient which continued to be regarded as a powerful and productive approach to development. Forman (1979) recognizes the value of the Humanistic/Existential
therapies from a cognitive-development standpoint. He (Forman, 1979) argues that these helping strategies operate out of a common framework which assumes that the most effective means of promoting social adjustment does not lie in the "...resolution of repressed childhood conflicts." Rather, the individual in the midst of turmoil needs to be able to realistically confront her/his dysfunctional behavior and recognize the destructive effect his behavior has in areas such as "...what he or she is currently doing that drives people away..."(Forman, 1979) From a developmental framework, it is significant that these counseling methods each incorporate a cognitive element designed to help the individual recognize and counteract self-defeating behavior (Forman, 1979). A key question for the developmental educator is to what extent s/he can develop a range of processing strategies to most effectively facilitate the student's self-scrutiny regarding her/his choices and behavior (Forman, 1979). In this regard, practitioners have devised numerous intervention strategies in an attempt to determine which environmental components are most facilitative of developmental growth. Schiller (1983) points out that often these strategies are developed in response to the perceived developmental needs of a given population. "In this way they are attached to population characteristics." (Schiller, 1983)
Moral Development Theory

Of the several developmental theories prevalent today (Loevinger's 1966 Ego Development Theory; Selman's 1974 Interpersonal Perspective Taking; Alschuler's, Evans's, Tamashiro's and Weinstein's 1975 Self-Knowledge Development Theory; Hunt's 1974 Conceptual Level Theory), Kohlberg's (1969) Moral Development Theory appears to be the one that is most widely applied in the design of programs geared to the promotion of human development. Furthermore, the most extensively utilized environmental approach within the Kohlbergian framework appears to be the "+1 modeling" method. The underlying thrust of this approach is that student development can be promoted through a process of exposing her/him to moral reasoning at one (+1) stage above her/his current stage. A number of studies that examine the effectiveness of this Socratic-type of dialectical encounter indicate a significant level of success in stimulating moral stage change (Blatt, 1969; Blatt and Kohlberg, 1974). In this sense, children learn ways to process moral issues rather than being "instructed" in moral behavior.

Several researchers (Scharf, 1978; Rundle, 1977; Reimer and Power, 1980; Wasserman, 1980) speak to the effective utilization of the "+1" modeling approach in which students are able to encounter and discuss "real life" moral issues rather than mere hypothetical discourse. The value of grounding this approach in meaningful social issues involving moral dilemmas occurring in natural environments has its theoretical origins in a key Piagetian (1967)
construct. That is, development occurs as the individual attempts to adapt to her/his environment. It is within this context that students are "pushed" to higher levels of reasoning in order to fit that environment (Reimer and Power, 1980). Wasserman (1980) emphasizes that moral development is promoted when a group encounters and confronts a range of norms including real life moral conflict, role taking, issues of fairness, "+1 modeling" and active student participation in the decision-making process. It is important to note that the establishment and maintenance of this type of environment relies to a large extent on the centrality of the practitioner's/leader's mastery in facilitating group process (Rest, 1974; Paolitto, 1977). In this sense the practitioner's skill is critical if the strategies cited above are to be utilized most effectively for the widest range of students at varying developmental stages. Programs such as the Cluster School (Wasserman, 1980) promote the type of communal relations between staff and students in which norms regarding trust, intimacy, participation and an active and collective sense of responsibility are engendered. Kohlberg (1972) points out that these conditions must be present regardless of the individual's particular stage.

It is important to note that in a number of instances cited above, intervention strategies were not selected on the basis of differentiating approaches within a general client group. These approaches exemplified by Kohlberg's "Just Community School" concept (Wasserman, 1980) attempted to match the methodology to the overall
developmental characteristics of the population. The underlying assumption is that a student population will naturally cluster within a developmentally narrow range. Thus, a program that operates within developmental parameters may, in a sense, be made to fit the population by utilizing approaches such as "+1 modeling" which may be effective for a wide range of children in reaching desired learning goals (B). A potential pitfall in this "a priori" or generalized form of developmental matching is that it runs the risk of missing important idiosyncratic information regarding the developmental needs of a given population. Along these lines, Turiel (1966) points out that children have difficulty in responding to moral reasoning more than one stage above their own and reject the reasoning processes peculiar to the stage below. However, he adds that if handled appropriately, the exposure to lower stage reasoning may in fact be utilized effectively.

Finally, Kohlberg (1978) stresses that the central issue in establishing the type of atmosphere conducive to moral development lies in the school's hidden curriculum: "...the hidden curriculum is the moral character and ideology of the teachers and principal as these are translated into a working social atmosphere which influences that atmosphere of the children." The key point is that the hidden curriculum of a program is not merely a matter of shifting or modifying a particular method or strategy; rather, it has to do with the educator's ability to communicate the moral energy or fundamental humanness of a particular program. The idea
is to transmit to students a "...believable human message."
(Kohlberg, 1972) Implicit in this is a warning to educators that
the primary message cannot be one that places the morality of
loyalty to a school or particular ideology at "center stage."
Rather, the hidden curriculum must move beyond a particular social
order of a program. "The teaching of justice requires just
schools." (Kohlberg, 1978) Furthermore, Kohlberg (1978) points out
that a developmental educator need not be overly concerned with the
mere existence of "...the praise, the power, the order and the
competitive achievement" within a program. The central issue
regards the provision of a climate within which a "...context of
justice" (Kohlberg, 1978) grounds these constructs in a meaningful
and productive manner. Thus, from a Kohlbergian perspective, the
attempt by some programs to deny authority (i.e., Summerhill, Maple
Valley--The Early Years) is misguided. The central mission from
this perspective is the explication and utilization of these
elements in a manner that helps students to use them in developing
their sense of morality and justice. Kohlberg (1972) ends this
discussion regarding the "hidden curriculum: with the following
message:

The educational use of the hidden curriculum is not to
prevent the dialogue by calling classroom law and
order moral character, nor to cast it out on the ground
that the child needs only freedom, but to use it to
bring the dialogue of justice into the classroom.

(Kohlberg, 1978)
Self-Knowledge Development Theory

Due to the relative newness of self-knowledge theory (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1977), less data has been generated in terms of applicability to psychoeducational programming. The first "live" experiment with self-knowledge theory consisted of the development of a curriculum for the prevention of alcohol and drug abuse for adolescents (Phillips, McLain and Jones, 1977). The curriculum was directed at helping the students to begin to identify specific situations in which they used drugs or alcohol, to recognize these recollections, and, finally, to develop and experiment with alternative behaviors in similar situations. The curriculum was developmentally sequenced in the sense that individual lessons, including the definition of methods and goals (content and process), reflected the sequential movement from the elemental stage through the internal-patterned stage. An "a priori" form of developmental matching was employed in the design of the program. There was no attempt to "scientifically" tailor specific interventions based on individual developmental differences within the student population. In a second study, Phillips (1980) implemented the same curriculum cited above; however, in the latter instance, she utilized experimental and control groups. The study's findings indicate that the methodology did not result in a discernable increase in the student's stage of self-knowledge. However, there did appear to be some positive movement in terms of self-esteem and a decrease in drug usage.
Ziff (1979) utilizes a matching model approach in an attempt to determine the relationship between an individual's stage of self-knowledge and her/his ability to effectively use stage-specific-processing questions in a human relations training exercise. His original hypothesis was that an individual's ability to meaningfully utilize specific-processing questions would be conditioned by her/his self-knowledge stage level. The results of Ziff's (1979) study indicate that his original hypothesis was accurate. That is, those individuals who were given appropriately "matched" processing questions were able to respond successfully. Conversely, those individuals whose questions were "unmatched" responded unsuccessfully. Thus, the study confirmed the central hypothesis: an individual's stage of self-knowledge development (P) is inextricably linked to her/his ability to effectively process her/his experience (B) when provided appropriate strategies.

Schiller (1983) conducted a study to determine if self-knowledge theory could be utilized as a functional basis upon which a psychoeducational curriculum, Education of the Self, might be appropriately matched to a given population. Schiller's (1983) original hypothesis was that an individual's ability to successfully participate in the program would be based on her/his level of self-knowledge. The underlying premise was that to the extent to which various aspects of the program were matched with an individual's stage of self-knowledge, s/he would derive benefit from the learning experience. The results of Schiller's (1983) study are inconclusive.
However, the endeavor had significant value in that it provided "...an example of developmentally-based evaluative research." (Schiller, 1983) In addition, the study in a general sense suggests that Self-Knowledge Theory can be effectively utilized in the design and implementation of programs directed at promoting human development.

Finally, Weinstein (a co-author of Self-Knowledge Development Theory) proposed in a keynote speech to the national conference of the Association for Humanistis Education (1979) a psychoeducational and psychotherapeutic questioning guide for use with students at various self-knowledge stages. The primary thrust of this outline is to enable psychoeducators "...to ask someone about his experience in a more appropriate and effective manner; i.e., in a manner that would match the capacities of the particular learner's response system." (Weinstein, 1979) Following is a description of Weinstein's (1979) stage question guide.

**Stage Question Guide**

To those at the **elemental** stage ask:

- Where did it happen?
- When did it happen?
- What were you doing when it happened?
- Who was there?
- Who did what?
- What did you do?
- Who said what?
- What did you say?
- How did people look?
- What happened right before that?
- What happened right after that?
- What did you want?
- How did you look?
How did your body feel?
What did you like or dislike about it?

To those at the situational stage, add the following:

What were some of the things you were saying to yourself during the time?
What were the feelings you were experiencing?
What made you think that?
What made you feel that?
What did you think would happen?
What started it?
What made you say that?
How did it effect the rest of your day? (Or anytime after that?)
What did you do as a result of what you felt?
What would a "title" be for the whole situation?
What did you want more (or less) of?

To those at the internal-pattern stage, add the following:

How does your response to this situation remind you of responses in similar situations?
What kinds of situations make you think or feel this way?
Do you find yourself thinking or feeling that way in other situations? What is the same about those situations?
What feelings and thoughts do you recognize about yourself in that situation?
How is the way you responded typical, especially the feelings and thoughts you had?
Would you like to change that response in future situations?
What does that response get for you or help you avoid in those situations?

And finally for those in the process stage, add:

When you know you are feeling that way do or can you do anything about it?
When you find yourself having those kinds of thoughts do or can you do anything about it?
What things do or could you say to yourself that would change, alter or interrupt what you are feeling or thinking?
How do your beliefs about yourself affect your attitude?
Weinstein (1979) points out the comprehensivity of the guide as an instrument to be used with individuals at any stage of self-knowledge development. He indicates that as the counselor works through the different stages of the guide, some individuals will begin to experience difficulty in appropriately responding to the level of questioning. This phenomenon may indicate that the counselee may have reached her/his "ceiling of developmental relevance." Furthermore, he cautions the practitioner in being careful about ascribing too much developmental significance in these situations. According to Weinstein (1979), it is entirely possible that the counselee may just be preoccupied with another matter.

In summary, this section is directed at the analysis of the models outlined above. They provided program planners with a theoretical basis upon which the methodological definition of the Maple Valley program during the Later Years occurred. Particular attention was given to those aspects which significantly impacted on programmatic design and implementation.
A Description and Analysis of the Maple Valley Program

A Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context

"The Pendulum Swings". During the Later Years stage, Maple Valley's relationship to the public sector became increasingly complex and interwoven. This movement may be characterized as an organizational metamorphosis from alternative school to human service agency. Maple Valley's initial foray into the public domain began with the certification of the program as a "special needs" school by the Massachusetts Department of Education. Within a relatively short period of time (approximately one year), Maple Valley had sought out and received complete licensure as a residential and day school from a number of public agencies including the Office for Children, the Department of Public Welfare, and the Department of Youth Services. Thus, by the latter part of the Middle Years stage, the program had begun to view itself and was regarded by these governmental agencies as a viable resource for children and families from across the state. The school's leadership assumed an emerging role of advocacy for the education of adolescents and their families.

This full-scale involvement with the public sector represented a major realignment of program resources. For instance, the program's leadership accepted responsibility for the guidance of internal program operations and also enthusiastically assumed their
new roles as political agents in the area of the design and implementation of social policy. As a non-profit human service agency, Maple Valley joined together with other similar agencies and organizations in seeking to exercise a measure of influence on the allocation of public and human resources. This emerging role (during the late 1970s and early 1980s) occurred in the context of a shrinking "economic pie" and an increasingly virulent ideological attack by "New Right" groups aimed at the very heart of Maple Valley's existence and the welfare of those individuals it served.

Park (1980) discusses the increasing threat posed by the "New Right" in terms of the protection of democracy in our public schools. He argues that the ideological attack mounted by these groups typically manifests itself in the debate over whether "secular humanism" constitutes "religious" (or anti-religious) instruction. This argument can be summarized by a segment taken from a pamphlet distributed by Pro-Family Forum entitled "Is Humanism Molesting Your Child?" (Park, 1980). The pamphlet claims that humanism—

...denies the deity of God; denies the existence of the soul, life after death, salvation and heaven, damnation and hell; denies the Biblical account of creation; believes in sexual freedom between consenting adults, regardless of age, including premarital sex, homosexuality, lesbianism, and incest; believes in the right of abortion, euthanasia, equal distribution of America's wealth, control of the environment, control of energy and its limitation; and, in the removal of American patriotism and the free enterprise system.

Park (1980) counters this "New Right" position by maintaining that
in a free and open society students must have the right and opportunity to have free access to information and to be able to consider the full range of issues effecting their own lives and to appreciate the "...diversity of human experience in our world."

Park's (1980) essay ends with an alert to all those committed to a democratic system in our schools in which students will be able to think and learn independently. It is his view that this noble mission is becoming increasingly urgent in light of the growing and "...pervasive influence of a handful of well-organized political interests in the New and Evangelical far-right." (1980).

It is, in fact, a basic premise of the "New Right" that a meaningful education should be one that effectively prevents students from exploring ideas and values independently; rather, the learning process should be structured in such a way as to impart to students the "truth" as understood by a "qualified" and selected group of authorities. Along these lines, Onalee McGraw wrote a booklet that was published by the Heritage Foundation (an ultra-conservative "think tank") entitled "Secular Humanism in the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come." As in the instance cited above, her premise is that humanistic education is the same as humanistic religion that "worships" humanity rather than God. The booklet promotes a view that opposes federal funding for education and all forms of progressivism and humanism in the schools. Barbara Morris (1980) outlines what she views as the most destructive impact of humanism on the schools. A case in point is her attack on
humanistic education programs as an "...invasion of privacy through values clarification and other behavioral modification and psychological techniques such as role playing and group dynamics." She goes on to stress the breakdown of public education support for traditional societal values and illustrates this point with an attack on "values clarification." Ms. Morris points out that in this instance the educator's role is that of helping young people to learn strategies to enable them to clarify their own values. This effort to facilitate a student's own process of clarifying her/his own values is what Ms. Morris finds most objectionable. In her fundamentalist perspective, she believes it is the school's role to exclusively impart traditional parental and societal values. During the early 1980s the "New Right's" influence is clearly on the ascendancy. Its impact is being clearly and powerfully felt in the political arena, in the determination of economic and social policy and on various societal institutions such as public education.

Ronald Reagan was elected President of the United States in November, 1980. He ran on a platform that represented an ideological perspective supported by a substantial coalition, including organizations of the "New Right." They subscribed to a view of government's role in the determination and implementation of social policy that appeared antithetical to the views espoused by many who spoke on behalf of the "disenfranchised" in our society. In simple terms, President Reagan advocated a governmental policy that essentially represented a "hands-off" perspective with regard to
government's role in defining as well as funding social programs. For many whose life work had been directed toward either the formulation and/or implementation of social programs designed to reenfranchise those "cut adrift" by society, Reaganism represented a systematic dismantling of programs whose ideological roots went as far back as F.D.R.'s "New Deal."

This ideological battle was occurring in the context of an ever-shrinking economic base. Governmental deficits were growing, interest rates climbing, and all this combined with a soaring inflation rate. For many middle-class Americans, increased funding for social programs was beginning to represent a major dilemma—in light of increasing taxes and a diminishing standard of living. It was within this climate that a number of tax "revolts" sprang up in various parts of the country. Two of the more prominent cases in point are "Proposition 13" in California and "Proposition 2 1/2" in Massachusetts (1980). In both cases, the intent of these two successful public referendums was to severely limit government's ability to increase real estate taxes. Also, in both states, it was collected revenues from this tax base that had previously been channeled into a range of governmental services, including support for public education and human services.

In this context, in a conservative movement in social, political and economic areas, the ideological and fiscal battle at the beginning of the 1980s was becoming crystal clear. Those individuals or organizations, such as the Maple Valley leadership,
who viewed their role as advocates for the more disenfranchised segments of society had an increasingly clear agenda. At the beginning of the 1980s the Maple Valley organization as a human service agency was operating in a non-conducive political and economic climate. Maple Valley allotted substantial resources in the effort to create opportunities to promote the human development of its client population. It is within this context that the program approached its Later Years. As internal development continued to struggle for enhanced programmatic effectiveness, the external arena demanded attention and effort to ensure survival itself.

Using the Behavior--Person--Environment Model: An Introduction

As initially stated in the Overview and Methodology section, the B-P-E model will be used as the primary vehicle for the purposes of defining individual needs, determining psychoeducational goals and understanding programmatic design. This model offers an economical framework within which one is able to gain a complete understanding of the program's construction of each domain in rather distinct terms. The breakdown of these areas into their component parts provides the reader with guidelines as to the degree of emphasis given to each area by program planners.

The Nature and Definition of the Student Population (the "Person")

There were twenty-eight residential students and five day
school students enrolled in the Maple Valley program at the beginning of the 1979-1980 school year. The students ranged in age from thirteen years old to nineteen years old (a demographic profile of the student population will be provided at the end of this section).

The nature of the student population remained fairly consistent during the transition from the Middle to the Later stages. Unlike the previous two periods, the Later Years did not bring with it a new "type" of student. However, there were significant changes occurring with the student group. As noted earlier, the "child seeking enhancement" had played an integral part in school life during the earlier years and was completely gone from the program by the end of the Middle Years. These children reflected a unique historical chapter whose time had clearly passed (see: The Early Years—The Socio-Cultural Context and The Nature and Definition of the Student Population).

At the beginning of the Later Years period, the student group consisted of the two representational "types" of students discussed in the Middle Years. They are the "child in distress" (see: The Early Years—The Nature and Definition of the Student Population) and the "disenfranchised child" (see: The Middle Years—The Nature and Definition of the Student Population). The changes occurring within the student group primarily concerned the demographic shifts reflecting the proportional representation from each group. That is, by 1981 the "disenfranchised child" represented a significantly
larger segment.

The "child in distress" continued to represent a numerically decreasing yet distinct portion of the student group by the end of the Middle Years. In general terms, these children came from middle class families in which they were typically regarded as "problem children." As was often the case, these children's psycho-histories were rife with individual and familial turmoil characterized by profound anguish and frustration. Parents of these children typically appeared overcome with despair and a sense of futility regarding their child's overall condition. This pervasive disillusionment often manifested itself in an atmosphere of desperation; parents appeared ready to explore any educational option that seemed in any way viable.

These children generally entered the Maple Valley program in an angry and confused state with poor self-concepts and formidable histories of failure and rejection. Many of these children were well behind in academic areas and this further compounded an already difficult situation. In most instances, they appeared immediately attracted to community life and ultimately invested themselves in it.

The second group of children, defined as "the disenfranchised child," was introduced in the Middle Years chapter (see: The Nature and Definition of the Student Population). During the Later Years, these children would come to represent the predominant segment of the student population. In a sense, this phenomena reflects the
nature of the school's growing relationship with public sector
human service and educational agencies (see: The Middle Years—The
Socio-Cultural Context). At the risk of generalizing and
oversimplifying the unique nature of these children, it may be said
that they tended to view the world as a threatening and hostile
place; many had histories characterized by neglect and abuse. Most
of these children were in the legal custody of the state's child
welfare system. In contrast to the "child in distress", these
children had in many instances lost contact with their families of
origin; parental rejection and abandonment had become all-too-famil-
liar themes. Also, these children tended to be of a lower socio-
economic status. In practice, a child from the "group" would be
referred to Maple Valley via a social worker or school psychologist.
In the main, they typically appeared awed with the level of intimacy
and informality of the school's atmosphere. For many of them this
feature appeared to represent a most positive change when contrasted
with the more institutionalized "treatment" they had previously
encountered.

The following excerpts from student interviews (see:
Appendix C) illustrate their understanding of reasons for coming to
Maple Valley:

I was looking for some place that I could grow from,
after I'd been moving around to a lot of places and
people that I didn't really like. A lot of the homes
I was in weren't really the greatest places in the
world and I just kept getting moved around, and I was
tired of that. So I thought I could go to Maple
Valley--I knew I could get my diploma and public
school wasn't really the thing for me, 'cause I didn't deal too much with all those people and all their bull, so I thought I'd come here and see how it was.  
(13th student interview)

I came because I wasn't getting along at home wasn't getting the education I needed. I needed to learn to cope with my problems; I used to have a really bad temper. I needed something to help me slow myself down instead of just going off fighting. Swinging it out...I needed to stop doing that. Instead of hitting someone, I needed something to help me learn to deal with people.  
(14th student interview)

Throughout the Middle Years, staff made significant and focused attempts to better attend to this changing student population. The program's ideological orientation remained firmly rooted in a romantic or maturational view of human development. It was within these theoretical parameters that program staff experimented with various educational models in an effort to redefine and redesign psychoeducational methods (E) and goals (B). In the environmental arena (E), the program shifted from a laissez-faire approach to a more sequenced and formalized attempt to organize the learning experience. In the area of learning goals (B), the movement was in the direction of greater differentiation and specificity. Goals were no longer construed in global and generic terms; they became more tailored to individual students within the unique school environment.  

The program's fundamental orientation regarding its conception of individual needs/differences saw the least change during the Middle Years. By the end of this period (see: The Middle
program planners viewed this relatively static conception of the "person" as a primary area of programmatic weakness. Program staff were not entirely satisfied with the resultant outcomes in spite of the success with which the restructuring of methods and goals had on the program's overall level of functioning. Simply, children were not making the type of progress staff had hoped to see. When learning did occur, it often appeared far too transitory in nature for a number of children. There appeared to be a basic weakness in the ways in which individual needs/differences were construed.

In functional terms, this weakness translated into the staff's "inability" to utilize idiosyncratic data in such a way as to enable a systematic approach to the selection of "matched" methods and goals. This "matching" process, in fact, often appeared as a haphazard, "hit-or-miss" proposition. Hence, planners had begun to reevaluate central assumptions peculiar to the Humanistic/Existential tradition. For example, one such assumption concerns the view that all children have an innate capacity to experience empathy for others and gain functional insight into themselves. In fact, program practices and experiential data effectively contraindicated this "universal" premise. A number of children appeared genuinely unable to understand basic cause and effect relationships; others seemed unable to process their experience in such a way as to enable them to gain and utilize self-insight. Thus, as the program enters its Later Years, it does
so within a climate of disequilibrium with respect to its underlying view of the person.

It was during this programmatic stage that staff began to explore and ultimately utilize the area of structural developmental theory in their efforts to better understand the unique needs of the student population. This developmental perspective regarding individual growth appeared quite compelling to program planners on two levels. Firstly, as a result of the haphazard quality associated with the "matching" process cited above, planners were drawn to the economical and more "scientific" way in which the developmental paradigm offered a functional "road map" for the selection of appropriate methods and goals. Secondly, it appeared that a number of structural developmental models integrated those qualities associated with the fully-functioning, healthy individual into an entirely new context. This latter point is essential in order for the reader to gain a complete grasp of the basic attraction to the developmental framework.

Program planners remained firmly committed to their historical conception of the "healthy" individual. For instance, the description of the fully-functioning person offered by Rogers (1959) (see: The Early Years--Theoretical Conception of Human Development) continued to represent a superordinal vision of human development during this period. However, it had become increasingly clear that those theoretical models of mental health which were foundational in underlying the program's first two stages did not effectively speak
to the unique needs of children in any functional way without significant modifications (Loevinger, 1976). According to Loevinger (1976) (The Author of Ego Development Theory), much of what was posited by the Humanistic/Existential formulation of the healthy individual is in fact represented by the highest level of developmental functioning. Furthermore, she argues (1976) that "the richness of the conception is lost when one sees only the extremes, and the nature of its course is implicitly distorted."

Thus, there exist significant parallels between the self-actualized, fully-functioning individual (as defined by Humanistic/Existential theorists) and the individual whose stage of moral reasoning is at the post-conventional level and the process stage of self-knowledge development. For instance, according to Maslow (1970), the self-actualized individual possesses a more accurate view of reality, acceptance of self and others, problem centeredness, independence of culture and environment, freshness and appreciation, capacity for utilizing peak experiences, social interest, being democratic in nature, ability to discriminate between means and ends, creativity and an ability to resist enculturation. Similarly, from a Rogerian (1959) perspective, the fully-functioning person has the ability to fully experience feelings in all their detail, is able to make the necessary delineations regarding the nature of her/his experiences, trusts her/his own process and takes full responsibility and ownership for feelings, and views personal constructs as ways of understanding
her/his experiences which are permeable and open to change.

In addition, an individual at the post-conventional level of moral reasoning utilizes universal ethical principles in making moral judgments. Furthermore, these judgments are not rooted in a fixed perception of "right and wrong." Rather, they are based on situational variables that take into account factors such as the level of democratic process. In addition, this individual is likely to consider the interpersonal climate (i.e., level of trust and respect) as prominent in his reasoning process. The stage VI individual regards her/himself as fully responsible for her/his actions. Similarly, the individual at the process stage of self-knowledge development is likely to construe her/his experience in terms of her/his ability to assume a pro-active posture with respect to influencing or altering his own internal states. Furthermore, it is at this stage that we see individuals describing their feelings and overall responses to experience in elaborate detail highlighting the ways in which they have been able to manage their internal life.

Hence, program planners were able to integrate their overriding view of human development within a developmental context. In other words, those qualities associated with healthy functioning continued to represent the ultimate aim of the educational process. However, the shift from describing the individual as "healthy" to an individual functioning at an advanced developmental level was not merely an exercise in semantics. To the contrary, the utilization of a theoretical schema that spoke to the differential nature of
human development implied a significant paradigm shift. These language changes, in fact, represented the staff's intention to construe an individual's growth in terms of her/his movement through a sequence of developmental stages which reflect her/his capacity to integrate and reason about her/his experience. It was also understood by staff that children at various stages would reason and organize life's issues in substantially different ways which would condition their behavior. Thus, through the use of a developmental framework, staff began to consider the varying ways in which students at different stages reasoned about their experiences. Furthermore, staff no longer construed growth as an interactive process in which the individual acts on and reacts to her/his environment. This interactive perspective regarding development promoted a recognition of and respect for the environmental role; this represented an entirely new formulation. Hence, children come to Maple Valley from environments where they had often experienced severe deprivation and were typically "developmentally arrested." This shift away from a static or fixed notion of personality "traits" to a developmental/process orientation enabled staff to be more cognizant of the necessity of "matching" a given (E) strategy with a child's stage of development.

As noted earlier, the programmatic movement from the Middle Years to the Later Years did not represent a significant change in the nature of the student population; there were no new "types" of children introduced during this period. It is for this reason that
I have chosen to depart from the case study format of a "typical student" utilized in the previous chapters. The case study approach was used in these instances as a vehicle through which new groups of students might be effectively profiled (see: The Middle Years--The Nature and Definition of the Student Population). The "disenfranchised child's" history was marked by a lengthy and profound process of failure and rejection both in terms of his family and school situations. The following excerpts were drawn from a comprehensive progress report written toward the end of his 2 1/2 year enrollment.

Name: Doug
DOB: 7/5/64
Placement Date: 7/18/79
Period From: 7/30/81-12/18/81

TEAM PROGRESS REPORT

Psychological/Social Development

Doug has made tremendous progress in the program, growing in very important ways. He has never been terribly prone to acting out, and has almost always obeyed school rules and policies, as indicated by his consistently high status in our privilege level system. He has, however, struggled hard and long, and in many ways successfully with some very difficult issues.

Doug had a very difficult time before he came here, both in school and at home. He has been judged and found wanting for most of his life; he has failed and been given a variety of "failure" labels by a variety of people. Out of these experiences have come some profound and far-reaching problem areas for Doug. These are the themes and issues that he will carry all his life; they will never "go away." He can and has, however, learned to manage these issues better and better. Regression to older patterns of management are likely to occur at times of stress.
One pervasive theme for Doug has been a feeling of powerlessness and helplessness, that nothing he wants or does makes much of a difference. Doug certainly has been in this position, and has at times fought hard to overcome it (as evidenced by his long struggle to get residential care for himself). However, these feelings are quite pervasive and tend to surface in many areas, even when Doug's factual position may be quite different.

Another related theme for Doug is his self-concept. Doug has struggled with conflicting feelings about himself. On the one hand, he fears that all the labels are true, that he is worthless and a failure. On the other hand, Doug refuses to accept that judgment. There has always been a spark in him that will not accept that judgment, that rebels against it when it comes from others and he is determined to change it within himself. This internal conflict has had some important results. First, Doug tends to be afraid of being vulnerable in any way. This includes emotional vulnerability (showing feelings, taking personal and interpersonal risks, being assertive) and the vulnerability that comes from trying to achieve. In all of this, he is afraid to fail, afraid of being judged a failure. Secondly, at the same time he fears failure, Doug fears success, for success means a radically different view of self. Finally, it is not easy for Doug to accept responsibility for himself or his actions. Responsibility is seen by him as critical, and any criticism only confirms all his worst fears.

These themes have a profound impact on another important area for Doug, his problem-solving and decision-making skills. Doug faces a number of difficulties in this area. First of all, it is often hard for him to see his actions as choices. This makes it hard to see and evaluate alternatives. A major reason for this is that choice implies responsibility. Doug had various ways of deflecting this view. He would say, "I have to do_____; I have no choice," "It won't help," etc. Another problem for Doug was his tendency to become overwhelmed. He would try to deal with too many issues at once, and had no sense of how to sort them out, or of how and where to begin working on any particular one. We have worked hard with Doug in this area. Our approach has had several components. First, we have confronted Doug with the choices he made and insisted that he bear responsibility for them.
Secondly, we would ask Doug what he was going to do, emphasizing that he had choices, each of which had costs and benefits. Finally, we tried to teach Doug concrete, step-by-step processes for sorting out issues, identifying feelings, wants, needs, priorities, etc., and taking action. Doug responded very well to these approaches and has increasingly been able to leave old patterns behind and to do more and more of these processes on his own.

Another important area affected by the themes discussed earlier is Doug's attitude towards authority. Doug has been treated unfairly by people in authority, and poorly judged by them. If he had not fought against these factors, he would never have made the progress he has made. He has also run afoul of some systems that can be oppressive (schools, social services, etc.). Again he has fought them and won important victories. However, these fights, combined with Doug's self-image issues have lead to a real suspicion of authority in structures or individuals. This suspicion can be healthy and functional, but it can also be destructive, especially when it is not grounded in reality. When Doug first came here he was very concerned with the structure of the program—who has the power, what are the rules, etc. He was also very concerned with what systems had power over us. He has, over time, let go of these concerns to some extent. He is still very concerned about them, however, and does not always trust even the people who have worked with him for a long time, seeing them as pawns of The System.

Self-Knowledge

Self-Knowledge, as the term is used here, refers to an individual's ability to identify, understand and act upon their internal emotional responses. There are developmental factors involved in self-knowledge but many other elements may also enhance or hinder an individual's abilities in this area. One of the first steps in self-knowledge development is learning to identify and express feelings. This has been a very difficult area for Doug. When he first came here he was a very well-spoken person, except when talking about his feelings. At these times he became choked and confused. Anger and frustration were particularly difficult; it was as if he saw no point in exploring these feelings—they were dead ends, leading nowhere. Doug has made
tremendous progress in his ability to understand and talk about his feelings, but still needs support, especially during times of stress. He is increasingly eloquent and elaborate in expressing his feelings and in understanding the links between events that cause his feelings, his feelings and his behavioral responses. He is thus more able to view those responses as choices and take some responsibility for them. The next step in self-knowledge development is recognizing patterns in one's internal responses. Doug is not yet able to do this very well or very consistently, but that is not unusual or inappropriate for someone his age. An issue related to self-knowledge is what action is taken on emotions, how they are vented and expressed. Doug has come a long way in learning that not only is it acceptable to feel upset and say so, but that that upsetness can be expressed in ways that are not destructive.

Peer Relationships
This has been another area of difficulty, and also of tremendous growth. When Doug was first here he was harassed and teased a lot, and was the butt of several pranks. It was very hard for him to assert himself with peers. He let issues pile up and then let them all spill out. He felt overwhelmed, like they were all related issues and there was nothing he could do. He refused suggestions and spoke of leaving. However, he did not leave, and by supporting, confronting and teaching him, we helped Doug make great strides in his assertiveness and conflict management skills. At first, Doug had no friends here. As time has gone on he has developed some good friendships from time to time. Most of his peers respect him. Doug can be a very caring and giving friend, and his peers have increasingly recognized these qualities and sought them out. However, Doug still has no consistent people he spends time with, and, in fact, spends a lot of time alone. Doug has also had some problems relating to young women. When he was first here the girls often found him abrasive. Doug worked hard to understand and change. Now many of the girls like Doug; some confide in him. However, the closeness and romance he would like has eluded him.

Attitude Towards the Program
When Doug first came to Maple Valley he was very enthusiastic about being here. He had waited a long time for placement, and he liked it very much. He contributed to the school in many ways: he organized
trips, he generated ideas, contributed at meetings and obeyed the rules consistently. After a brief struggle with limits around classes Doug's consistent contribution and responsibility brought him to the top of our privilege level system. When we opened a new responsibility dorm, separated from the main campus, Doug was a leading candidate and was one of the first groups of students to live there.

Sometime around the spring of 1981, Doug began to be increasingly disturbed about changes in the program. Our program is always changing. We are constantly striving to find evermore effective structures and methods to deal with a wider range of problems. We have also tried to differentiate our structures so that those students who do not need as much structure have less. For the most part these changes had no pragmatic affect on Doug. Nevertheless, he was upset by them, and he began to complain loudly and at length. Some of his complaints seemed legitimate, but it also seemed that the changes touched old authority issues for Doug. Furthermore, his dissatisfaction was sometimes expressed in destructive ways, muttering and gossiping with other students. Finally, Doug's dissatisfaction became a vehicle for him to avoid responsibility; he would not do his work, or became upset when confronted about his attitude. For awhile we engaged Doug at a content level, trying to convince him that the changes were not all that bad. However, we soon switched to insisting that Doug consider his choices. O.K., so you don't like it here. Are you staying or not? He tried to say that he had to, but we always emphasized that there are choices, even if none of them are good ones, and that, therefore, he was choosing to stay. The consequences of that choice were that he must do his work and not be destructive, or we would end the placement. Doug has hung on; his attitude has vacillated. However, the above-mentioned struggle has been a constant on some level for many months.

This excerpt from the assessment report serves to illustrate the ways in which program staff had begun to construe individual differences/needs during the Later Years. There are a number elements incorporated into this assessment that are worthy of distinction. Firstly, the report substantiates the notion that the
program had broadened its theoretical perspectives in defining the "person." Program staff continued to view individual differences/needs in ways that are linked to earlier programmatic stages. Thus, references to self-concept formation remain quite relevant: "He has been judged and found wanting for most of his life; he has failed and been given a variety of "failure" labels by a variety of people. Out of these experiences have come some profound and far-reaching problem areas for Doug. ...he fears that all labels are true that he is worthless and a failure." Also, utilization of Weinstein's and Fantini's (1970) model (see: The Middle Years—Understanding Individual Needs), which places identity, connectedness and power at the center of their formulation, remains operational. Statements such as, "One pervasive theme for Doug has been a feeling of powerlessness and helplessness," testifies to the continued strength of the construct. Furthermore, in the area of connectedness, significant emphasis is given to defining Doug's world of peer relations. Characteristic of this description are references to the way he is regarded by other students: "Doug can be a very caring and giving friend, and his peers have increasingly recognized these qualities and sought them out."

During the Later Years, program staff began to utilize a developmental paradigm not only in attempting to better understand how individual needs such as identity and connectedness are relevant for a child at a given "state" but also in assessing the qualitative nature of how a child reasons about her/his experience. Thus, the
entire section relating to Doug's self-knowledge development attempts to define his reasoning processes that are developmental in nature. An example of one such instance is: "He is increasingly eloquent and elaborate in expressing his feelings and in understanding the links between events that cause his feelings, his feelings and his behavioral responses... The next step in self-knowledge development is recognizing patterns in one's internal responses. Doug is not yet able to do this very well or very consistently, but that is not unusual for someone his age."

In summary, during the Later Years, the Maple Valley program began to utilize a developmental framework in an effort to better understand the differential nature of individual needs. In this effort, program planners attempted to integrate historically recognized precepts regarding individual needs and place them within a developmental context. Thus, program staff appeared better equipped to utilize student-specific data in such a way as to enable the systematic approach to the selection of developmentally-appropriate methods (E) and goals (B).
Table XII
A Demographic Profile of the Student Population of the Later Years
(NOTE: All statistics are based on yearly averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18/10</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>75% C 25% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=Female M=Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19/9</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>70% C 30% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C=Caucasian M=Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determining Psychoeducational Goals and Objectives (the "Behavior")

In outlining Maple Valley's psychoeducational goals during this stage of its development, it is important to reemphasize the fundamental relationship that these goals had to the underlying conceptualization of student needs. In the Later Years, the structural developmental perspective as interpreted by program planners began to represent a new way of construing individual differences/needs. The very nature of the developmental paradigm lent itself to the establishment of a functional goal framework. That is, stage characteristics themselves were meaningfully translated into learning objectives. Thus, from this perspective, a primary learning goal was the promotion of an individual's movement toward and attainment of the next developmental stage. However, Maple Valley staff were fully cognizant of the inherent trap in the direction of "stage acceleration" in that significant emphasis was placed on a student's horizontal growth within a stage as well as vertical movement to the next highest stage. Thus, the ultimate
learning goal was the eventual adult attainment of the highest stage.

The developmental approach also enabled staff to more effectively promote student progress in contemporaneous or horizontal areas which may or may not be stage progressive in nature. Thus, the utilization of a developmental paradigm enabled program planners to construct a goal framework which rooted the establishment of learning goals in a more "matched" context. Hence, Maple Valley staff began to ask themselves the following questions:
1) What should the student be able to know? 2) What should the student be able to feel? 3) What should the student be able to do?

Once again, this process enabled the program to operate out of a theoretically clear set of criteria for selecting meaningful and appropriate goals and outcomes.

During the Later Years, program staff employed developmental guidelines in the two primary areas of learning goals outlined above. As previously noted, stage characteristics themselves were translated into functional goals. Thus, a child at the situational stage of self-knowledge, for example, would be encouraged to elaborately and in as much detail as possible report on their internal responses to a given distinct situation while emphasizing the causal nature of various elements within that situation. The assessment report regarding "Doug" (see: The Later Years--The Nature and Definition of the Student Population), written in the spring of 1981, illustrates this point of using stage characteristics as goals in themselves--"He is increasingly eloquent and
elaborate in expressing his feelings and in understanding the links between events that cause his feelings, and his feelings and his behavioral responses." A brief outline of specific goals written for and with "Doug" are listed below.

**Planning: In Placement**

The two main goals we want to concentrate on are competency-based high school diploma and progress towards independent living. Of course, hand-in-hand with these goals is the continuing strengthening of the movements Doug had already made. Doug may not achieve his diploma by June but can certainly make solid progress towards it. We will be looking for new ways to provide Doug with more opportunities for decision-making, for transferring his learning to outside situations, and for the development of independent living skills.

**A. Short-term Goals:**
- Doug will continue to improve his skills in self-knowledge
- Doug will continue to improve his skills in self-responsibility
- Doug will continue to improve his skills in decision-making
- Doug will continue to improve his skills in stress and conflict management
- Doug will continue to improve his skills in problem-solving
- Doug will continue to improve his self-image
- Doug will continue to improve his peer relations
- Doug will make progress towards a competency-based high school diploma

**B. Long-term Goals:**
- Doug will develop his independent-living skills
- Doug will achieve a high school diploma

It is noteworthy that program planners employed the same general description of program goals and objectives during the Later Years as it did in the Middle Years with one important difference: all goals identified for individual students were based on their
developmental readiness. This is indicated by the notation follow¬
lowing the seventh point in the cognitive-academic area. The
following represents an outline of Maple Valley's overall program
goals and objectives as submitted to the Department of Education in
the spring of 1981.

Program Goals and Objectives

The two general goals of the Maple Valley School program are the total psychological development of the child, including the cognitive and affective, and preparation for successful reintegration into the family and local school system or for independent living. Specific behavioral goals fall under one or both of these goals.

I. Total Psychological Development

A. Psychoemotional/Affective Development

1. Students will increasingly express feelings words or constructive physical acts

2. Students will increasingly identify pressures, experiences both internally or externally, which affect behavior

3. Students will increasingly identify behaviors which lead to personally desirable outcomes

4. Students will increasingly identify behaviors which lead to personally undesirable outcomes

5. Students will increasingly demonstrate awareness of the impact of their behavior on others

6. Students will increasingly interact with adults and peers in constructive ways

7. Students will increasingly initiate interaction with adults seeking support, assistance, or clarification
8. Students will increasingly demonstrate awareness of choices they make, decisions to act one way instead of another, alternative ways

9. Students will increasingly accept consequences in their actions without displaced anger or blaming

10. Students will increasingly engage in activities which have uncertain outcomes and are not necessarily congruent with a restricted self-image

11. Students will increasingly evaluate their own and others' behavior/performance in non-punitive ways

B. Cognitive-Academic Area

1. Students will attend classes designed to improve academic skills

2. Students will demonstrate awareness of time and its relationship to behavior and consequences

3. Students will increasingly identify realistic interests and goals

4. Students will identify and communicate circumstances which are conducive to skill and knowledge acquisition

5. Students will increasingly articulate questions

6. Students will increasingly identify personal deficits in skills and knowledge which can be addressed in classes or activities

7. Students will increasingly choose classes and activities based on personal interest and on desire to achieve specific, realistic goals

NOTE: Appropriate goals are identified for each student based on level of psychological development.
II. Preparation for Successful Reintegration into Family and School System and for Independent Living

A. Reintegration

1. Student will demonstrate age-appropriate academic skills

2. Student will demonstrate ability to satisfactorily reenter family as verified by student and parental assessments or vacation periods

3. Student will realistically assess educational alternatives available in their school system and make choices cooperatively with all necessary authorities

4. Student will, verbally and behaviorally, at home and at school, demonstrate sufficient self-control and responsibility to reenter their home environment

B. Independent Life

1. Student will demonstrate sufficient reading, computational and survival skills in a variety of situations, both in Maple Valley and away, to effectively cope with independent living

2. Student will participate in pre-vocational training experiences, likely including both paid employment and some Apprenticeship Program activities

3. Student will demonstrate the capacity for realistic life planning

4. Student will demonstrate the ability to establish and maintain a network of relationships sufficient to satisfy social and emotional needs

It is significant that these same goals which had been utilized in a non-developmental context during the Middle Years were now being employed without alteration in a developmental schema. A
number of these goals have stage-specific connotations. For example, the following statement, "Students will increasingly identify behaviors which lead to personally desirable outcomes," is a program goal which highlights a central and basic causal relationship. This goal, for instance, is linked to stage two of moral reasoning and the situational stage of self-knowledge development (see: The Later Years—Understanding Individual Needs). In another case, "Students will increasingly demonstrate awareness of the impact of their behavior on others." This program goal, with its more advanced causal relationship than in the previous instance, directly corresponds to stage three of moral reasoning development as well as the situational stage of self-knowledge development.

As noted earlier, a developmental framework was utilized by staff in their efforts to tailor the selection of goals (developmental and non-developmental) to particular students. In an in-service document circulated to the staff, Sweitzer (1980) outlines how one particular goal, the development of self-responsibility, appears to children at various levels of moral reasoning and self-knowledge development. He begins with a description of how the notion of self-responsibility is construed by those individuals capable of expressing their experience to the fullest extent possible. These individuals would be likely to describe their experiences in the following ways:

- understands their response to a situation as a choice
elaborates the events and feelings that led to that choice

- describes their response as part of an internal response pattern (if that is the case)

- describes alternative responses

- understands the effects of their choices on themselves and others

- recognizes their ability to make alternative choices, or take action on an internal pattern

- accepts the responsibility for the effects that their choice had on themselves and others.

(Sweitzer 1980)

Sweitzer (1980) adds that in order for an individual to describe her/his experience in these terms s/he would need to be reasoning at least at the conventional level of moral reasoning and the process stage of self-knowledge development. However, for the Maple Valley student population, many of whom were reasoning at significantly lower levels of development, the notion of self-responsibility appeared somewhat different.

The meaning of self-responsibility changes when viewed through the stage-specific "filters" of various moral developmental levels. Following is an outline of the ways in which the goal of self-responsibility was understood by program planners within a moral developmental framework (Sweitzer, 1980).

At stage one a student would be able to demonstrate self-responsibility by owning their role in a particular act and accepting their resultant consequences. Students at this stage
would be unable in any meaningful way to grasp the causal connection between the act and the consequences.

At stage two a child would be able to weigh the benefits and disadvantages of a particular act in terms of pragmatic variables. Thus, a judgement would be made based on the relative merits of the choices involved.

At stage three a student would be able to recognize the impact her/his behavior had on others. S/he would also be able to describe how this factor influenced her/his decision-making process.

At stage four a child would be able to recognize the extent to which their behavior is in violation of or conflicts with a particular rule or law. S/he would also be equipped to explain how this notion influenced her/his reasoning process and her/his ability to accept the consequences of the rule violation.

At stage five a child would move beyond the reasoning characteristics of the prior stage in that the act referred to in the previous instance would now be understood more in terms of a "social contract" than a rule violation. A child at this stage would likely be concerned with the welfare of the entire group and would be able to translate this concern into a primary motivating force in her/his reasoning process.

Sweitzer (1980) points out that during this period very few students were able to reason at this level. None were reasoning at stage six levels.

The meaning of self-responsibility also changes when
understood within the parameters of self-knowledge development (Sweitzer, 1980). Following is an outline of the ways in which self-responsibility was understood by program planners from a self-knowledge developmental perspective.

At the **elemental stage** a child would be able to report fully on what s/he did and observed in very concrete terms and in a sequential manner. Also this child would be able to recognize the existence of cause/effect relationships but not grasp the nature of this relationship in any meaningful sense.

At the **situational stage** a student would be able to describe her/his internal responses to a complete situation. A child at this stage would be able to recognize the causal nature of her/his actions, and the relationship her/his feelings have to her/his behavior and vice-versa. It is important to note that a child's ability to construe self-responsibility at this stage is bounded by the parameters of a given situation. Thus, this individual can only be accountable for her/his behavior and/or feelings within a particular situation.

At the **internal-patterned stage** a student would be able to understand and take responsibility for their internal responses and behavior across situations and over time. They would be able to view their own responses as characteristic of a unique personal tapestry and recognize their impact on others. Thus, self-responsibility for an individual at this stage translates into one's desire to work on a particular patterned way of dealing with a class
of situations, or accepting full responsibility for the consequences of their behavior if s/he elects not to do so.

Sweitzer (1980) points out that during this period very few students were able to process their experience at the internal-patterned stage. None were able to report on their experience from a process stage of self-knowledge development.

The following excerpts from interviews (see: Appendix C) illustrate student and staff perceptions of personal learning outcomes and program goals during the Later Years period:

Personal and interpersonal development was always the major emphasis at Maple Valley. This reflected both the values of the staff and the needs and goals of the adolescents we worked with.... They needed to learn to understand their experience and their feelings, to communicate their wants and needs, and to assert themselves effectively and nondestructively. This required a full-time emphasis and the Maple Valley staff was dedicated to that.

(Annie—staff)

I think it tried to get people to learn together--and to help people who had bad situations in other places--that's what they tried to do. They gave people a home who didn't really have good homes, you know. They tried to make it better for them.

(15th student interview)

In summation, the program's conception of psychoeducational goals underwent a significant transformation during the Later Years. The utilization of a developmental approach enabled program planners to establish a goal framework that was theoretically clear and utilitarian. Not only were various "stage" characteristics translated into meaningful goals, but additional goals, not necessarily or directly stage progressive in nature, were better
"matched" to a student's reasoning capabilities. Several examples, taken from school transcripts and documents, clearly illustrate the above points.

Programmatic Design (the "Environment")

This section will examine the theoretical models used by Maple Valley program planners in the design and implementation of psychoeducational methods and strategies during the Later Years. Particular attention will be given to those environmental ingredients which impacted most significantly on program design.

During the Middle Years, the central programmatic movement was toward a more organized, sequenced and prescriptive learning environment. The emphasis was away from a preoccupation with children's "rights" per se and toward providing students with more systematic opportunities for their total psychoeducational development. This activity occurred in non-academic as well as academic areas.

The ensuing examination will illustrate how the utilization of a developmental framework influenced the Maple Valley program in two primary ways. Firstly, the structural developmental schema impacted the staff in such a way as to affirm and validate their general overriding approach to dealing with children. Secondly, the developmental approach enabled staff to expand their repertoire to interventions in their effort to more "scientifically" match strategies with a more elaborate and sophisticated view of the
person in the direction of more realistic and appropriate goals.

As in the Early and Middle Years chapters, I will focus the following discussion on Maple Valley's psychoeducational climate. This analysis will include the type of documentation that will serve to illuminate life at the school as it was lived at this particular time. This data is designed to provide the reader with an overview of programmatic functioning rather than to establish an elaborately detailed account of a particular intervention or method.

As in the previous chapters, I will employ Hunt and Sullivan's (1974) analytic schema in an attempt to facilitate the reader's ability to organize the Maple Valley School environment. Their model provides the reader with an opportunity to view a full range of environmental factors. The table of "Levels of Educational Environments" (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974) on page 96 in the Early Years chapter--Programmatic Design--illustrates the framework.

NOTE: The environmental paradigm provides a general guide for the purpose of outlining the Maple Valley program. It is important to point out that several elements that comprise this schema have been examined and developed in other sections of this chapter or previous chapters. Therefore, the emphasis in this segment will be on elaborating those aspects previously uncharted and undefined.

Cultural Setting:

Due to the nature and significance of the cultural context during this stage of the school's development, I have previously delineated and discussed this area as a separate sub-section of the
Middle Years (see: Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context).

Cultural School Setting:

During this period the Maple Valley School culture continued to be one in which personal development for both students and staff remained the central thread. The philosophical posture peculiar to this orientation has been examined in depth in prior chapters.

As discussed in previous chapters, the school is located in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts. Wendell, a rural town northeast of Amherst, Massachusetts, continued to represent a fertile climate for the development of the Maple Valley program. A detailed profile of the cultural dynamics of the town, which remained fairly stable during this period, has been provided in prior chapters (see: The Early Years—Programmatic Design).

School Characteristics:

Information regarding the size of the school and the number, age and sex of students is provided in an earlier section of the Later Years chapter. The following chart will serve to illuminate the number, age and sex of the teachers/counselors during this period.
Table XIII
A Demographic Profile of the Staff Group of the Later Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Plant Characteristics:

During this stage of the school's development the physical plant was modified and expanded in order to accommodate the changing physical needs of the school/community. Designated school areas are defined and listed below. They are:

I. Main Building
This building is a renovated and converted colonial farmhouse consisting of three inter-connecting units as follows:

A. Main House - This section includes:
1. school kitchen
2. dining room
3. staff workroom
4. infirmary and overnight staff areas on the second floor
5. cellar, including food storage
6. attic for miscellaneous storage

B. Dormitory Section - This unit includes:
1. six dormitory rooms for 13 residential students
2. two bathrooms

C. Classroom Section - This is a converted barn that includes the following:
1. large arts and crafts area
2. classroom/seminar room
3. classroom
4. school maintenance room and equipment area on the second floor
II. Classroom/Dormitory Building
This uniquely-designed building was completed in 1976 and consists of the following:
1. large multi-purpose room (classroom, meeting room, etc.)
2. library loft
3. science room area
4. two bedrooms
5. two bathrooms
6. maintenance/utility room

III. The "White House"
This group residence is located approximately one-half mile from the main campus. This building was acquired and remodeled by the school in the fall of 1980. This building includes:
1. a large kitchen and dining area
2. a small staff office
3. a large living room area
4. a large staff live-in area
5. a large basement used for storage
6. a student bedroom on the first floor
7. a bathroom on the first floor
8. seven individual student bedrooms on the second floor
9. a bathroom on the second floor

IV. Director's Office
This small office module is a separate unit used by the director for general school purposes, including administration, meetings, conferences, counseling sessions etc.

V. Administration Building
This building was erected in the spring of 1981 and includes:
1. secretary's office
2. clinical director's office and conference area
3. executive director's office

Maple Valley is situated on 15 acres of both wooded and meadow land.
School Organization:

During the Later Years program planners began to integrate the structural developmental approach in an effort to establish a more theoretically precise framework within which the most appropriate strategies (E) might be selected. As noted earlier, the utilization of a developmental model influenced program design in two primary areas. Firstly, the program's historical emphasis on the centrality of the therapeutic relationship was validated and reaffirmed. Specifically, the Humanistic/Existential approach to the helping relationship involves a "here and now" focus as a means of promoting awareness. This basic approach to children remained highly valuable in teaching about interpersonal relationships and personal responsibility. Staff and students continued to engage in an open and direct dialogue in which they encountered a myriad of issues ranging from affairs of routine business to the most painful and trying interpersonal/community dilemmas. The program's norms regarding authenticity, particularly within the context of the community meeting process, remained quite powerful. Within this honest and open climate children would naturally be confronted with difficult dilemmas regarding acceptable standards of behavior, their own values and the behavior of their peers (see: The Early and Middle Years--Programmatic Design). Forman (1979) substantiates this overall approach to the helping relationship from a structural developmental perspective. He (Forman, 1979) argues that this type of relationship helps the child to realistically confront her/his
behavior, recognize the costs and benefits of her/his actions, and explore alternatives that may be more productive and rewarding. The significance of this approach from a developmental perspective is that it consists of a cognitive dimension which helps the student identify and ultimately counteract self-defeating behavior. Thus the components of the helping relationship that staff believed to be critical were reinforced by this "new" theoretical paradigm. The key ingredient remained the idea of making "real" contact with children as a prerequisite for developmental movement. 

Within this climate of reaffirmation and enthusiasm, program staff directed their energies at developing a more expansive methodological repertoire that was developmentally based. The overall aim was to structure and refine processing strategies to more effectively promote student growth. It is important to note that during the Later Years there was no real attempt on behalf of program staff to "scientifically" determine student developmental levels. On the contrary, program planners believed themselves facile enough with the structural developmental framework in general and these two developmental models in particular to be able to design strategies and interventions to "match" the overall developmental characteristics of the student population. As noted earlier (The Later Years--Defining Methods and Strategies), this "a priori" or generalized form of developmental matching was extensively used in studies involving Moral Development Theory and Self-Knowledge Development Theory (see: The Later Years--Defining
Methods and Strategies). The developmental profile of the student group during this period appeared to reflect a "bell curve." That is, the majority of students were assumed to be functioning at stage three of moral reasoning and the situational stage of self-knowledge. There were a few students that either exceeded or fell below these stages. Following is a breakdown of three primary areas in which the developmental approach was utilized during this period. They are: the "+1 modeling" method, the employment of a developmentally-based processing guide, and the establishment of a structured privilege level system for students.

During the Later Years the community meeting continued to function at the very core of the program. This area represented the primary forum within which power relations, decision-making patterns, communication patterns, and the overall interpersonal climate was established. Within this context of emotional connectedness and involvement there existed a dual thrust of helping students learn to live with realistic limits and to build a sense of personal responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

From the earliest days the community meeting process was utilized as a central forum within which students and staff encountered and discussed "real life" moral issues and dilemmas. This programmatic structure had historically been used as an opportunity to facilitate interpersonal process whereby active student participation in community affairs was standard operating procedure. It was primarily as a result of the staff's emerging familiarity
with the "+1 modeling" approach (Reimer and Power, 1980; Scharf, 1978; Rundle, 1977; Wasserman, 1980) that they were not only able to recognize the strengths of their historical approach, but were also able to refine processing strategies in order to more systematically ensure the type of dialogue that exposed students to reasoning levels at one stage (+1) above her/his current stage. In this Socratic-type of dialectical encounter, conflicting opinions were expressed concerning real life social issues involving genuine moral dilemmas. Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) argue that an interactional atmosphere in which norms regarding trust, intimacy, participation and an active and collective sense of responsibility are engendered is critical regardless of the range of developmental levels. In a number of studies cited above the utilization of the "+1 modeling" approach was viewed as having the potential of being effective for a wide range of children in reaching desired learning goals (B).

There are two final points that should be noted regarding the utilization of the "+1 modeling" approach. Firstly, a number of theorists and practitioners (Reimer and Power, 1980; Wasserman, 1980) stress that using this approach in the context of real life situations occurring in natural environments as contrasted with hypothetical dilemmas used in contrived situations is far more effective. Secondly, the centrality of the practitioner's skill in facilitating and directing group process and development in the establishment and maintenance of the type of environment outlined above cannot be overemphasized. It was a function of years of
experience that key program staff had developed and refined a range of group skills such that the "+1 modeling" approach was effectively implemented. These skills included the staff's ability to accurately diagnose group and individual needs (see: The Middle Years--Defining Methods and Strategies) and direct the "process" in order to promote development along a number of continua.

The nature of the therapeutic relationship during the Later Years remained firmly rooted in the basic tenets of the Humanistic/Existential counseling approach (see: The Early Years--Programmatic Design). The foundation of this relationship is contact between students and staff in which respect, caring, genuineness, listening and choice are emphasized. Concrete behavioral feedback and limits were built into these relationships in a sensitive and consistent way. In a general sense, a student's demonstrated ability to negotiate the triadic process of internal awareness, realistic choice-making, and acceptance of personal responsibility was regarded by staff as a barometer of psychological development. However, during this period the employment of a structural developmental paradigm enabled staff to become more knowledgeable and sophisticated in terms of arriving at realistic expectations (B) of the student's capabilities (P). Thus, models such as Weinstein's (1979) "developmental stage question guide" were regarded by program staff as an ideal way in which to make solid contact with children, stretch their reasoning capabilities at their current level, and nudge them (if appropriate) to the next highest level of reasoning
(Weinstein, 1979). This "stage question guide" is provided in an earlier section (see: The Later Years—Defining Methods and Strategies). The contact, stretch and nudge model was effectively utilized with children at various stages of development. For example, for a child at the element stage of self-knowledge, the very first step would be to have her/him provide as much sensory information prior to asking her/him to reflect any causal connections which may have been provided by the counselor. Similarly, for a child at the situational stage, the counselor would first ask her/him to discuss her/his feelings in a given situation prior to asking her/him to begin evaluating her/his behavior in the situation and then examine alternatives. Weinstein (1979) points out that an effective way for a practitioner to use the "guide" is to work through its different stages until the individual begins to encounter difficulty in appropriately responding to the level of questioning. It is at this point, according to Weinstein (1979), that the counselor may have reached the student's developmental "ceiling." However, he cautions the practitioner about ascribing too much developmental significance in these situations; the student may simply be preoccupied with other matters.

During the Later Years program staff implemented a privilege level system. This "system" reflected the underlying developmental orientation (particularly moral development theory) as interpreted by program planners. An outline of the privilege system is provided on the following page.
Privilege Levels

Level I
1. You may sign out two (2) school nights (Sun., Mon., Tues., Wed., Thurs.) until 8:30 p.m.
2. You may sign out for (1) weekend night (Friday or Saturday) until 12:15.
3. You may not sign out on staff meeting night.

Level II
1. You may sign out three (3) school nights until 8:30 p.m.
2. You may sign out both weekend nights until 12:15.
3. You may not sign out on staff meeting night.

Level III
1. You may sign out on any school night until 10:15 p.m.
2. You may sign out both weekend nights until 12:15.
3. You will receive $3.00 per week allowance.

Level IV
1. You may sign out any school night until 10:15 p.m.
2. You may sign out both weekend nights until 12:15.
3. You may request special sign-out permission (late curfew, leaving during the school day, etc.) at any time.
4. You will receive $5.00 per week allowance.
5. You will be invited to portions of staff meetings from time to time.

When we are assigning privilege levels, or deciding whether to move you up (or down), we will be looking at how you have done in the following areas:

I. In School Behavior

A. Classes and Meetings:
   1. Making all your classes on time.
   2. Coming to class prepared
3. If you want to miss or change a class, getting teacher's permission ahead of time
4. Not disrupting classes (yours or anyone else's)
5. Attending all morning and community meetings

B. Room Clean-Up:
1. Being at your room on time during every morning and afternoon clean-up
2. Getting staff members to check your room
3. Having your room consistently clean and neat (to be decided by you and your staff)

C. Personal Responsibilities:
1. Personal cleanliness—bathing, brushing teeth, etc.
2. Doing laundry regularly
3. Making all medical appointments on time
4. Following all doctor's orders

D. Obeying All School Rules and Policies:
1. Quiet time
2. Possession laws
3. Cohabitation
4. No hitchiking

E. Dining Room Behavior:
1. Quiet and respectful during meals
2. No food throwing, etc.

F. Respecting Rights of Others, Including:
1. No harrassment of others
2. No verbal abuse of staff
3. No hands raised to anyone
4. Respect people's rights to privacy in their room

II. Out-of-School Behavior
1. Responsible behavior while signed out
2. Meeting curfew responsibilities
3. Responsible behavior on field trips

1. The privilege level you get to start will stay for at least two weeks.
2. After that, or anytime later, you may request to move up, but you can only make that request at an afternoon community meeting. The staff will decide on your request at the next staff meeting.

3. If you are knocked down to a lower privilege level, you must wait two weeks before you can make a request to move up.

Following is an example of a student's privilege level request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privilege Level Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME: &quot;Wendy&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long at this level: 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the main reasons you were refused?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well are you meeting your responsibilities in these areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Meeting: &quot;Always go to meetings&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Clean-Up: &quot;Almost always do my room and get it checked&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Have missed about 5 room checks&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes: &quot;Go to all and participate&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;May swear sometimes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Room: &quot;Eat and run&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting Rules: &quot;Obey most rules&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Have broken about 3 or 4 rules&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Others: &quot;Always!!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Community: &quot;Always respect property of others&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships with Staff:  
"Fairly well"  
"May get mad sometimes"

Relationships with Peers:  
"Not too well"  
"Always fighting"

Evening Behavior:  
"I try to stay in my room"  
"I go out at night without permission"

Field Trips:  
"I go on very few"  
"My behavior is fine"

Signout:  
"I have never signed out"

List the three most important reasons why you should move up.  
1. More privileges  
2. I feel I have been doing O.K.  
3. I think I can do better if I move up. I'll feel better about myself.

List the three areas you want to improve in.  
1. Swearing  
2. Peer relations  
3. Running away when things get tough.

Signed: _____________________________  
STUDENT  
______________________________  
STAFF PERSON

There was a range of factors which inspired the creation of this new programmatic structure. Staff had become increasingly aware of the frequency with which they attended to those children whose negative or "acting out" behavior required immediate intervention. These children seemed to require a disproportionate amount of staff time and energy; thus, those children who were doing well had less frequent feedback and attention. In an attempt to counteract the obvious drawbacks in this dynamic, this system attempted to create a structure whereby students would be able to
receive more feedback that wasn't tied directly and automatically to staff involvement. Thus, the overriding aim was to offer children a structure in which they would receive immediate and concrete feedback regarding clearly defined expectations. Furthermore, this system provided an opportunity for students who were "succeeding" to receive privileges or rewards that would continue to reinforce such behavior. Also, for those students expressing negative or self-defeating behavior, the system provided the necessary sanctions as well as delineating a concrete means of "getting on track."

Furthermore, given the staff's recognition of appropriate developmental expectations, it appeared that a more concrete delineation of expectations and goals would help those students who had difficulty with more abstract goals and expectations. Sweitzer (1980) points out that "Respect, responsibility, making a positive contribution..." had naturally been primary programmatic goals. During the Early and Middle Years staff had mistakenly assumed that most children would be able to functionally utilize these expectations in the form in which they were given. In other words, program planners expected children to be able to employ a level of abstract reasoning which for too many was simply "out of reach." In addition, program planners assumed that, if provided with the "right" climatic conditions, children would choose to be respectful, responsible and honest based on the intrinsic value of such behavior. Of course, this required that a student be reasoning at stage five or six of the moral developmental scale, and therefore
was dysfunctional.

Thus, in taking the general developmental characteristics of the student into account, this system was designed to:

- provide students with a concrete breakdown of expected and acceptable behavior
- incorporate a system of increasing responsibility and privileges as students advanced through the sequence (i.e., the ability to leave school grounds for extended periods)
- make public those student successes that resulted in the attainment of a higher privilege level in order for the student to receive community recognition
- match the student's developmental level with a system of rewards and punishments
- provide students with exposure to and stimulus for reasoning at a more advanced level
- help to elucidate the causal nature of feelings, behavior, choices and consequences
- build in a system of more frequent and specific feedback for students
- provide students with a structure that promoted the establishment of short and long term goals

Finally, it should be noted that one of the highest "rewards" for students attending the Maple Valley program during the latter part of this period was the opportunity to be invited to participate in a small group living experience named by the students as the "White House." The "White House" was located approximately a quarter of a mile from the main campus. It housed a total of eight students, both girls and boys. This smaller community of students had the opportunity to engage in a more independent and autonomous
living arrangement under staff supervision. These students had a much broader range (than the students on the main campus) within which to determine the standards and rules governing their home. For a number of students attending the program during this period, the "White House" experiment represented the ultimate goal. Those students who "made it" to the "White House" generally viewed themselves as successes. For many children at the "main campus" they represented an inspiration; for some they were a negative target for their own frustration at their lack of progress. Nonetheless, the "White House" was systematically tied in to the new privilege level system in a meaningful and exciting way.

Following is a description of several program characteristics. This information is taken directly from a submission to the Department of Education during the spring of 1980. Several areas remain relatively unchanged from the program description provided in the Middle Years chapter; other areas are entirely new.

I. General Community Laws
These rules are established to provide the baseline of limits for the program. These include:
1. No individual has the right to infringe on the rights of others
2. General health and safety considerations as defined by the staff
3. No possession of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia within one-half mile of the school boundaries
4. No one is to leave the school grounds during the school day unless granted special permission
5. Residential curfews are as follows:
Sun. - Thurs.    Fri. - Sat.

LEVEL I          8:00 p.m.       12:30 p.m.
LEVEL II         9:00 p.m.       12:30 p.m.
LEVEL III        10:30 p.m.     12:30 p.m.
LEVEL IV         TO BE ARRANGED TO BE ARRANGED

Appropriate levels are determined and changed by the director, in consultation with the staff. Additional curfew changes may be made in individual cases if the staff and director feel they are necessary.

6. Quiet time in dormitories begins at 10:00 p.m.
7. Kitchen and dining areas closed after 10:00 p.m.
8. Meal times are as follows:

   Breakfast:  9:00 - 9:30 a.m.
   Lunch:      12:30 - 1:15 p.m.
   Dinner:     5:30 - 6:30 p.m.

II. Responsibility Meetings:
When a student violates another's rights or a school law, the student is held accountable via a responsibility meeting. Participants include the involved parties, including appropriate staff, the Director, and at times students who want to offer constructive help. These meetings serve disciplinary, counseling and educative functions in the context of helping students learn to take responsibility for their actions. The Director serves as facilitator, mediator, and, when necessary, arbitrator. Students usually demonstrate responsibility via a written statement or contract of a behavioral sanction or agreed-upon action. When appropriate, students are encouraged to solve problems and resolve interpersonal conflicts in one-to-one and small group meetings led by staff without coming to the Director for a responsibility meeting. These meetings are scheduled as soon as possible after a given incident and during the school day so as not to conflict with scheduled and required activities.

III. School Day Schedule:
All classes are regularly scheduled Monday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Significance is placed on minimizing student conflicts, maximizing offerings
and the full development of curriculum continuity. Students are required to choose classes from a range of options provided by the staff and based on affective and cognitive developmental needs.

IV. **Assigned Staff Member:**
Each student is assigned a staff member for the purposes of monitoring educational programs, medical care, sign-out permission, general counseling, etc.

V. **Sign-Out Permission:**
With written consent of parent or guardian and staff consent, students are permitted to sign-out off school grounds from 4 p.m. until curfew on weekdays and on weekends. This policy allows for social/psychological growth, demonstration of responsibility, etc.

VI. **Diploma Program:**
A competency-based High School Diploma program, is designed to meet state requirements in addition to Maple Valley requirements.

VII. **Community Responsibilities:**
Students are expected to participate in daily execution of community chores. This involves routine cleaning and rotating evening kitchen responsibilities.

VIII. **Apprenticeship Program:**
A program designed to provide students with job experiences and an opportunity to develop marketable skills and attitudes.

XI. **Parent/Family Conferences:**
Meetings are scheduled on a regular basis as needed or desired by parents and child. The focus in these meetings varies from information sharing to a consciously therapeutic effort. Particularly when reintegration into the family is a goal, family contact or assistance is an important aspect of a child's overall program. Each year a Parent Day is held in the fall when all parents are invited to the
school and given an opportunity to ask general questions as well as to meet staff members and discuss their child's progress.

X. Field Trip Program:
Maple Valley maintains and operates a field trip program that is extensive and varied in scope. Trips may include both educational and recreational activities and vary in length from brief afternoon trips to overnight excursions.

XI. Summer Program:
Maple Valley runs an eight and one-half week, residential summer program. The primary thrust of the program is a pre-vocational and on-the-job training. Students who qualify (as most do) and who are interested are given jobs through various youth employment programs. Life skills such as punctuality and money management also become appropriate areas for counseling. Students who cannot or do not choose to participate in these programs are given opportunities to earn money at school. In addition, a program of activities is offered during the day.

XII. Allowances: Work-Job Program:
Students are given the opportunity to earn money each week. The maintenance staff coordinates the assignment of jobs each week. On the average, students can earn up to five dollars per week.

The area of curriculum development remained relatively consistent between the Middle and Later Years. Included in Appendix B are course outlines written during the Middle Years which provide the reader with this general framework. The central movement during this period concerned the systematic and serious manner in which the area of curriculum development was approached. During the Later Years staff were just beginning to examine various ways in which the structural developmental framework might be applied to curriculum
development. Thus, by 1981 program staff had only begun to make initial attempts in terms of the selection of more appropriate (developmentally based) goals (B) and methods (E); no formal curriculum design reflecting the structural developmental perspective existed as of this date. As noted earlier during this period the developmental approach was utilized in three primary areas. They are: the "+1 modeling" method, the employment of a developmentally matched processing guide within the counseling relationship, and the establishment of a structured system of privilege levels for students.

Staff Meetings:

As was the case in previous programmatic stages, staff members were expected to operate on the basis of those principles outlined in this chapter. The movement begun in the Middle Years in the direction of a more focused and systematic approach to staff meetings continued through the Later Years. The size of the staff group continued to grow (see: The Later Years—Programmatic design).

The establishment of a weekly meeting agenda was approached in a well-conceived manner. For instance, distinct segments of these meeting were devoted to program areas. These include: the assessment of student needs and learning goals as well as implementation strategies and the ongoing refinement of curriculum areas. One major programmatic feature with respect to these meetings was
the new emphasis given to an "in-service" workshop approach in a range of areas. For example, there were quite a few "in-service" seminars devoted to the examination of developmental theory with emphasis on psychoeducational program design.

As was the case during prior programmatic stages, significant emphasis continued to be given to the personal/professional development of individual staff members. Thus, within a more structured staff meeting format, there remained a strong group commitment to the psychoemotional life of its members.

Personal Characteristics of Teacher:

As was the case in previous chapters, those vital personal/professional qualities characteristic of a staff member may be found in a number of segments throughout this chapter. At the risk of oversimplification, there appeared to be a subtle yet significant shift in the "type" of individual working at the school during this period. During the earliest years and to a lesser but substantial extent in the Middle Years, adults who sought out Maple Valley were typically inspired and motivated by a vision of human development expressed in the Human Potential and Alternative Life-Style Movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s. This vision (see: The Early Years--Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context) for many individuals of the "60's Generation" was a vision of limitless possibilities; anything was possible if the commitment was strong and deep enough. Those adults working at Maple Valley during the
Later Years were becoming well aware of the "hard lessons" of reality. The socio-cultural context (see: The Later Years--Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context) had undergone a profound metamorphosis; society had moved from the progressivism of the late 1960s and early 1970s to the conservatism of the early 1980s. Thus, it was necessary for those staff members working at the school during this period to renew and maintain a commitment to human development with less benefit and support from the larger society. In addition, given the shifting nature of the student population, the workplace became a more emotionally taxing and difficult environment.

Although these adults were no longer fueled by the anti-establishment fervor of an earlier time, they may be described as the "true radicals." In other words, by 1981 it was quite a statement for an individual to work in a residential setting for meager wages with a very "needy" and disenfranchised group of adolescents (who tested the very limits of their personal/professional boundaries) in a cultural context that viewed such work as "out of vogue." These adults were willing and able to make the types of commitment to these children which in a number of cases represented their last real hope for psycho-social adjustment and healthy functioning; the new "political statement" was directed at making the "system" respond.

It must be noted, however, that as was the case in earlier periods, the school continued to attract individuals who were
seeking an opportunity to work in an atmosphere in which their own personal/professional growth represented a superordinal and unifying aim. During the Later Years, the Maple Valley staff consisted of a group of individuals who viewed themselves as a sophisticated group of mental health and human service professionals.

Teacher Behavior:

As in the previous section, the area of teacher behavior has been addressed in a variety of ways in preceding sections. However, there are a number of aspects that characterize the relational behavior between staff and students that are worthy of distinction. During the Middle Years, the staff had begun to assume a more pro-active and directive posture in an effort to better organize and focus the learning environment. This overall movement in the area of program structure continued to be strengthened during the Later Years. As was the case in the prior periods, the nature of the student/teacher relationship was not differentiated within or without the classroom itself. Staff continued to emphasize the establishment of the type of therapeutic relationship with students which elicited psychological data indicative of a child's underlying needs/concerns and capacities.

During the Later Years, the structural developmental approach to human development impacted staff in such a way as to facilitate the redefinition of what constitutes a "helping relationship." As part of an existing trend toward approaching students in a
multidimensional and differentiated manner, staff began to utilize this new theoretical model. For instance, staff began to consider the notion that children at various stages of development organize their experience in uniquely different ways which condition their feelings, thoughts and behavior. Staff used a developmental framework combined with a functional and horizontal view of individual differences/needs to more elaborately differentiate their response patterns.

As a function of a more differentiated approach to the therapeutic relationship, staff attempted to utilize a range of appropriate responses to a given child or situation. Thus, the key theoretical organizer was the notion of "repertoire." Staff were provided with systematic opportunities to expand their range of helping behaviors and their ability to access such behaviors. Hence, the "ideal" teacher/counselor was viewed as an individual with the capacity to respond to a student in a non-directive manner as well as in a more prescriptive style. The developmental paradigm provided staff with a "road map" which helped to inform them as to the relative wisdom of a particular approach.

In a basic sense, certain key elements of the student/staff relationship continued to remain in a superordinal position during the Later Years. Staff valued and promoted relationships with students rooted in an atmosphere of safety, trust, caring, respect and flexibility.

During this period, the "disenfranchised child" began to
represent the predominant segment of the student population. These children entered the program with histories rife with deprivation, failure and rejection. Thus, it remained essential for staff to establish relationships rooted in those components of the therapeutic relationship as understood by Carl Rogers (see: The Early Years—Understanding Individual Needs).

In summary, during this period, Maple Valley staff continued to utilize a full range of therapeutic interventions shaped by a new theoretical framework. As in the Early and Middle Years, the staff continued to place a premium on the necessity of modeling healthy relationships for students.

The following excerpts from student and staff interviews (see: Appendix C) highlight various aspects of program design:

What stands out the most is how kids responded to staff people—how important integrity was to kids, which was a reflection of how important it was to the staff people. The way that kids would cop to things that they had done wrong that they wouldn't have if they were approached by adults in a different way. Integrity was the key, and caring—caring about individuals. Integrity was probably secondary to the caring and a direct result of it.  

(Dennis—staff)

...Kids came to Maple Valley with serious problems in their lives, and what they found at Maple Valley were adults that were tolerant but consistent, that they were willing to provide them with caring, but also to enforce limits, and, as a result, kids found that they could allow themselves to be controlled by adults—to be influenced by adults—to be influenced by the situation they were in, and receive some real benefit to their lives. When kids acted responsibly, they received respect and recognition not only from the adults but also from their peers. Generally, I think kids learned here that they could become part of a society, a community, and feel good about themselves....  

(Jerry—staff)
Well, it changed over the two and a half years that I was there. There was just a whole different atmosphere of people at the beginning of the two and a half years than at the end. But it was always trying to help kids on academic levels and with their moral decision-making—that was always a big part of the scene. Just a general thrust with how we interact and communicate with people.

(12th student interview)

...One of the things that I learned to do during my years there—once I got a clearer picture of what the real issues were for the kids—was to try to integrate, identify and address those things in the curriculum.... The longer I stayed at Maple Valley, the stronger the academic program became....

(Phil--staff)

My sense was that the bulk of the work that needed to be done with the kids was personal and behavioral more than academic. I think that the personal growth that needed to happen and the behavioral changes that needed to take place were kind of a prerequisite to getting any effective academics that they were going to take with them accomplished. I know that kids who had not done well with academics at Maple Valley but did more personal growing have gone on to do that work having gotten their personal stuff together. And that only makes sense. I think it's a lot to ask for someone to concentrate on academics when their lives are in pieces....

(Dennis--staff)

I think about those community meetings a lot. Those kids were confronted and dealt with—you just set a tone for all that the kids and I learned from. You really worked and clarified moral dilemmas for those kids constantly. Asking the kids and helping them to process some community issue—naming all the different parts.... Kids got the chance to screw up and be real and to see what that was all about—maybe for the first time in their lives. I remember when you would play out the entire dialogue for them—you would do their script for them—and some of them would watch you and couldn't believe what you were doing....

(Phil--staff)

The decision-making process by the students changed over the years as the population changed and we grew in our understanding of developmental issues that relate to
appropriate decision-making functions. Sometimes this was difficult when it meant taking away some of the students' previously defined "rights," like the right to vote equally with the staff on school rules and responses to violations. Whatever the actual decision-making responsibilities they had at the time, the students' input was always highly valued. Time was always spent and care taken to explain the reasoning behind staff decisions in ways that made sense to the students and validated their feelings and concerns. I believe that most kids felt this.

(Annie--staff)

During my time at Maple Valley there were two major program changes. One was in providing more structured physical activities for the kids which was real helpful with the management of their free time. I think the refinement of the privilege level system was also a good thing. The bottom-line business in human relationships is that--you do such and such, and I'll do such and such. All the loving and caring really take a back seat to that reality. The privilege level system really helped the kids to focus in a very concrete way to do that. It helped the kids to be more responsible for their behavior. It helped the kids to see that they couldn't have the freedom they wanted without demonstrating responsibility.... And sometimes with Maple Valley kids you also needed to be very concrete--you need to go to your room now, and in a half hour we'll talk about it.

(Rick--staff)

When we changed to the privilege level system, it was good in a way--it made people stop and realize that if you want something you have to earn it and you just couldn't get away with as much as you could before. It helped people slow down and it made you want to learn more. It was bad because sometimes when you wanted to go out at night and you messed up during the day--that was it, you just couldn't go out!

(14th student interview)

I guess the strongest point of the school would be that the staff had a good relationship with the kids. All the different staff and all the people who were involved just seemed to get it together with the kids, and were consistent with one another. That was really the best thing--the way it was run. It wasn't so strict that the kids felt pressured like--I got to get out of here--like
so many other places that can drive you crazy you know. It was a really nice environment...

(13th student interview)

...the most dramatic change was when we began to use the B-P-E model and Development Theory. Although there were not specific program changes, they lead to many changes, and, more importantly, they helped us to navigate, understand and respond to some difficult changes in the population, the political climate, etc. The B-P-E served for me as a meta theory. It formed a coherent framework in which to approach many tasks—development of clinical and program strategy, integration of various theoretical frameworks, staff development, crisis intervention, etc. Developmental theory was and is useful in all three of the B-P-E columns. It was a way to understand the kids better (P), to guide and tailor interventions (E), and to select, operationalize and modify goals.

(Fred—staff)

...As the program became increasingly populated with more seriously troubled students, I think a crucial change should have been to move more concretely towards supervision and structure throughout the day and evening until bedtime...

(Carl—staff)

...I think that we were limited in that we had a white middle class staff and more of a blue collar and third world student group—although the third world group was never huge. So I think we had a limited cultural perspective—although there was a range within the staff group. One of the reasons why I think that you were so good at working with those kids is that you had the "street smarts" and knew the street life and bullshit the way the kids did, and you could relate to them on that level. But on the whole, I think the staff group was limited from a cross-cultural perspective.

(Phil—staff)

"A Day in the Life:"

The programmatic shift evidenced during the Middle Years toward providing students with a more structured day was
strengthened during this period. The school day was comprised of a mixture of scheduled activities; classes as well as space for unplanned and spontaneous activity. The central delineation between these two periods concerns the program's emphasis on a required group of "core" courses in the basic skill areas. However, children continued to have considerable choice in ordering the remainder of their school day. Additionally, there was a greater emphasis given to the time commitment required of each child in her/his overall activity schedule.

Program staff continued to perceive a need to more carefully and narrowly define the limits within which children were able to structure their daily lives. Children were always provided legitimate mechanisms whereby they could propose changes in activities in which they were enrolled; they were never subjected to arbitrary change. They were required to approach this process with an attitude of respect and a willingness to examine all the issues—ranging from self-scrutiny to areas relating to course content.

The establishment of the "White House" program discussed earlier added a new dimension to the overall "ebb and flow" of daily life. White House students joined the larger school/community for most of the school day—specifically early mornings through late afternoons. These students had the option of spending their time on the "main campus" or at their own residences from late afternoons until the next morning. As was the case with the students on the main campus, White House students were obligated to conform to the
same structures during the course of the school day. However, at all other times, these children exercised a far greater degree of autonomy in the decision-making process with regard to the structure of their living environment and their personal "free time."

The outline of the "typical" day during this period is similar to that of the Middle Years. However, the nature of the student population significantly shifted during this period. Thus, what was offered as a mere addendum in the outline of a "typical day" during the Middle Years must now be viewed as representative of the texture of daily life. That is, there were simply more students attending the program who were characteristic of the "disenfranchised child" and whose behavior patterns were generally of a more dysfunctional and inappropriate nature. Hence, on any given day, it was entirely possible for a student to express her/himself in ways that were disruptive to the overall "flow" of the school day as well as to require a significant level of staff attention.

For the purpose of providing the reader with additional information in order to form a picture of daily life, I will describe a Maple Valley School day as it may have been viewed by a visitor at any point during this period.

Morning staff meeting began at 8:30 a.m. and continued until 9 a.m. These meetings provided an opportunity for evening and overnight staff to update the day staff group regarding the overnight situation and for the staff group to begin to organize and coordinate the day's activities.
Breakfast was served from 9-9:30 a.m. Staff members would move through the dormitories waking up children who were still asleep to give them the chance to "make it" to breakfast. Children, although not required to attend breakfast, were reminded that the kitchen would absolutely close at 9:30 and not reopen until lunchtime. On most school mornings, there was generally a majority of students in attendance. Meals were prepared by the kitchen staff, and staff and students ate their meals together.

After breakfast, a morning community meeting was held—and student attendance was mandatory. These meetings consisted of a discussion of the previous evening's activities and included recognizing those students who had impacted negatively on the evening's events. In addition, these morning meetings functioned as an opportunity for the group to plan the day's special activities. This included the organization of special and school field trips.

After morning meeting, children were required to return to their rooms for clean-up. Staff would make themselves available in the dormitory areas to help students in this effort. In addition, staff utilized this time to "touch base" with those students who appeared to be having difficulties in beginning their day.

During this programmatic stage, time between classes represented a mixture of "free" periods and study or preparatory periods. However, it should be noted that children continued to have a substantial range of choice within which they might spend their time. Staff who were not teaching class during these periods sought
out students not in class for either counseling time or more
spontaneous activity, such as an art project. During the morning
hours, the school climate reflected a mixture of those students and
staff who were task oriented and those students who might be simply
making social contact.

Lunchtime is the busiest time of the school day; almost the
total community is present. For many, this part of the day
provides a time to make contact with others and to discuss the
afternoon's activities. The atmosphere is generally "electric" and
somewhat chaotic in either positive or negative directions.

Afternoon activities follow a similar format as the morning
ones. However, these activities are typically outside the basic
skill areas. They encompass a range of activities including arts
and crafts, cross-country skiing and improvisational theatre.

It is now late afternoon--children are once again required to
return to their rooms for afternoon clean-up. Day school students
spend this time helping to straighten up community areas. Clean-up
time takes place from 3:30 to 4 p.m.--at which time the school day
"officially" ends.

At any point during the school day, a child has the right to
call a responsibility meeting if s/he believes that her/his rights
have been violated or that a community/school law has been broken.
Participants in these include the involved parties, appropriate
staff, the program director and, at times, those students wanting to
offer constructive help. When appropriate, students were encouraged
to solve problems and resolve disputes or interpersonal conflicts in one-to-one and small group meetings led by staff without coming to the program director for a responsibility meeting. These meetings were scheduled as soon as possible after a given incident and during the school day so as not to interfere with scheduled and required activities.

Supper is served between 5:30 and 6 p.m. Most community members are present except for those staff members "off duty" and day school students. This mealtime is generally less frenetic than lunchtime. Kitchen staff prepare the meal and both students and staff clean up. Community members begin to "map-out" the evening's activities.

The evening—as in the Early Years—has its own very special atmosphere. It is the time of day where children appear the most vulnerable and seek out staff for nurturance and support. It is also the most unstructured time of the day and would translate into increased levels of negative acting-out behaviors.

During this period, there was an increasing emphasis on evening field trips and, of course, trips to the nearest pizza palace. The older students use the late night hours to listen to music and socialize. Quiet time is at 10 p.m. Some of the students talk with each other until far into the night. This is generally fine with the evening staff provided they are quiet.
As was discussed in the previous chapter (see: the Middle Years), the Middle Years represented a transitional or bridge phase between two related yet distinctly different programmatic movements. As I will discuss in the subsequent chapter of Integrated Theory, an external observer viewing the Early Years would see a markedly different program in contrast to the Later Years. Thus, the Later Years resulted in a program where applied theory translated into meaningful programmatic change.

The overriding construct representative of this change is the integration of the developmental perspective into program practice. Firstly, exploration and utilization of two specific developmental paradigms had a major impact in the underlying conception of individual differences/needs. Secondly, as program planners reframed their perception of the person in the context of the Behavior-Person-Environment interactive model, the implications for the restructuring of psychoeducational goals (B) and program features and characteristics (E) were profound and extensive. In short, there was increased intentionality, congruence and matching emanating from this developmental perspective.

Program planners' access to structural developmental theory proved to be a timely enhancement for the determination of individual needs. This timeliness is a direct result of the clear shift in population to an exclusively "disenfranchised child" group. The particular needs of this group had not been effectively attended to
in the context of a paradigm that was both adult-oriented in its definition and undifferentiated in its application. Thus, program planners would often feel "stuck" in their ability to tailor environmental interventions to achieve specific learning goals. This new orientation enabled the staff to more effectively pinpoint where a child was in her/his development and therefore match both interventions and desired outcomes to the realistic capabilities of the child. In addition, this population typically exhibited behaviors that highlighted staff's uncertainty about diagnosing individual differences/needs in a functional manner as to allow for appropriate intervention. The developmental model provides a schema in which the concept of "arrested" development can be understood and utilized. Staff now have a functional "road map" by which to diagnose and assess individual differences/needs, develop realistic goals and design structures to educate a broader range of children.

In the area of psychoeducational goals, planners continued the earlier process of defining short- and long-term goals in both behaviorally specific and educational terms. However, this process was made more theoretically precise and coherent and therefore more effective as a direct result of using stage characteristics themselves as both an additional and superordinal umbrella. The determination of learning outcomes in discrete and specific terms was no longer as much of a "hit or miss" diffuse process; developmental theory served as a filter. Thus, all goals were identified in the context of a specific moral and self-knowledge stage of
development. Stage movement in and of itself, both horizontally and vertically, was a common goal for all students.

Program design was ripe for a variety of modifications in response to the above processes. A differentiated approach rooted in structural developmental theory to both identify student needs and determine learning goals clearly necessitated concomitant design changes in programming. "Free time" could not be assumed to meet the needs of the population; therefore, developing ways to increase staff supervision and structured activities was primary during this period. The process of limit setting was viewed differently from prior periods. The nature of limits and boundaries was in an "a priori" context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs. The broadening of counseling methods and procedures—with particular emphasis on "+1 modeling"—was an important programmatic enhancement. Thus, the above changes in program practices had a definitive impact on increasing Maple Valley's effectiveness in its defined purposes.

Program planners continued to be cognizant of areas of programmatic weakness. Specifically the entire domain of curriculum development did not receive the concerted effort necessary to keep pace with other programmatic enhancements. Program planners maintained primary focus on program areas outside of program practice; therefore, students and teachers experienced a measure of difficulty in integrating these changes. More attention toward curriculum development was clearly needed as it had changed little from the
Middle Years. Ongoing staff training and development was required in order to effectively utilize a developmental approach. Any model can only be effective as a result of its implementation. The required training and retraining of staff necessitated a more extensive and focused effort in this regard.

Chapter Summary:

This chapter has provided a comprehensive description of the Maple Valley program in the period of its Later Years (1979-1981). The discussion is focused on two basic realms; 1. the fundamental theoretical underpinnings relating to human development in general and theories and models most relevant to program design; and 2. a detailed description and analysis of the program itself.

During the Later Years, program planners utilized and emphasized structural developmental psychology in their ongoing search for a theoretical body of knowledge to provide them with a context for ever increasing programmatic effectiveness. Structural developmental theory would enable staff to select the most appropriate environmental response for an individual at a given developmental stage (P) in order to promote movement toward a particular goal (B). Structural developmental approaches postulate that development occurs through a movement of invariant, non-reversible and hierarchical stages and this results from organism-environment interactions. Thus, individual differences/needs began to be defined in the context of developmental stages; development itself became the "aim of education" at Maple Valley.
Thus, we see a shift from the theoretical positions employed during the Early and Middle Years in that the romantic/maturation-ists viewed education and development as an organic/unfolding process or direct biological maturation. Moral Development Theory and Self-Knowledge Development Theory—structural developmental theories that are stage-specific and premised on growth as an interactive process between an individual and the environment—were employed by program planners as new theoretical cornerstones for the Later Years.

The Behavior-Person-Environment continued to be employed as the central mechanism for program practice. The primary shift during the Later Years occurred as a result of a reorientation in the area of the "person"—the identification of individual differences/needs. Moral development theory is a cognitive model that depicts development in terms of an individual's capacity for making moral/social judgments. Kohlberg identifies six stages that range from gratification of one's own needs and an absence of concern for others at the lowest level to the application of universal ethical principles as a determinate for decision-making at the highest level. Self-knowledge theory discusses four stages of development that focus on how people describe their experience about themselves and their knowledge of themselves. The lowest or elemental stage involves the capacity to view self and others in concrete terms; at the highest or process stage, an individual is developmentally capable of elaborately describing her/his management
of her/his internal life. Thus, we see two theories that articulate different dimensions of development within an identical context of stage sequences that are invariant, non-reversible and hierarchical in nature.

The implications of the application of these two theories were profound when translated into program practice. Firstly, the predominance of the "disenfranchised child" became virtually exclusive as the student population. Developmental theory provided a significantly more useful framework in which to diagnose and assess a more differentiated construction of individual differences/needs. Secondly, this approach provided a functional model in which to better match desired outcomes and learning goals (B) and appropriate and relevant environmental interventions (E).

In prior periods, the superordinal goal was self-actualization; in the Later Years this translated into viewing stage movement as the concrete manifestation of self-actualization for Maple Valley students. In short, the primary learning goal was the promotion of an individual's movement toward and attainment of the next developmental stage. The process involved a solid grasp of the elaborate identifications as provided by the theorists. This fact provided the means for defining and assessing student progress. Program planners recognized that stage acceleration could not stand alone as a learning goal. Significant emphasis was also placed on a student's horizontal growth within a stage.

The design of the program reflected the above processes in a
consistent and direct manner. Primary emphasis was placed on the expansion of a broader range of counseling methods and procedures to better attend to a more clearly identified and differentiated assessment of the student group. Two specific methods included the employment of a developmentally-matched processing guide and the "+1 modeling" method through which students were provided opportunities to elaborate their current stage-specific reasoning capabilities as well as be exposed to the characteristics of the next highest stage. In the area of overall programmatic organization, the movement towards increased staff supervision and structure of daily activities continued. Within this context, further development and differentiation of limits and boundaries occurred in both content and process. That is, rules were more extensively developed and student input in the process was tailored toward a more differentiated approach. Finally, the institution of a formalized "privilege level system" was designed and implemented to specifically promote the goals of stage development as outlined earlier.

As Maple Valley continued to change so did the larger socio-cultural context in which it existed. The fact that the school continued to consist of children of various public agencies resulted in an increased accountability to and relationship with the larger socio-political arena of the child welfare system. These systems were experiencing the stresses and strains of turmoil and redefinition directly rooted to the agenda of the "New Right" (see:
The Later Years--Profile of the Socio-Cultural Context). This movement was committed to a view of society that represented a lessening of commitment for social services coupled with a reactionary construction of the nature of social welfare and public education itself. The progressive climate that spawned opportunities for humanistic education had shifted to a substantially different atmosphere that represented a threat to the school's central mission. Thus, the socio-cultural "Pendulum" had swung dramatically.

The final section of this chapter involves a summary examination in which the effects of theoretical applications to program practices both promoted and inhibited all of the above. The use of structural developmental theory was integrated into program practice in ways that significantly changed previous modes of operating and therefore enhanced overall effectiveness. Areas of weakness were not seen to be a result of limitations of the theoretical context; simply, its under-utilization and lack of refinement in areas such as curriculum development remained as a programmatic weakness.
CHAPTER V

An Integrated Theory for Psychoeducational Practice: Maple Valley School (1981)

By the Fall of 1981, the Maple Valley program represents a composite entity of an integrated theoretical model for psychoeducational practice. In this study I have traced and analyzed the program's developmental progression over a period of eight years. The analysis and the integrated theory result from a constant interplay between theory and practice. The Early Years (1973-1976), and The Later Years are three programmatic periods that are distinguished by clear differences in theory and practice. The study describes each phase, the accompanying theory of each phase, and the impact of the phase on the students and staff of the school. An integrated model results from a process characterized by this experiential metamorphosis and theoretical evolution; theories were applied to practice, then these new practices in turn required changes in theoretical perspectives, thus effecting new applications.

It is important to recognize that the categorization of the program's development into three discrete stages--The Early Years, The Middle Years and The Later Years--is somewhat arbitrary. The primary function and value of this approach is one of organization and analysis. In reality, the program's evolution was not of a
linear nature but was more cyclical in its movements. In a "real life" context, the program's maturation resembles the process by which a child learns to walk--two steps forward, one backwards, etc. Thus, in this "living" context, the lines of demarcation of these periods were significantly more amorphous and much less evident. Hence, by the year 1981, the Maple Valley program is an expression of a number of historical forces ranging from the original theoretical formulations which inspired its creation to the unique experience inherent in living the very real day to day life and the resultant impact on the lives of many people.

In the ensuing pages I will define the program's unique conception of a coherent theory for psychoeducational practice and describe the nature of the integrative process itself. A comparative analysis of the central experiential and theoretical progression will be included. This historical analysis depicts an evolutionary process of "natural selection" in which theoretical conceptions and methodological approaches that were perceived as successful are maintained while those that were not are discarded. As a function of this analysis, the reader will be provided with a comprehensive theoretical model utilized by the program as of the Fall of 1981.

From the beginning, program planners identified the program's central mission as the promotion of human/adolescent development. This superordinal position remained firmly intact during the eight years of this study. In this sense, the evolutionary movement
reflecting the program's development of a comprehensive theory is a
matter of the ongoing refinement, elaboration and maturation
occurring within this umbrella construct. The school's central
foundational premise was that the educational process itself must be
directed toward the establishment of programs for children whose aim
is the deliberate promotion of individual development. This
position was and continues to be diametrically opposed to the
"cultural transmission" (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972) educational
ideological view. This cultural transmission model is rooted in a
concept of education as a process involving the impartation of the
requisite skills, knowledge and discipline directed at enabling the
child to adjust to the larger social order. This framework which
has dominated traditional and public education is steeped in an
academic tradition.

The Behavior-Person-Environment model has been employed as a
theoretical organizer in each of the three programmatic stages in
order to clarify and define the program's evolving conceptions and
practices with respect to each domain. Thus, the definition of an
integrated theory in this context represents a comprehensive
synthesis of the development of these areas.

As noted earlier, the process of integration within a Maple
Valley context was in reality far more circular than the
programmatic stage-sequence might indicate. The historical Maple
Valley experience may be characterized as an ongoing "experimental
laboratory." That, is, while key constructs remained superordinal,
there existed a large degree of permeability and malleability regarding this institution's capability and desire to promote its own development. Thus, the underlying developmental paradigm consisting of theoretical formulations and their applications and the resultant evaluations was an ongoing process constantly broadening in scope. This continuous and circular model is depicted in the following chart which outlines the sequence of a "feedback loop."

**TABLE XIV**

**The Process of Integration**

Thus, the organizational learning model suggests a process of ongoing programmatic formulation and modifications that is dynamic
in character.

The following is a review and summary profile of the program's development in the areas of the underlying conception of the person, the definition of goals, and the establishment of a learning environment during the course of the three programmatic periods. It is important that the reader keep in mind the inherent "trap" of construing the following outline in a linear fashion; once again, it is imperative to note that this organizational construction of three periods is intended to serve as an analytical taxonomy and not as a reflection of a discrete linear sequence.

Maple Valley School began as an experiment in which a very specific conception of personhood could be actualized in a learning environment for children. The premises upon which this formulation was based were clearly rooted in a view of human development that has been labeled as the romantic orientation (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972). Central to this conception is the belief that individuals possess all essential and useful knowledge within themselves and therefore learning is simply a process of allowing that inner wisdom to unfold. External intervention is not only unnecessary, it runs the risk of inhibiting this natural unfolding process. This perception postulates that all individuals are inherently good and wise; these characteristics are universal and global in nature.

During the Middle Years, program planners began to question the utility of this perspective. Different children were seen to manifest various characteristics that made a blanket subscription to
this paradigm increasingly problematic. At times, the "natural unfolding" did not seem to occur; a change either happened as a result of an external intervention or didn't occur at all before the child left the program. This dissonance prompted the beginning of a reconsideration of the romantic ideology to include a more differentiated view of individual needs within this global context. This differentiation took the form of a recognition of more specific concerns that were labeled by Weinstein and Fantini (1970) as identity, connectedness and power. Thus, natural unfolding no longer occurred in a vacuum; dimensions of the person culminated in the acquisition of structural developmental psychology as a relevant theoretical tool for understanding individuals' differences/needs. In short, learning could no longer be seen as a natural unfolding process applicable in a global and undifferentiated sense to all individuals. Individuals developed through definitive stages that are distinct, invariant, sequential and hierarchical along a number of dimensions (moral, self-knowledge, ego, etc.). This development was not a given; in fact, it was an interactive process directly related to environmental variables. Thus, development could be accelerated or arrested. These theoretical conceptions represented a major shift for program planners. Since attending to individual needs was the purpose of the program, this redefinition resulted in programmatic redefinitions as well.

The definition of desired outcomes and learning goals is a direct reflection of the conception of individual
differences/needs. That is, one can only define a desired behavior that is directly contingent upon the perception of the "person." Thus, as the conception of the person in the Early Years was global and undifferentiated, so was the construction of learning goals. The key construct was self-actualization; this goal was seen to be the ultimate aim of education and life. Self-actualization possessed a number of characteristics; these attributes appeared to describe the phenomenon rather than prescribe the means to attain it. Thus, "being in touch with one's feelings," "being autonomous and self-directed" are examples of the ways in which program planners described desired outcomes for students. All students were seen to be capable of achieving these ends.

During the Middle Years and concomitant with the perceived necessity of the redefinition of individual differences/needs, the formulation of psychodeucational goals also moved toward greater specificity and utility. Simply, program planners concluded that too many children seemed confused and lost in an adult world of expectations that they did not understand. Meanwhile, program planners began to perceive that expecting certain children to make decisions based on community concerns required a level of insight and/or functioning that they did not possess. Thus, the value of behavioral specificity became more evident and active. Staff began to discriminate more concrete goals that could be broken down into short- and long-term parameters and also be more tailored to particular children. Unfortunately, program planners remained
uncertain as to the organizing principles of this movement.

The roots of this transition took hold in the theoretical body of knowledge known as structural developmental psychology. This comprehensive model allowed for the existence of self-actualization as conceived of in the Early Years. More importantly, a "road map" was acquired that guided the determinations of learning goals in the direction of self-actualization in discrete, specific and individually tailored steps (note: self-actualization was always viewed as a process and not an end in and of itself). A dimension of human behavior could be selected, (moral, self-knowledge, ego, etc.) and then desired outcomes could be formulated according to the stage-appropriate capacities of each dimension. Thus, an individual could be assessed to be at a given stage, and learning goals could be matched to the unique capabilities of that individual at that point in time. Maple Valley program planners discovered and implemented a means to promote human development in a systematic and differentiated manner while maintaining the highest goals of human development as ultimate process.

Learning environments exist as a reflection of the conception of the person coupled with the relevant and desired learning goals. The programmatic design of Maple Valley clearly reflected this interactive process; program planners constructed a world to reflect their views of human development. In the Early Years, learning was seen to be a natural unfolding process; therefore, a laissez-faire/libertarian approach in which adults adopted a more passive posture
in deference to "children's rights" was quite natural. The innate wisdom of the child was paramount; choices of daily activities were left to the individual child in her/his innate wisdom. Since direction could only come from within, external and imposed structure were rejected as irrelevant and destructive methodology. The "here and now" realities of existence were to be integrated into the pragmatics of program design; a "free flowing" approach to daily life could enhance this process. Learning was viewed as an immediate process in which the past and future could be impediments; therefore, organization itself was seen as a potential liability. The designs and structures that were promoted focused on creating the scenario in which interpersonal and group level confrontation and interaction and engagement would occur. This was the essence of the intensive living/learning community. Finally, since all children were viewed in an undifferentiated context, decision-making processes were conducted on a one person/one vote basis.

A "free flowing" design postulates the ability of the participants to positively respond to these particular structures. As stated earlier, in the Middle Years, program planners began to determine that not all the students were positively responding to the program. Thus, in conjunction with emerging redefinition of the person (P) and the behavior (B) we see changes in program design. In short, as the understanding of individual differences/needs became more behaviorally specific and differentiated and desired outcomes reflected these understandings, so too did the school
environment (E) undergo beginning transformations. External and imposed structure was no longer immediately rejected "out of hand"; rules, limits and boundaries began to be viewed as a potential means of increasing psychological safety by increasing environmental predictability and order. The "grab bag" approach to academic learning was substituted for a more intensive and serious emphasis in the area of curriculum development. Attention was given to classroom structure and design directed toward meeting student concerns in the areas of identity, power and connectedness. Counseling methods and procedures that linked past experience to future goals and aspirations in behaviorally specific terms were viewed as a valuable methodology in promoting development. Thus, the system had begun its transformations.

The Later Years witnessed the culmination of this process in a highly differentiated and intentional movement toward program design and structure that could maximize learning potential for a broad range of students along developmental continua. This process necessitates a consistent and ordered environment in which a broad range of individual needs can be matched with specific behavioral goals in the context of a single program. Thus, we see an increased sophistication in the school environment. Limits and boundaries are now tailored within the privilege level system that allows for movement by individual students according to demonstrated behavior. Hence, both increased autonomy as well as limited opportunities are functionally tied to developmental readiness in an elaborate manner.
The "+1 modeling" approach represents increased intentionality by program planners to link "real life" moral dilemmas to an individual's capacity to grow and change in a positive direction. The structure of daily life continued to be developed in the direction of greater specificity and predictability.

Following is a chart that outlines the Maple Valley journey toward an integrated theory for psychoeducational practice. Included in this profile are those characteristic elements which define the program's development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Stage</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES/NEEDS</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOMES &amp; GOALS</th>
<th>PROGRAM DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE EARLY YEARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 - 1976</td>
<td>-individual needs/differences defined in terms of a child's concern with her/his sense of identity, power, and connectedness</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-school day is more structured and defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new &quot;type&quot; of student forces ongoing need for clarity</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-environment is more &quot;on track&quot; but needing more sophisticated means of differentiating environmental (E) structures in order to better match environment (E) with changing population (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-utilisation of structural developmental psychological theory as &quot;road map&quot; by which to diagnose and assess differences/needs for a broad range of children</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-formal structured developmental application to area of curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new framework helped to clarify unique needs of predominant &quot;type&quot; of student</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-continued differentiation and elaboration of counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-awareness of environmental (E) impact on arrested development</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-awareness of environmental (E) impact on arrested development</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic Population: - Predominant: Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Child in Distress</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-New - The Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE LATER YEARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 - 1981</td>
<td>-individual differences/needs defined in terms of a child's concern with her/his sense of identity, power, and connectedness</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new &quot;type&quot; of student forces ongoing need for clarity</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-utilisation of structural developmental psychological theory as &quot;road map&quot; by which to diagnose and assess differences/needs for a broad range of children</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new framework helped to clarify unique needs of predominant &quot;type&quot; of student</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-awareness of environmental (E) impact on arrested development</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic Population: - Predominant: Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Child in Distress</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-New - The Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATED THEORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-individual differences/needs defined in terms of a child's concern with her/his sense of identity, power, and connectedness</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new &quot;type&quot; of student forces ongoing need for clarity</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-utilisation of structural developmental psychological theory as &quot;road map&quot; by which to diagnose and assess differences/needs for a broad range of children</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new framework helped to clarify unique needs of predominant &quot;type&quot; of student</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-awareness of environmental (E) impact on arrested development</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic Population: - Predominant: Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Child in Distress</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-New - The Disenfranchised Child</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-individual differences/needs defined in terms of a child's concern with her/his sense of identity, power, and connectedness</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new &quot;type&quot; of student forces ongoing need for clarity</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-nature of limits and boundaries in an &quot;a priori&quot; context more narrowly defined to meet developmental needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-utilisation of structural developmental psychological theory as &quot;road map&quot; by which to diagnose and assess differences/needs for a broad range of children</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-more differentiated approach to counseling methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-new framework helped to clarify unique needs of predominant &quot;type&quot; of student</td>
<td>-search for additional developmental paradigms</td>
<td>-use of develop mental &quot;filters,&quot; &quot;1 model&quot; and question guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-awareness of environmental (E) impact on arrested development</td>
<td>-goal framework focused on differentiation and sequencing</td>
<td>-greater and more sophisticated differentiation in program structures &quot;privilege level system&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The integrated model for psychoeducational practice can be viewed in its two distinct and yet highly correlated aspects. Firstly, upon review of the Later Years stage itself, we see the logical outgrowth of all the prior stage processes relating to understanding individual differences/needs (P), the definition of learning goals (B) and the development of programmatic design and implementation (E). Various structural developmental theories became the central organizing foundation for programmatic design and practice. All the various components and parts that are known as the Later Years represent the sum of learning and experience of the prior stages.

The power of the integrated model resides in the axiom that states, "The whole is greater than the sum of its parts." Upon investigation and reflection, the functional question that needs to be answered is, "Why didn't Maple Valley cease to exist upon confrontation with the dissonance in any given period?" A corollary question is, "What was it about the nature of life and relationships at Maple Valley that allowed for validation of questioning and integration of change?" These questions are broad and complex in scope and the purpose here is not to answer them in their entirety. To do so would most certainly involve yet another major undertaking. However, one of the responses to these questions is directly linked to the conception of this integrated model.

In short, a primary reason why Maple Valley survived throughout the course of powerful transitions and changes was that
the original inspirational vision of the essence of living relationships remained continuous throughout. More specifically, the nature of the "helping relationship" that required meaningful engagement and commitment between and among staff and students, between and among staff and staff, and between and among students and students, never changed.

Theoretical development and utilization must be directly linked and attached to the "a priori" conditions of engagement and commitment in a Humanistic/Existential sense in order to promote learning. In using a photographic metaphor, developmental theory is the lens by which a picture can be created (the learning outcomes); the Humanistic/Existential approach to relationships is the "light source" that makes the camera's use and picture possible.

In conclusion, Maple Valley developed an integrated theory by blending a variety of theories and practices within a laboratory context of constant and fundamental redefinitions, principles and tenets of the helping/educational relationship. The Later Years represented an increasingly sophisticated period of program development. The synthesis of this sophistication with the prerequisite condition of the therapeutic relationship is, in fact, the integrated theoretical model for psychological practice.
CHAPTER VI

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter will consist of a brief overview of the entire study. The preceding chapter entitled "An Integrated Theory for Psychoeducational Practice: Maple Valley School (1981)" provides an in-depth and detailed and evaluative summary of the primary thrust and conclusions of this dissertation.

The study has traced and analyzed the development of the Maple Valley program's psychoeducational theory for enhancing adolescent development. The Early Years (1973-1976), the Middle Years (1976-1979), and the Later Years (1979-1981) are three periods that are distinguished by differences in theory and practice. This analysis includes a description of each phase, the accompanying theory of each phase, and the impact of the phase on the students, staff and structure of the school. An integrated theory for psychoeducational practice emerged as a direct result of the school's development from 1973-1981. In addition, the study highlights the program's developmental progression and places this development in a larger sociocultural context.

The Behavior-Person-Environment paradigm (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974) was utilized as an organizing vehicle to enable the reader to gain a comprehensive view of the program's development. This paradigm organizes and analyzes the ways in which psychological
theory is translated into psychoeducational design and implementation. Specifically, this "matching model" was employed as a means of identifying the ways in which the program's underlying view of human development influenced the conception of individual differences/needs (P), the determination of learning goals (B), and the establishment of specific methodologies (E), during the three programmatic stages.

The study is descriptive in style and has been organized in conceptual and theoretical terms. A participant/observer approach is utilized in an effort to effectively integrate an objective analysis within an appropriately subjective context. Thus, the methodology utilized in this study provides the type of documentation that draws upon a range of data sources. Noteworthy in this regard is a series of direct and structured interviews conducted with former students and staff members who participated in the program for the period 1973-1981. These interviews provide the reader with a variety of recollections and experiences which greatly enhances the overall presentation.

Of course, there are numerous other Maple Valley stories quite worthy of examination and illumination. This study is thorough and comprehensive in terms of describing the program's psychoeducational development; however, it barely "scratches the surface" with respect to the nature of the relationship between key individuals and the program's survival and development. The program's viability at a content level and its capacity for ongoing change and development
resides primarily with those staff and students who gave their vitality and life to the school. Theories in and of themselves do not translate into programs; in the final analysis it is the practitioner who must effectively adapt and integrate theoretical constructs into a meaningful and utilitarian tapestry.

Since its inception, the primary purpose of Maple Valley has been the promotion of human development. It is within this superordinate conception that the emergence of an integrated theory occurs. Those theoretical formulations and, more importantly, program practices that continued to be positive and relevant remained; those that no longer appeared viable were eliminated. In a sense, this movement reflects a "Darwinistic" process of natural selection. The Early Years (1973-1976) was a period of birth and infancy in which Maple Valley clearly reflected the basic tenets of the Human Potential and Free School Movements. During the Middle Years (1976-1979) program planners began to direct the program's development in a more systematic, sequenced and focused manner. During the Later Years (1979-1981) the foundation had been established that allowed for an even more "scientific" and sophisticated application of psychological theory to educational practice.

This study has provided the type of examination which is beneficial on two levels. Firstly, the study illuminates the Maple Valley program's theoretical and practical heritage and thereby provides those staff members currently associated with the program
with a more comprehensive grasp of contemporary practices.

Secondly, this historical analysis, by its very nature, does have direct applications for a wide range of settings. These applications include the delivery of human services to adolescents, parenting, schooling, psychotherapy and social work. In summation, and more specifically, this study is significant in that it contributes to a growing body of knowledge which is directed at the development of psychoeducational programs for adolescents.

Recommendations for further research include the following:

1. On the basis of this study it is clear that further research is needed in the context of ongoing psychoeducational programs in order to expand on the theoretical and practical implications of this examination.

2. This study is descriptive in style and is organized in conceptual and theoretical terms. Further research that is empirically oriented is needed to test and further validate the underlying theoretical and design features discussed in this study.

Finally, it is fitting that I conclude this study with the quotation with which I began. According to Dewey (1964) the very heart of the educational process can be summarized as follows:

The aim of education is development of individuals to the utmost of their potentialities. But this statement leaves unanswered the question as to what is the measurement of development. A society of free individuals in which all, through their own work, contributes to the liberation and enrichment of the
lives of others, is the only environment in which any individual can really grow normally to his full stature.

This study has contributed to the understanding and development of this type of educational process.
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APPENDIX A

Note: 1. The following transcripts of meetings are a sample profile of General and Emergency Meetings conducted during this period.

2. (C) identifies participant as child
   (S) identifies participant as staff
Community Meeting Transcripts

1973-1976
(1973-1974 School Year)

Maple Valley School Community Meetings:

GENERAL MEETING: November 5, 1973

Moderator: Steven(C) Secretary: Leslie(C)

- There was much discussion about writing on the bathroom walls. Special graffiti paper will be put up, and until then, we can't write on the walls.
- Motion passed to have a monitor for dorm cleaning to tell the scheduled workers when and where they have to clean.
- Jane(C) was voted monitor.
- Motion was passed that we have milk to drink every other day.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: November 12, 1973

Moderator: Jane(C) Secretary: Sheila(C)

- Motion made by Robert(S) that the community write a letter concerning the oil shortage to Senator Kennedy. Robert will write the letter. Motion tabled until Dennis(C) and Tina(C) arrive.
- Motion made by Susan(S) that any letter containing a controversial subject, and having the Maple Valley School name on it, has to be voted on unanimously. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made by Sheila(C) that if there is an issue that requires a unanimous vote, and if one or more members of the community are absent, (and it's not a weekend or authorized holiday) then the absent members are denied their votes at that time. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made by Brian(C) to impeach Jane(C) as moderator. MOTION FAILED.
- Meeting adjourned.

EMERGENCY MEETING: February 1, 1974

Moderator: Dennis(C) Secretary: Robert(S)

- Brian(C) is elected dorm monitor for this week.
- Motion made that the monitor has the responsibility to inspect all cleaning jobs and to make sure they are done right. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made to look into changing Y.M.C.A. memberships to Greenfield. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made that Brian(C) be the head of a committee to look into getting a pool table. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made that no one can call the Question until a reasonable amount of discussion has taken place. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made that people who make lots of noise after 10 p.m. are brought up at a meeting, and that a fine of money be imposed if found guilty. MOTION PASSED.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: March 4, 1974

Moderator: David(S) Secretary: Louise(S)
- Tina(C) is elected monitor for the week.
- Motion is made that no dishes, silverware, or cups be taken out of the kitchen area. Also, everyone should round up all lost kitchen articles and return them. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion is made that if someone at the meeting is directing business to another person, and the person speaking does not object, an open dialogue can take place between those two people. MOTION PASSED.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: June 10, 1974

Moderator: Louis(C) Secretary Leslie(C)
- Discussion about canoe trip. Decided that another meeting be held.
- Discussion about Brenda(C) filming the meeting.
- Motion made that it requires a majority vote to decide this, and not a unanimous one. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made for Brenda(C) to be able to film as much of the meeting as she wants to. MOTION PASSED.
- Discussion on swimming today. Robert(S) said that he would like to go to Lake Mattawa. Many agree.
- David(S) talked about and requested co-op help for tomorrow. No one volunteered.
- Motion made for a community effort to get the entire building cleaned for the school year. Kids clean the dorms, staff do the house, including office area, kitchen, dining room and hallways. Both will do the barn. MOTION PASSED.
- Motion made that any one person who is cooking in the kitchen has the right to throw anyone out at any time. MOTION FAILED.
- Meeting Adjourned.
EMERGENCY MEETING: November, 1974

Moderator: David(S) Secretary: Louise(S)

- David(S) outlined rules about leaving school grounds—no one is permitted off the school grounds between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m.
- Maria(S) and Laura(S) called this meeting to speak of destruction in the Art Room. Paint brushes were ruined, wax mixed in with dye, wax all over the floors, etc.
- Maria(S) made a motion that the Art Room is closed after 4 p.m. unless a staff is in there. DEFEATED.
- David(S) made the motion that whoever destroyed the Art Room not be permitted to use the room or its facilities the rest of the 7th and all of the 8th periods. PASSED.
- Louis(C) made the motion that whoever destroyed the materials in the Art Room be required to either replace them or pay for them. PASSED.
- Scott(C) made a motion that Pat(C) look for the pieces to his game today. If he doesn't find them all, he will pay seven dollars to him on Monday morning. PASSED.
- Motion by Arron(C) that Scott(C) pay him eight dollars or replace his pliers by Monday morning. PASSED.
- Robert(S) points out a correlation between Scott(C) owing Arron(C) eight dollars, and his charging Pat(C) seven; putting pressure on Pat(C) as Arron(C) puts pressure on him. Scott's ability to pay Arron depends on Pat's(C) paying him.
- Discussion of the invasion of Evan's(C) room during his absence—and things being monkeyed around with (i.e., oreos eaten, bed disturbed, etc.)
- Motion made by Evan(C) that no one enter his room without him being there. no need to make a motion—is already school law.

EMERGENCY MEETING: January, 1975

Moderator: Scott(C) Secretary: Laura(S)

- Called by Digger(C) because he switched washing the dishes with Arron(C), and Arron refuses to do them on his turn. Arron(C) says he refuses to wash dishes at all.
- Motion by Robert(S) that Arron(C) cannot eat at school at meals where dishes are washed by community: evening and weekends, until he is willing to get back on the dish schedule. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
EMERGENCY MEETING: January, 1975

- Called by Arron(C) for the purpose of being put back on the dishes schedule because there's meat loaf for supper tonight.
- Motion by Bobby(C) that if 1. Arron(C) again refuses to do the dishes, that there be at least one week of community meals until he is allowed to call another meeting; 2. that he have to do the dishes for Robert tonight besides his regular dish duty. PASSED.
- Arron(C) accepts decision!

GENERAL MEETING: January, 1975

Moderator: Dana(C) Secretary Laura(S)

- David(S) introduces Elizabeth(S) Rick(S), Philip(S), and Terry(C) who are all going to be new Maple Valley School members.
- Bobby(C) makes motion that he be allowed to keep a school chair in his room. PASSED.
- Emma(S) asks for someone to help care for Sean(C) during men's and women's Sex Ed. meetings. Rick and Peggy Sue volunteer to share the job.
- David(S) asks for feedback on the separation of men and women for Sex Ed.
  Comments: - makes no difference
  - good to have some time together
  - and some time separate
  - important to be together
- Scott's(C) BACK!
- Motion that an impartial person be chosen as moderator at Emergency Meetings. PASSED.
- Max(C) makes a motion to have a school table in his room. There is some discussion of setting precedents--taking all the furniture from the Common Room, etc. PASSED.
- Arron(C) makes a motion that he take a chair. DEFEATED.
- Rick(S) offers community an Auto Mechanics class.
- John(C) wants to bring some movies to Maple Valley. Explained who Baba Ram Das is.
- Philip(S), Peggy Sue(C) and Laura(S), Max(C) and John(C) will be on a committee to arrange for and publicize showing of movies.
- Some discussion of what exactly is motionable. It was clarified that suggestions can be made on anything, but motions cannot make someone do or think something.
- Meeting adjourned!
GENERAL MEETING: January, 1975 -
- Discussion over the mandatory nature of Emergency Meetings.
- Evan(C) makes motion exempting him from coming to an
Emergency meeting—in return for losing his right to call
such a meeting. This is to take place during a seven day
period. DEFEATED.

EMERGENCY MEETING: February, 1975 -
- Called by David(S)—motion made that the next time anybody
plays with the fire extinguisher, they lose a whole week’s
allowance.
  Amendments — that person who plays with the extinguisher is
  responsible for getting it filled.
- If a staff shoots extinguishers, he must pay
  five dollars per extinguisher. (Ed. Note:
  please note the demanded equality status)
- Day students should pay according to their age.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: March, 1975 -
Moderator: John(C) Secretary: Dana(C)
- May(C) "Be kind to gerbils, no fingers in cage, etc."
- Louis(C) "Curfew law sucks." He wants it changed because he
feels that he is 18 and old enough to stay out later.
- Barbara(S) makes a motion that no bikes or mini-bikes, go-
carts, etc., be allowed in the Art Room.
  Amendment — Also, none in the hallways. PASSED.
- David(S) says that there will be no Person Class tomorrow
afternoon but a giant class—staff and students at 7 p.m.
Some discussion of whether we could have a whole day's Person
Class, and if we should have the 7 p.m. Person Class or not.
(Ed. note: Person Class is a regularly scheduled class where
the intra and inter-personal domain is the subject matter)
- Motion made that we have Person Class Thursday afternoon and
Thursday evening. PASSED.

EMERGENCY MEETING: March, 1975 -
- Called by Dana(C) because Max(C) has been violating her
  rights in her room.
- Discussion of Max's(C) general harassment of Dana(C).
- Motion by Laura(S) that Max(C) not be allowed down the
  corridor past Dana's room for three school days.
- Motion withdrawn after Max(C) stated he would respect Dana's
  rights and not harass her anymore.
- Meeting adjourned.
GENERAL MEETING: April, 1975

Moderator: John(C) Secretary: Maria(S)

- Mary(C) wants to know if her brother and sister can come to Maple Valley on Wednesdays at 2:30—to hang out and participate in school's activities. Made into a motion and PASSED.
- Laura(S) makes a recommendation that Victor(C), Jennifer(C), and Doug(C) read this law book and ask questions, if necessary.
- Bobby(C) makes a motion that he not have to do dishes here because he never eats dinner here.
  Amendment — that he at least have to do the dishes twice to make up for the times he missed. This means that he cannot eat supper here anymore.
- Ricky(C) makes motion that people who make noise in the dorms after 10 p.m. lose their allowance for that week. After much discussion, Nancy(S) called the question. DEFEATED.
- Reminder that Maria(S) is taking pictures of kids’ activities for the Maple Valley School yearbook!

GENERAL MEETING: April, 1975

Moderator: Ricky(C) Secretary: Michelle(C)

- A motion is made that there be no sleeping in the Common Room.
  Amendment — 1. until a fire exit is arranged.
  2. except for the day school students.
  3. that amendment #2 is withdrawn.
  PASSED.
- A motion is made to create a law against ripping off anything from any school community rooms. Seminar Room Little kids Room Art Room Common Room Kitchen and Dining Rooms Offices
  PASSED UNANIMOUSLY!
- A motion is made that these new laws be posted in the Dining Room for one week by Secretary.
  Amendment — that a list of all school laws be posted also.
  PASSED.
- A motion is made that the "Executive Table" (Ed. note: Older kids' table) members not be allowed to exclude others from "their" table. NOT SECONDED.
- A motion is made that there be two lunch periods.
  Noisy: 12:15-12:35  Quiet: 12:35-12:55 (Ed. note: note the absence of directing values: noisy vs. quiet) PASSED.
GENERAL MEETING: April, 1975

- Nancy(S) announces that there will be a field trip to the Leverett Crafts Center on Friday.
- A motion is made that there be no noisy guns or guns that shoot anything out of them on school grounds. PASSED.
- A motion is made by David(S) that a major school clean-up take place today instead of Outdoor Skills class. People from the bank are visiting the school to determine if they should lend the school money for a new building. The motion does not require mandatory participation. PASSED.
- Francis(S) asks if there's any interest in forming a film group?
- Laura(S) asks if anyone is interested in going to a Wendell Zoning Board meeting?
- Mary's(C) question—If someone bakes a cake at school, who does it belong to?
- Answer: (consensus of group) Big things cooked with school ingredients must be shared!

EMERGENCY MEETING: May, 1975

- Ricky(C) called the meeting because Laura(S), Philip(S), Francis(S), Maria(S), and Mary(C) were rough-housing in the Common Room. Upon further examination it was made clear that that was a skit in Drama Class having to do with staging a snowball fight. Motion was made that nothing be done!
- Francis(S) wanted to clarify "rough-housing." The discussion was tabled and should be brought up at Wednesday's General Meeting.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: May, 1975

Moderator: John(C) Secretary: Nancy(S)

- Evan(C) requests that locks be put on the bathroom doors. Group okays request.
- Jennifer(C) asks Ricky(C) to get his clothes out of the Lost & Found.
- John(C) brings up discussion about how the Emergency Meetings have been ending—he feels dissatisfied with the current situation.
- Discussion on Food Abuse:
  Suggestions: - If you don't finish the food you take, you must eat it at the next meal.
  - Marion(S) would like to do the serving.
  - Wasting food should be grounds for an Emergency Meeting.
- Styrofoam cups are a waste and are ecologically bad.
- A motion is made by Philip (his first one—way to go Philip) that we issue each person his own cup. PASSED.
- Earl (S) wants to vote on whether his friends can visit the school. PASSED.
- Request that Maple Valley buy a punching bag.
- Meeting adjourned.

EMERGENCY MEETING: May, 1975

Moderator: Mary (C) Secretary: Roy (C)

- The meeting was called by David (S) because a wall was damaged by Arron (C), Digger (C), and Bobby (C).
- A motion is made by David (S) that Arron (C), Digger (C), and Bobby (C) be suspended for one week.
- Laura (S) - "I'm upset about Arron's (C) joking and games about the hole in the wall."
- Leslie (C) - "I think that a suspension is too strong a punishment."
- John (C) (asks David) "Why is the sentence so heavy?"
- David (S) responds, "I'm tired of Arron's (C) bullshit. It's more than destruction. He doesn't give a shit! You (talking to Arron) don't belong here now if you can't pull it together for the last four weeks of school."
- Doug (C) says he appreciates honesty in communication. He says that many people have feelings that haven't been expressed, "There are times I feel good about Arron (C). But this is where I live—it's important to me."
- Nancy (S) - "I'm really a person and don't feel you three have been treating me as such."
- Jennifer (C) - "The punishment is too strong."
- John (C) - "The punishment is not too severe."
- David (S) - "I feel frustrated and angry."
- Maria (S) - "I can't vote on any motion which affects people's lives here without hearing how they feel about the destruction."
- Nancy (S) - "Some people are cleaning the school while others are destroying it."
- Laura (S) - "I see the destruction as childish but not meanness."
- Arron (C) - "David (S) has been a different person since he has had relationship hassles."
- John (C) - "How does this affect you?"
- Arron (C) - "I don't know."
- Doug (C) - "Why don't Digger (C), Bobby (C), and Max (C) talk?"
- Scott (C) - "David (S), your generalizations about how no one gives a shit really sucks!"
John(C) (to Scott) "What does caring about Maple Valley School really mean?"
- Scott(C) - "I don't know."
- Leslie(C) - "It means trying your best to be you and live within the community."
- Evan(C) - "I don't consider myself part of the gang. When I choose so, I am with them. I am concerned. And, I do give a shit. I, too, resent the generalizations."
- David(S) - "People must accept responsibility for what they do."
- Scott(C) - "I'm willing to repair the wall, but to get kicked out sucks!"
- Nancy(S) - "It isn't the hole for me, it's the attitude of the people involved that pisses me off."
- David(S) - "I'm hearing lies and bullshit. Scott(C) must make another motion if he wants to suspend himself. I won't accept his name in my motion."
- Laura(S) - "I wish the three would say something about this."
- Digger(C) - "I do care about Maple Valley, but I don't want to speak."
- Robert(S) - "I don't want to live in a place where people are destructive."
- Arron(C) - "Ricky(C) and Victor(C) destroy things and they don't get kicked out!"
- Nancy(S) - "Ricky(C) and Victor(C) are a separate issue."
- Philip(S) - "I once made a hole in a high school room wall because the school didn't give a shit about me. Do you feel like people here don't give a shit about you?"
- David(S) - "If this motion passes, it is to go into effect as soon as possible. I will inform all parents. No one is to leave until I've spoken to the parents."
- Bobby(C) - "If we leave, we won't be able to attend our classes and graduate on time."
- Arron(C) - "I didn't make a hole out of hate for this place. It was something different."
- Philip(S) - "Where was your bad attitude toward Nancy(S) and David(S) coming from—why?"
- Max(C) - "They were spoiling our fun."
- Digger(C) - "I love this school very much. I don't speak because I don't have anything to say."
- MOTION DEFEATED.
- Bobby(C) makes a new motion that Max(C), Scott(C), Digger(C), Arron(C), and he repair the hole.
- David(S) - "I don't think this motion means shit."
- MOTION PASSES.
- Meeting adjourned!
EMERGENCY MEETING: September, 1975 -

Moderator: MaryAnn(C) Secretary: Karen(C)

- Guy(C) called this meeting because Peter(C) was picking on him, threatening him, and throwing his stuff out the door.
- Denise(C) makes a motion that Peter(C) be suspended for one week. Motion seconded by Robie(C).
  (Secretary's aside--"Just for the record, this is only the fourth time somebody made the motion to suspend him from here, and it's getting pretty damn ridiculous sitting in a goddamn meeting every morning.")
- David(S) makes an amendment that the suspension be for one week and that Peter(C) leave tomorrow.
- Amendment is accepted.
- Motion PASSED.
- Meeting adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING: October, 1975 -

Moderator: Mary Ann(C) Secretary: Rick(C)

- There will be a Drama Workshop after the meeting.
- Brenda(C) asks for more respect for the piano--so does everyone else.
- Dick(C) and Tom(C) are gonna fix the piano.
- Brenda(C) is also upset about a million people messing up her room.
- Max(C) will be back on the laundry schedule.
- Meeting Adjourned!

EMERGENCY MEETING: October, 1975 -

Moderator: Tom(C) Secretary: Rick(C)

- Called by Denise(C) and Brenda(C) because somebody fucked up their Birds and Cages.
- A motion is made that all animal cages are off limits to anyone--except the owners and Bruce(C).
- Amendment - if given permission, people can visit the animals.
- MOTION PASSED.
GENERAL MEETING: November, 1975

Moderator: Karen(C) Secretary: Barbara(C)

- John(C) makes a motion that the kitchen should be open on Monday night during staff meeting. PASSED (until 10 p.m.)
  Tom(C) suggests a school trip to Mt. Monadnock for Saturday—all day hike.
  discussion -
  - The issues of caring for Cinnamon (ED. NOTE: school pony) will be the topic for discussion to take place in the animal room.
  - Jugglers to come on November 2nd.
  - School trip to Plum Island on November 3rd.
  - Thursday night—Planned Parenthood.
  - Laura(S) states that she doesn't like doing laundry duty alone. She suggests a schedule—one additional person to help would make it go faster.
  - Bruce(S) makes a motion that there be a laundry schedule with two students helping one staff member each night. PASSED.
  - Meeting adjourned.

EMERGENCY MEETING: November, 1975

Moderator: Mary Ann(C) Secretary: Laura(S)

- Meeting called by Brenda(C) because Victor(C) and Robie(C) messed around with the fire extinguisher last night.
  - Motion by Greg(C) and Dick(C) that they be excused from the meeting. PASSED.
  - Motion by Brenda(C) that Victor(C) and Robie(C) fix the hole in the bathroom and pay for all the materials that go into it and be responsible for seeing that the fire extinguishers get filled before Thanksgiving vacation.
  Amendment— that they do not get any allowance until all the above is taken care of.
  Amendment— that they are liable for any damage to the musical equipment involved.
  Suggestion— that there be more indoor activities at school in the evenings.
  - PASSES.
  - A motion is made that for every emergency meeting called on Victor(C) and Robie(C) between the end of Thanksgiving and Winter recess, where it is determined that they have violated either a law, or somebody's rights they lose half of their allowance. PASSES.
  - A motion is made that if Victor(C) and Robie(C) lose their allowance, that it go into a general fund for upkeep around
the school. PASSES.
- a motion is made that instead of waiting for Thanksgiving to begin the first motion, that we enact the motion now. PASSES.
- a motion is made that anybody fooling around with the fire extinguishers lose their allowance, and fill them. DEFEATED.
- Motion that Jane(C) lose half of her allowance for neglecting to come to an Emergency Meeting. PASSES.

EMERGENCY MEETING: December, 1975

Moderator: Rick(C) Secretary: Brenda(C)

- Meeting called by Bruce(S) because he's heard that people are possessing drugs at school.
- Doug(C) says he's heard so too, and is upset that people are lying.
- Rick(C) asks if the two visitors are to be allowed at the meeting.
- Bruce(S) made a motion that the two visitors, Kate and Elaine be allowed to participate but not vote. PASSES.
- David(S) asks who has had dope on school grounds since Thanksgiving vacation.
- Jane(C) says she's smoked pot but not a mile away from school (ED. NOTE—the one mile boundary was incorporated into the school law at the time in an attempt to clearly separate the school from such activity) and, it was not her dope.
- Bruce(S) asks if she was alone.
- Jane(C) says she wasn't.
- Dana(C) says she smoked with Jane(C), but it wasn't her dope either.
- David(S) reminds the group that the one mile law was established in order to keep the school disassociated from drug activity.
- Jennifer(C) makes a motion that we make an amendment to the law that it's a half mile instead of a mile boundary.
- Point of Order: Rick(C) states that the motion is unacceptable because it isn't Emergency Meeting business.
- Mary Ann(C) takes over the moderatorship.
- David(S) asks Jane(C) and Dana(C) if they were aware that they were going to be on Step #3 of the Drug Law Policy as a result of their latest action.
- (Editors NOTE: Step #3 of the Maple Valley School Drug Policy refers to the third time an individual has on their possession any illegal drug or alcohol. It requires that the individual be expelled from the school/community).
- Jane(C) says she wasn't aware and Dana(C) says she was but didn't really think about it at the time.
- Jennifer(C) says she's really upset that they might get kicked out.
- David(S) says he gets the feeling that there are other people who have had drugs here and wishes they would say so.
- Helen(C) says she accidentally brought a pipe bowl to school and showed it to David immediately and they dealt with it.
- Bruce(S) says he sees a conflict between people wanting to be at Maple Valley and also wanting to use drugs here.
- Mary Ann(C) states that there's going to be an awful lot of mistrust here if people don't start owning up.
- Barbara(C) becomes the moderator.
- Mary Ann(C) makes a motion that Jane(C) and Dana(C) be allowed to stay at school.
- Rick(C) asks her to please hold off her motion.
- Max(C) makes a motion that pot be allowed to be used at school all day today. **MOTION WITHDRAWN.**
- Brenda(C) says that she can see that Jane(C) and Dana(C) are just beginning to learn at Maple Valley School and, how can we ask them to leave at this point. You (Ed. NOTE: the staff) should teach when the person is ready to learn and not when you feel like teaching.
- David(S) makes a motion that the meeting break for lunch. **PASSES.**
- Meeting begins again.
- David(S) makes a motion that group should get into a circle and everyone that chooses to talk about their involvement with drugs at school do so.
  **Amendment:** that no one be permitted to leave once we begin, only before and afterwards. **PASSES.**
- In the circle Helen(C) and Greg(C) say they have both possessed pot at school. They are now on Step #2.
- David(S) says it is late in the day and there is still much to talk about and makes a motion that we reconvene at 10 A.M. tomorrow. **PASSES.**
- Meeting begins again.
- Robert(S) makes a motion that two visitors be able to attend the meeting if they choose to do so. **PASSES.**
- Robert(S) asks group how they're feeling about yesterday's meeting?
  **SILENCE**
- Robert(S) asks if anyone felt anything new or different.
- Brenda(C) says she feels the loss of friends she's recently gotten close to and that her life at Maple Valley will drastically change.
- Jane(C) says she feels really hurt about having to leave school.
- Jennifer(C) states she said most all she could say yesterday and feels it didn't do any good. She's still hurt and feels hopeless and sad.
- So does Brenda(C)
- Laura(S) says that Maple Valley will be crippled if we just hug and kiss and pretend nothing happened.
- Jennifer(C) says she doesn't understand that.
- Helen(C) says issues are fine but people are people. Why can't we see the love and humanity behind the issues?
- Rick(C) says that he doesn't think the issue is that they are real people who have to leave. He feels that the issue is the preservation of Maple Valley and its morality—that it wouldn't mean much if we just said fuck it and let them stay.
- Brenda(C) says that feeling and humanity can reach anywhere, and if we wanted to we could make it any way we choose. That in the end all there are are people. We are being mechanical and ruthless and unfeeling and insensitive. We are dwarfing people. Maple Valley means nothing without people. Everyone keeps talking about the "devastating effects" if they stay. But what about of their going?
- Helen(C) agrees.
- Robert(S) says he's been thinking a lot. Not about issues but about trying to balance what's really important. Life will go on for Dana(C) and Jane(C) and Maple Valley too. This time is painful—it's a tearing process. But, it isn't like someone died.
- Jennifer(C) and Dana(C) must go to a doctor's appointment. A motion is made that they be able to do so. PASSES.
- Doug(C) says that he doesn't feel comfortable continuing the meeting with these people gone!
- Rick(C) says he doesn't know what to expect from this meeting—but, he supposes it's as complete as possible right now.
- A motion is made to reconvene the meeting later in the day. PASSES.

GENERAL MEETING: March, 1976 —

Moderator: Bruce(S) Secretary: Karen(C)

- Karen(C) makes a motion that Klondike (Ed. note: a cat) be able to stay at school for a couple of days until she can find it a home.
- Tom(C) asks Karen what the chances are of giving the cat away?
- David(S) gets upset that all of a sudden there's a new cat at school. (Ed. note: school policy is that no pets other than those in cages, i.e., hampsters, etc., are permitted on school grounds.)
- Karen(C) says that she knows someone in town who might be willing to accept the cat.
- Maria(S) asks if this person can be called.
- Brenda(C) says she knows this person and would be willing to stop by his home and ask him today.
- Maria(S) says she's feeling a lot of anger from Karen.
- Karen(C) says she's pissed because she doesn't think people believe her story.
- An amendment is made to Karen's(C) motion that she be given a full week to find the cat a good home. PASSES.
- A request is made for the ping-pong table to be fixed.
- Some people say they will give it a try.
- Bruce(S) makes a motion that when the Band is using a room for rehearsals, it is reserved for them and only them. In other words, anyone who is there that is not in band rehearsal—no fooling around! PASSES.
- MEETING ADJOURNED!

EMERGENCY MEETING: May, 1976 -

Moderator: Dick(C) Secretary: Helen(C)

- The meeting was called because Victor(C) and Robie(C) were seen torturing and maybe killing frogs.
- Denise(C) says she saw them kill a frog by keeping it on a fishing hook.
- Bruce(S) says he's disgusted and would like to see them suspended from school for awhile.
- Brenda(C) says that this is the bottom line for her. She says she's tried to understand the issue—but feels she really doesn't want anything to do with anyone who would do that!
- Victor(C) says that he wants to stay at school because he loves Maple Valley. He doesn't think he'll do it again because he talked to his "Mums" and knows if he does it again, he may get kicked out of school. He says he has low values about killing animals because he's grown up with hunters in his family. Anyway, Victor(C) said there's nothing he can do now because the frog is dead. He said that killing frogs and snakes was the normal thing to do; and, that it's strange to see people caring so much about it.
- Maria(S) says that she grew up with hunters in her family, and she never saw them just kill animals for play—kill them and throw them away. She said that when they killed an animal, they would eat it.
- Robie(C) agrees with Victor(C) and both promise not to do it again.
- Meeting adjourned!
APPENDIX B
Curriculum Areas

Competency-Based Diploma Program

In order to receive a Maple Valley Diploma, Students must:

1. Demonstrate competency in the following academic areas:
   a) Reading
   b) Writing
   c) Effectiveness of Expression
   d) Mathematics
   e) Social Studies

Competency exams are administered in the spring in each of these areas. Students may prepare for the exams in a variety of ways, depending on the specific department involved. In some areas, students may demonstrate competency in ways other than the exam, and in other areas, the exam is required regardless.

2. Be in regular attendance at Diploma Class.

I. Diploma Class: This class explores issues of students' futures, various topics about life at Maple Valley, area skills for survival. Students also participate in written and oral evaluations of themselves as contributing community members.

   a) Objectives
      1. Students will be able to speculate about their future, and to give and receive help in planning their future lives.
      2. Students will participate in discussions about Maple Valley issues.
      3. Students will be able to
         Complete a tax form
         Write a check
         Balance a checkbook
         Write a letter applying for a job
         Complete a job application
      4. Students will participate in written and oral self-evaluation

   b) Materials
      1. Class presentations
      2. Handouts and exercises
      3. Interview simulations and role playing

   c) Evaluation
      1. Survival skills will be measured in the competency exam
      2. Attendance will be monitored by the teacher.
      3. The primary evaluation tool will be self-evaluations, both written and oral,
Note: Additional Diploma Requirements
1. Student must attain at least his/her 16th birthday by date of graduation.
2. A minimum of one year's enrollment is necessary to acquire a Maple Valley Diploma.

The Proficiency Exam

In brief, the Maple Valley Proficiency Exam is designed to verify basic skills—language use, reading comprehension, computation, practical reasoning and writing skills. Questions on the exam are cast in terms of various elements of the core curriculum and of everyday situations, but these terms should not be taken to mean that we are measuring anything other than the foregoing skills. Almost none of the questions call for recall of facts not contained within them. The fundamental rationale is that a student who possesses these skills has the tools necessary to survive in the world, and to learn whatever he/she sees the point in knowing, wherever he/she sees it.

Part of the Proficiency Exam is the Basic Skills Assessment Test put out by the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, NJ. This test measures basic skills in English, Reading, and Mathematics. In addition to this test (which is more fully described in the following pages), students must take a Reading Supplement, a test in survival skills, and a take-home writing sample. These, too, are more fully described later.

Outline of the Test
Part I (4 hours) - The Basic Skills Assessment Test

1. A Writer's Skills (English) 45 min.
   A) Mechanics of writing
      a) Spelling of common words
      b) Capitalization and punctuation
         Capitalization of proper nouns
         Capitalization of proper adjectives
         Unnecessary capitalization
         End punctuation
         Commas in address and dates
         Commas in series
         Commas for clarity
         Unnecessary commas
         Apostrophe to show possession
         Apostrophe to show contraction
         Quotation marks
      c) Fill out forms competently
B) Effectiveness of Expression
   a) Appropriate Usage of Standard Written English
       Subject-verb agreement
       Verb form
       Tense
       Sentence fragment
       Double negative
       Diction, according to meaning
       Pronoun agreement with antecedent
       Pronoun shift
       Pronoun case
       Adjective-verb confusion
       Unidiomatic infinitive
       Comparison of modifier
       Unidiomatic prepositions
       Logical agreement
       Logical comparison
       Dangling modifier
       Parallelism
   b) Evaluation and Organization
       Clarification
       Irrelevancy
       Sentence relationship
       Economy
       Ordering information
       Diction, according to tone

2. Reading Skills (45 min.)
   Skills Measured
       Literal Comprehension
       Inference
       Evaluation

   Materials Read

   Telephone Directory  Driver's Application Form
   Loan Agreement      Law
   Guarantee           Political Propaganda
   Advertising         Community Resources
   Operating Guides    Medicine Labels
   Product Information Product Warnings
   Newspaper or Magazine Nutritional Information
   Narrative Fiction  First Aid Information
   Dictionary          Road Map
   School Catalogue    Job Application
   Cartoons            Description of Benefits
   Book or Periodical Titles Bus Schedule
   Editorials          Want Ads
Tax Forms

Work Related Information

3. Mathematics (2hrs)

MATHEMATICS SKILL TO BE MEASURED

Add or subtract whole numbers
Multiply or divide whole numbers
** Add or subtract decimals
Add or subtract fractions
Multiply fractions
Identify equivalences: fractions, decimal, percent
Find the percent of a number
Approximate numbers by rounding
Find what percent one number is of another
Compute an average
Identify the expression of an amount of money in words
as on a check
Approximate sums, differences, products, and quotients
Estimate measurements (intuitive comparison)
Compute measurements
Read graphs (bar, line, circle), tables and scales
Interpret scale drawings
Compute interest
Compute elapsed time
Combine operations
** Multiply decimals
Total

Part II 4 hrs.

1. Survival Skills (1 hr.)
   This section is designed to test the practical skills that students will need to survive in the world.
   Interpreting political cartoons
   Reading road maps
   Writing and recording in stub book
   Balancing a check book
   Tax forms
   Job application

2. Reading Supplement (1 Hr.)
   This section will measure the same skills as the Reading Test in Part I. The context will be three somewhat longer passages from a variety of sources.

3. Social Studies (2 hrs.)
   This is an optional portion, described earlier in the Diploma Program description.
Part III Writing Sample

These samples will be assigned at the end of the test and will be due at the end of the following day:

- One letter, writing for a job (using sample classified ads)
- One business letter
- One argumentative essay

Social Studies Program

I General Goals:

The Social Studies program at Maple Valley is designed to raise and measure student skill levels in the areas of critical thinking and problem solving. Students will study and use the skills of gathering, locating, evaluating, and presenting information with the overall goal of facilitating students' ability to approach both academic and everyday situations. The basic rationale is that students possessing these skills can leave whatever and whenever they choose in the Social Studies. It is a skill rather than content based program. However, content courses such as American History are available according to staff ability and student interest.

Provision for the acquisition of these skills is made in the Social Problems course. They are also available in various short term projects, ranging in length from one day to one week. These skills must then be demonstrated in various month-long projects offered in the spring. Participation in the Social Problems course or demonstrated equivalent competency and in one project are the Social Studies requirements for the Maple Valley Diploma.

II Course List:

1. Social Problems
2. Special Projects
3. Required Spring Project
4. Other content courses (American History, Psychology, etc.)
III Detailed Course Description:

Social Problems
A. Objectives

Locating Information
a) Students will be able to develop a list of potential resource materials for research
b) Students will be able to locate and use the various types of resources available in a large library, specifically covering the following skills:
   1. using a card catalogue
   2. using periodical and newspaper indexes
   3. using encyclopedias, dictionaries, atlases
   4. using an index and table of contents

Gathering Information
a) Students will improve their skills in taking notes from a variety of sources including readings, lectures, and audio-visual media
b) Students will improve their ability to read for content. Specifically:
   1. Students will be able to find the main point in a paragraph and explain the relevance of subordinate points
   2. Students will be able to outline an article, showing main and subordinate points
   3. Students will be able to develop and use study questions

Evaluating Information
a) Students will be able to distinguish between statements of fact and opinion
b) Students will be able to distinguish between descriptive statements and value judgements
b) Students will be able to name the value expressed in a value judgement, and to state their agreement or disagreement
d) Students will be able to use footnotes and other methods to check accuracy of materials
e) Students will be able to identify assumptions and to comment on their effects in a statement
f) Students will be able to identify and explain the misleading potential of various forms of propaganda techniques, and to recognize their use in various contexts
g) Students will be able to find "catches" in
advertising, editorials, leaflets, etc.
h) Students will be able to understand and solve the problems using the principles of elementary logic.
i) Students will be able to identify and explain the misleading potential of various logical fallacies
j) Students will be able to evaluate statistics for their size of sample, representativeness, etc.
k) Students will be able to recognize various misleading uses of statistics.

B. Materials
1. Class presentations
2. Handouts from various sources
3. Chapters from the following books
   Critical Thinking, Book I - Harnadek
   American Consumers - Wolf
   Propaganda, Polls and Opinion - Mitchell
   The Elusive Truth - Roden
   The Propaganda Game - Allen & Greene
Other sources for handouts and exercises include:
   Skill Development in Social Studies - McCracken
   Your Key to Creative Thinking - Baker
   Critical Thinking and Reasoning - Evans

C. Evaluation
Students receive credit for each unit by successfully completing assignments. There is a test at the end of the year with sections corresponding to each unit. If a student has not completed assignments in a given unit, he may receive credit by passing that portion of the exam.

Required Spring Projects

These projects are designed to give students the opportunity to demonstrate skills learned in the Social Problems course. Students pick a problem or an issue of interest to them. It could be anything from a contemporary problem to an area of academic interest that raises a question or issue. Students then explore their issue and report their conclusions in a written report.
A. **Objectives**

1. Students will define a question or issue in an area of interest.
2. Students will develop a list of possible resources to explore their topic.
3. Students will locate these resources.
4. Students will gather information from these sources using note-taking, outlining, etc.
5. Students will evaluate their information for assumptions, propaganda techniques, fallacies, etc.
6. Students will form tentative conclusions about their topic.
7. Students will present their conclusions in writing, documenting the completion of the above objectives.
8. In these reports students will be able to:
   a) use complete paragraphs
   b) define terms
   c) use an introduction, development, and conclusion
   d) back up generalizations
   e) write an argument free from the critical thinking pitfalls described earlier

B. **Materials**

Will depend on the topic.

C. **Evaluation**

1. Each step in the project will be monitored and evaluated by teacher and student.
2. The final result will be evaluated according to how well the above objectives have been met.
ADDENDUM

Social Studies Program

Within the social studies program, an elective course, Foreseeing the Future—Talking About Tomorrow, Today, is open to students interested in discussing the world in the year 2000 and beyond. The main goal of this course is for students to recognize the potential future outcomes of trends and events occurring today in the areas of population growth, pollution, resource depletion, food supplies, life styles and world affairs. Students will explore the theory that technological advances will overcome any obstacle to continuous expanding global affluence and compare it to the theory that finite limits will necessitate simpler life-styles for survival in the face of scarcity. Students will adopt a theory and will discuss the implications it will have on their life in the future.

This course utilizes activities and exercises as questionnaires, graph making, simulations, role playing and games are completed and discussed in class; and student evaluation is based on successful completion of the exercises and active participation in the discussions. To the degree that students' interest in their future is stimulated, the course has met its goals.

Materials used have been developed from a broad array of future oriented references. As the course is essentially activity based, no specific text is used.
Arts and Crafts Program

I. Overall Program Goals
   1. To provide the students with the opportunity to acquire skills in the following Arts and Crafts: drawing, painting, sculpture (including different forms of relief and mobile construction), jewelry making, simple leather and tile work, and fabric design.
   2. To provide the students with means of self-expression through the experiential studio activities in the visual arts.
   3. To encourage and assist the students in the development of their individual creativity through the exploration of the varied media.
   4. To help develop and exercise the student’s perceptual capacities by training the hand to skill, the eye to appreciation of the visual experience.
   5. To help the student develop a sense of personal identity through the development of potential skill and individual perceptual, emotional and imaginative responses.
   6. To aid in the student’s development of responsibility through the use and care of arts and crafts equipment.
   7. To aid in the student’s development of appreciation of other students’ art work.
   8. To explore with the students the possibilities of practical application of their acquired skills.
   9. To encourage the appreciation of the Arts and Crafts through the experiential activities as well as through field trips to museums and craft workshops, and to gain a sense of the history of art.

II. Course List
   1. Drawing/Painting
   2. Sculpture
   3. Fabric Design
   4. Field Trips
   5. Varied other craft activities

The sequence and progression of this course will be such that within any given week, work can be done in several of the interrelated skills of hand/eye coordination, use of color, composition, figure/ground relationship, structure and texture. Specific activities will progress from the elementary with the emphasis on acquiring specific skills, to the more complex and the application of those skills as a means of self-expression.
III Specific Goals and Activities

A. Drawing/Painting
   1. To assist the student in learning to draw and paint with an emphasis on the perceptual abilities of hand/eye coordination and color perception.
   2. To assist the student in becoming familiar with the scope of drawing and painting through exploration, experimentation, and specific exercises using: pencils, pen and ink, charcoal, acrylic paint, and watercolor.
   3. To integrate studio instruction in drawing and painting with art history and visual appreciation.
   4. To help the student develop a strong sense of self, through the integration of heightened mental and emotional experiences in graphic expression and the use of color.
   
   Activities
   - Line drawing
   - Drawing form and mass
   - Drawing with an emphasis on surface texture
   - Drawing portraits
   - Painting a color wheel
   - Basic color design composition
   - Still life painting/drawing
   - Landscape painting/drawing
   - Painting with free expression
   - Murals with multi media

B. Sculpture
   1. To assist the student in acquiring some basic sculptural skills, with an emphasis on 3 dimensional design and the tactile sense of hand/eye coordination.
   2. To assist the student in becoming aware of the scope of sculpture through exploration and experimentation with a wide variety of materials
   3. To integrate studio experience in sculpture and an appreciation of the work done by local crafts people as well as museum exhibits.
   4. To help the student develop a strong sense of self through expression in this media.
   
   Activities
   - Plexiglass structure
   - Wood sculpture with carving and construction
   - Stone sculpture
   - Relief with clay, shells, stones, tiles
   - Found object sculpture
   - Mobile construction with paper, shells, wire, found objects
C. Fabric Design
1. To assist the student in acquiring some basic skills in fabric design, incorporating many of the skills learned in the drawing/painting activity sequence.
2. To assist the student in becoming aware of the scope of fabric design through exploration and experimentation with a variety of materials.
3. To integrate studio experience in fabric design and an appreciation of the work done by local crafts people with an awareness of commercial fabric design.

Activities
- Tye-dye
- Batik
- Drawing/painting on fabric
- Printing on fabric
- Sewing soft sculpture with designed fabric
- Sewing cloths, curtains, pillows with designed fabric

D. Varied Other Craft Activities
1. To present a variety of other materials to encourage spontaneous creativity.
2. To assist the students in becoming aware of the wide range of arts and crafts available for self-expression.

Activities
- Collage work
- Linoleum printing
- Wax paper pressed flowers
- Drying flowers
- String art
- Tile work
- Jewelry making
  - beading
  - featherwork
  - glass, stone, wood etc.
- Link belt work
- Raffia work
- Rubbings

E. Field Trips
1. The Leverett Crafts Center
2. Museum of Fine Arts—Boston
3. The Clark Art Museum—Williamstown
4. The Smith College Art Museum—Northampton
5. Field trips for Landscape painting
6. Field trips for Object Finding
7. Field trips to local crafts' people studios
IV. Evaluation Procedures
   a. demonstration of skills
   b. production of work
   c. participation in activities
      1. Evaluation in the form of:
         Individual critiques and student self evaluations
         Class critique
         Student evaluation of overall course and specific activities
         Teacher evaluation of overall course and specific activities

English Program

I. Overall Program Goals
   1. To develop a variety of language skills including: conceptual, operational and cognitive skills.
   2. To provide course work in the following areas: basic skills, creative writing, and vocational reading and writing.
   3. To provide experiences with direct reinforcement for success in order to aid in the alleviation of anxiety often associated with the study of language arts.

II. Basic Skills: Goals and Objectives
   1. To provide training in the mechanics of writing that is correct, clear, effective and appropriate.
   2. To aid in the students' development of specific grammatical skills with appropriate usage of standard written English.
   3. To aid the students in the development of effectiveness of expression through writing skills with an emphasis on outline and composition in the form of the letter, the written report and the essay.
   4. To help students discover, develop and refine the skills necessary to meet speaking, writing and reading demands and further academic and intellectual endeavors.

Activities: using the text: McGraw-Hill Handbook of English
   Grammar exercises - using handouts
   Writing of Outlines
      a. outlines written material
      b. outlining in preparation for writing
   Practice writing of letters
      a. friendly
      b. business
   Writing Reports
   Essay Writing
   Readings
Oral Reporting
Language arts games

Evaluation:
Criteria - demonstration of skills
a. production of work
b. participation in activities
c. response of the instructor and of fellow students

Evaluation in the forms of:
  a. individual evaluation of work by student
  b. individual evaluation of work by instructor
  c. group critiques of work
  d. periodic written narratives by instructor
  e. course evaluation by entire class

III. Creative Writing: Goals and Objectives
1. To provide the students with the opportunity to use and
   improve their writing and language skills.
2. To provide the students with activities that will
   encourage self expression and creativity through the
   written word.
3. To help develop and exercise the students' perceptual
   capacities through the translation of feelings, events,
   concepts, etc. into the written word.
4. To help the students develop a sense of personal identity
   through the development of skills and individual
   perceptual, emotional and imaginative responses.
5. To aid in the students' development and appreciation of
   creative writing.

Activities: using the texts: Wishes, Lies and Dreams -
K. Koch; Stop, Look and Write! - Leavitt and Sohn
a. Circle writing
b. Word association games
c. Selected readings: poetry and prose
d. Observation writing exercises
e. Reaction papers
f. Use of photographs, music, verbal suggestions to
   stimulate creative writing
g. Use of dreams as writing material
h. Character sketches
i. Language arts games

Evaluation: (See II, Basic Skills Evaluation)

IV Vocational Reading and Writing Skills
1. To provide a flexible English curriculum that is directly
   relevant to the practical interests and needs of the
   student who is interested in the vocational-technical
   world and who has relatively limited language skills by
   emphasizing specific, concrete and job-related skills.
2. To aid the student in acquiring the specific practical
language skills necessary in a vocational-technical program by matching the students' interests and abilities, through a wide range of choice.

3. To prepare the student for future vocational education or for future employment.

Activities: use of Vocational reading series "SHOPTALK"

   a. Following complex, sequential directions, both written and oral.
   b. Mastering technical and work-related vocabulary.
   c. Reading for specific details and main ideas, and recognizing and understanding the correlation between them.
   d. Filling out job applications accurately.
   e. Writing acceptable business letters and brief technical reports.
   f. Recognizing and writing the names of vendors for the purposes of taking inventory and ordering materials.
   g. Making out well organized work orders/itemized bills.
   h. Using oral language to learn to deal effectively with co-workers, supervisors and the public.
   i. Using an index and table of contents.

Evaluation: (See II, Basic Skills Evaluation)
NOTE: The identity of student participants in this study is confidential; names are changed and identifying characteristics avoided.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. What stands out most is that while at Maple Valley I reached what I would consider to be a pivotal point in my life. I made decisions and changes that would affect me and who I am for the rest of my life. I consider Maple Valley to be the positive influence that shaped my decisions as to how I wanted to be.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I had been kicked out of the school I was at previously, had spent 7 weeks in a "halfway" house getting counseling, and needed to return to school. Maple Valley was one of a few I considered, and I chose it because of its smallness, its alternative educational philosophies, its location, and Mom liked it too!

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. I feel like my experience at Maple Valley is deeply ingrained on my consciousness in many ways—but not in a way where something will happen to me and I'll react and remember, "Oh, I learned this at Maple Valley," but more in this kind of hokey phrase that I think sums up what effect it all had—"Maple Valley saved my life." Yeah, well, I kind of feel silly writing that, but it's true. That was one of the things I thought of writing about once when I considered writing an article defending Maple Valley in the local Wendell paper during the time we were getting so much flak from the community. But really, in my fantasies I imagine what could have happened if I had gone anywhere else—would I be a selfish (am anyway!), unself-aware, twisted-emotionally type person? Maybe, maybe not, but Maple Valley and especially you, Mitchell, in the way you wouldn't let me get away with any shit, helped me take a look at myself and make conscious decisions. "I choose to break (or not break) this school rule" etc. Get it? Anyway, my pen runneth over—

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. That I was ultimately responsible for my own happiness. If I was in need of help, emotionally or physically, it was available if
I had the courage to ask for it, but it would not be offered on a silver platter. In other words, you have to ask for what you need.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. That to give of myself or my energy in unlimited or indiscretionary ways can be detrimental to me.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. To give people a sense of identity and independence while providing a supportive and familial environment.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yes and no—I do think that this fostering of personal growth was extremely beneficial for those ready for the opportunity, but for some, allowed freedoms were used in destructive or self-indulgent ways.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I would have made certain class requirements and other responsibilities mandatory (other than doing the dishes!)

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Underemphasized. I think that academic work is necessary, at least in part, for the development of basic living and communication skills. I also think that it is important to give students something to do that would exercise their minds, no matter how abhorrent this may be to them.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think it was given almost enough attention. I know that I was profoundly miserable in some of the relationships that I had while at Maple Valley, and often felt at a loss as to how to deal with my peers. I also know that the "Person Classes" held were a very positive and influential part of my experiences while at Maple Valley, and they did make a difference in many of my dealings with my classmates.
11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I don't have a very strong recollection of how I felt about this. My only thoughts are that given the motivation, I would have liked to be more involved with the decision-making, possibly as a student representative or part of a student committee. Even if a student council's conclusions are only partly considered in the final word, it still gives a feeling of involvement to those who care about what happens. I think that, in general, the decisions and rules made by the staff members and administrators were reasonable and fair.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. In its estimation of, and identification with, the youth of its students. I think that the so-called generation gap was minimal, and the lack of same contributed to a certain sense of respect that the students had for the staff. They (the staff) were not removed and out of touch with their own youth and the problems encountered by us as teenagers. I think that you missed the boat, in a way, by underestimating the deviousness that kids will employ to get something they want or ways in which they will lie to cover up their own actions (or mistakes).

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I'm very blurry here. It seems that the number of rules increased. The procedures became more complicated as more students were admitted. More classes on more subjects were offered, and the intimacy of the relationships with staff members decreased. It seems that Maple Valley began to try to be a "real school" rather than a summer camp/family type of place. This, of course, required sacrifices and caused changes. What I remember most are my own emotional reactions to the changes that occurred. I think that I have a somewhat idealized image of the first year and, thus, felt slightly alienated as the school changed.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I am working as weekend manager at the Record Plant, Sausalito. Nothing specific at Maple Valley influenced that, yet it very definitely affected the person I am today. The music scene in Wendell which I was on the fringes of did instill in me a desire to somehow be a part of the music industry.
15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Maple Valley didn't give me any unrealistic notions of how the world was, or provide an insular environment removed from "real life."

16. Any additional comments?

16. I don't feel like I was provided enough challenges. The demands on me were minimal. Somehow I wonder if getting those challenges would have resulted in my being any happier with my experiences though--speculation is very difficult.
**Student Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lisa</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry Date</td>
<td>2/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination Date</td>
<td>6/77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age upon entry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I think just the whole thing of living in a community situation. It was the first time I really felt like I was out—even though we were isolated up there—just being in the world, meeting a broad range of people—more than just a few Vermonters or whatever. There were people from the city, people with real problems, stuff like that. Vermont was pretty isolated. When I came to Maple Valley, it was like jumping into a real crazy situation—like wow! Real people talking about real things—that's what I think my first impression was.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. Well, of course, my mother taught there, so that was one major thing. But I was also 13 and I was ready! I was ready for a big change. I was sick of Vermont and I was dying for it. I remember coming down to visit on the weekends—and feeling that all these people here think I'm so neat, and they all want to get to know me—oh my god, maybe I am! I didn't have much of a social life in Vermont, so coming down there and meeting all these neat kids who really wanted to know me was exciting, was great. So that was pretty much it.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Of course it has. I think the biggest thing was over the years I was going through all the phases—all the way from, you know, the rebellion thing and hiding from the staff—well not hiding from the staff so much—but I had a lot of social things to learn in terms of dealing with my own peers—on a semi-rebellious party level, to growing through that and really learning how to deal with people, figuring out who your friends really are, stuff like that. Dealing with myself and other people—interpersonal relationships—is what I learned. And, respect and honesty—all that was reinforced there. I mean it did take me a while.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. That was it. Just learning how to deal with people in a group.
I learned a lot just about myself and the world—being able to deal with figuring out what I wanted and what I believed in, and acting on that. Before Maple Valley, my life was based on academics, and I was pretty much of a loner. And going to Maple Valley and dealing with people and learning who I thought was an asshole and who I really liked—what I appreciated in people—just stuff like that. And also how to deal with feelings was a big thing—to express myself clearly.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. Well, I wouldn't trade the fact that I did learn all those personal skills about myself and dealing with other people. But I could have used a little more academics. When I went back to regular high school, I really wished that I had had a more structured base. I had the basis of learning down really well, so I could pretty much attack what I wanted to anyway. But just, you know, taking a real history class that had more continuity to it—that lasted and followed through and everything. There'd be like two classes that were pretty good, and then emergency meetings would take over and that was it. But overall, I still wouldn't change it around—I would keep it the way it was.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think Maple Valley was trying to give kids a chance—an environment where they could discover things for themselves and work stuff out and learn things—sort of the hard way which is not having someone tell you certain things, but experiment and fail and learn. Being confronted by people who'll say, "O.K., I don't care that you just bashed this door down—what is your real problem?" You know, the real problem is not that the door is broken, but that you're upset about something and that's why you broke the door. You know, just giving kids with problems or whatever a chance to learn in a different setting. And also a freer environment. I remember kids "freaking out" when they first got there. "You mean no one is going to tell us we can't smoke cigarettes, or what time we have to go to bed or any of that stuff." It was also hard at first—myself included—when you first got there—it was like—oh my God, I mean you have to stay up until five o'clock in the morning every night and smoke two packs of cigarettes! And then you sort of mellow out and kick back and realize what it's really all about after a while. Some kids didn't go through that, but I think a good portion of them did.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think it really depended on the individual kid and where s/he
was in their process. For me, it was definitely successful. I learned a lot. In looking back, and even while doing it, I was aware of the different stages I was going through and progressing and stuff. Some kids did stagnate. Their previous problems before Maple Valley were so strong that it was real hard for them to break-out of the whole thing. Some kids really learned a lot. Everyone I've talked to of the past students has real strong feelings about what they learned or didn't learn while at Maple Valley. So, it really depends on the person. It was there if you wanted it—but it also had a lot to do with what you came with.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Well for the era that I was there, during the emergency meeting era and all that stuff, I would have made it a little bit harder to totally stop everything—to let one isolated little problem, that only affected a few people to totally overtake the entire community—and give actual classes/academics more of a chance. Because really, when I think about it, emergency meetings were a really big part of making that too difficult to maintain. Because after you miss a few weeks of class, you get to where you don't really want to go—it sort of "fizzles out." I would make academics a higher priority. Like, there is a time you can call an emergency meeting—but not between 10 and 3 when classes are happening. The meetings were great, and they were important, but I think other things should have been given a chance. Just like we had a set time when everyone was asleep, and you couldn't call an emergency meeting at 1:30 in the morning.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. They ended up being underemphasized. I got the feeling that a lot of the staff really wanted to make it a bigger thing. But the way that the school was set up at the time, it wasn't really possible. Plus, a lot of the kids were going through the beginning stages—I remember when I first got there, I had no interest in going to class at all. I remember Mark literally dragging me out of bed saying—"Come on, let's do algebra now." At that point, I didn't really even want to look at an algebra book. I mean, I did, sort of—but when it came right down to it, I didn't want to have anything to do with it. It was also hard with a constant influx of kids at that beginning stage, always coming in. If you could have taken the same group of kids from junior high school and followed them through all the way to graduating, I think that academics would have naturally become a bigger part of the whole thing, once kids worked through a lot of their personal shit. So it was underemphasized, but I think other things were more important at the time too.
10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I don't really think it could be overemphasized. I just don't think it's possible because—well, in my own life, I feel that I've worked out a lot of that personal relations stuff—and now I'm fine. Once I really want to study something, I really can go for it—without constantly thinking in the middle of whatever training is going "Oh, I'm such a horrible person, I can't deal with it, I hate my mother." It's like I've worked through a lot of that major stuff about how I feel about myself. I mean I don't necessarily know every aspect of who I am, but the bulk of the stuff—I really feel I have the skills to deal with it now. So I can focus on other things. So I think all that learning was important, and if you talk to a lot of the other kids, you'll find that that was the most they got out of Maple Valley—discovering they were a real person, and stuff like that.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. The time that I was there, we were still doing emergency meetings, and we'd still have other kinds of meetings at times too. We'd make a motion and it would have to be seconded, then we'd discuss it and vote on it, which I think was the right idea. I think it was hard because Maple Valley ended up with kids who were looking for alternative ways—which meant often that they had lots of problems—in excess—I mean more than the "normal" kids coming from a good home environment or good school environment. At times it was hard because they weren't ready for doing that whole thing. We got caught up in a lot of stuff I found often—going 'round and 'round. I think it could have used a little more structure—like this is it—or you shut up. Because people/students really power-tripped knowing they could—purposely or subconsciously, holding up the whole community, because they knew they could, or because they knew they wanted the attention, or whatever. Whereas, I think the process was right-on, I don't know if we were all prepared to deal with it at the time. Maybe we should of had classes on how to deal with an emergency meeting. Instead, we were all thrown in there to try to do it. I think we made a pretty good go of it, but it was hard. It was also hard with new students constantly coming in—after my first six months, I knew how to handle the whole situation with people making motions, and talking in order and moderators and all that stuff. But there'd always be the new kid who'd sit there and scream or wouldn't shut up, or constantly interrupt, or not go and pull the same shit that I pulled a year earlier. I would have wanted the staff to do more in preparing people a little better.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the
12. It's sort of related to what we've mostly been talking about. It was right on target in terms of giving kids the freedom and helping them learn to deal with their own lives. Taking responsibility for their actions, that was another major thing. One thing I really learned there was—I'll never forget the time—the transition when I was there when I realized that the kids weren't my real friends—the ones who were breaking the rules—I felt more responsibility and love and everything towards the staff members—this part really shakes me up—that the staff were more real friends to me—and that it was important to me that I wasn't going to break the law—not so much because I believed it was going to help—or anything like that—because I didn't want to be in a position of having to lie to you, and Lowell and Mark and Annie and Fred or whoever was there. And that's why I stopped breaking the drug law—not so much because I still didn't want to get high—just the whole transition of realizing that I had more real relationships with you guys, than a lot of the newer kids who were back at a stage that I was two years before. And I think it really helped a lot of kids, you know, to really learn what they valued and how to deal with themselves. Not everyone fully learned that, but at least they got a taste of it and realized it was possible. A lot of kids came from places where that wasn't even possible—no one ever even sat down with them and listened to them. So I think that was really right-on—I think the staff and everyone really made a big effort to try to do that. Missing the boat is sort of a hard one. Maybe just in some superficial way I think the academic thing—which is secondary as far as I'm concerned. But in recent years, it has become more stressed, hasn't it? I mean that was part of Maple Valley's learning process. Sometimes I felt that the staff was naive in a way. Us kids did a lot of stuff—at least when I first got there. We did a lot of naughty things—but at least we were kool about it. We didn't disrupt anyone's life or destroy things. Whereas later on a lot of the kids would do terrible things and get caught almost on purpose—outrageous stuff. So I felt for a while that the staff sometimes didn't have a clear picture of what was happening. But it was hard—sometimes we hid and didn't give you the opportunity to see what was happening. I think everyone gave it their best shot—I really do—that's all I can say.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. Let me think, what changed? It was pretty much the same structure the whole time I was there. I think there was still emergency meetings. But I think things did tighten up a little bit—not so much. The one funny thing I can remember—when we came
back to school the second year—with the new law—not being under the influence of any alcohol or drugs while on school grounds. So the very first night, what did we do? We all ran out and got stoned and came back to school. But that one was, of course, changed after a while—it was unrealistic—it created too much of a police state with you guys saying, "Are you guys stoned now?" Sometimes it's just too hard to tell. Over the years, it did start to tighten up. I came in the second year, and I think the staff and everyone did learn a lot the first couple of years. Everything gradually became a little more organized, a little more structured—as people realized that it had to happen. One thing that started to happen is that the staff put down a couple of laws without consulting with us kids—like changing the curfew laws—and things like that.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well one thing that's sort of interesting is that I've been working in the same restaurant for the past three years—which is something new for me—to really stick with something for that amount of time. It's almost the perfect place to work after Maple Valley—it's really crazy with a real family feeling, real loving, very intense kind of place to work. And I have all the perfect skills to deal with that kind of stuff. When people make me mad I look to have them deal with it right then and not get hung up on it and then move on to something else. Or, to tell someone you really love them or that they're doing a great job. Just really a lot of interpersonal skills. We all work really hard for that place. That's one thing I really learned at Maple Valley—really caring about the school. I really care about this restaurant. When I clean up, I don't just do what I have to do and split; I do a good job and I do everything because I care about the place. The roots of that I learned at Maple Valley—being loyal and caring to the point where loyalty isn't even a question. When I was at Maple Valley, and I'd see a kid bash up the place, I'd get real angry, and not go tell a staff, but take care of it myself and tell them I thought they were a jerk for destroying the place. I feel that way at the restaurant. I also learned a lot about being assertive at Maple Valley. I was real quiet before I came there. As an adult now, I insist that people deal with me—I won't take no for an answer.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. That's sort of hard for me, I feel I was different than a lot of the kids there. I came from a lot more of a solid background than a lot of the people. I really got a lot out of Maple Valley. I learned a hell of a lot there. But then again, I really wasn't coming in with as great a deficit as a lot of the other kids. So I got what I really needed to get out of it. The academic thing
could have been stressed more. To be able to have a class rather then being overtaken by all the other crap. It's really funny, I can remember some emergency meetings--where a kid did some terrible thing and the staff were really tired--maybe in that way, someone got short-changed--but I feel that everyone gave it their best shot.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I've really said most of the things that I want to say. I learned so much there. That's why I just wanted to come up the other day and just look at the buildings and everything--do a little trip of my own. You sort of grow up and realize all the things you're good at doing, or not good at doing. And to come back and to remember all the stuff that happened there--get back to the roots--remembering I'm like I am now because I had a screaming fit over here or because so and so grabbed me and helped me out, or I sat in these meetings and dealt with things until--because I did lie and went through that and grew out of it--that I'm able to do the things the way I can now. But to remember those days when it wasn't so easy--when I was a kid. I met a lot of really neat people there--I wish we could get a reunion together. Just that I love the place!
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. When I think of M.V. now, the close friendships I had with several staff members stands out in my mind. I also think about one person. I think about a person who affected me a lot, and it was my time at M.V. that formed and ingrained in me my hatred and revulsion of drugs.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to M.V. in 1977 because I was scared of going to a new public school. My mom thought it would be a good idea and she was working there, so I went. I didn't leave after the first year because I was absolutely terrified of going to Amherst Regional High School.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. The M.V. experience has had a lasting effect on my life in that it taught me to question myself; what I think and how I feel. It made me admit to myself (during the hell of being 13 and 14) that feelings are an integral part of my life and I can't subvert or ignore them. M.V. also instilled in me a sense of responsibility in that if I want something to happen for me, I have to make it happen, and that I am capable of making things happen for myself. Also, because of M.V. I do not smoke or drink or take drugs. It was only last year that I considered drinking beer or wine.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning at Maple Valley was that I can count on other people to help me. I am never completely alone. It is very easy to lose faith in the world, but by being around supportive adults who constantly encouraged me and in a group whose ideal was "expression" and "support" I have faith that I can find or write to someone who will remind me I'm a good person and that I have "the strength to get up and do what needs to be done."

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while
5. I wish I could have learned more formal academics while at M.V. (most notably Math and literature).

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think Maple Valley tried to instill a sense of freedom of expression, of self-worth, and responsibility to a community and for yourself.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. For me, I think it was successful; for others I don't think it was. I think that due to the personal nature of the approach, the level of success was very individual.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I might have put a higher priority on intellectual development or perhaps made classes more accessible. Perhaps there could have been better structured classes, but you already did that, didn't you?

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Academics were underemphasized. Classes were always interrupted by emergency meetings, or staff meetings, and if they weren't interrupted so much they died, they generally lost steam by the third or fourth week (with a few exceptions).

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think personal/interpersonal development was overemphasized— but that was a good thing for the age group. "Person class" was the most attended, longest running, most consistent class I remember.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. The decision-making process by the students was erratic and not always consistent, but we were happy with our feeling of power. All I remember of the staff decision-making process was that the staff always looked exhausted after a staff meeting. Of the leaders' decision-making process, again, I remember little but I clearly
remember when I asked Mark or Mitch a question (asked them to make a decision for me) they would usually ask me, "Well, Ann, what do you think?"

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. I believe M.V. was right on target in that it focused on having a close, emotionally-encouraging group, and in that it tried to teach responsibility to kids before it became a major issue (i.e. leaving high school). I think it missed the boat in that its founders were not independently wealthy (what I mean is only that idealism is always a little easier when you have a lot of money). Anyway, I think that in trying to encourage openness and responsibility there was sometimes so much freedom that, as a twelve-year-old, I felt lost. I think that for many of the kids there could have been more guidance in terms of everything.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I can't remember any major program changes except that I took an English class my third year that Fred taught that I liked a lot and Mark and Mitch got a separate office. "The Office" was resented by the kids, but that's normal, and it was necessary for the director's sanity.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I am at Colorado College as a junior and I have been on the Dean's List for the past two years. When I was at M.V. I didn't learn a lot of formal things and this "academic vacation" bothered me a lot when I went to Amherst High School. I felt like I was behind and had to work extra-hard to catch up with my class. Now that I'm in college I realize I was just being paranoid. Last summer and the summer of '81 I worked with kids from low-income families. Last summer I was with the Upward Bound Program and working with these kids. I was the only counselor who approached the kids on their own terms and tried to help, not lead them, through the program. M.V. had something to do with that.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I don't know what it didn't do because it didn't do it. It sure didn't give me a formal education.

16. Any additional comments?
16. I enjoyed my first two years very much though I think I was just hanging on my third year. I think the way the school worked in the first few years (less structured than now) would have worked wonderfully if you had had interested, motivated, conscientious kids who continued on into later years. I remember loving the freedom and encouragement but hating the "big kids" because I felt they dragged things down. I always felt on the social fringe, but proud of it. In the end, I can't think of a better way for me to have spent junior high school.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Well first of all, the people. I remember people—I think of those people probably as the most important people in my life. They gave me confidence and friendship and trust and things that I really needed at that time, and still need. I mean I can always think about those people and have a special feeling and know that if I see them, even if the years have gone by, they're there. So that's the most important thing for me.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I was unhappy with the public school system, and there was a whole history of my rebelling against the system. But I think it wasn't so much the rebellion, it was just that I was looking for a place that fit my needs in terms of my values and in terms of being in a place where I could grow as a human being. I think that was the most important thing. And M.V. was the place that I found after a long search.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Absolutely, I continue to have flashbacks. Yeah, I mean I think that I would be a different person if I hadn't been through that experience. You know, I always get into these things of trying to weigh which experience was most important—and everyday you think about different things I suppose. But M.V. was just a powerful experience in my life. And I know that because I continue to think about it. It continues to be a part of me—when I go to make decisions or choices in my life, I think about that place and I think that that was where I learned some of the ropes. And where I gained the confidence to do a lot of what I do.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. Just about my human potential—you know, I learned to communicate. I think I came to M.V. with abilities to communicate and I think that it was a real natural environment for me to express myself and to be supported—to do the things that I was doing—to think about what I was thinking. So that was the most important thing.
5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I guess academic kinds of things—science and math. You know, I don't know if M.V. was the place for me to do that. I don't know whether I was in that frame of mind. I think maybe it wasn't important to me at that time. And, had I been anywhere else maybe I wouldn't have chosen that. I guess those are the things that I didn't learn there—if I could change it. But I really don't think like that. I don't really think about the things that I didn't get out of it.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think it tried to be a place for people—for many young people—to live fully—to be human beings. Especially for people who have had a hard time—who continually found resistance in the "real" world—or whatever it was—school or whatever. But I think it tried to be, you know, sometimes a utopia. I think M.V. was in a way on a power trip. It just wanted to be all things to all people. And it tried real hard to do that. I think it tried harder than most places I've ever seen. And it fell short in some places—you know it was like anything else. It was dynamic. It tried to be a place for people to experience their full human potential. I think that was the main goal.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I can only speak for myself. You know, I don't think it was always successful. I think that people were there for different reasons. And, I think some people went by the wayside because they didn't come to M.V. looking for just kind of a place to really release—just a lot of, you know, positive feelings about themselves, and just needed sort of a vehicle for expression and to do the things that they wanted to do. I think sometimes people came with some real anger—and real problems that M.V. wasn't able to address at that time. I guess I experienced that with some of the violence and conflict—stuff that was going on that really forced people to have to leave the place. And I don't think M.V. was equipped at that time or wanted to be a place for kids who really had a lot of anger and didn't know what to do with it. Because I think more of what it was, was a community and it provided a place for people who could operate within a community and could be cooperative to some extent.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Well in retrospect, I wish they had forced me to go to classes.
I wished that there was more of an emphasis on academics. Not that the optional thing wouldn't be there, because I think the choices were important—M.V. was about choices—but at the same time, there was a real emphasis on developing human potential and growing. And I think that academics were sort of slighted. When I was in that community it felt that it just wasn't important—that that's not what M.V. was all about. But if it was what M.V. was about, it would have happened. There would have been more energy and direction. And, in some ways, I wish it was there—I wish there had been a powerful drive toward learning. And it didn't have to be in the classroom. There's a lot of other ways, you know, within the community itself that we could have directed ourselves toward learning and projects and experiences—things like that.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think it was underemphasized, but I'm not sure. I guess that last question sort of answered it. I don't know if it was important that it was underemphasized, because what I think was emphasized—what M.V. was—was not necessarily a place for academics but was a place for all the other things. And in retrospect, it would have been nice maybe to have that direction, but maybe that just wasn't what M.V. was.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. Definitely overemphasized—too much growing going on in that place. Growing all over the place. That's what it was about. And, it didn't work sometimes—and we were all growing together. I felt like sometimes we were all pioneers. Because you know, sometimes I had the feeling that everybody's spirit was there, but sometimes we didn't know what we were doing or where we were going, but we knew we were going. And that it was right. That was what it was all about.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders

11. You know, that's another thing. M.V. was about making choices and learning to be decisive in our lives. And it provided a structure for people to do that. It didn't force it on anybody. But for myself, I think I thrived on the structure and playing around with it, manipulating it and being a voice, being a vote, being someone in the community. I really loved the structure—there was a lot of freedom within it—-it allowed people to be heard—allowed us to debate. To me that was the learning experience—people communicating all over the place, all the time. Even if it was like
walls—which it was sometimes—but the structure was there.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I think it was right on target—it was totally clear that people there—you and Mark and Carl and Annie and Fred and Lowell—everybody was there for a purpose, because they cared. They wanted it to be the best place in the world—and that was right on target. Because it tried to be the best place in the world. Everybody was pulling for each other. We had our problems and everybody fought—but I think some people, weren't ready for that experience, to see that that was what M.V. was about. And, I used to get into these debates and arguments with some students who were always down on it—M.V. sucks, or the staff sucks, or this or that. And I always felt very defensive about it because I think everybody cared—that everybody just wanted it to be the best place in the world. It doesn't seem like much maybe, but I think that's the most important thing for a place—for a community—is that everybody's there because they just care so much. Where it was off target was that it didn't always work so well. Everybody had all these high ideals and you know, I just think that there was a lot of idealism about the place. It was very young and people were very young. M.V. couldn't serve the needs of such a diverse group of students. And, I think they were very diverse. There were people with all kinds of different needs and I know that I was part of a certain group of students who was there just to take in everything that it had to offer, just to experience and be a part of it. And I think there were other students there just to resist everything. And then there were the people in between. You know, I always felt a kind of schizophrenia—M.V. doesn't know what kind of place it wants to be. After I left, I think it moved in the direction I think it wanted to be in, or had to move for whatever reason. But I remember it as being very schizophrenic because there was just too much of a diversity in the student body to really deal with everyone's needs.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. There were structural changes in terms of the meeting process and I was there when we ended the automatic emergency meeting. The power trip—you know, that anybody could stop the process, stop school, stop anything. I don't think I was ever comfortable with emergency meetings. And I don't think we ever came up with the right system. But I saw that happen. I started to see more of the beginnings of a change in M.V. with more of an emphasis on academics. But I didn't see enough of that to really see where it was going. I guess things didn't really change that much—I guess
people changed. I noticed a big change in the population, but not so much in structure.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I've graduated from UMass. It's been seven years since I've been at M.V., and I don't know what I would be doing if I hadn't come there. It changed my life because I met people who were great people--people who care about me and who I care about, people who gave me support at a very difficult time. And I think those kinds of things stick with you. I think those kinds of things help you to move on to the next thing. So when I look back, when I look at my diploma, I think about M.V. Maybe I think about M.V. first--because I think that's where I got the confidence. It was a loving place, and that's the thing that sticks with me.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I've talked about academic stuff--it didn't do that. But I don't think that's what I really needed from M.V. Maybe it gave me sort of an over-idealistic view of the world, and that I needed to settle into a more compromised position in that I had to accept more things. But I don't know--I think part of it was age too. I think it did for me what it did. I don't really need to think about what it didn't do. I guess I thought about it when I left M.V.--I was interested in academics, I wasn't satisfied with the student body, my friends have all gone--you know, I needed to move on. At that point, it just wasn't serving my needs. But, the year that I was there, which is the year that I think about, it was the greatest place in the world.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I don't think so.
Student Interview

Name: BRUCE  Sex: M
Entry date: March 3, 1975  Termination date: June, 1976
Age upon entry: 15  Current age: 24

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. The contact with people. The meetings—the structure of the meetings. I guess if there was one word it would be the process of the meetings—the way we dealt with each other, and the way problems were solved. Also, it was a place for me to deal with my problems or things I wanted to work out. Pretty vague huh? (laughter)

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to M.V. because I was dissatisfied with school and my family. Number one, it became apparent to me right away in school that I was a failure. The way that the school system was set up for me—someone having learning problems and not being able to do the things that people learn how to do in elementary school, like reading, writing and spelling—all those things were hard. All of a sudden I was in the failure group. There was something in me that just felt that there wasn't necessarily something wrong with me. That maybe there was something wrong with the system and the way the system was dealing with me. So at that point I started looking outside the system. Like, a best friend that I had, the two of us had been talking about our friendship and what that meant and growing up and different things like that. When I got to junior high school, there were new groups being formed. And what I noticed about those groups was that they were doing the same things I had seen other groups do. The people who were accepted got accepted not because of who they really were, but because of how much pot they smoked, or how they talked, or what kind of clothes they wore. You were especially cool if you got laid. I was dissatisfied with that. So I decided that I was going to find something else--I might not. I was going to go out and make a living on my own. I had some ideas, and by hook or crook I was going to be the person I wanted to be, and test that out. I didn't really know what was out there, but I was beginning to know what was in here, and I was willing to take that risk. There were also people outside the system that helped me to get confidence in myself--people like Herman Hesse, J.D. Salinger, the Beatles and Paul Simon. So I left school and my family and hitchhiked across the country--stayed close to myself and was pretty successful making a living and also with people,
doing things that I really wanted to do. My father came out to Texas, showed me brochures about different schools and something clicked in my head. There were schools that were set up by people with the ideas that I had had, or with the premises that I started out with. I came to M.V. because I felt that there were people who had established something different than what I had been used to, and maybe find a system where I could be successful.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. When I talked to you on the phone before I came to M.V. and throughout the time I was there as well as during the time I wanted to leave, it was about getting the right tools to be able to go out into the world. So, when I think back to M.V., I think about the tools I got while I was there. M.V. capitalized on the qualities I think I already had like the ability to talk, the ability to perceive paradoxes, the ability to take risks, to take stands, to be straight with people. I think I became a lot better at doing those things and learned a lot of tools from doing those things at M.V. Just to name a few things—I did stand-up comedy routines this semester—and there are all those things having to do with running meetings, the process of the way meetings work—I set up a process of the way business meetings should run at UMass. There were a lot of things I used from parliamentary procedure that I learned from Maple Valley.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I don't know, I learned on a lot of different levels. I learned academicaly and as a person. I don't know what would be the most useful one—it was all pretty much round. I guess in a way, the whole process was.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. Anything that I didn't learn there, I've learned since. I don't know. At that time, where I wanted to be, it was there for me. It wasn't perfect, and there were a lot of bad days, but as for that time, it was what I wanted. Since that time, I've wanted other things—and I've gone out and gotten them—or I've tried to. But for that time, what was there was right for me.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think M.V. was looking to give people avenues that weren't there in the system before—for gaining tools, for dealing with both themselves and the world. I think that was the basic purpose of it.
7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yeah I do—it was successful for me. I think back to the things I learned at M.V.—as far as things I said before like meeting processes—ways of dealing with things. In the past, like in eighth grade football, I didn't feel like my abilities were utilized at all—it was like beating up on each other with no confidence building or anything, so I quit. At M.V., all the qualities I had or felt I had were utilized. That same analogy can be used on academic levels where my strengths were also utilized.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. In the beginning, M.V. was an energy center within the structure I talked about before. I can't really see that there were any structural changes that I would make because the avenues were always there to change—at least when I was there. I could take part in making changes happen. So, at that stage of the game at M.V.—I don't know what things are like now—I was responsible for any changes that I wanted to make.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. M.V. was by far the best place I'd ever been to academically. I went farther and learned more at M.V. in terms of material and in how to approach learning—I learned how to organize—I learned in the one-to-one contact, and I learned in the one-to-four contact. The first time I ever made the association that learning is frustrating was at M.V. So I've kept that in the back of my mind. Every learning that I've had since then—in getting here from there—has been very frustrating. But, knowing that frustration is a big part of the process has helped me get from here to there.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I thought at the time I was there, it was just right for me. There was a balance of academics—we could go out and play football—and personally, being able to be part of the community and take responsibility for being part of the community. Academics just wasn't emphasized at that point. If I remember the philosophy right, it was that people learn when they want to learn—which was certainly true in my case. I learned when I wanted to learn—and I wanted to learn. So the answers were there. So I would say it was a good balance for me.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple
Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I'm somebody who makes my own rules, which is hard, but I'd rather make my own rules and structures and go through the hard work than to have somebody do it for me and do it wrong. When I got to M.V. I thought the decision-making process worked very well. There were avenues in which people could have impact or could take responsibility for themselves. And in learning--taking responsibility works well. Staff had more of one idea, and students would have another. That wasn't always true--in certain ways you had to be there to know just how it was--I don't know how to express it. I felt that the decision-making process was as good as any place I've ever been.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. For me it was right on target all the ways I described before--enabling me to work on my strengths, and to learn a process, a process that I could work in. Where it missed the boat has to do with where I've gone since M.V.--this goes back to the academic question. The next school I went to had more classes--it was bigger. It was also an alternative school, but it didn't have a lot of the things M.V. had--the positive traits in being small--but there were more classes and more ways for me to pursue those avenues. There were also more women. Sometimes I got claustrophobic at M.V.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I can't really remember any program changes. During my second year, I could sense things being on their way toward changing. We were swamped with emergency meetings a lot. But besides that, I can't really remember any structural changes.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I'm in business for myself. I'm currently chairman of the board of all student-controlled business at UMass. I set up a vendors' union for the street vendors in Philadelphia. All of those areas go back to the M.V. process and structure and how M.V. helped me. Going back to those tools--how to deal with meetings, how to be funny when it's right to be funny, what the difference is between the time to be funny and the time to be serious. I've also sensed the changes having been made at M.V. and the difference between being a part of an energy center, a new idea, and then going through the second and third and fourth steps of establishing something.
I've kept that in my mind's eye when I've come to the point of having to go to a different stage or having to establish something.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. If I was about eight years younger--It didn't pull my head all the way out of my ass. It wasn't utopia. It wasn't home forever. Besides that, it was there.

16. Any additional comments?

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Well, it's definitely the people. You and Mark and another student who really made an impression on me. Everybody for different reasons, of course, mostly the fact that it was my first real experience with other people coming together and for the most part having a lot of love and respect for each other. And, being a part of that--being trusted as an equal part of that--that's got to be the most important impression. To be part of something as basically an equal--a respected member of a community--that's the most important thing.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. My family felt strongly about putting me in an alternative system for education. And I guess I was responding mostly to what I didn't want from what I'd experienced before. They had hopes for what could come out of the situation. They were the ones who found the place. I was in Mohawk Trail Regional High School when I started at Maple Valley. I was just doing time--really wasn't anywhere. Up until a year or two before that I was a straight A student. And, it all broke apart. In eighth grade I started cutting classes and I never finished that grade. I mean it deteriorated rapidly. I got cocky--I said, I'm a smart guy--and I'm not happy. There was also the fact that I switched living from my mother to my father. He wanted me to be in a situation that was more complimentary to the difference that he felt between my mother and himself.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life. If so, how?

3. One thing that came up recently, when I did the EST training--they spent a tremendous amount of time getting people to acknowledge that there are rules in life--and that by fighting rules you're only fighting with yourself--and that became very clear to me at Maple Valley--where you had a situation where as kids fought against the rules, they were only destroying their own home. And, I really got a stong sense from that, that everywhere you go you're going to come up with rules that are imposed on you--and you're
going to find that it pays to impose rules yourself. And that to
fight against rules is really ridiculous—really self-defeating—
that the existence of rules doesn't mean that there's any real
restriction—certain rules, that's not true—but the basic concept
of rules, of structures—should be accepted more easily.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning was in non-academics—in the ability to
learn how to localize an issue—to get it right down to "I feel
this—what do you feel?"—because people have to live together and
that's where the difficulties are going to come. It's much easier
to pick up a book about math than it is to just one day decide
you're going to learn how to get along with people. And I think
mostly establishing those priorities and then learning to explore
them is where my learning took place; the ability to express myself
in a crowd—to speak to people and to speak for people.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while
at Maple Valley?

5. I've learned plenty. I feel most people spend a lot of time
during the school years up until 18—reading books—literature—
learning that. At Maple Valley I didn't learn a lot of that stuff—the traditional academics. But I can't say that I
wished I had them because I was learning other things—and certainly
it hasn't been the case that as a result of not having learned that
then, I haven't gone on to learn it since. So I could have spent
more time in an academic situation but there's certainly no regrets
there that I didn't. I've made up for that since.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think Maple Valley tried to provide an environment where kids
could learn to express themselves and to see themselves without
having to feel victimized or manipulated or overwhelmed or overcome
by whatever external forces might have been dominating their lives.
That kids were given an opportunity to live among each other as
equals and to express themselves and to pursue whatever interests
they had—or could develop. To provide an environment where they
could feel safe and secure with who they were—to look at
themselves—to not have molds imposed on them. As a kid you were
told to do this, to do that, and by the time you turned around, you
were 23 and realized that I hadn't paid enough attention to me—and
so I think that just to allow a kid the opportunity to say this is
going to be your life—it's going to be yours forever—and your life
is the only thing you can ever say is yours forever. It's a good
time to start learning not what choices to make, but that you have
choices and have to make priorities.
7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Well, that was—for me, it was very successful. At the time I was so intrigued and overwhelmed by the experience that I felt strongly about following up on that—about getting into education myself. When I initially applied to UMass., I applied to the School of Education. But thinking about it I realized I was being too naive and idealistic about determining success—and that it's not that clear cut. If I was looking for a situation where as an educator I could say that through my encounters with kids, I could see noticeable changes in a kid—where I could see him becoming better or more mature—I decided that if that's what I needed to see, then I shouldn't get into it—because there's just too much frustration there. So many times at Maple Valley I felt that here was a kid who typified a punk—a mixed-up street punk—who was, you know, and at times really thinking like wow! this kid's turned his life around—you know, and then just to see him fuck-up and watch the old systems revert. To try to judge success and failure with kids like that is just too frustrating. For me, I thought I was fairly successful. I really didn't need much more than friends and love and support. But for people who needed more it seemed to be—can't say it's unsuccessful—I was looking for success in measureable amounts—which you just can't find there. I'm sure that for a tremendous amount of people who came through those doors, that experience will last for them. The experience might not emerge as meaningful until years after the fact, but someday a kid has got to look around and say, oh yeah—people were telling me I could do things for myself. People were telling me to open my eyes—you know, so I think that in that sense there was probably a lot of success. As far as trying to measure it, it became very frustrating at times.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I remember meeting B.F. Skinner and thinking this guy is just full of shit—and yet in a real sense you've got to deal with the real noticeable manipulatable whatever—the things that are going on. And it's nice to try to work from the inside out, but there's also a lot to be said for working from the outside in. Apparently these are some of the changes you've already made. Over the years, I've surprised myself in how much I've come to support systems, especially proven ones. Because if a kid who's given freedom is going to respond the same way as to controls—you might as well establish the controls. You know, there's certain tightropes that you have to walk there. But I would have required more mandatory adult behavior.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or
9. Yeah, well I thought they were very underemphasized. And that in a way is more directed at a person like myself. I mean there was no reason why I couldn't have handled academics as well as everything else that was going on. But I essentially have a lazy core and if somebody says, "If you want to have academics, you round me up and find me and maybe we'll do that,"—it didn't work for me— it didn't work for me. Yeah, it was underemphasized.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. What can I say? That's what it was all about. Maybe I'll have more to say about it later. In a way I think I've already answered this question.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well, the thing that makes me come back to is the start of the third year—with the discussion of the "influence policy" which in a way speaks for both sides of it—it was a situation where you as the director and the staff got together and imposed something. This was one of the few decisions that was very imposed. And yet it wasn't very imposed as it eventually got taken away. So that it really went both ways. The ability of the kids to have a major impact on the decision-making processes was one of the major aspects of Maple Valley. And, I thought it was all fairly appropriate—all down the line. I always thought that particular incident was a shame. I thought it was an incredible distraction—an incredibly bad way to start a new year. And probably had some lasting effects throughout that whole year as to the way people felt about each other. I mean there were some very emotional, angry meetings that we had. And yet it spoke very well for the way decisions were made, because regardless of the way you felt going into it, it was all dealt with. The good decisions as well as the bad decisions were all dealt with. And that had to foster respect for the decision-making process all the way around.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. Well, I guess it was right on target in its intentions—in a way, that's not true though. Really believing that you could make a big difference for kids, those intentions were strong—and I think everybody felt those intentions. I think they stand on their own for a lot of people. But it's funny, we didn't really miss the boat, because it comes down to how you try to evaluate successes and
failures. Many things that are important just aren't measureable. Hopefully, it didn't miss the boat that much on the whole—I mean I'm sure for some people it really did--for me it really didn't—it didn't miss the boat.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. The major one I saw was the restriction of the age—to keep the young kids out. I mean there were really young kids there when I started, and at times I really didn't think that it worked, so that was a change for the better. Other than that, I think I left right before the major changes came. Actually, there was the summer program change, but I never took part in that. So, I can't comment on that, but for the most part the school was effected not so much by any program changes, but by the personnel changes that occurred.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. The things that are important for me in my life center a lot around being important, and being or having a feeling of accomplishment with other people, for other people, to other people. My life wouldn't be worth nothing to me if it was a solitary experience. And that feeling comes I'm sure a lot from Maple Valley—from being exposed to a community—the ups and downs of a community. This nurtured in me a feeling that good things were better with other people and bad things weren't as bad with other people. As far as my career aspirations—it's to be important to other people—what I've been doing the last 3 or 4 years is really something I stumbled into by accident. There's a lot about it that I like. When you're a cook you're doing something and hopefully you're doing it well. You're making things good for the people who are eating the food, serving the food—and you're a central figure—you're the one that people come to. These are a lot of the aspects that I hope to find in the film industry. Like being the director—being the one who has the big picture—finding the combinations that work—and getting the feeling of accomplishment that each person that's with you feels. And to be able to cushion your failures with the people around you. Whatever I do I hope to have that centrally connected feeling—to feel that I'm worthwhile not only for the individual things that I'm doing, but also for the fact that I'm doing those things with other people—in situations of mutual respect and admiration.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. The only thing that comes back to me from that was that I felt
at times distanced from my own peers because of the smallness of Maple Valley and the fact that it was far removed from other peer situations. So at times there were regrets that there was such a limited choice of peers around--that's one thing--the only thing I can think of right now.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Maple Valley will always be a real special experience for me. Some of the things we did will always stand out. Some of the people I met although I haven't seen them for years, I'm still very fond of and they will always have an incredible effect on me. Another thing for me personally was that I had the opportunity to pretty much live on my own at that time. Overall I've got a lot of good feelings about Maple Valley and the people that run it.
Student Interview

Name: Tim
Sex: Male
Entry date: 6-28-77
Termination date: 8-23-78
Age upon entry: 14 1/2
Current age: 20

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   Well, stealing. I mellowed out when I was up there. I spent a year and a half up there. It helped me get back on the straight track I suppose. On the right side of the fence, that's a good word for it—not on the wrong side of the fence. That's really about it, you know.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   Because, if I didn't I would have gone to reform school. The court gave me a choice to either find a school or go to Roslindale or Mattapan or Danvers State. So, my mother and me chose a school instead of one of those places, which is a kind of a jail.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   Well, I've stayed out of trouble pretty much. I learned a lot from people up there about how to deal with people, even people I hate. And, I suppose about how to get along in life in general, a better understanding of things. I can have more of a relationship with a person. I didn't know that before I came up there.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

   I learned to stay out of trouble. You didn't have to be always a troublemaker. That's a hard question. I learned to talk with people more—get along with people. To see something other then what I was doing before I went to M.V., and benefit from that point of view.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

   More academics, more educational things, so when I got out of Maple Valley to go to another school, I would have been able to go into the grade I should have been put into. I didn't have enough credits, so when I went to the Voc. in Beverly I had to go into the tenth grade, when I should have been put into the eleventh grade.
grade—but I didn't have enough credits. All they could do was put me in tenth grade—it was tenth grade take it or leave it—so I took it! And I put up with it for three years. I wish there would have been more academics. It would have helped me—and I wouldn't have had to learn a lot more when I got out. Definitely education-wise, that's one of the things that was missing at M.V. at the time I went.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. It tried to help the kid get back onto the right road. It tried to show the kid that some of the things he was doing or that she was doing wasn't really good for them. It tried to steer kids away from their bad points and to show them their good points. That's about it really.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yeah, not all kids. In any group of kids, there's always going to be the bad ones and the good ones—the people who fail and the people who don't give a damn, you know? And I suppose it has to be the person who really makes it work for them. I mean the teachers and the staff can only do so much, they can talk to you—if you get a psychiatrist, they can only talk to you, they can play head-games with you, but you can play the same head-games back with them. No one's going to benefit from that, it's mostly the kid. I think for the kids it did help, it helped them out a great deal. Sometimes it kept them from where they would have went or what would have happened to them.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I would have made it more educational. I can't really say stricter, but I don't know, when I went there I was wild, I wasn't really ready to listen. I wanted to do my thing, and to hell with anybody else. Actually, it could have been a little stricter, I think. For me it was really weird going to a school like that with all that freedom. But I kind of liked it I suppose. I met a lot of good people there, and learned a lot. That's about it.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Underemphasized. At the time I went, educational things were starting to get going. But then there was an emergency meeting being called for something being broken or other things, you know. But for the most part it was good, we learned a lot. At that time, when I went, educational things were starting to get going, but then
everyday—emergency meetings, someones rights were violated and then you got to drop everything just to go to a goddam emergency meeting.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think a lot of that's good, a lot--like for me, it was the prime of my teenage years, you know, when you really meet people, and start dating and this and that, you know. And I met a lot of really good people. I've only kept in contact with a few people. The kids I went to school with, they're all gone, I don't know where they are or whatever. And I kind of miss that--seeing people I grew up with. I went there for a year and a half, at least the people I liked, you know, they come and go--like the military. When I was younger, I suppose I always thought about that. But as I got older I learned that you meet people, you move on and so on. In a way I learned that there. Some of the emphasis was good, but not all of it. When I went up there, I wasn't open about things--I kept things to myself, figured things out for myself--you kind of cover your own ass. It helped me express myself and kind of open up more to some people. I can't really open up to too many people, that's about it.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think the student thing was good and the staff decisions were good. It can benefit the students, and it can go against the students. When I went there, I was well-liked—at least the friends that I hung around with liked me, and I think a few times the school was going to throw me out, and without being in good with the students I would have been thrown out, you know. I think some of the teachers wanted me out. I think I was always on "step two." And I think they tried to throw me out on the third step—the students I hung around with, they all spread the word around, don't have him get thrown out. It works both ways. Sometimes I might just hate a person, and I want to fuck him and fix their ass just cause I don't like the guy. You never know what a person's going to think, and it's their vote, you know what I mean. You can get burned by a person who doesn't give a shit about you. The teachers, they consider all aspects of the situation and of the thing you did or whatever happened. But a student can say, "I hate that turd and I want him out of here" and just want to throw him out. So, it works both ways. But the staff will evaluate the problem. They're supposed to be counselors to evaluate and see both sides of it—to see what they can do for the kid if they can do anything.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss
the boat?

12. The education was way off—I never got no education really. The counseling—I don't know, I was really never one for counseling—listening to someone tell me this or that—I listened to one or two people, that's about it, you know. Everyone else could tell me something and I could care less. But the counseling is good for the people. Also, the summer jobs program was real good—when we worked for the town on the roads.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. The education was starting to get going a little bit—not too much cause there were still emergency meetings going on—with people destroying whatever—there was a meeting called everyday, and it was mandatory for a student to go to that meeting, that meant all the classes got fizzled, just dropped. All the teachers had to cancel classes because some idiot called an emergency meeting. But I suppose it's their right, if their rights have been violated, but if you got along with the right people, you never had anything happen to you, or happen to your belongings, occasionally, yes. If you are a turd, sometimes things happened that were unexpected, you know. So that part of it was good. The work programs were just getting going and that was good—it was definitely good for me. The first summer I was bored, just hanging around, but with that program I could work, make some money, come back to school, take a shower and go see my girlfriend.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I'm doing brick work—went to school for masonry, I'm doing that now for a guy—learning a lot from the guy. The school helped me get my head screwed on straight and it helped me get along with people better. I learned how to have a relationship with someone—to be more open with people, to get a general knowledge or understanding of a person. Whether a person was bullshitting you or really wanted to be a friend of yours. I've seen some people come and go from M.V. go back to D.Y.S. get thrown out, and end up in jail or whatever they went to. But most people who managed to keep their ass clean, or just get by, it benefited them, like me, it benefited me. It helped me to straighten up and fly right—it put me in the right direction instead of going right back out and start doing what I was doing. Years ago when I was in trouble, we were kids, we used to think that if you got in trouble, they'd put you in jail for a little while, but you're going to get back out real soon. And if I had beaten the rap that put me in M.V., I would have
probably gone right back out and done it again. So, I'm glad I made it to M.V., or I would have probably made it to jail. It just helped me out and put me in the right direction.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Academics should have been better. Some of the relationships with the teachers should have been better—it really depends on the person that's doing it—whether he wants to be open or closed.

16. Any additional comments?

16. There should be more schools like M.V. to keep more kids like I was at fourteen or fifteen from detention or jail and having them get gang-raped or something, and all the other good things about jail. There should be more schools to help kids out to really straighten them out and get them back on the right side of the fence. There's two roads you can go down, you can go off to the left, which is the bad road, or you can go off to the right which will bring you back onto the good road. It may be a slow and long road, but eventually you're going to get there if you keep your act together and clean.
Student Interview

Name: Mary Sex: Female
Entry date: November Termination date: October 17
Age upon entry: 15 Current age: 21

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Well, I had a lot of good times there. I think about you a lot—you're the first person I think about. I had a lot of love there—I had a lot of attention. I really needed the attention because I wasn't getting it in a lot of other places. I got it from you and Big Fred and Mark. I got a lot of what I needed there. At the time I liked the attention but I was also into partying. I wanted to find guys; I was at that age when I was interested in men. I had a lot of good times there. I think back about it sometimes and I would really do it differently. There was a lot of help there that I could have gotten—I had an opportunity that a lot of other kids didn't have and I didn't take advantage of it.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to Maple Valley because I couldn't go to public school. Anything my parents said, even if it was right—now as I look back on it—I just didn't care—because I just didn't want to think about it—I was just out for a good time.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. The main thing that I did take with me is that almost every day I think about how it was when I used to drink a lot—and how I used to get uncontrollable. Also, after a while I accepted being at Maple Valley—and I remember the violence that used to happen when I would get jealous. I used to feel bad about the attention that you and Mark would give to others—I mean I just didn't know. I was so unhappy. I took with me a lot of the love and caring that I got there.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I learned so much about everything—about life. I learned that life was a game. One time I remember talking with you, and you said that life was a game and that you have to play to win. You just have to play it the way the rest of the world is playing it or there isn't going to be anything to play. I play it now to a certain
extent like with my boss—he's my boss and sometimes I kiss his ass to make him happy—I don't know, I guess it's o.k. I learned a lot about people's feelings there too—because before then I was just a spoiled brat. I really was. I was bad. I didn't think about other people's feelings because there was really no one around to think about. I was really in a groove there—I can remember the emergency meetings—they were real bad—there was just too much time spent in those meetings.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. What I wish I could have gotten there—I wish I would have been up at 9 o'clock in the morning. I wish I would have gone to classes more—there were so many opportunities there--there were only twenty-five kids and all these staff around. I COULD HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF ALL that time and gotten one-on-one—something that no one else in public school came close to. I could have learned so much more than I did. I could have gotten my diploma--I could have been to college by now. But all I wanted to do was screw off. I could have learned a lot more there if I had just applied myself.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I would say that we as kids were given rights too. We had a say in what went on in our lives and really that was it—we were people too. The school didn't deal with you like o.k. you're a child and you have no right to say this. At Maple Valley you felt that you did have a right to say what happened in your life. If you wanted to take other roads or whatever, it was on you. Even though I didn't get enough in the educational, I did learn a lot about how to deal with myself and with people.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think it was successful for me because if I could look back five years after I left and still see things that I can really use—then it was successful for me—even though it didn't seem to be working to well at the time. If the kids wanted it to work, it would work. Like me, if I didn't get off drugs, then it really wouldn't have made it for me. I would have still been wacked out. I think it really depended on the kids. But for everybody that was there--something did stick in their minds because there were a lot of real things that went on there.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I don't know, the program has changed so much since I was
there. I mean it was all so easy—if I would have just applied myself, it would have been the easy life for me. I wouldn't have changed anything—I mean I had good people around—people who would tell me you know, "Hey you know you're being a shithead!" You know most people in life seem to put on a front—you know—well you're not really a shithead—or hey, how are you doing? I learned a lot there so, if I don't like somebody, I'm not going to bother with them—I'm just not going to be two-faced. I really wouldn't have changed anything. I liked it the way it was—well, maybe the cooking.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Well, when I first went there, there was no emphasis on it. You know, when I first got there, there was all that stuff about emergency meetings—fire extinguishers being shot off and that kind of shit. But, after a while it changed where if you weren't going to show up for class there was going to be a punishment—but I didn't really care because the punishment was easy enough for me. Classes were there if I really wanted to take them—I could have gone to anyone on the staff like Carl or Big Fred. Those guys would really get on me—one time Big Fred picked me up out of bed and carried me across the street for a class in my pajamas. By the time that I left, there were regular classes happening every day. There was graduation and kids that had to have their papers done and stuff like that.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think it was just great—it wasn't under or over. The staff knew that you were an individual there—and they didn't look at this person and say, "Look at the way he grows." You were your own person and you grow the way you can and at your own limits.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think you and Mark didn't take enough. But when you did step in, you stepped in at the right time. I remember seeing you sit through emergency meetings and also looking frustrated. I think the kids had almost equal say. We sat through those emergency meetings day after day, I remember. And things that I would have never copped to, I eventually did because of peer pressure. It wasn't like the staff or your mother looking down at you. They would say, "Hey, you shithead, what are you doing?" I mean, they put the pressure on—they had to live with the bullshit. And, I think that was good—they had a right to be really mad at you. I think that
School was the best idea anybody had in a long time.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. The strongest part of Maple Valley was the people there. I mean, they showed you that they really cared—and, they showed you that you're a person and that you're capable of being loved. The possession policy having to do with drugs was too loose—I mean, we could get out too easily and get buzzed. Some people would come back to school—me, sometimes—and carry on in a real wild way. Some people were more cool than that. It was just too loose.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I remember once when I came back after a vacation we had started those levels—I started on level one. I figured that, oh yeah, I'll get level four, right? Now I couldn't go out past 8 o'clock—and that was a drastic change from being able to go out until 11 o'clock. The whole thing changed to where if you didn't want to get up and go to school, you ain't going to have these privileges. You're just not going to have the choice if you don't want to do what you're supposed to do. Which I guess was a lot better, although I didn't think so at the time.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I'm happy, I'm healthy, I got family here. Maple Valley has continued to affect me. When I think back upon all the things I went through there—times when people would tell me that I had a drinking problem and I didn't want to see it. For a while, my life after Maple Valley was totally unmanageable. Once I got away from the people in my old neighborhood—I knew that I would be o.k. as a person—and that I would make it. So I just left and met somebody and now I'm so happy. And Maple Valley played a part in all that.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. That's a hard question—Maple Valley did a lot for me. I really don't know, Mitch. It didn't solve all my problems—only I could fix them. At that time of my life, I wasn't ready to do anything—I went from program to program—hospital to hospital. Nothing's going to change you unless you're ready to do it yourself. And, I just wasn't ready when I was at the school. Even though the school was real nice and there were a lot of nice people there, I really felt forced to be there in a way. So the school really
didn't and couldn't change me until I was ready to do it myself.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I just loved my time there when I think back upon it—the times I had with you—you showed me that you really cared—and the little things that people did for me still stick in my mind. The staff let you know that they wanted to be with you—and it wasn't their job, they didn't have to do it. There was just a lot of caring there.
Student Interview

Name: DEBBIE
Sex: F
Entry date: March, 1977
Termination date: March, 1979
Age upon entry: 14
Current age: 19

1. When you think about Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. One thought I remember was that I wanted to go home and I didn't want to be there. I really didn't want to be there but I knew I had to be—so, I just stayed there. I did what I had to do, I guess.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. Well, I guess I had a choice—I either had to go there or some other place—kind of a lock-up and I didn't want to go there. I did have a choice of different schools that I could go to—I had a month in which to make a decision—and if I didn't choose a school in that month, they were going to send me to a lock-up. Maple Valley was the first school I went to—actually, I had visited the school a long time before that—and, I don't know, I just seemed to like it. I didn't really want to go, but it was better than the other ones.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?


4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I guess just living with other people. And, towards the end, the responsibility thing—that became a real big thing. And just generally trying to get along with other people.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I don't know. I wish I was made to go to classes more. Maybe I needed more of an education that I didn't get and hopefully someday will get. When I first got there, it was looser—you didn't really have to go if you didn't want to. And then, all of a sudden, things changed and you had to start going to classes. And I didn't like the change—I felt that I didn't have to go if I didn't really want to—that's what they told me when I first got there.
6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I'm not sure what they were trying to accomplish when I first got there—but later on, they were trying to help kids learn a lot more responsibility—and to get stronger emotionally and stuff—and just get kids back on the right track—because I know kids that were there needed that kind of help.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Well, it depended on the kids—and how much they really wanted it and how much they got involved in the program and stuff. I know that there were some kids that weren't and didn't get involved. So they left as mixed-up as they were when they first got there. And, they may always be mixed-up. But for the kids that did get involved—I know that it did help me a lot. When I left, I felt a lot better about myself than when I first got there. I felt that I really needed to get out and try the things that were taught to me when I was there.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I'm not sure—maybe I would have made it more of a one-to-one thing between staff and students. It sort of was a little bit—I mean, each person had a staff member—but I'm thinking about classes and stuff. I know that's what I needed—more of a one-to-one basis, instead of trying to work with a bunch of kids because I couldn't concentrate on what I was trying to do.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Under. You should have been made to go to classes. No ifs, ands or buts about it—you just had to go!

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I don't know. That's kind of borderline. I think that probably depends on the kid. Maybe it was a little bit too emphasized sometimes. I can remember reading the papers you sent to my parents, and going, "What is this with the emotional development stuff?" "I went there to go to school, and there wasn't enough school!" I think a lot of the times, the emotional development happens just by growing up and having the space to do so. And, not be forced into it.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple
Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think the kids should have had more say and been able to come to staff meetings—because the kids felt that, "Oh, God, they're all over there!" "And, they're probably talking about me!" We never really found out what went on at those staff meetings—that was always a mystery, a big question. I felt kind of cheated, because there were these people there who have this say and they're the power—and they're the ones who are making the decisions. Some of the kids had some say like in the meetings and stuff, and I liked it when you could call an emergency meeting for one reason or another—I was there for a little while before the meetings changed and I used to think they were a good idea. I didn't think they should have ended.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I don't know, there's just something about this question that just doesn't register.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I think that drug possession rule that was changed to a half a mile was totally stupid—I think it should have been left at one mile. It would have made it harder for kids who wanted to get high—they would have really had to walk! I didn't think that rule that made it not o.k. to hitchhike was good. Sometimes, if you wanted to get somewhere, a staff couldn't take you—I can remember sometimes I wanted to go somewhere and a staff just wouldn't take me! So, if the staff didn't want to take you—you were stuck! And I couldn't go anywhere and sometimes I felt really isolated there—like here I am, now how do I get out of here? I didn't like the privilege level system then, but I can see now how it was a good thing. Maybe it was too heavy—I think a lot of growing happens when you have more of a choice—to be able to voice your opinion and not feel that you're being shot down for it. I know a lot of times I wanted to say something and I just wouldn't—maybe it was just me—but I would be afraid that yeah, I'd be heard but it might be turned against me or something. Sometimes it felt that the staff was programmed to say a certain thing to me at a certain time—it seemed that they weren't voicing their opinions either—like they were just going by what they were told to do.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?
14. I'm being a mother and Maple Valley didn't influence it at all! Well, I'm doing things a lot different than when I was a kid--I didn't like the way I was treated at all. I give my kid a lot more caring than I ever got.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. It didn't teach me how to be a mother. It didn't teach me that I really needed an education if I wanted to get anywhere in this world either--or maybe I just refused to see it--I don't know, I don't really think of anything else.

16. Any additional comments?

16. No.
Student Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Anthony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry date</td>
<td>5/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination date</td>
<td>6/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age upon entry</td>
<td>14 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I think the things that stand out the strongest are the excellent times I had outdoors—canoeing with the staff, and bottle-digging—I really enjoyed that. Every once and a while, I remember something that I forgot for a long time. There are so many things that I'm endlessly remembering something else that happened. Sometimes certain things just stand out stronger than at other times. But mainly it's the freedom that it had and the excellent people that were there.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I remember it being that it was just because I didn't do my work in school. But when I talk to my mother about it, she says that it was also because of my not getting along with her and with her not being able to make me do anything and stuff like that. But since I chose to go to M.V.—I remember feeling fine about the decision because I decided that I wanted to go there. I remember Mark got me psyched!

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life. If so, how?

3. I couldn't imagine what my life would be like if I never went to M.V. And, I thank God that I did go to M.V. It was the beginning of my spiritual growth. I mean, when I think of how much I've learned and grown between then and now, it's incredible. All the things that I wasn't aware of then, I've become aware of and have begun to work on.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I think it was the learning just about life. I think it was real helpful to me to see the way the different staff dealt with different students. I learned just by watching the way people related to each other. And also, I learned how to learn. There's so much more to it than that—I learned so much when I was there. All the learning was useful.
5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I really can't think of anything.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think the school was trying to help the kids feel more comfortable in living, and having the staff be there just for the kids—that was positive. To help the kids in whatever growing they needed—working on family problems, that was a big thing.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yeah, definitely. I think it really depended on the students. I mean some students just decided that everything sucked, and it did because they made it that way for themselves. Some students really took advantage of the resources, the people to talk to, and the things to do.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I'm trying to think back. I think the amount of freedom that people got was good. It did get to a point where it was a problem for some kids who were abusing drugs and stuff like that. I really liked the idea—when I would see the kids there just running around and saying, "I'm bored." I think that that was a good thing—I think it made them calm, it mellowed them out. Kids just really had to be with themselves.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. From when I first remember, there wasn't much academic stuff at all. There weren't many classes in the beginning. But as it went on, there was just more and more. Then, there was the rule that you had to go to at least three classes each day. I think that was good because students started getting into it after awhile—reading and classes and the whole thing.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. It definitely wasn't overemphasized. There certainly wasn't too much—there could have been more. I remember there being somebody there when I wanted to talk.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple
Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think through the whole time—no matter what the situation —it was always good. There was always a lot of thinking and figuring out done before decisions were made—whether it was just by the staff or it was through student and staff meetings. In the beginning, there was a lot more of the students being able to be involved in the decisions—like with votes and things. Towards the end, decisions were being made much more by the staff.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I wonder if it would have been better if the staff didn't put out their anger to the kids. I think that would have put out such a peaceful example that it might have spread to the kids maybe. I think it would have been better if the staff would have been a lot calmer about everything. I think it was really great in people being able to go out—I remember there were a lot of field trips to places kids just wanted to go—kids would just take votes and end up going roller skating or to a movie or whatever. It was good to be able to get out and go different places. Though most of the time, I didn't go out, I just stayed at home.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. The changes in the classes was a good program change, and it probably should have been done much earlier than it was. In the beginning, too many students just floated around too much of the time. But, I feel that I have an advantage. I had interests that just kept me busy. I mean, the major one was bottle-digging—that was and still is a treasure to me—digging up things that someone threw away one hundred years ago and being able to keep them. Any time I got bored I could do that. It seemed to me that the students liked the change in the meetings—having less of them—because they didn't have to spend their time in so many meetings. But I think it was great when so much time was spent in meetings—just talking—in a way I think there still should have been more meetings than there ended up being—when emergency meetings were gone.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I'm doing woodworking. I guess I made my contacts who got me into it at M.V. But, also as far as M.V. and its influence in my life, it goes deeper than I can even think of—as far as really getting into a positive life—it really helped me. Plus, I think
all that time I wasn't living with my mother really helped me. I think whether or not somebody gets along good with their mother or not, with their parents, I think that they should move out of the house as fast as they can because it speeds up growth and it makes them more secure as far as living their own lives and setting things up for themselves and not falling into old patterns. The relationship with me and my mother gets better and better all the time. I'm also able to see her as a person more and talk to her that way.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. They didn't take me hang-gliding! M.V. is a place where I've seen people give a real lot. I think it's beautiful the way you and Mark spent so much time giving to the students. I think it really depends on the student. I guess there were a few students that it didn't work for but then again, that doesn't mean something was missing from M.V. That's really all I can say.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Yeah, I love you!
Student Interview

Name: LIZ  Sex: F
Entry date: 1/77
Termination date: 6/77
Age upon entry: 14
Current age: 21

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I think the friendships that I made there—definitely.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. Well, this is one of those statements where now is different than then. When I first went up there, it was really just to visit a friend who was there as a student. So, the day that I got up there, I met this boy and everyone was saying what a good couple we made—and, I really liked him a lot. So, I pushed my parents hard to let me go there because of the people that were there—my friend and my new love. That was why I started going there, I think. Academically, I was having some trouble at Amherst. I think it was because of the size and also maybe I just wasn't a good student either, then. In any case, that's what I remember being the reason I went there then. Now I see it a little bit differently. I think I see it more as a rebellious act against my parents—because they didn't want me to go, I wanted to go that much more! I saw it being a much freer and looser atmosphere than the school I was going to. And, that really excited me. All of a sudden, I didn't have to be anywhere between ten and four especially, and I was going to be free to do what I wanted. So those are all the different reasons that I see now—in being older.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Yeah, because I've been through three different kinds of educational experiences. One was a traditional public high school, and one was a traditional private high school, which I would not put Maple Valley in the category of! Plus, before I went to Maple Valley, I had read a little bit about Summerhill, so I sort of had a little idea of the kind of philosophy that was behind the school. And I really treasure that I, as one person, was able to have three such different kinds of educational experiences. Of course, it has a lasting effect. I was thirteen or fourteen at the time and that was a very influential age; and, I really learned mostly that adults and kids my age could really be friends beyond just authority figures. Before then, my experience had only been with my parents
or my parents' friends—which was "Go to bed" or "Do your homework"—and all of a sudden, I was in a situation where I could really get to know adults as friends. And, I see now that that really made a difference with my parents. I think that was the most lasting effect.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. Learning to speak out and say how you feel. Those emergency meetings did it for me because normally, I don't think I would have spoken out; but, I was so angered and so thrilled with something someone else said that I did speak out almost without even wanting to. It just blurted out. And then, when I got the report back--the report card that you made up, and I looked and I'd gotten credit for something that you called Public Speaking, that made me feel so good. And, even now I have some trouble speaking up in classes where I don't know anyone. But, I'm so much better than I used to be, and that means a lot--just learning to speak publicly.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. A little math, maybe! I wish I would have been able to learn things like that as well as all those other things I learned about myself and growing up. I missed some academics. But, it was six months out of my life and I think it was better spent learning about being a person than learning how algebra and geometry work. I think it was time better spent, but I'm sorry I couldn't do both at the same time.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. That's tough because I think it was different for every child. A lot of the kids that I saw there were from very different backgrounds than myself--I felt that I was there because I wanted to be there, and I think that some of the other kids that were there didn't really want to be there. So, I think that the school was trying to instill in each kid there that they were worth something. That's what I saw them learning. That they were important and special and worth something and I think that's probably the most important thing you could do. And from that, they could go on to learn academics or whatever--but, I think that's the basics. They needed to know that they were important to do other things that life's about. Some of these kids just had no confidence.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think it was with some kids. You have to make mistakes and a
lot of kids were there when it wasn't the right time to be there. If it had been a year later or a year before, you might have had a lot of success with them. But, on the whole, I think it was successful in doing just what I said before.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I wouldn't necessarily change the academic thing because the kids that were doing that were the ones that wanted to be doing it. Others just needed the freedom and support so that they could feel better about themselves. At the time that I was there, I know that academics were not the strong point. I'm glad that I was there when I was and I wouldn't change anything.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I guess it was underemphasized; but, I don't know that I would have wanted it more, simply because of what I said before. I don't think that it was as necessary or important as some seem to feel.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think the personal/interpersonal emphasis was just right. I don't think it should have been any other way. It was right.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students, by staff, by leaders?

11. I think probably at the time I didn't think that students had enough. I remember when I was at some meetings, the staff still had the final say on what happened. You know, at my age, it was rebelliousness against authority. So, I didn't think it was enough. But, now as I look back, it was good. I think it was very even, as even as it could be in a situation like that because kids could get very crazy—like in deciding punishments for someone they didn't like. You can see what would have happened. Yeah, I think that the kids had a good amount of input and the more mature and responsible you were, you were given that much more say. It happened according to what you put out.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. Well, I'll tell you. Something I wish you would have been more strict about was drugs. I think there was just too much freedom, too many opportunities. If I hadn't experienced all that at Maple Valley, I don't think I would have gone on to all that
experimentation after I left. And, I think that if the rules had been more strict, I might not have. Of course, I don't know. Maybe I would have gone farther into it and I would be in a hospital right now. But, my feelings about drugs now are a lot different than they were then. I think that, unfortunately, Maple Valley contributed to my involvement because it was too lenient. So that's where I think the school was not on target. It was right on target everywhere else. I can't really think of anything else. The food was great! I felt really close to the people there for the most part. I mean, I had arguments but it was one place where if you got into an argument, you hashed it out right then and there. You didn't go around talking behind people's backs--because there was no point. It was the kind of place where you just might as well get it out and into the open and that was really important. Most people don't do that enough; and, it's sad because it just builds up.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. Well, I don't know that there were a whole lot of program changes that occurred when I was there. It seemed pretty steady the whole time I was there. I think right after I left, I heard that a lot of things started cracking down and changing. So, I don't really know if that question applies to my time there.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I'm currently enrolled at UMass. When I left Maple Valley, I went back to the Amherst High School where I stayed only about three weeks. From there, I went into a private school in Waltham which was a much more traditional private school or prep school. When I got out of that school, I came home for a summer and then I had a semester at the University which didn't go well. I think that was because I was also working about forty or fifty hours a week which I stupidly did the next semester. Then I was academically suspended so I spent the following summer and the fall after that on Cape Cod, working. Then I went back to UMass, and I did really well which made me feel a lot better about being back at school. So now I'm still at UMass, and I'm working a couple of jobs but there's time—it sort of all evens out because part of it is business and that's part of the area that I'm studying, so it helps. The influence that Maple Valley has on what I'm doing now is in my personality; and, that is, when I make decisions, I think through them a lot more clearly than I might have if I had not had the experience of having to decide for and with other people within the emergency meetings and for myself within those meetings. So, I think its lasting effect was not academic but I think its effect has
been on a lot of my decision-making process, on my choosing of people I want to spend time with. My feelings about deprived kids is also really influenced. If I hadn't seen some of the things that the kids went through at Maple Valley—if I hadn't seen what it actually does to people—I would never have known because in the area I live in, I would never have come into contact with it. It opened my eyes to a lot of that.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. The academics. That's really the only thing and it isn't really a complaint, but that's the only thing it didn't do. But, like I said before, at the time it was right that it didn't for me.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Only the things I said before. I'm really appreciative that I was able to be part of it; and, I hope that Maple Valley continues and is able to keep some of the important things that made it unique which I know is hard to do and still be a "real" school.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. It was interesting. It was a good experience I had for the two and a half years that I was there—aside from some of the personal difficulties I was having with Maple Valley at the time, especially during the end portion of that time. But overall, it was a good experience there.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I don't know, the main reason I guess was to escape home. I was trying to get into an atmosphere where I could get my act together because things weren't working out at home.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Well, it helped me to deal with people a lot better. You know, it was a social kind of experience which really helped me to deal with people. Learning to deal with the community there was positive in some manners.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. The most useful things I learned had to do with the social aspects of it. And some of the academic level of learning at Maple Valley was good because Maple Valley when I was there would teach very different aspects than most schools would.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. To be perfectly honest with you I wish I could have gotten more of a heavy academic backing.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. Well, it changed over the two and a half years that I was there. There was just a whole different atmosphere of people at the beginning of the two and a half years than at the end. But it was
always trying to help kids on academic levels and with their moral decision-making—that was always a big part of the scene. Just a general thrust with how we interact and communicate with people.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. In some ways it was very successful and in some ways it wasn't. For me it was successful in that it helped me get over some of the problems I was having during the time I was home. And it was also successful because it helped me get into the school atmosphere much better. And dealing with people slowly became a lot easier for me. I think it was most successful in the beginning of the time I was there when things seemed more relaxed—I think it helped people. I think toward the end of my time there the atmosphere changed and communication started to break down. Toward the end, the students seemed to be getting wrapped up in the whole rules thing and the tightening structure. I don't think that I was the only person who thought that.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I'd work over the academics, that's what I'd do. The structure of the program was fine. And the types of kids or clients are fine. But if you ask me I think the program needed some more hard-core academics.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think that basic academics were underemphasized. There were academics, that were being emphasized there that had a lot to do with decision-making and moralizing and things like that. In looking back on it, I remember having some problems with how much of that was a priority as opposed to your math and reading and the rest of it.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. That was not underemphasized. There was a lot of interaction. There was enough—it was just about right. I mean towards the end the communication wasn't so hot. It seemed that in the beginning things were more relaxed. At the end of my two and a half years there, things were getting more tense—more blocks between people. I think as time went on, people started to feel a bit more distant from one another. I did but there was still lot of contact always going on.
11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think the decision-making processes at Maple Valley during that time were real good. Looking back on some of the stuff that happened is interesting. I mean I got upset about the way some of the decisions were made then. Then I felt like I didn't have enough to say about it. When I think about it now I think that you were right. But at that point I could never admit to it.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. At the beginning of my time there the program dealt with students like me real good. But then they were beginning to take students who were not like me and I think that was difficult for Maple Valley to deal with. The school began to change its environment to suit their needs. I think at times the program was trying to meet the needs of too many different kinds of kids. Sort of going back and forth.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I think the White House dorm was a very positive move for the people that were in it. I'm not sure about this but I felt that there was a real problem between the two groups of kids—the kids that lived in the White House and the kids that lived on the main campus. Maybe we did set it up where we stuck our noses up at everybody at the main campus but there was a lot of friction as far as communication went. The White House was a very good experience as far as decision-making processes went and all that.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well, I'm doing real good at this point. Maple Valley really helped me get into the working world. I got some good work experience when I was at the school in apprenticing. I'm finding it easier to go to work and to find a job and all that good stuff. Maple Valley helped me to do all that—which has made my life a lot easier and better. And now I understand a lot more about living with a group of people. I'm living with a group now and after Maple Valley I'm used to this atmosphere. Some of the courses I took at Maple Valley have helped me with my college courses.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?
15. I think what was really missing was the academic thing—and I don't know if that's a personal thing with me or not—but I think it was really missing. And that was about it.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Overall, I think Maple Valley was a real good experience for me, it has helped me out a lot. It's really helped me to deal with people which was one of my biggest problems when I first got there. In the decision-making and moralizing, I think the school did a good job with me.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Learning how to deal with people, and trying to get along in a different environment; it was much more than just a school. I learned how people can live together, what it involves, like true feelings that come up in people, how to deal with them, a lot of bad things I learned about people too, and how to deal with those things. I had been in a lot of foster homes and things like that, before I got to Maple Valley. I wasn't really at any place with myself, still trying to find some place where I could just stay and grow and try to get myself together. It wasn't just a place you could stay but really a place you could grow from. It was a good time for me there. I learned a lot about people. I got my stuff together and got my diploma. Then I moved on. I joined the service.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I was looking for some place that I could grow from, after I'd been moving around to a lot of places and people that I didn't really like. A lot of the homes I was in weren't really the greatest places in the world and I just kept getting moved around, and I was tired of that. So I thought I could go to Maple Valley—I knew I could get my diploma and public school wasn't really the thing for me, 'cause I didn't deal too much with all those people and all their bull, so I thought I'd come here and see how it was.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. The school was the basis of what I am. It made me realize that there's more than just being a bum. You know, hanging out and just being with your friends which is fine but you've got to move on, get an education; growing up, facing responsibilities, dealing with different issues and whatnot.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. All the things I just said.
5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. At the time there was nothing that I wish I could have learned that I didn't. I mean everything really just fell into place because there was a group of such different people there all the time. I basically learned all I needed to at that time which was how to deal with people—how to have a good time—what to say, you know?

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. It was trying to get kids to realize that if they were going to get anywhere, there were just certain things—roads you had to go on, so to speak, as far as how you were gonna grow up, you know, things you had to realize to get a jump on things.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Oh definitely. I believe that every kid who goes there and leaves in whatever circumstances learned something good at least. If they use it after that, well that's their own prerogative, but at least they all get something good. They all get a chance to learn how to deal with people, and learn something about themselves. I learned a lot about myself that's for sure, and about being with others.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. During that time I think I would have made things a little more strict—the rules for instance. It took too long in my opinion for the school to tighten-up its sign-out policy. During that time, kids would go out and get into alcohol and pot. It just took too long for the school to come down hard and put a stop to it. It was hard to explain to the kids that, #1 it's illegal, and #2 it will screw you up. I'm not really sure what being more strict would have been. I guess room searches would have been too much, but I would have watched more carefully the people and "friends" coming in and out of the school. I would have let those people know that there was a strict policy not to have that shit around the school.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think it was emphasized enough. I don't think kids took it too seriously because of the relaxed environment. But as far as the quality of the schooling, yeah I think it was good. I started taking it more seriously after being there for about a year when I
got into the diploma program and started getting my shit together. I knew I needed to get my diploma and put myself into it. I think maybe the educational level could have been a little higher.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. It definitely wasn't underemphasized. You know, being around all those people, it was always there—working on relationships—dealing with each other. It was always happening, people getting together, talking, sometimes for hours. Sometimes classes were missed because people were working things out. But I don't think you can ever have too much because people, no matter how great they think they are, always have some kind of problems and a lot of people just keep it bottled up. I know I do sometimes, until I can either work it out by myself or find somebody who can help me, and go from there.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think everybody had an active part in it; everybody had a say in what was happening, except sometimes as far as educationally—a lot of kids didn't really care about having a say in that. There were a lot of problems about what was eaten because the food that was being cooked wasn't really appealing like a bowl of cocoa pops and milk. There was a lot of health food that was unfamiliar to people who came from areas where "health food" was a bad word and they just couldn't accept it. Like tofu, right? But I eat a lot of health food now and I take vitamins. And that's all because of Maple Valley. So that was good. As far as how the school was run, I don't think the kids were too involved in that. The main things came from you and Mark, but as far as field trips and stuff like that, the kids had plenty of say.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I guess the strongest point of the school would be that the staff had a good relationship with the kids. All the different staff and all the people who were involved just seemed to get it together with the kids, and were consistent with one another. That was really the best thing—the way it was run. It wasn't so strict that the kids felt pressured like "I got to get out of here!" like so many other places that can drive you crazy, you know? It was a really nice environment—nice country road, nice and quiet, which gave kids a chance to go out and think about what they were doing and how to improve it. And the bad part, or what they really missed on, I think, would be the after follow-up, when they left. I know
there was always contact being made but as far as the influence goes on what happened with kids once they left as far as extra educational programs or different programs to move on to, I think it was missed. People now still need different programs that Maple Valley doesn't offer. I'm not saying they could offer it but maybe could be better about referring to other places that could help them out.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. The biggest one was the White House. That was a definite factor in my happiness there. The school was really good, but as far as your personal time, sometimes it felt a little crowded. At the White House you got your own room and the time and the place to relax. The kids there were pretty good for the most part. You could pursue different things as far as education goes. You could really get it together there and that was a really great place for me. I got my job and I worked and lived there until I went into the Service. It was a good retreat from the main buildings at the school where I could go and relax a little bit, and get the benefit from two different but linked parts of the program and relationships with people. Sometimes I would act one way with the people at the White House and act differently with people at the school. I learned more about people and more about myself, some good, some bad. I just improved upon the bad.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well, I'm in the Service. I have been for over two years. The Service is good. You do have to deal with a lot of bull which was something I got help with at Maple Valley. I learned to deal with it productively, anyways—instead of saying "Fuck you!" to an officer, you know? In my case I'd go to jail. It gave me the basis of how to deal with people and how to resolve conflicts in a productive way instead of breaking things or other things that I would do like retreating from people, withdrawing, drugs, you know. There are all ways of dealing with things. So Maple Valley helped me to get through those things. Now as far as financially and socially, I'm moving up. I'm trying to get on a higher building block than where I've been, and it takes time but I'm getting on it. I meet different people that can help me out financially and socially, so I'm trying to take advantage of that. I had my days where just going out with somebody, grabbing a beer and getting high was a good time, and I did have a lot of good times, you know, but it was a whole different time, and time is a big factor in anything you do. I couldn't do that now. I believe I was a good influence at Maple Valley about that, calming people down. I and a couple friends at
school had a lot of influence.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I don't know. I guess what it didn't do wasn't too much. It did just about everything. It was education and relationships. It could have been more strict about the amount of contact boys and girls were able to have. I think there was a lot more sex going on than the staff really knew about. I guess in a place like Maple Valley there's plenty of chances for kids to get together like that and do what they're going to do. But I think the staff could have been more strict about it. Like they could have separated the dorms better. The boys could have had one building and the girls the other—I don't know. There were always more boys than girls. But in its own way I think it was a good thing too—it helped a lot of kids to grow—it helped me to grow—it helped me to think about who I was and where I was going. Plus, going out with a girl tends to keep your spirits up if it's going well. Being in a relationship helped me to get through certain things and to learn from them.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I think the school is a good place to start for any young kid, you know 13, 14, 15 or whatever, as long as it meets the needs of kids in general, whether they are educational, social or especially emotional needs. There are a lot of people there—different people, different feelings, offering anything a kid could need, except financially I suppose, which is not really a big one. I think growing up is more important than being financially well off. But I'm at that age now where I'm growing up and now I need to get financially well off. But Maple Valley was a real good place for me to do some growing up.
Student Interview

Name  George  Sex  Male
Entry date  10/31/79
Termination date  6/5/81
Age upon entry  16
Current age  20

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   1. I remember some of the students there, and I remember the way the place used to look—and, well, it's changed now. I have some good memories and remember some of the things we did and places we went.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   2. I came because I wasn't getting along at home. I wasn't getting the education I needed. I needed to learn to cope with my problems. I used to have a really bad temper. I needed something to help me slow myself down instead of just going off fighting. Swinging it out or dukeing it out—I needed to stop doing that. Instead of hitting someone, I needed something to help me learn to deal with people.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   3. It really has. I don't go out or get into fights or anything anymore. I just don't get into trouble like that. It helped me to cope with my family better.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

   4. How to get along with people.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

   5. I learned mainly what I wanted to learn there. I wish I had learned to stay in school. I wish I could have gotten a diploma.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

   6. It was trying to help kids. It was trying to help them get an education. It was trying to help them deal with reality instead of just going off and taking drugs and stuff. Like I used to take alcohol and drugs a lot to get away from reality and Maple Valley
tried to prevent that.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think the school was successful for quite a few kids. It made a big difference for those students who made it all the way and also a difference for those who didn't make it all the way. It was successful for me.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I wouldn't have changed it. I really liked it just the way it was.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I don't know. Sometimes it seemed that nobody wanted to learn—the students would think it was just a get-over place. In classes, a lot of the kids wouldn't pay much attention and I was one of them. You know, just fooling around and saying something rude. The kids seemed like they didn't really want to learn. I think the teachers tried a lot—I think they gave what they had to give.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. Yes, it was fine—I learned. I think the staff tried hard—they really did with me and I always had trouble learning something like that.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think we all had just about the right amount. A lot of people took in what you guys had to say. The students had enough to say except one time when you made changes about the room situation, nobody listened to what the students had to say or what they were feeling. That made me feel bad and I think it made a lot of people feel bad.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. It was really great that I could go home as often as I did. Where it missed the boat with me was when I got in trouble and I had to stay in and sometimes I wasn't able to go home because of the trouble I was in and I never liked that. The school gave me a lot
of knowledge about a person being himself and not somebody else. That was one of the best things I learned, and it is still important to me.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. Yes, when we changed to the privilege level system. It was good in a way. It made people stop and realize that if you want something, you have to earn it, and you just couldn't get away with as much as you could before. It helped people slow down and it made you want to learn more. It was bad because sometimes when you wanted to go out at night and you messed up during the day, that was it—you just couldn't go out!

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I don't know how Maple Valley figured into what I'm doing now. After I left Maple Valley, I went back to public school and I just couldn't stick it out—so, I quit. And, it's been rough on the outside—in the real world for the last two years. But, I'm trying to get back into school now. I just couldn't find work out there—I had to find that out for myself. Maple Valley helped me try to get it straight, I guess.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. There ain't nothing it didn't do for me. That's the truth. You guys and the program did a lot for me. There really wasn't nothing you didn't do.

16. Any additional comments?

16. It was just great—you know, everybody had their bad days but when I think about it now, I realize how much I really did like it!
Student Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>LESLIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Date</td>
<td>12/10/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination date</td>
<td>6-10-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age upon entry</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. The relationships I developed with the staff—mostly with the staff—and the social skills that I got. That stands out the most. I have this with me now more than I have anything.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I didn't do good in public schools, and family—the home situation wasn't that great.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Has it! Oh yeah—I still have these relationships and that's lasting. I still have these skills. I give great massages. I don't know if that has anything to do with M.V., but it's where I learned to touch, you know, oh yeah, definitely.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning was about myself—what I learned about myself and how to work through things, that was good learning. And, how to deal with changes, which now I think I'm pretty good at—now I'm a pro.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. Well, nothing that I haven't picked up except for maybe a little more academics, which could have been useful. Pretty much, I feel that I got everything I could have. There were times when I was there I wish I had gotten more out of the staff. I think you know, at those times I just didn't want to deal with anybody—those times I wish I'd gotten more. But, I had to work to get to the other side to understand that.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think it tried to get people to learn together and live
together—and to help people who had bad situations in other places—that's what they tried to do. They gave people a home who didn't really have a good home, you know. They tried to make it better for them.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. In some points, yeah, very successful. I think it had a lot to do at times with who was there—the different groups of people set the feeling or what could be done, or what people want to work on, you know. It has to be up to the people at any point.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I don't know, I think they did a great job. I don't know if I would have changed anything. I can't say I would have because it worked out for me just fine—just the way it was. Maybe there could have been a little more involvement with the students as far as some decisions went, but mostly it was done just fine.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Definitely underemphasized. I mean, that it was too easy, but it was easy basic academics. It wasn't biology and whatever that stuff is. You see. just by talking to me, you can see that I don't know those things. I can deal with people well. As far as academics, it was definitely underemphasized. It was pretty loose. I mean, there was Joe who went there for a long time, who didn't even graduate, who probably didn't go to classes most of the time he was there. It was pretty much up to choice whether you wanted to go or not. But, it started to get a little more like you had to go, you know. And it was still, even if you had classes and you had an excuse, you could still get out. When I graduated, I had to put everything into it, though.

10. Do you think person/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think it was neither, under or over. I mean, maybe a little over, but not really. I think it was more a part of what happened then—people working on stuff within themselves—in that way, it was emphasized a lot but not in a bad way or anything.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well, for the students, I think it was pretty good, the
decision-making, when I first went there. When people wanted to get things done, they could just call a meeting anytime and it would happen. So far as that goes, it was good for the students when something was missing or something was wrong because I think it was more of a group thing! It wasn't staff versus students. In some cases, it should have been a lot tighter, but for some kids, you should have made them go to classes. Classes were sort of laid back—you could smoke cigarettes, not like public school, that's for sure. Basically, the staff had regular meetings, I think once a week; and, when they made decisions, they would put it out to the kids first which I think was pretty good on the staff's part because it helped the students feel more of a part of what was happening. Mitch and I would get into some good battles and they were good especially when we came out the other side, which we always did.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. Maple Valley was right on target socially-wise, or dealing with yourself, or whatever shit you had to work on. I mean, I had lots of shit, you know, I mean tons of it. I mean, that it was right on target—especially the time Annie spent with me personally. I thought that was great—that was right on target for me. Probably academics missed the boat a little.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I saw a lot of changes. As far as academics—to be a lot more concrete about it—I mean, after awhile you just had to go to classes or you would be in at night if you didn't. So, it changed there a real lot. That was good because it made people get up and do that and you had to go to the morning meetings fully dressed. Before, you could just about roll out of bed even in your bathrobe and not really listen to what they were saying and then go right on back to bed. That was a good change. I mean, some of the changes I wasn't too crazy about—like staff changes, I wasn't crazy about that. That was just hard because I had connections I had to break. I think there were mostly positive changes as far as the school goes, structure-wise.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well, I'm living in the area and I love it. M.V. influenced that because I just love the area. I'm working—well, in a couple of days—and M.V. helped to get me going, to have more drive than I ever did. I mean, I'm really into it—I want to work.
15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. There could have been some typing or stuff like that—skills that you could take with you. I mean, I have social skills but I mean vocational skills. Now that's something I didn't get. That definitely would have been helpful if I could have got that too. But, I don't know if that would have worked out or not because working on yourself is so hard to do—it takes so much time—and then, to focus on these other things might have been too hard. I don't know, it's too hard to say. It might have been good too.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Well, it was just a real positive experience all the way around for me. I got a lot out of it. And, I'm glad I could do this interview for you.
Student Interview

Name: SEAN
Sex: M
Entry date: 12/5/79
Termination date: 11/17/80
Age upon entry: 15
Current age: 19

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   1. I think about how close everybody was, you know. That was one of the best experiences I had. It was like family for a long time. That's what I liked when I first came. That's what I really liked about Maple Valley.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   2. I was messing up in school and stuff and not doing good at home—so basically, I got sent here—I really didn't come; I got sent. I mean, I didn't have any choices. I had to leave where I was. It was either this place or some academy out near Boston. Believe me, you'd want to come here. So, I came here and I grew to like it.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   3. Hugs and stuff and being close to people and being able to express myself and everything—that's what I got out of Maple Valley. You know, that's one of the best things I've come out of here with, most definitely. I'm glad I came here, just for that.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

   4. I learned to deal with people, that was the best learning. I didn't really learn to control myself all that good, but I did learn how to deal with people better—there was a real big difference.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

   5. I don't really know. I can't really say. Nothing, I guess. I think I learned everything I needed to learn—everything that really makes a difference in my life, you know.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

   6. It tried to help kids learn some respect and just tried to help
kids to deal with people better, so you could get along in life. Definitely, that's what Maple Valley was trying to do. It did good, by the way!

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. It was successful for me, the Valley was. Yeah, I think the school was pretty successful—well, with some people successful, with others not. I think more people learned respect than others did—I think more people came out of here with something good than with nothing or something bad.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Well, right now, when I think back, I thought it was pretty good. Truthfully, I wouldn't change anything about it. It was a real good program. I just couldn't make it so well at first because I was kind of wild—you know, I just came off the streets and I wasn't used to discipline type things. I definitely learned to handle it. But, I think it was a good program, a real good program.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think it was just right. I really did like it back then and I wish the place was the same...the same old friendly Valley, you know. Now it's become a school. I think the academics were pretty good—well, for the school year—but, for the summer, you could have cut back on the academics in the summer. You shouldn't have really had any classes in the summer. Activities would have been much better!

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. That was the best part of the place, you know. I think it was perfect back then in that way. I think that was good. Nowadays, there doesn't seem to be enough emphasis on that stuff. You should push it more these days. I liked it back then—working on personal stuff, that's what I liked about it.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by the students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well, at times I felt that people didn't listen that much but I would say that the majority of the time the students did have a say --a good amount of say. That was the good times--in the old days.
Time changes everything—for the worse sometimes. I think you guys did what you had to do—what you felt was right and stuff.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. It was the best in the closeness, in the family type matters. It was the worst in classes and stuff like that. It was the worst in the summer when you had classes in the summertime. I think that was a mistake. People want their summer; I know I did. I did a lot of complaining about it.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I think the T.R. (temporarily restricted) was a big change and I thought it was a drag. People were too closely monitored on that and it kicked off the point system which came after '81 and the point system is a serious drag. I think the regular level system could have dealt with the people. I think you should have stuck with that.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. People here more or less inspired me to go after the music thing more. There were a lot of people available here to teach me and that's part of the reason why I've gone as far as I have. I'm a good musician and I have a lot of help from here.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I can't really think of where it fell short. I'm sure I'll come up with something, but right now I can't really come up with anything. As far as skills go, I really could have gotten more if I wanted them.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Yeah. Even though I screwed up a lot back then, I thought this was the best place in the world—the best place. I thought it was the coolest place in the world—well, at least in Massachusetts. There were and are some really great people here!
Staff Interview

Name: Betsy
Sex: F
Employed from: September 1973
to: June, 1975
Position: Co-founder/Teacher

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. When I think of Maple Valley now, there isn't one particular experience that comes to light. Rather, I think of the tremendous drive and ambition we had, to see a dream come true.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to Maple Valley to fulfill a dream. During my college years, I became very disillusioned about our educational system, and felt that there had to be more alternatives available.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Maple Valley has definitely had a lasting effect on my life. Living and working in such a therapeutic environment helped me to grow and learn a great deal about myself.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I learned that with enough ambition and drive, you can achieve your goals in life.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. In retrospect, I wish I could have learned how to function better in that environment. Although my goal of starting a school had been accomplished, I personally felt very overwhelmed and frustrated. Having a successful school and maintaining a comfortable, fulfilling private life seemed impossible.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think Maple Valley tried to offer an alternative environment to children, where they could begin to understand themselves and make decisions governing their lives.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?
7. I felt that Maple Valley was successful in providing a very comfortable, supportive environment for many children. I don't know if Maple Valley had any lasting effects on these children because I have lost touch with all of them.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. During my two years at Maple Valley, I don't think we could have made any programmatic changes. We were only five staff, responsible for teaching the classes, cooking the meals, running a business, and being guardian parents to the children that live there.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think academics were underemphasized by choice. Most of the children attending Maple Valley at the time rebelled against academics. It seemed more important to help these children feel good about themselves. We believed that the interest in academics might come at a later point. For the few younger children who attended, we tried to offer as much as possible. However, with such a limited staff, it was difficult to offer a wide variety of academic courses.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think that personal/interpersonal development was overemphasized, but also by choice. Personal/interpersonal development was one of our foremost goals at Maple Valley.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. The children at Maple Valley had a very vital part in the decision-making process. Aside from certain rules of health and safety, it was essential to have everyone involved in the decision-making process, in order to provide a community where we could all live and work together.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. Maple Valley's philosophical goals at the time were right on target. We offered a viable alternative for many youngsters. We missed the boat by trying to do too much with no money, few staff, and little experience. However, in retrospect, any business takes awhile to get off the ground, and Maple Valley has not only survived, but has grown tremendously.
13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I was only at Maple Valley for two years and during that time witnessed more staff changes and personal crises than I did program changes.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I teach nursery school part time, and I give private piano lessons. Maple Valley helped me to realize that I had a great rapport with children and much to offer.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Maple Valley did not fulfill my personal needs. Although I love working with children and believed so much in the goals of Maple Valley, I had a difficult time surviving in that environment.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Maple Valley was a very significant part of my life, and will always have an impact on me. I am proud to say that I once founded a school and lived to see a goal fulfilled. Furthermore, it makes me feel good to know that the school has grown tremendously and been so successful over the years.
Staff Interview

Name: Lowell
Sex: F
Employed from: 6/74
to: 9/77
Position: Teacher/Counselor

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. The relationships among the staff people there, and the quality of caring, the risk-taking, the honesty, our awareness of and our commitment to being clear with each other, staying with it beyond the professional commitment; these experiences stand out. The originality and creativity with which we dealt with everything also stands out.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to Maple Valley because I was looking for a setting where I could experiment, and I was looking for people to do that with who I thought would be open and who reflected the values that were coming out in me that had previously been kind of stuffed away in me. At Maple Valley there was an aliveness, an excitement about what we were trying to do together the risks, although I didn't necessarily see them as risks at the time. It was a good group of people really trying to do something different. The whole free school idea was appealing to me. I had read A.S. Neil and felt really alive with his ideas about growth and learning. Maple Valley had a mixture of youth, openness, softness and also had enough strength and stability in its leadership so that it was a safe enough place for me to do this. It had other specific attributes that were important for me, too, like it was a hundred miles away from Vermont where my kids were, a setting that could accommodate my newness out in the world. It was a whole community for me where I didn't have to start out completely on my own...things like taking care of the logistics of living independently which I had never done before. That was part of what I needed at the time. It also included a place for my children.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Ah, yes! "I lost my heart at Maple Valley...," or rather I found it at Maple Valley, because the thing that feels like the lasting effect on my life has to do with the relationships...the depth of loving and trusting that was established there in the quality relationships—in the friendships that have continued—Annie and Mitchell being the highlights of that. There's a lot that I
learned, of course, that's real important to me, but, this is what stands out for me now.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I had sort of liberated myself from this really confining relationship and narrowly constructed life. I was very idealistic and going out into the world to make a perfect life for myself and to effect others perfectly and to "put it all together." I think that is a major learning, that, even with all of the good will and all of the gifts that we each brought to Maple Valley, our daily life was still full of struggle, mistakes, weakness, and fear, and no matter how much we all loved each other and how much we all learned from year to year and how much we wanted to transform these young people who were in our charge, they still came in and ran the same patterns, maybe were touched and effected and maybe weren't. It still took time and it was still a process of their own. We couldn't do it to them; we could only provide a setting where they could be safe and guide them while they went through their process. I'm more realistic about what can really be accomplished and what kind of daily work it takes to do it. I had had this whole idea about being a self-sufficient community with gardens and chickens and recycling everything... I remember doing maple syruping with the kids and we used up a whole tank of pyrofax gas to make three quarts of maple syrup... getting in touch with how hard it is to put all those things together.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I learned what I could at Maple Valley while I was there and what I was ready to and what I needed to and what was offered and all the rest and I've continued to learn what's been right for me to learn since I left. There's lots that I didn't learn at Maple Valley but I don't feel that I can put a... "wish I could have..." on it.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I had a very strong sense always, while I was there, that we were all there for our own reasons, of course. I think we were all trying to outgrow our adolescence.

We attempted to create a setting and a structure within which kids could get in touch with their own process, learn to communicate, learn to be honest with themselves and each other, have some space from all the criticism and the "shoulds" and the punishments and the constrictions of their families and homes and society. Giving them the freedom where they could get in touch with
themselves and see what it is that motivates them and inspires them, what interests them, and to do that in a setting where they are affirmed, hugged, and where the staff provides modeling. We were all doing this ourselves, and the premise was that that's healing, and that's a setting where learning can really happen and where people can grow healthfully, and where we can keep them safe while doing that—give them a chance to bump around, make mistakes where they won't get hurt too badly, while they learn to gain control.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. During the first two years or so most of the kids were there out of a philosophical commitment on their part or on their parents' part to living the way we chose to live. That was really successful. The students at that time were able to use and could deal with the freedom to make their own decisions and take responsibility for governing themselves and all the rest. As the school grew and changed towards a population which was not so mature, and was not there out of a philosophical choice, I think that we needed to change in order to accommodate their changing needs. They needed clearer lines and different kinds of therapeutic activities. It's real difficult dealing with adolescents who have been through the kinds of trauma that those kids had. It challenged us. We didn't want to be "heavies" and draw lines that would restrict their freedom and limit their responsibility. We learned that freedom does not always heal.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Thinking about specific kids, I think that we tended to treat the whole group fairly similarly without really tuning in on different kids and looking at what kinds of gaps they had, what could we learn from their behavior in terms of what they understood about the world, what they tended not to notice about the world, in what areas could we mediate learning. To be more directive... specifically, for some of those kids it was social skills, for some it was personal hygiene, for others it was time management, for others it was academics. Programmatic changes...a lot less free time, less choice.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Academics were overemphasized in that we were offering academics to kids who weren't necessarily ready for them. We were coming off a public school model which is all that we all knew, in terms of our own school experience, the sense was that we should function like a school. In some ways that served an important
purpose in that one of the things that all of those kids needed to learn was how to adapt to structure and learn how to get through a day that has a schedule to it and in that way I think we did them a service. I was not really close to the academic part of the school so a lot of what was going on I really don't know about. I want to acknowledge that I really can't comment very fully. We did a lot of wonderful things in nontraditional classes like person class, womens' studies, improvisational drama and I know that a lot of the academic classes were really individualized. I can remember kids getting real individual attention on writing and math. The school part of the day felt really good.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think that personal and interpersonal development was appropriately emphasized. It was emphasized and that's good! Sometimes it seemed really oppressive sometimes for one person's needs to be able to call a halt to the whole community. Stopping and processing stuff, when many people wanted to get to class and do other things, really didn't seem worth it when attention to the individual's rights seemed to be at the expense of the larger group's wishes.... But I don't think that hurt anybody. I think it was really good for all of us to see what that felt like and to try doing it that way. I'm not sure what kind of a system we could develop that could really protect individual rights as well, particularly the younger ones, and the angry, hurt ones, the ones who'd never really been listened to before, who had never had the power to stop the system and say, "Listen to me, I need this now! I need everybody to come in here now and help me deal with this shit NOW!" So, it was important and it was valuable in terms of a balanced and functioning community that was forging ahead in a lot of different ways, and growing and developing. It was good, and it was difficult at times.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well, we started out with no rules other than a few rules about safety and laws of the outside community. It sounded great. Now let me see, did it really work? The experience of that process was wonderful for us all. The results aren't even all that important. Whether or not it was an effective way to govern the community, the fact is that that was the first time and probably the only time that most of us ever tried to govern ourselves like that and to experience that kind of responsibility. We were getting in touch with the ways that we each needed to grow up a little bit and understanding what we had to give up in terms of sanity and order and impulsivity. It made all of us look at our priorities.
Sometimes we had to do an awful lot of pushing to get the kids to see the effect of their behavior and choices, so that often it ended up that they weren't nearly as responsible as we idealistically tried to set up, that they really would feel the results of their decision. Actually, we had quite predetermined ideas of what kind of results and decisions were satisfactory to us. There were a lot of things that were already established on the staff which I never questioned and now wish I had. It was very clear that the school was not starting fresh with no rules and a lot of which I think were Mitchell's ideas, most of which I agreed with and trusted and was very happy not to question. In retrospect, there were some things that I went along with that I would have liked to stop and taken back to step one. I wish I had trusted myself more and put my sense of the world and my values and my little pieces of wisdom into the whole system more and not relied as much, not to have rested so safely in the leadership that Mitchell and Mark offered. I also felt that the staff process was the most touching and drew from the deepest parts of each of us than any experience of my life. I really appreciated the process that Mitchell and Mark had between the two of them--sort of caucusing separately--and getting things from seeds to sprouts and then bringing it to all of us to cultivate and nourish and develop.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. It was right on target in the heart and missed the boat a little bit in the brain. Something that's coming to mind is about drawing lines--I think we tolerated too much. I can remember times when the tough kids came in and there were moments when it was tyrannical. At times I think we were not firm enough about drugs and sex in drawing those lines. Some of what we assumed was beyond our control I believe was in the realm of our responsibility to monitor and limit.

The quality with which we embraced each person that came into that community was right on target--it was so clear that they had just never been met with that kind of acceptance and that kind of appreciation for who they are--their individuality. No one was unloved that came into that community--no one personal thing was that unlovable--and that was unique in the world--in most of these kids' worlds and in my life to a large extent also. Another way that we were right on target was our sense of the quality of the staff relationship being a model for relationships for the kids also. We were right on target in our valuing fun and humor and spontaneity and--there was a huge amount of enthusiasm on the part of the staff for working with these kids.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what
program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I would need to be reminded of program change. I wasn't there for some major changes that occurred. We developed a summer program while I was there and an apprenticeship program where kids were going out of the community to do work and learn skills and stuff. Other than these I can't really think of any specific changes in programming. In a way there was constant change; and when I think back to my time at Maple Valley about five years ago now, I remember the essence and the feelings more than other aspects.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I went from the frying pan into the fire. What I am doing now is working at the Hill School with what is termed severely emotionally disturbed and violent young adults 15 to 22 years old. Yes, of course, Maple Valley influenced that, in helping me to feel safe with young people who before that I was afraid of and afraid to confront especially. I've gotten much more courageous and demonstrative. What I am doing with them is expressive or creative therapies. I wish I could have done what I'm doing now at Maple Valley. I've been doing Art Therapy and I also use my Art Therapy knowledge in activities with other kids. I'm also doing more music than I ever did before. I just learned about play-back theatre, which is wonderful. It's a combination of community and personal development and art/theatre. I'm going to be incorporating that in some ways in the work I do at Hill. One of the ways in which Maple Valley influenced me is that I teach at the day school. I'm not part of the residence at all. My time at Maple Valley was the extent to which I was willing to be totally consumed with my commitment to the welfare of these young people 24 hours a day. One of the things I learned there was to set my limits. The quality of the staff relationships at Maple Valley is continuing to influence me in that I am still trying to deepen the quality of relating at Hill and develop trust and playfulness, encouraging all of us in learning to lead the staff in ways that establish safety between us so that we can really do our best work.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. What didn't Maple Valley do? Maple Valley did not...have a compost bucket. It really bothered me when I first got there. What didn't Maple Valley do? The slow development of conscientiousness of the environment and aesthetics...sometimes the place would get so trashed! Anyway, what didn't Maple Valley do? I don't know, I don't want to think about that now.
16. Any additional comments?

16. Um, I love you.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. What stands out the most for me about my experience at Maple Valley is the excitement of being a part of the creative nucleus of this dynamic organization over a period of many years—being a part of its development—its struggles and triumphs. My own personal and professional growth has been inextricably linked to the growth of the school and the other key individuals there.

Many students—now young adults—have been a large part of my life over the years. Their struggles and triumphs also stand out for me as well as the vital role that Maple Valley played in their lives.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I came to Maple Valley in the beginning of the second year of its existence, as a student teacher, dissatisfied with traditional education, seeking a relaxed experimental environment and was impressed with the staff and the creative process that they were involved in. I believed in what they were doing with children; it confirmed my own sense of values. Having read and gotten very excited by Rogers, Perls, Maslow and Neil, this seemed a rare opportunity for real learning. I had a sense that I could grow at Maple Valley. Integrating personal and interpersonal growth within a professional setting whose purpose was human development lacked the contradictions that had been frustrating to me in other educational settings. I was needing a creative, growthful experience, and that is what I found at Maple Valley School in a more profound sense than I could have imagined at the time.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Maple Valley has been a lasting experience in my life. My longest held adult commitment (other than to family) has been to this organization. The work I have done with children there has taught me invaluable lessons about life. My relationships with key individuals there have come to be some of the most important in my life. My association with both staff and students at Maple Valley over the years fills me with a sense of pride.
I am currently planning to leave Maple Valley to pursue family life and other creative career choices. As I approach leaving I realize that I do so with mixed emotions. I am filled with excitement about my new directions and at the same time I feel a sadness at the ending of so rich an experience. My experience at Maple Valley has had a profound effect on my personal development. That is the lasting effect that Maple Valley has had on my life.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning? There are many: the ways I understand people, development, the helping relationship, the effects of the cruelties of this world on children, their profound hurts and the debilitating effects of those hurts. My most useful learning has been how to be a part of a dedicated team of individuals facing a wide range of human experience in the form of disadvantaged, abused, neglected, hurt and angry adolescents, and actually helping them to grow in their abilities to trust, to cope, to learn, to become healthier more responsible adults, with self-confidence, motivation and the ability to love.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I would have liked to have had the opportunity to develop a more comprehensive art and design program at Maple Valley, and thereby develop my own skills in teaching this content area. Unfortunately, with limited resources and other priorities this was impossible. Other than that, I feel like I learned what I needed to, and more. I had the opportunity to work with exceptionally dynamic and sophisticated individuals in an atmosphere that encouraged learning. I also had the opportunity to combine my experience at Maple Valley with graduate study at the University in such a way that my learning was enhanced and stimulated by both. I was encouraged to share my expertise with the staff in workshops and staff meetings, which also served to strengthen my own skills and confidence through the years. Maple Valley has been a tremendous learning experience for me. I am more than satisfied; I am very grateful.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. Maple Valley tried to provide an alternative for adolescents. Early on this meant an alternative to the public school system and family structure which did not provide the psychological space, freedom and safety for them to reach their creative potential. Soon, it meant an alternative for children whose special needs could not be met within the traditional school system and whose families, when they were intact, were unable to meet their needs in the home setting. For what has become most of the life span of Maple Valley,
we have tried to provide adolescents with an alternative to lives of failure, rejection, neglect and abuse; an alternative to being bounced around in an all too often sterile, uncaring and dysfunctional system. We've tried to provide an education in psycho-emotional and social survival for kids who would otherwise become more and more cut adrift and alienated.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yes, I do. We always offered something very special and powerful to kids. The clear majority of the adolescents that came to Maple Valley left more able to cope with their individual situations as stronger, less angry, more responsible human beings. Were we successful with all the kids? Could we have done better? We were constantly learning and changing our strategies to better meet the needs of the individuals we serviced. Some kids didn't make it at Maple Valley; it was often a race with time—hoping the kid could begin to trust and invest in the program before he or she blew out. It's a two-way street. Sometimes the kids we had hoped to help didn't make it. That was always sad. We always had limits. I don't see that as failure. I'm proud that we gave so many kids, who so many people had given up on, a real chance and that most kids really did benefit from their experience at Maple Valley. I call that Success.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I was involved in all of the programmatic changes that occurred during the time I was there. I was more than satisfied with my involvement and felt that the changes we made were entirely appropriate given the times, the individuals we were working with, the goals we had for them, and the resources available. What I had to say, I said at the time. I always felt listened to. I was a part of a group whose decision-making process was exceptionally healthy, whose insight was multifaceted, and whose goals were consistently reexamined and refined, and whose commitment to human development was solid and applied to children and staff.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Program structures in the academic area have changed over the years with a decreasing freedom of choice for the students giving way to more and more in the way of basic skills and structural requirements. The amount of emphasis given to academics has been a direct reflection of underlying theoretical principles and changes in those theories over the years. Many classes were taught combining the actual content areas with both the basic skills
necessary for success in the literate world with personal development issues and interpersonal skills necessary for the socialization of these young people. With psycho-emotional and social needs as acute as they were for these individuals, at times academics had to take a back seat to personal and interpersonal development.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. Personal and interpersonal development was always the major emphasis at Maple Valley. This reflected both the values of the staff and the needs and goals of the adolescents we worked with. These issues were primary to any real learning that could take place for these kids. They needed to learn to understand their experiences and their feelings, to communicate their wants and needs, and to assert themselves effectively and nondestructively. This required a full-time emphasis and the Maple Valley staff was dedicated to that.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students, by staff, by leaders?

11. The decision-making process by the students has changed over the years as the population changed and we grew in our understanding of developmental issues that relate to appropriate decision-making functions. Sometimes this was difficult when it meant taking away some of the students' previously defined "rights" like the right to vote equally with the staff on school rules and responses to violations. Whatever the actual decision-making responsibilities they had at the time, the students' input was always highly valued. Time was always spent and care taken to explain the reasoning behind staff decisions in ways that made sense to the students and validated their feelings and concerns. I believe that most kids felt this. Staff decisions were made in the context of open discussion where again, input was valued. Individual concerns and feelings were validated. The emerging needs of a growing organization coupled with new larger political considerations prompted a refining of the staff decision-making process. Often the leaders assessed needs and made decisions which they then brought to the staff for consideration and comments. The level of staff input was appropriately geared to the nature of the programmatic issue. For example, fiscal decisions with organizational implications were not a part of the staff meeting agenda. The realm of staff decision-making involved issues pertaining to daily programmatic functioning and work with the student group. The organization remained small and committed to openness and accessibility. There were no issues that were arbitrarily off limits. The leaders were extremely sensitive to and respectful of their staff and this set the tone for
a very healthy work environment.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. Maple Valley was right on target in its creative growth process and in its ability to change without compromising its integrity. It was right on target in terms of the intelligent caring that was given to numerous children through the years in ways that inspired them and strengthened them to move beyond what sometimes appeared to be crippling odds. Whatever it was that we may have missed the boat on has to be truly insignificant given how right on target we were with the essentials. I can't think of anywhere that we missed the boat.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I saw the program change many times from its Summerhillian roots through its emerging emphasis on psychological education and the later incorporation of developmental theory as the basis for understanding children, goal setting and defining programmatic structures. I saw the organization change in its ability to reach out to a larger population of disadvantaged children. I saw the staff stretch and grow to meet the needs of this population. To say that these changes were positive would be an understatement. They reflected Maple Valley's fundamental dedication to these children.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I'm still at Maple Valley. I hope my enthusiasm for the work that we do is evident in my answers to other questions. I've felt a personal and professional commitment to and deep satisfaction from my involvement through the years. I look forward to life beyond Maple Valley--family and new career goals.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I don't know what Maple Valley should have or could have done beyond what it did. It was never the Utopia that those of us in the early years had hoped it would be. One thing it didn't do was compromise its integrity. It never did that, despite all the pressure and struggles.

16. Any additional comments?

16. It seems such a shame to me that there isn't more support in
our society for places like Maple Valley—that there's always a struggle to make ends meet, that we don't have such "luxuries" as a gym or a science lab that ordinary schools would take for granted. In addition, it seems ironic that there is dwindling support for disadvantaged kids and families who are gripped by increased turmoil and need. Maple Valley, as wonderful as it is, is very small and the need for such service is great.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Maple Valley represents a significant era in my life. The length of time I stayed, the variety of experiences I had, the profound richness of the personal growth support available, the friendships that will last a lifetime—all these things came at an important time in my life. I've emerged from this era feeling like I left home, feeling that I grew into mature adulthood. I was parented, loved, challenged. I parented others—I lived in closeness with others in a unique, special way. It's this aspect—the impact on me that stands out the most.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. My decision to go to live and work in the Maple Valley community was originally based on my need to explore options for myself professionally and personally. Professionally, the prospect of working in an alternative educational community seemed an exciting and valuable experience. It had the potential to be able to give me skills and mobility in the field. The community appealed to me because of the isolated, closed sense which promoted a closer, sharing level in working relationships. Mitchell, Mark, Annie and Lowell were the first people I met. They were all such vital, intelligent, exciting people. I wanted to become friends with them all—to share as well as learn from them. On a personal level, I needed to make a dramatic change in my relationships and mode of living. Wendell was more in line with the lifestyle that I was leading prior to taking over the Sunflower School, and wanted to continue to have.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. By all means, yes! As I mentioned in question 1, I feel that I've gained the most important friendships I could hope for in my life. These are friendships which enrich and nurture me as well as give me immense pleasure. I have the personal satisfaction, self-esteem, and pride in knowing that I was a part of building Maple Valley into a viable entity. In doing this, I found new
potential in myself. I'm capable of giving, working and caring for people in a way I never believed. I have the same pride in knowing that Maple Valley will continue to live and grow and provide the quality caring for kids that can hardly be matched by others. My experience as an educational coordinator stretched me in terms of my leadership ability, my ability to organize myself and my ability to handle complex situations confidently. I have Maple Valley and the valuable lessons learned there to use as a resource in my career pursuit.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning was the sophisticated overview of situations and the careful analysis, breakdown and implementation of ideas which key staff utilized for developing the program. The process of examining options and variables, trade-offs, priorities, outcomes, and defining issues accurately was excellent in terms of providing sound, workable results. There isn't any one method or technique in this process that stands out for me, because it was uniquely different depending on each individual's style. But, the overall meticulous, careful intensity and integrity brought to making decisions is what I found most valuable. I was often amazed at the thoroughness and depth with which they operated and their ability to turn over so many "stones" in their path to examine the variables underneath. In my endeavors in California, I have brought that sense of process with me and integrated it into my own unique style. The more resourceful and invested I become, the greater the end product for me. I often utilize this learning in working on problems, such as: "Mark would probably....", "Mitchell would be seeing....", "Fred would not stop until...."

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I wish I could have learned more about supervising an educational program. I found myself feeling deficient in terms of clarity and direction with the academic programming and disciplinary program as well as providing leadership for the teaching staff. This same leadership difficulty spilled over into other aspects of my position. The changes I mentioned above were new. I wanted to learn more while at Maple Valley, even though leaving has been productive for me.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. Maple Valley tried to accomplish a valid, reliable program for troubled adolescents where they could learn to value themselves, survive healthfully in their environment and become potentially healthier adults. Maple Valley has also tried to become (and is
becoming) an important establishment in the mental health field where families and individuals can receive important services. M.V. also tried to accomplish the creation of an organization which provides support, caring and promotes investment from its employees through giving genuine opportunity to reach each individual's potential. The sense of "family" which developed for a good percentage of the staff each year I was there, speaks to this accomplishment. Maple Valley is a "laboratory" where people have been experimenting with progressive theories and practices of group management, special education, psychological education, counseling, and an eclectic approach to mental health services in general. Either directly and intentionally, or indirectly, M.V. has been trying to accomplish the utilization of its program in these various areas. Maple Valley is trying to become an important, viable force in the human service field. It is trying to become a voice of recognition to help promote the notion of public support for social services. Maple Valley tried to become an independent, financially successful business which could withstand the economic stress of the the times and still remain capable of rendering quality services.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think Maple Valley was successful in the above. Over the period of time I was there, numerous changes occurred across the board from the administration to maintenance department. Externally, the politics and economics affecting the school have also changed dramatically. Both of these factors, the internal and external variables, could individually or collectively have had a devastating effect and caused the termination of the program. So, overall, there were enough strengths in the program with its successes to keep it alive and moving. For most of my time at Maple Valley there was a strong core of staff who were there from the program's inception for 2-4 year periods. This group worked through issues of interpersonal relationships, program development and personal needs, together creating a functional, trusting, dynamic staff whose relationships were more than just sharing tasks. The openness and willingness of the leaders to include and solicit input into certain aspects of the program helped cement the sense of investment and "We're all in this together." Their diligence in terms of promoting a healthy staff, one which doesn't perpetuate covert, destructive negativism is a special, somewhat unique quality to Maple Valley that just doesn't exist too often in other organizations. The programmatic success at Maple Valley can be measured by the quality care students are receiving. The variety of techniques and theories being utilized, experimented with, all contributed towards these ends. I experienced success in educational growth in students, individual and group counseling with students, and major program renovations addressing residential group
care and management. The key to this success still exists in the willingness to experiment and the resources to implement these changes. One final comment about success. Mitchell and Mark developed an influential voice in the human services system which has lifted Maple Valley into the public service system as an establishment. This accomplishment is perhaps the most profound success of all.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. In retrospect, I would have focused more on structuring the awake time overall in the program. As the program became increasingly populated with more seriously troubled students, I think a crucial change should have been to move more concretely towards supervision and structure throughout the day and evening until bedtime. Upon reflection, there are probably a good percentage of incidents that occurred because of this "loophole." Also, because of this population change, I would have separated the males' and females' dorm space physically and with more security throughout the night. I think a split-shift schedule for the counselor staff would have helped in terms of providing back-up in the day program and consistency from day to day. I think more frequent staffings, specifically about the children, would have been helpful in terms of learning goals and techniques. Even though we were all receiving outside training and in-service training, I believe we needed even stronger skills and/or knowledge base as a staff. Perhaps, one or more hours per week could be set aside with 10-15 minute intervals devoted to each student. Discussions should be extremely structured to goals and techniques with a few minutes for general comments.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. The academic picture was constantly changing. By the time I left, I think an appropriate emphasis was being placed on academics. There was a great deal of experimentation with academics ranging from a very creative, eclectic program to a basic skills approach. I think there are important aspects to learning that must be addressed, and academics is one of them. It is the "business" of growing that prepares children for surviving in our society as it exists. Emphasizing basic skills for those in need is important. The emphasis on psychological education and integrated curriculum was important and was developing when I left. I think these themes should be strongly emphasized.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?
10. For the student population, personal/interpersonal development could never be overemphasized when it's done as intelligently and therapeutically as it was at M.V. I think the freedom of interaction, the language norms and role modeling provided, combined with important interventions, helped improve social skills for students and provide a healthy means for communication. Staff development proved to be a great strength in the program because it promoted a sense of importance in communication on an interpersonal level which eased the process of dealing with interpersonal conflict and stress. I mentioned earlier the sense of "family" which developed for me. I learned through the interpersonal development training and everyday operations how to use communication effectively. Probably, the more important aspects for one was intrapersonal development. Since the key to my continuing in this field meant developing my own personal powers, I found this extremely useful. There was also tremendous relevance to my life in general.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. As the population evolved to more troubled, lower-skilled students, the privileges of decision-making about their lives diminished appropriately. It seems that the shift from the kids making the final decisions about community to decisions coming from staff was much more appropriate and effective for the population. I always felt a part of the decision-making process at Maple Valley on almost all levels of the program—and enjoyed the pressure and challenge created by being given such a large role to play. I think that, rightfully so, the decisions of business management and administration were removed from staff. The structure provided a vehicle for me to assert my values, beliefs, theories and techniques—what more could a staff member ask for? Leadership at M.V. has always (except for a short period) been exceptional in my view. Strength, clarity, compassion, accessibility, and carefully planned introduction of issues always impressed me and instilled a sense of loyalty and devotion.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. Maple Valley was right on target in terms of emphasizing the relevant, critical aspects of adolescent issues. These messages came through clearly in terms of the response to the program from students, care providers, families and regulatory commissions. Maple Valley was able to scramble with the changes in regulations and personalities involved in regulations to secure a respected position in group residential care and human services in general. Maple Valley dynamically increased its ability to draw from theory, research and pragmatic techniques. I'm probably too subjective to
talk about where we "missed the boat."

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I saw the change from private-paying students to public funding. I saw the change from complete autonomy in program design to compliance with public regulatory commissions. I saw the change from a "Summerhill" format to a structured therapeutic milieu utilizing behavioral/humanistic concepts and techniques. I saw the role of the teacher/counselor have more of a job-specific focus, with the installation of evening and overnight staff and an evening director. I saw academics become a mandatory responsibility. I saw drugs, violence and sexuality issues cease to be immediate cause for expulsion from the program. I saw the installation of the behavioral system's top honor, the "White House." I saw the expansion of the program to a 12-month year. I saw the educational program evolve into a viable, functional program. Yes, they were positive. They addressed the real needs of students in terms of safety, limits and containment as well as creating Maple Valley as an important program for troubled adolescents.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I am currently working as an educational therapist in an acute care psychiatric hospital as part of an adolescent treatment team. Maple Valley was my classroom experience for providing the quality of care that addresses clinical therapy issues and translates them into pragmatic program techniques to meet the goals of therapy. My administrative experience provided a base for developing leadership abilities. I have been influential in this program's development and in providing in-service staff training. I am also helping to develop a private therapy practice into a mental health organization. My main focus is a home tutorial/counseling service and special education instruction, testing, diagnosis and treatment planning. Maple Valley again was my springboard for ideas and training both in developing the program and learning the administrative/management aspect.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Provide a retirement/pension plan. (Just a joke!)

16. Any additional comments?

16. I hope the highly positive, subjective tone is helpful towards your research and doesn't miss the constructive criticism you might
be seeking as well. This was an emotionally charged, difficult, wonderful experience—filled me with Maple Valley as if I just left—and invokes powerful feelings of wanting to return.
Staff Interview

Name: Frederick
Sex: M

Employed from: 9/76
to: Still Employed

Position:
Teacher/Counselor
Assistant Director
Clinical Coordinator

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. There are three things that stand out for me. The first is the opportunity to be with children and facilitate their growth in ways that felt very real. I always felt that I was dealing with vital and important issues in their lives. Also my use of my "self," my feelings, experiences, etc., along with a variety of approaches, was and is guided by coherent principles and not by arbitrary guidelines. Second is the incredible group of adults that Maple Valley has attracted and held over the years. People of the personal and professional quality of Mitch, Mark, Annie, Carl, Will, Rick, Dennis, Phil and Jerry B., to name several, are rare to find, let alone to find them all in one place. Third, Maple Valley has allowed and helped me to stay on my growing edge as a person and a professional for many years.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I was trained as a social studies teacher and spent eighteen months looking for a job. During my training and student teaching I became more and more interested in the social and psychological lives and growth of my students, and wanted to be in a school that considered this at least as important and legitimate a conscious focus as academics. Maple Valley offered me a job, and an opportunity.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. The lasting effects on my life of Maple Valley would fill many, many pages. I have gained invaluable skills as a teacher, counselor, group facilitator, clinician, writer, leader and administrator. I have learned many things about myself, some of them profound. And I have made friendships of a kind I didn't know were possible.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I think perhaps my most useful and far-reaching learning has
been my own sense of myself as a competent and worthwhile person, who has something real and important to offer to the children and adults around him.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. This is a hard one. I guess I could have learned more as a clinician had circumstances been different when I was Clinical Director. I always felt some of my talents were not being utilized, although I understood why.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. Another hard one. The broadest answer is that we were and are trying to help children increase the amount of choice, autonomy and control in their personal, social, family, and work lives. We try to repair some of the damage done, to impart some skills, to give children the experience of living and learning in a loving, caring, consistent, and challenging environment. We help them learn to survive.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above?

7. I think we were and are more often than not. We have been in many ways pioneers, learning as we go, and our adaptation to new populations, political trends, and organizational shifts has not always been smooth, but we always regain our equilibrium, and I am constantly amazed to see, sometimes not for years after a child has left, what a difference we really have made.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Two things I can think of here. First, I wish we had done more sooner with vocational training and aftercare planning. Too often kids left us with a tremendous amount of personal growth, and even a diploma, but with no real concrete alternatives to the idiotic way in which a lot of the people around them make their living. Because of this, some kids ended up at home again when they really shouldn't have, got into legal trouble, etc. Secondly, I wish we could have done more for and with the families, although a lot of factors made that difficult.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. For me this is a question of priorities. Clearly our financial and personnel resources were used first where they were needed most. I don't think we ever reached the potential that we
have for a rich and varied psychoeducative curriculum, although we get closer all the time.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. These are the most important things to me, the things that these kids will probably never get any place else. It is the umbrella under which everything else fits. How could it be overemphasized?

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think we have struggled for a long time to find a developmentally-appropriate balance in terms of student decision structures. I have seen the chaos that can result when they have too much, and the apathy and hostility when they have too little. It seems to me that the new wing meetings are a good step. The trick is to make the structures flexible enough to allow for individual growth.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I have talked a lot about where we were on target. The emphasis on a Rogerian counseling environment, on development as an aim and a model, the insistence on relationships as the main vehicle for growth, etc. One way I think we missed the boat was in not building enough opportunities for kids to pick up concrete, marketable skills. I think of this especially for some of the inner city kids from a delinquent background and subculture. What many of them lacked from us was the concrete ways (not the desire) to survive economically; the criminal world is very attractive when it's all around you and you don't have other ways to make reasonable money, feel respected, etc.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I saw many, many changes—diploma program, house parents, summer work program, abolishment of emergency meetings, in-school jobs, TR, privilege levels, the White House, etc. Overall though the most dramatic change was when we began to use the BPE model and Developmental Theory. Although these were not specific program changes, they lead to many changes, and, more importantly, they helped us to navigate, understand and respond to some difficult changes in the population, the political climate, etc. The BPE
served for me as a meta theory. It formed a coherent framework in which to approach many tasks—development of clinical and program strategy, integration of various theoretical frameworks, staff development, crisis intervention, etc. Developmental theory was and is useful in all three of the BPE columns. It was a way to understand the kids better (P), to guide and tailor interventions (E), and to select, operate, analyze and modify goals. These models form, to this day, cornerstones of my educational, clinical, and philosophical framework.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I am still working at Maple Valley on a consulting basis. I am finishing my Ed.D. and doing some teaching at the university level. My experience at Maple Valley has made me want to stay in the field, and has given me a clearer focus on what I want to do in the areas of theory and practice, hence the Ed.D. Being able to work at Maple Valley pursuing my doctorate has helped me to maintain a dynamic interplay between theory and practice in many areas.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I'm not sure what to say other than things I have already said.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Yes. In looking back at my response to question II, I see that I neglected to answer the part about staff decision-making structures. There has been a trend away from direct "democratic" decision-making (I use the term as a relative one, not an absolute), that has, by and large, matched up well with the evolving needs of the organization, especially with regard to the number and complexity and sensitivity of the decisions that have to be made. There have been times when I and others, have not been as active as we could have been. This often leads to a dissatisfaction with "decision-making," which is not the real issue. The real issues often center around support, inclusion, etc., which may be, but are not necessarily addressed through the decision-making process.

Thanks for asking me to do this. It is always enjoyable and productive to reflect back on my experience at Maple Valley. For one thing, it helps me feel once again what a special place it really is, full of special people, including you.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   1. The things that really stand out for me are first, the exhaustion that I felt by the end of the time I was there. And second, the personal development that I went through not only while there, but after having been there. Those are the things that stand out for me. You know, nightmares about some of the kids continue—no, actually they stopped about a year ago.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   2. I came to Maple Valley because I was hungry to do something important, to make a name for myself, and to throw myself into a situation where I would be tested and where I could put to work my own skills and energy and enthusiasm and the whole Humanistic Education and Counseling thing that had come to life for me in the few years of my life prior to when I came to Maple Valley. It was a real opportunity. It was real people in a real setting and exciting and on the edge—it was a dream come true—to find that kind of setting in which to set about realizing some of my own professional development and ambitions and also some of my more philosophical, self-actualizing kinds of ideas. It was all of those things.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   3. It was really the first time in my life when I set out to do something in that realm, that professional, academic, achievement-oriented realm, that I wasn't successful. Not only was I not successful, but on some level, the harder I tried, the more love I gave to those kids, the more I attempted to stretch, the more my self-esteem and my heart and soul were on the line with every relationship and every meeting. After going through that I ended up feeling pretty defeated about it—not because I don't know that there were lots of successes, and that I added a lot to the program, and that I was a part of moving the program philosophically, in directions in which it really needed to go as we began to deal with a whole different population of kids who had a whole different set of needs, like learning how not to end every conversation with an angry outburst. It was really a growing up experience for me and I have all kinds of positive associations with the people and the
place and the experience. I have such a positive feeling about it because there was such learning for me.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. And that leads right into this next question because when I came out of Maple Valley, I was able to reflect on all the different pieces of what went on. I was really putting it together in terms of why it didn't work? Well it really didn't work because I was trying to be someone other than who I really am. In some ways this led me to some sort of self-acceptance around my own limitations and an appreciation of my own gifts as a person. In a fundamental sense, from that time on I've never even come close to feeling the kind of unsettled, vague distress about who am I trying to be and whether it will ever work out and those kinds of things. So what I learned is really who I was and who I wasn't and who I could become if I could accept who I was now. So as hard an experience as it was, I don't have any question that it was worthwhile for what I got out of it, and that I did a lot of wonderful professional growing at the same time. I mean I really accomplished what I set out to do professionally, even though it was quite different than what I had in mind at the outset.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I guess the feeling that I have about it is that I did and went through what I needed to go through—I learned that there are no shortcuts. As hard as it was to go through it, I don't have any regrets about it or second guesses. I don't have anything but good feelings about how I went through it. I wish I could have been more grown up before I went into it. I wish I could have not been so close professionally to what I was trying to accomplish on a personal level, so that I could have learned more—if I went back to Maple Valley today, as director, I could do a much better job than I ever could have then. And that's not because I spent a whole lot of time working on my counseling skills between now and then. It's because I'm much more secure as a person and as an adult. When a kid told me to "fuck you," it would no longer be a big personal deal for me. So I wish I could have learned that distance, that separation for myself sometime through that process so that it wasn't necessary for me to go through all the heartache that I went through, and for the program to go through all the turmoil it went through because of that. I really set myself and the program up for a whole lot of turmoil as a direct result of my inability to choose the terms on which conflicts took place.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?
6. One of the wonderful things about being at Maple Valley for me was that Maple Valley was trying to design a program and live a life and make a way for dealing with kids that was rooted in our own personal ideas and ideals about what being a human being was about; in terms of taking responsibility, in terms of being open and available, and in terms of being real with each other as people and teaching the kids the value of being real with themselves. We were looking to have a program that could be transferred to other places and that could be built into educational theories; it was an exciting time for all of us.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think the program has in large part been successful. It was so different than what I expected when I first got there. I had come out of this other school where I was dealing with the kind of kids that Maple Valley started out dealing with--middle class kids who were unhappy and bored or whatever in traditional settings--and that's a population that I was personally much better equipped to deal with. I sort of expected to do that. So, given what we were faced with, given financial survival in the state and given the types of kids that we were called on to deal with, we began to restructure the program in ways that made it viable and not only made it viable, but made it possible to maintain and extend so that it could be successful. I don't think that I was successful as director establishing that kind of program because of the personal things that I talked about before. At the point at which I left the school, it was needing something other than the leadership that I was providing to reestablish itself and to survive. So, there was a missing link at that time that had nothing to do with theories and ideals and those kinds of things.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I think that by the end, we had made the necessary program changes. I think the key thing that could have turned it around was if you had stayed on for an overlapping period so that I could have seen what it really looked like to work successfully with those kinds of kids. That's a staffing change more than a programmatic change. But, we moved the program in the direction where there was more behavioral accountability for the kids--where there were more and clearer limits and boundaries for kids, where responsibility was taught not simply in an abstract sense but in a behavioral and "earning your way" sense by demonstrating that you can effectively manage your own life. I remember being affected by Glasser and the need for students in that kind of setting to be held accountable for their behavior. So, I think in large measure, we moved the program in the direction it needed to go. We might have done that sooner
but all things being equal, we saw what needed to be done and we began to do it.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized?

9. Academics were, as they must be in that kind of setting, secondary. They were underemphasized in the overall scheme of things, but there were more important things that had to be taken care of. In an ideal world we would have had a better academic program set up and functioning but that wasn't where we were coming from and we began to make steps in that direction.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I really think that's where it was at! It has to be with those kids with that kind of developmental framework. The important thing about personal and interpersonal emphasis is that people be dealt with in real ways, and be held accountable for their behavior in real ways that are not punitive and not destructive to who they are. Once those things are in place, it doesn't matter whether it happens in an "Outward Bound" program or in a class or out working in the garden or whatever. I think we got more sophisticated as time went on about the need to have more structured activities taking place, but we also knew that with the kinds of kids we were dealing with, everything had to begin with the personal and interpersonal. And, I still agree with that.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. When we first started, the students had too much to say—I mean, we got into all kinds of trouble early on by having a structure that was set up for kids at a very different developmental level than the ones that were there when I came in as Program Director. We were probably about right with the staff and with the leaders, but we would have saved ourselves all kinds of headaches if we had run a different kind of program for the students as far as decision-making went. The kids we had then could hardly manage their own lives and had no business having the illusion that they could run the community's effectively.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. I don't think it completely missed the boat anywhere. With as much difficulty as we had at times, agencies all over the state continued to view us as a successful, effective program and so I don't think we missed the boat at all. It was that we had higher
ideals and higher standards for what we were trying to accomplish than 90% of the programs that I'm familiar with that were active in human services at that time. Most of the people who were running programs were talking about when to use physical restraint rather than how to set up a program that really worked for helping kids realize how they were hurting themselves on a day-to-day basis with their behavior. So with all our struggles, I think we were right on target in terms of what we were trying to accomplish. We could have handled the transition better in terms of the shifting population of kids. Having a few kids who were angry and acting-out was not a programmatic problem when the core of the student body was active and involved and self-directed, but when that core of students was gone, we should have been more on top of what implications that really had for the program. But, it was a little hard to take a few months off and restructure the program. We also could have done a better job in defining what kind of staff person we needed for a changing set of kids--instead of having so many middle class idealists, we could have looked for people who had more experience and capacity for dealing with the angrier "street kids".

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. We did away with the emergency meetings and instituted a morning meeting which was much shorter and to the point and run by adults. We began to enforce time limits and boundaries that were meaningful and gave the kids a sense of where they stood in the course of a day. We instituted all kinds of specific rules about personal hygiene and systems for enforcing that. We just moved the whole program in the direction of more structure and more accountability for the kids. Well, the key thing here, is that we shifted from a program where the kids defined the agenda to one where adults defined what was appropriate; and, that was a gradual evolution. Some of this occurred as a result of the external pressure of having to negotiate with the needs of state human service agencies. But most of it occurred internally, because it was clear to us that we needed to restructure the whole program so that it would worked better. Well, I definitely think the changes we instituted were positive on the program level--there's no question about that.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I'm a mortgage banker in a family business back in Birmingham, Alabama and the experience that I went through at Maple Valley had a whole lot to do with redefining where my gifts really are. And that doesn't mean that I inevitably ended up in business because of that, but it does mean that I stopped beating up on
myself to be somebody or to achieve something in the educational and counseling world—and to look for something that was stimulating and satisfying and fulfilling for me. This led me to where I am now, which I feel very good about. My experience at Maple Valley had a whole lot to do with that. An ancillary part of that has to do with what I saw of government agencies and government bureaucracies and public school systems while I was at Maple Valley. I made the absolute determination that I wasn't going to spend my life being dependent on the public sector for what I was doing. To be talented and creative and routinely having to answer to people who never did and never would understand half of what I was trying to accomplish with kids in and of itself had a tremendous impact on me. I knew I didn't want to be a therapist in private practice and I knew I didn't want to be in public systems. It was, given that, pretty hard to stay in counseling and education.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Well, what it didn't do in those years, I really think of now as what I didn't do, because I never really had any limits placed on me by Mitch and Mark. What I didn't do was take enough control of the total atmosphere of the place to redirect it in the way that it needed to move.

16 Any additional comments?

16. Buy low and sell high! And, always think Plastics!
Staff Interview

Name_ Jerry Sex M
Employed from_ July 1977
to_ June 1983
Position Teacher/Counselor

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   1. I can remember a real sense of community. I didn't know if that was typical or not for the human service field but it was definitely unusual from my previous experience. I came to Maple Valley and there were six of us that did everything. And, there was never really any question about how much we got paid or if it was overtime or whether it was on the schedule or not. None of those questions seemed to apply. The issue was, what needed to be done and what was the best way that we could do it? Everything seemed to revolve around the needs of the students. It involved things like who was going to cook breakfast in the morning to who was going to drive kids to work to who was going to cover during staff meetings. We, as a group, just understood that we had a 24-hour operation and that meant we had to cover the needs of the population. So, I can remember my coming on here at a time when the demands were great but so was the sense of comradery I felt with other staff people.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   2. My primary motivation for coming to Maple Valley was a change in my personal life situation. I was trying to get into a career where I could both work and be a parent. Another factor was that I wanted to work in a human services type situation; just the idea of working with people instead of things was an idea that appealed to me. Working in a school with kids that were having difficulties was something I thought was important. Just prior to coming to Maple Valley I did a short stint in a nearby public school and found that very dissatisfying--which made me even question if I still wanted to be involved in the field. When I came to Maple Valley I found that the problems that I had with the public school system didn't exist at Maple Valley. I felt challenged and satisfied with what I was doing. So, there were really two reasons for coming; both a personal desire to do this kind of work and the kind of flexibility in my work life that Maple Valley provided.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   3. The positive and lasting benefits that Maple Valley has had on my life has been an exploration into a different career field at a
place that also supports and encourages personal growth and exploration. So, I feel that I grew both as an individual and as a professional in a new career field. I believe that during my tenure at Maple Valley I've been successful in this field as a teacher/counselor. And, I've also had the chance to examine who I am in relation to other people and in relation to children. I've learned some valuable things about myself. I really feel like my life has benefited as a result.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. The most useful thing that I've learned and something that has universal value to me regardless of what setting I'm in, is the ability to interact with people and influence them without necessarily having a hierarchical or structured role in the interaction. In my previous situation, I was a supervisor and therefore could and would expect that things I wanted to get done would get done just because of my position. At Maple Valley, in working with those children who have defied those figures and adults in general, I found that I had to learn to influence their lives in a certain way without having position-power. So, I had to develop my persuasive and reasoning skills and also my willingness to listen. This has been a useful lesson for me and has enhanced my ability to positively interact with all people. This has been the most useful thing. Specifically, I feel that I carry a broad range of skills with me as well.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. While I was working at Maple Valley, I was also enrolled in a graduate program in counseling and had an opportunity to learn a variety of intervention strategies and various therapies. The nature of my role at Maple Valley didn't allow me to explore this learning firsthand. I was able to explore some of those things, but not many. For instance, I was involved in taking courses in family therapy, learning structural and strategic approaches, and couldn't do that at the school because we weren't that involved with families. Another example is that I was learning psychoanalytic therapy and we just didn't do that kind of work at the school. So, the idea is that I didn't have all the opportunity to try to operationalize all the various therapies and modalities I was learning.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I would say the primary goal of Maple Valley was to allow for the growth of individuals. There was support for both staff and students to grow. There were opportunities and encouragement for staff to grow as people because that was seen as a primary way in
which they could learn to help others to grow. Now, that began to change a little toward the end of that period. The children were much needier and required that much more time and energy from the staff. So there was less of a focus on staff personal development. We understood that our primary goal was to be there for the children to help them grow, both psychologically and in academic and practical ways and to be able to be more successful than they had been when they reentered the world at large.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think for the most part Maple Valley was successful in both areas—in helping staff and students to grow. From my own personal experience, I know that I grew tremendously and I was aware of that and valued it while it was happening. I observed that same thing in other staff who came and went. I saw countless kids come to Maple Valley who were troubled; and, as a result of their experience at Maple Valley and with the adults here, they really grew. Most were better able to look at themselves and know more about what they were about, what their problematic behaviors were, maybe why they had problems in the past, what kinds of consequences usually resulted from those behaviors, and what was reasonable to expect. Over and above the behavioral issues, a lot of them came in here unable to care or trust people and were able to experience that—some for the first time.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Toward the beginning of my time here, I think there was too much of a willingness on the staff's part to not hold kids accountable for some behavior that was clearly unacceptable. Some of those kids engaged in things that were destructive to themselves and the community. And although they were dealt with and called out on it, in some cases it didn't end with their leaving the program early enough. There was a tolerance for certain behavior that I think was harmful to the program. But, in most of these cases, the necessary program changes did come about—so, in hindsight maybe I would have made the changes sooner. I think the kinds of changes that needed to take place did. We were learning as we were going along; so, in a sense, we had to experience some failure before we knew what needed to change.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. When I came here, there was a carry-over atmosphere from the "free school" days that existed right from the beginning. At that point I wasn't sure, being new to the field, what was the right
thing. The hope was that even if they weren't doing academics, they were engaged in personal growth—that it didn't have to happen in the classroom. I believed in that concept. What I saw happening with some kids was that it seemed that they weren't engaging in anything. Maybe that represented a necessary time-out for a kid. I'm not sure. I remember feeling frustrated. So, I did feel that there was a lack of emphasis. The idea of kids being self-motivated to learn was not generally applicable to the population that I was working with. As time went on, we changed from the "free school" notion to the idea that we needed to insist on the kids being engaged in at least the "basics"—reading, writing, and math. Also, they were still allowed some real choice in other areas. After a period of time, I think that kids began to feel better about themselves and that made me feel good. So, the emphasis toward increased academics was beneficial and by 1981 had gotten to a very good place where there was a pretty rich curriculum and kids were clearly expected to be involved and it felt like there was a lot of learning taking place and that kids were really interested in the academic program. It wasn't a forced situation.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. It was given primary importance. That was consistent with our view of where most kids were at in their lives. I really could see where a lot of kids were stunted in their ability to learn because of turmoil either in their families or in their own personal lives; so this learning needed primary attention before they could advance academically. The degree of emphasis changed with individual kids in specific situations. As kids advanced in their personal growth and stabilized their own individual situation, emphasis began to be placed on other things like academics or preparing them to move on into the world. Sometimes staff felt frustrated with a particular kid who was not engaging in the academic program. But, in looking at the entire situation, most of the time, it made a lot of sense.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. The entire decision-making structure for the organization changed from a majority rule format. When I first got here, the whole community would get together to make decisions. The kids were given one vote, the same as the staff. When it became apparent that kids were not respecting the process, like trying to manipulate it, maybe to make an angry statement against the adults, we knew that changes needed to take place. And the changes that did take place involved the adults assuming more control of the decision-making. Complimenting that was a growth of the numbers of staff at the school, and the leaders became more in control of decisions
affecting the staff group. In the beginning the staff group was involved in every decision except things that involved regulatory agencies etc. But, as the staff grew, the decision-making shifted over to supervisors and leaders. In fact the title of "Supervisor" took on more of the conventional meaning and responsibility. There was a transition that was taking place that seemed to make sense as it was happening.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. The first part of that question is easier for me to answer. The reason why Maple Valley is important, is the reason why I'm still here. Kids came to Maple Valley with serious problems in their lives, and what they found at Maple Valley were adults who were tolerant but consistent, who were willing to provide them with caring but also to enforce limits; and, as a result, kids found that they could allow themselves to be controlled by adults—to be influenced by adults—to be influenced by the situation they were in and receive some real benefit to their lives. When kids acted responsibly, they received respect and recognition not only from the adults, but from their peers. Generally, I think kids learned here that they could become a part of a society, a community, and feel good about themselves. They could see that improvements in their behavior not only benefit themselves but their entire living situation. And, this would make them feel better about themselves in the process. So, in this way the school is right on target. Kids learned how to care for others and be cared for. Where Maple Valley missed the boat—this probably happened in individual situations. It would not be with the program at large. I believe that there were some kids who came to the school whose needs weren't properly recognized or strategies that were used were off target or maybe where it was just a mismatch for a kid and Maple Valley. I don't believe there were a lot of kids like this but there were some whom we had where we just missed. So, in a general sense, Maple Valley doesn't miss the boat. I went through a number of transitions on both program and organizational levels that were very difficult to experience. But, in retrospect, I see that those experiences and changes were necessary and important.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. During the time I've been at Maple Valley I saw leaders change, and with those changes, there were program changes. I also saw different types of kids come and go and the program changed as a result. We began to use a privilege level system that for some kids reflected how, in a concrete way, their behavior for the day was.
We moved away from the whole idea of kids' "rights" to holding kids accountable for their behavior. This began, as many other changes did, as an experiment with a few kids and led to major overall program changes by 1981.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well, I'm still at Maple Valley, and just started a new position here in an administrative capacity and I'm no longer in direct care. During my time at the school, I got to the point where I wanted to try something different—I felt that I had done enough in direct care after doing it for six years—and it just so happened that an opportunity existed at Maple Valley at a time when I was ready to change, so we were able to come to an agreement on that.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. My first reaction is that what Maple Valley didn't do is what so many of the places that began like we did in the sixties with all the love and idealism didn't do—continue on as this happy little community of adults and children loving each other and living happily ever after. Of course, I'm saying that facetiously; but, at that time, there were some people like myself who wanted to find that place—that Nirvana or Utopia. And my sense is that in its own unique way, Maple Valley was trying to do that. The school wasn't able to continue with that dream. I don't know of any places that really have. Some of that sort of thing had subsided by the time I joined the school. And the school has developed into this human service agency dealing with troubled kids in a successful way.

16. Any additional comments?

16. Well, another thing that comes to mind—and I don't know if its appropriate here or not—is that the organization has moved away from being person-specific, where it was founded by a few dynamic and competent people, to the type of organization that can exist, that doesn't depend on any specific individual. It will always need the kind of vitality and energy and competence that was there from the beginning. But, Maple Valley has been trying to become the kind of place where any one personality can't determine the school's success or failure. It has been attempting to create a "system" that would ensure its success. And that's a significant shift that I've seen take place here. I remember when we started to have real turnover with staff, where I, as one individual, would feel pangs of remorse or sadness with someone leaving the "family" to moving to more of a view and feeling that I am part of an agency that exists more independent of specific individuals.
Staff Interview

Name: Kathy-Ann  Sex: F
Employed from: January 1978 to October 31, 1981
Position: Houseparent/Counselor

1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. Individuals, and the collective group of individuals, the focus that was on each other and the caring that was always there.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. A Maple Valley kid had been staying at our house and that was nice, but I was always a little suspicious of Maple Valley. It was like an elephant came into town—what is it? Everybody trying to check it out without getting too close. So we both wanted a job and it seemed like maybe we could get a job there. We knew Carl and it seemed exciting but I wasn't sure because I was pretty raw material for a place like that. We also needed a place to live. We were at a major juncture and Maple Valley seemed like a real adventure and it seemed like a good idea to be part of that adventure.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Well I think that I am in the nursing program because I learned a lot of skills at Maple Valley. I was taught a lot of skills, and I wanted to go somewhere with them after that. I also learned a lot about my weaknesses too, and I felt that nursing was a good way to pursue that nurturing part that I had without needing some of the limit-setting abilities that I had less of. The two combined and I felt like I learned a lot about myself. So I think it was a direct path.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. Well, I wish I'd been able to hear a lot of what I was learning. I think the biggest problem that I personally had was separating the anxieties out from how I perceived the scene, and at the point that I was there, during the earlier parts of my time there, that was worked on heavily. But I don't think I really learned that until I left and looked back on it. I still feel like I'm learning the lessons from there. I still work on pieces of this and that and learning to see just how much is mine. It's like unpeeling layers and looking at it again.
6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. To enable kids to learn skills to survive, and that included trying to give them a sense of self-respect, giving them a little bit of space to look at themselves and see that other people found them valuable and to be able to express themselves as if they had value in a safe environment where they were seen probably for the first time.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Yes. As I talk to kids now that have gone there—they're still learning, they still want to talk about things that happened there—things that they learned and are re-learning. These are kids that have been away from there awhile now that sometimes the learning is a couple steps beyond and they still trace a lot of them almost as if they were born there. That was when they began to have the space to express themselves and not just be reacting to fear. So I think, from the kids that I've talked to, I do think that it was successful. Sometimes some of the kids say, "Oh, I think I would have liked to have had a little more science," or something, but the thing is that they got the strengths to be able to initiate activity on their own, to go back and pick up some science if they want. The kids that I see and talk to are ones that have really good feelings about Maple Valley, so I know that my perspective is colored by that. I'm not associated enough with the school to hear the stories of the ones that we might have missed. The ones I do hear from see Maple Valley as their family so they want to share their successes with people.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I have problems with that question because we tried as we saw problems arise; it was always a flexible experience. We tried to respond with capabilities and ingenuity and I thought there was a lot of ingenuity, like when there was a problem with the night program, say, different changes were made. I couldn't answer the question with suggestions about what we could have done better because I think we tried the best that we could with what we had. So I wouldn't have criticism.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think what Maple Valley did was get kids ready for learning and a lot of the experiences they just weren't ready; they had so much going on inside that there was just no learning readiness there. I think in every way we tried to plug that learning in.
There were excited teachers there who were willing to go when the kids were ready, but it was forward and back, forward and back; the kids needed a lot of work on themselves and in getting their self-concepts ready to go before they could take on all that external stuff. So to me the question doesn't even pertain to what my experience was there with those kids because a lot of those kids came out ready with a stronger self-concept. Then they could go out and learn, and they left feeling so good about themselves that they were able to grab ahold of something they wanted and feel like, "Yeh, I want to do this, and I can!"

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. Well, certainly emphasized. I don't think it was underemphasized; it was a need, an absolute need, and so it was emphasized in everything that we did.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well it was really amazing to me because it was your dream and you invented it and always have been the inventors but, the amazing thing is that people, kids and staff could feel like that too. It was significant to me that kids could feel like they had a part in their life, too, and that they could make some kind of controls and that they could be taught. A lot of what I think we did there was teaching kids to not feel victimized by things that were going on but to see how maybe they could make a change, and the decision-making process allowed for a kid to make a change in his life, and the staff could too. That was one of the big things that was going on—constant decision-making in keeping with what was going on and the times and the needs. It was really important that the kids could feel like they actually had a part in the decisions that were being made.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target--where did it miss the boat?

12. The same theme. I think that kids were able to start again in a new place with people who were caring and supportive and not always be dominated by their fears but able to have some confidence and grow and be excited and be kids. That was something you always said, and I would sometimes be astonished when you'd say it because it was easy to forget, but you would always say, "There kids!", and they got a chance to do that. They also got a chance to start making changes and looking at themselves and picking what they liked and changing what they didn't like. What I think about not being on target is that maybe they could have felt more involved in the
community, and I'm not sure how that might have happened. It worked really well being the school community, if maybe they could have swept over into the broader community that would have been ideal. But that's a tall order.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. Well, there were nine million. And it is hard to pick one. So I won't. I couldn't pick one. I just think it was part of the flow, always reexamining. People were so earnest that they made those new ways to do things. Most changes were not that drastic. It was always a process of reexamination and it came from the best energy that people had, so I really think that they were good changes and they usually were precipitated by some need that people saw, like coed kinds of things, or building changes—how we could see ourselves interacting with the buildings, or rules etc. All those things were needs or directly related to a need. It was always a process. There was nothing static about Maple Valley. So it was always action, interaction, change, looking at it and changing again. It was really amazing to think that it was you guys' dream and that so many other people got invested in it, that it was always new and different.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Now I'm in Nursing School and I think I'm there because of Maple Valley. As a result of looking at myself, too, and thinking about what I liked and the things that I didn't like and not feeling afraid of the things that I didn't like and feeling good about my strengths. I liked working with a team. I certainly got a lot of learning at Maple Valley about what's healthy in a team. I thought I liked the nurturing and the reality kind of things but I also really liked having my hands on and touching and doing and so I went into the nursing field absolutely because of Maple Valley. Nursing is pretty structured and there's that team that I need. I don't think I'm strong enough to go out in the field and do some of the things that a social worker would do—on your own, surrounded by the whole.... At Maple Valley I got scared by what I saw. People didn't fit into the ideas that I had as a minister's daughter. They weren't quite the same. So, I'm still really amazed by what humans are. It's like I found a structure and a milieu that I feel that I fit in really well and I feel like I made a logical evaluation of myself because of the perspective I got at Maple Valley.
15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I have trouble with this question because people tried to cover so many bases and they were always looking for the gaps and the worst thing that anyone wanted to see was a kid falling through the cracks and people gave so much of themselves that the most dangerous thing that could happen would be that people would burn out, and there was never a way to keep that from happening. There were support structures that people tried to have, but I really couldn't pick out a thing that Maple Valley didn't do, just because they tried so hard with all the wealth that there was with all the different kinds of people, and there was a lot of talent there, so it would be beyond me to say what Maple Valley didn't do.

16. Any additional comments?

16. It makes me feel good now and I'm glad that we had this chance to wrap it up. This was really important for me that we did this. I feel freshened up, because there are so many ways to feel about Maple Valley from having crawled out of there on my hands and knees, feeling mechanical and like a milk machine that was drained of all the vital fluids and feeling dry. I kind of blew out of there in a way that made me sad later, and I went through a whole bunch of feelings. It makes me feel good to feel that this is a closure and that I can have some positive input in a project, even though I'm gone.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. What stands out the most is how kids responded to staff people—how important integrity was to the kids, which was a reflection of how important it was to the staff people. The way that kids would cop to things that they had done wrong that they wouldn't have if they were approached by adults in a different way. Integrity was the key, and caring—caring about individuals. Integrity was probably secondary to the caring and a direct result of it.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. That was kind of happenstance. My previous work experience was totally unrelated; I had no experience in the field. I had an intuitive grasp of what was going on. I had experienced some real difficult interactions in an industrial setting that made me very unhappy and prompted some changes that were unplanned. I was mainly looking for an employment situation where I could grow and have people I was working with and for appreciate what I was all about, and that was to do the best with what I had to work with.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. It's had incredible lasting effects. Directly related to my answer to the last question, to be able to have respect of co-workers, superiors that made it O.K. to take risks, and be who I am, to just grow personally and to be invested in as a real valuable resource which worked both ways; the whole organization became a real valuable resource for me. And so I grew and grew and continue to grow.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. My most useful learning was that an employment situation didn't have to be devastating to me personally—that it could be a real growthful experience. That's always been the case at Maple Valley. If that changes, then it will be time for me to leave.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?
5. Well, I don't know, I think what I didn't learn was probably a function of not having as much contact with certain people as I would have liked to. Working evenings made a real separation from some real dynamic people that were working during the daytime hours. People who were really loaded with talent and so were less available to me as a resource just by virtue of the time frame that I was working in. That just slowed the learning down. I don't think it made it impossible to get what I needed. It's a real flexible place where people are reaching out to each other, over the boundaries of different shifts. So that wasn't much of an issue.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. The goals that I see being meaningful have been to help young people with their feeling of self-worth and from that to be responsible for themselves and to other people and to take care of themselves in a real healthy way so that they continue to grow and that necessarily means that they're going to be caring about themselves and other people. You can't not care about yourself and care about others effectively. And what it means to care about yourself in a real way has a lot to do with responsibility and that was number one—integrity.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. In general, yes. I was always amazed in community meetings to see kids spilling their guts with stuff that they could have easily gotten over with, but because they saw themselves being the cause of disappointment to the adults that they truly cared about, that was the bottom line for them; they weren't going to let that happen. I can't think of many kids who weren't willing to take some measure of responsibility. They were all better able to take responsibility by the time they left compared to when they got there.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I think one feeling in general from that period was that there were too few staff people for that many kids, not to say that that diminished the work that was being done. People were incredibly dedicated to what they were doing—enormously caring people. It would have been nice for everyone to have the luxury to have more people to be giving. It took its toll on people. It would have been more ideal. As far as programmatic changes, it was a real comfortable place to be. It felt genuine and real, people were laying their cards on the table and caring about each other so it made laying those cards out safe.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or
9. My sense was that the bulk of the work that needed to be done with the kids was personal and behavioral more than academic. I think that the personal growth that needed to happen and the behavioral changes that needed to take place were kind of a prerequisite to getting any effective academics that they were going to take with them accomplished. I know that kids who had not done well with academics at Maple Valley but did more personal growing have gone on to do that work having gotten their personal stuff together. And that only makes sense. I think it's a lot to ask for someone to concentrate on academics when their lives are in pieces. So, I would say that they were appropriately underemphasized.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think it was right on the mark. I don't think it was overemphasized, I guess you might say it was appropriately overemphasized. That's what the kids needed and that's what they got, an environment where they could grow personally.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. In terms of the way decision-making happens on the staff group level, it was very democratic. It seemed as though everyone in the group had as much input as anyone else in the group. People were valued on an equal basis. As far as kids' decision-making, my sense was that things had been more democratic before my time and that changes in population created the need for changes in how decision-making was done as far as the students went. What they had to say was certainly valued, but my sense was that it was no longer a determining factor. I think the leadership was one that kids trusted and it didn't especially turn them off that they didn't have more of a say than they did. They felt cared about and trusted what was going on for the most part. So I don't think that it was much of an issue during the time that I've spent there.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. We were right on target with the idea that what these kids really needed to be able to grow is people that care about them. That was always the bottom line. I guess controlling behavior when it was really out of hand, appealing to the kids on a level of mutual respect and caring wasn't always possible. I don't know what we could have done to make that happen. That's when patience and just hanging in there with the kids needed to happen and did happen.
Sometimes they made it impossible to continue working with them. However, even at those times, they always took something away with them. So, I don't know if it was really a case of missing the boat or of doing as much as you could do never having ultimate control over the kids. That's where success and failure come in. If you see a kid leaving not having accomplished what you had hoped would be accomplished, seeing that as failure can be a trap for a counselor. The growing continues even though you may not see it. I don't think there was any real missing the boat. That might have happened on an individual level but organizationally those are things that you can't really control.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I wasn't seeing a lot of program changes. There were some structural changes around the way scheduling happened and house-parenting versus having a rotating counseling team toward the end of that year. I think there was a certain loss with not having houseparents around. Kids really responded well to having that consistent two or three people live there. It really made it feel like more of a home atmosphere. I don't think it was a drastic loss but it did make a difference in how it felt there.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I am now a Residential Director at Maple Valley. That is a direct result of the kind of growth I was looking for, the kind of atmosphere that would be healthy for me to be able to explore my abilities and develop them and that certainly happened over the course of the three years that I've been working at Maple Valley. Interactions with the kids were equally as valuable in the growth that happened for me as the interactions that happened with the staff group. It's been a really healthy and growthful experience for me personally and professionally. I've learned a lot about human services on a range of levels, from counseling to working in groups, working with people dealing with a range of problems, to being an administrator and a supervisor. It's been a real opportunity for me to grow and have people respond to me with caring and respect and so in that way the whole philosophy of Maple Valley, working with kids in that way, works for staff people, too.

Growth is painful, whether you're an adult or a child. There have been times when I've thought about hanging it up, so I'm sure that it was easy for kids at times to hang it up. I needed a lot of strength to deal with things I was being confronted with both with the kids and the adult population. At times I had my doubts about
whether I had that strength and with the support of the administration and other staff people and the kids, I pulled it off. We pulled it off.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I don't know if I can make Maple Valley responsible for anything that didn't happen. That's all part of responsibility-taking. If something isn't happening, the first place I've got to look is at myself. Is something not happening because I'm not making it happen or because I'm denying something? That's the first things. I really can't blame the organization for something that's not happening for me. There was never a lack of support for me personally through all my growth stages over the years. Organizationally, there were a couple of points where things could have happened more smoothly. That's a developmental process. It's a young organization, and it's growing and learning about how it needs to grow and usually you have to experience the need for learning before the learning happens. Personnel changes at various times, and more advanced planning in some cases, might have been more effective. I don't think that there have been any major mistakes.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I think Maple Valley is doing something really right, based on my own experience there and what I've seen of kids. I've got some history to draw on at this point and I see the success which is different for everyone who's been through Maple Valley on the staff or in the student body. It feels like a real successful place.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I would say learning—being with kids in that school—in a close way. Another thing that stands out is the support from staff people there. I needed that support in order to get through a lot of the time. I guess also learning about myself and how to deal with situations that conjured up various things about myself and my life. I think those are the biggest things.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I really needed a job and I wanted to try working in a school that was smaller—where the classes were smaller as compared with a public school situation. There seemed to be more opportunity in dealing with individual kids in terms of classes and meeting their needs. Learning about counseling was appealing too. Also, the school was close by and that was another big reason.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Well, I know that I wouldn't want to have a job like that again. I remember being a little leery of the complete commitment you need for a job like that. After trying it, I know that I would never do it again. I did learn how to deal with people in ways that I can transfer to other situations.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I learned about being more open to situations—being able to see different sides more clearly—being able to separate my own feelings and tolerances in order to see the student's perspective. I learned how to not let things in my own life overshadow what it was I was trying to do with the kids.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. Maybe how to say no! I was pretty much aware when I started there about the kinds of things that would be expected of me. I really didn't expect more than what I did get. I think I did
learn how to say no better. I also learned about setting boundaries around my own personal needs—classes. Or even things like scheduling, working weekends, being able to say, "Hey, I just can't do that.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think the first thing is that the school was going to accept kids who really hadn't been accepted in many situations before. Number two was to try and teach these kids, show them by example perhaps, a more worthwhile way to run their daily lives. And then, I guess, to try to give the kids the kind of education they just missed out on.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think for a lot of kids the school did meet those needs, especially through the structure of the daily program and the contact they had with other kids and staff. I do think that in a couple of instances, no matter how things went in terms of the program, there were kids who were just too far beyond it. And sometimes it felt like "beating your head against the wall"—I mean, it was a joke! And that was real frustrating. It really depended on the kid and what his needs were; and, also what the school could provide at a particular time.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I think there began to be changes with the way staff communicated with each other. The building of the administration building itself created more gaps in the communications. It felt harder to be heard—to have input—there were more memos about various decisions. I think if I would have changed anything, it would be in making those changes less drastic than they were. It began to feel more like a bureaucracy—decisions began to be made at the top and passed down to the staff. Sometimes it felt like, "So now what do we have to do?" I didn't feel that way at first and from what I've heard, it wasn't that way before I got there. I also had problems with the whole boy-girl thing, in their living so close to each other. Changes happened, but they were real slow. I didn't feel comfortable for the girls in a lot of situations. I felt worried. I know some real changes—physical changes did happen, but it did take a long time.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I think, if anything, it was underemphasized. And, the reason
why is that there were just so many things that came before it in terms of the kids' needs. That's not really a problem with the school because that wasn't its main goal anyway.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think it was overemphasized but without the negative connotations. I think it was really important—that was the thing they really didn't know how to do. They didn't know how to get along with one another. They knew too many destructive ways to deal with each other—hatreds and jealousies and so forth. We tried to help kids to learn to talk with each other, to help them try to better understand what was really going on or maybe what the other's motivation was.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I don't think the kids were prepared to make decisions in any other way than what they did. They had input into smaller types of things, token things, I guess. I don't think anyone on the staff or the administration would have wanted to run the school on the basis of what the kids thought. Sometimes they had some really good ideas, and they had a chance to express them. As far as the staff group is concerned, more and bigger decisions began to be made by the administration—and there were a number of reasons for that. In the beginning of my time there, there was more opportunity for staff to have input into decisions. There were just more and more decisions coming from the "top down," telling staff what to do. I think it got harder and harder to keep everybody involved in making decisions. I think it would have been ridiculous for everybody to have stayed up at staff meetings until midnight—after working on a weekend or something—just to "blow air." So, it was also a matter of getting more organized. Fewer people needed to be involved. Sometimes staff would go over things in such a way, it just became repetitious. I do think that free and easy spirit needed to be tightened. You couldn't have a tired staff there the next day. I personally wouldn't have wanted to make the decisions either. So, I was perfectly content with, "Tell me what to do." It was easier for me at that point.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I think it was on target in terms of certain staff really being able to talk to certain kids in ways in which they could grow—relating to them either as a parent or a friend or whatever. I think that maybe it was off-target in terms of providing the kids with enough things to do when they weren't in classes. I think
with enough things to do when they weren't in classes. I think there was too much loose time. I also think that there weren't a lot of public places kids could go without getting into trouble—things they could have handled. It wasn't off-target in that it wasn't planned that way. It would have been good to have more facilities right there, I guess. But, that would have been a huge project in itself.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. When I was first there, there were houseparents, and that eventually outlived itself; and, I think that was for the better. There were different kinds of kids coming to the program and it wasn't appropriate to keep that family-type feeling in that way. This was also a major change in terms of having a day and night shift—and this had a big impact on the kids. I think the "White House" program was a good change for the kids who wanted to be there. I don't think it had a major impact on the other kids, though.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Well, I'm working part time. After I left Maple Valley, I was real tired and I didn't want to work at all or deal with teenagers for awhile. I'm just playing in my garden.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. That's a hard question. Of course, there are a million things it didn't do. I don't think the school provided staff with workable schedules, the kids with enough activities, and sometimes there weren't enough staff people around to make it more manageable and less of a "free for all" for the kids; that took a lot out.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I think the economics of the situation was a little shaky, especially when it came to deciding whether or not to accept a kid who was visiting, particularly if that kid was "on the line." That was kind of a weird time—that interview or visiting period. With certain kids that came in, it was really difficult. Sometimes I didn't think we could cope with the kid, given the way that the program was set up at the time. It was pretty hairy for awhile with a few difficult kids dominating the scene.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

   Well, one thing is the way people from diverse backgrounds, people from different areas, people from white middle class and blue collar environments were able to make connections with people who grew up in different socio-economic environments. This is what Maple Valley is all about—appreciation for each other, and that's what I think was really special and that's one thing that really stands out for me.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

   I was really impressed with you. I thought you were a person that I could learn something from. I had student-taught there and I really enjoyed it and loved what was going on there; and, when I came back interested in a job, I felt really good getting a lot of support from some of the kids. It was easy to make a decision. It was a nice thing for me because I really cared a lot about kids and what Maple Valley was doing was so positive. I really wanted to be part of that. I wanted to change the world a little bit. I didn't know how else to do it other than to care about these kids and do it in that small way.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

   I feel like I grew up personally at Maple Valley. I think I learned to be more sensitive. I think I'm more aware of my own blind spots, my own personal issues, my own shortcomings, the things that are difficult for me. If I ever become a parent, I believe that I'll be a significantly better parent because of what I learned at Maple Valley about dealing with people, about dealing with children. People who worked with me gave me honest feedback. We didn't kid ourselves a whole lot. I feel very fortunate. I changed a lot of my relationships—with my family, with my friends. I'm a better friend; I'm a better brother; I'm a better son. It was no accident. I ended up at Maple Valley because I sensed that it would be good for me—the kind of place I'd want to put some energy into.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?
4. I learned that I was a person who could change. And, even though I had some ways of operating that were clearly dysfunctional within the Maple Valley system, I didn't have to be stuck. I realized that if I really concentrated on changing those things, it could work for me.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. The whole experience was wonderful and I still hold it dear because it was so intensely personal. There wasn't a day that I wasn't challenged; there wasn't a day that I didn't have it right in my face. I always felt challenged to grow; not only by the kids, but by the people I worked with as well. I really wanted to be there—and, it wasn't easy for me. I wish that I could allow myself to appreciate a little better just what the experience was all about for me. The more I think about it and the more distance I get from it, the more I realize how powerful the whole thing was. I loved it when I was there. I love Maple Valley; and, other than my family and the time I spent with them, it was the most important thing going in my life. I knew that I wasn't as talented as some other people, but I tried to make up for that by putting in some extra time and energy.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. I think the program was trying to teach kids how to be winners. Too many of the kids were well trained and were oriented toward being losers. These kids had learned to deal with the world in a way that was self-destructive for them. One of the things that I'm most proud of is when they interviewed this kid in the school paper. Now, here's this poor inner-city Puerto Rican kid being asked who was his favorite staff, and he said me, this white middle class WASP-- and when they asked him why, he said, "He treats me with respect like I should be treated." And, that meant a lot to me--maybe it was the cherry-vanilla ice cream cones--anyway, it really did touch me. For me, that sort of sums up a lot of what was going on around there and what was important to me. So many of these kids had been mistreated and hurt and abused in a lot of ways. I wanted to and I believe I did do something that was important in changing that experience for them.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Well, I guess it was a mixed bag. We really cared about those kids and some of them took it in and it made a difference. For many of these kids, it was the only real caring they had ever had in their entire lives. And, I know that some of them still look back
on that time and remember the feelings—that there were people around whom you could really talk to, who would listen to you and maybe appreciated you. This is what many kids are able to look back on. The other side of that is that I think we were limited in that we had a white middle class staff and more of a blue collar and third world student group, although the third world group was never huge. So I think we had a limited cultural perspective although there was a range within the staff group. One of the reasons why I think that you were so good at working with those kids is that you had the "street smarts" and knew the street life and bullshit the way the kids did and you could relate to them on that level. But, on the whole, I think the staff group was limited from a cross-cultural perspective.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Well, I think that I would have made sure that you were running the program the whole time I was there. You can print that if you want. And, I think we spent too much time, and this was particularly true when I first got there and very true for me personally, in nurturing kids when we should have been more ready to confront kids more directly about some of their behavior. If one kid threw something across the lunch room, maybe two out of six staff sitting there would confront that kid in the way s/he needed to be. I think I would have liked to see some of the staff people who were great nurturers be able and willing to really confront kids when it was needed—and, that goes for me too. I can recall getting lost when I tried to confront a kid in a powerful way and it didn't go very well. In general, there was a need for tougher limit-setting. I think there were other staff like me who needed help in learning more effective ways to go about that confrontation; learning how to confront a kid without making it an uproar, without escalating the situation beyond what it should have been.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. When I first began as a student-teacher at Maple Valley, I think that academics were definitely underemphasized. And, even though I wasn't teaching many classes, I was learning a hell of a lot more than I could have learned in most other situations. One of the things that I learned to do during my years there—once I got a clearer picture of what the real issues were for the kids—was to try to integrate, identify and address those things in the curriculum. I think that academics took a back seat to the other kinds of things we were trying to do. Some people who made great counselors didn't necessarily make good teachers. The longer I stayed at Maple Valley, the stronger the academic program became. During my first years there, there just wasn't a lot of
administrative emphasis placed on academics. Sometimes I felt that when I screwed up with a kid in a counseling situation, I knew about it; but, when I screwed up in the classroom, and I messed up plenty of times, no one ever knew about it or, if they did, nobody ever said a word about it. Look, one of the things I really loved about the place was that I had some real academic freedom. I had a chance to be creative. I got to do some things there that I never could have done in most other places.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I think that this whole area is directly related to the source of what most of the stress in these kids' lives was all about. And, I think that that's what we were dealing with. And, even though I played up what the kids did or didn't do on their math homework, I believed that the academic component was and should have been secondary. It could have, and eventually did become more important than it was. There's just no way that the personal/interpersonal area could have been overemphasized. We dealt with those issues constantly. I thought those community meetings, where a lot of this stuff was highlighted, and the way you ran those things sometimes was nothing short of brilliant. I mean, in listening to you—I was an adult twenty seven years old—and I would check myself out. One of the reasons why Maple Valley will always be important to me and why you will always be important to me is that I sat there and listened to you talk about it all, what was really going on and who you were and what you were feeling. I know the kids and staff were learning from you and the way you brought other people into those discussions, made it even more powerful. You know, I've talked to kids since then about those meetings and it's still with them; they still refer to specific meetings.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I think that when I first started there, and this has been pretty much acknowledged, the decision-making process wasn't appropriate to the student population. These kids weren't able, many of them, to really accept responsibility for the decision-making powers that they had. They just weren't able to see the consequences of the decisions they made. I think it was necessary and appropriate that the decision-making process change; and when it did, I supported it. It was right that it moved in a more hierarchical direction. I felt good about that particularly when you were running the program because I trusted your judgment and ability. I knew that I had some latitude to make the necessary decisions at my level. I mean it was a pretty wide open thing. There were all sorts of things I could have done. There were never any strict guidelines about how you're supposed to deal with kids,
only in a general sense. I think that you handled the leadership in a way that was sensitive and appropriate.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I think about those community meetings a lot. Those kids were confronted and dealt with. You just set a tone for all that the kids and I learned from. You really worked and clarified moral dilemmas for those kids constantly. Asking the kids and helping them process some community issue—naming all the different parts—"Who do I want to be with you?" and "What kinds of choices do I want to make?" and that sort of thing. The reason why it was so successful was that you were able to set the appropriate tone and we were all able to get with individual kids and care about them. And, they cared about what we, as staff, thought and how we saw them. They knew that if they were going to be bullshit or some image, it wouldn't go or they could get real and say, "I fucked up." A lot of those kids were able right in those meetings to say, "I fucked up and I did something that I probably shouldn't have done." What they learned was that the world didn't fall in on them. They had to deal with the consequences, of course. Kids got the chance to screw up and be real and to see what it was all about, maybe for the first time in their lives. I remember when you would play out the entire dialogue for them. You would do their script for them and some of them would watch you and couldn't believe what you were doing. What was important for me as a staff listening to you was how to be able to tell the kids when I fucked up and make it a real learning opportunity for the kid and myself. These kids had very seldomly encountered any adults who would admit to them that they were real and they could screw up when, of course, they did. Of course, that made it easier for the kids to be real with me. I think that where Maple Valley missed the boat goes back to that whole discussion on confrontation we were having before. I think that in some ways the staff was just too passive. I would have liked to see the staff take the initiative in more circumstances. In getting feedback from kids over the years, I've heard from time to time that one of the things they appreciated about me was that I was tough with them about their responsibilities. I think the kids generally could have used a little more of that. I could have been a little tougher myself. I also think that the academic expectations we set for the kids could have been a little tougher. Too many kids got to the school at fifteen and sixteen and didn't know how to read and write. It's hard to know how to set up a social studies curriculum with kids who can't read. It was hard to know just what to hit first with some kids. It wasn't as if we helped them to understand and direct their behavior a little better; there would all of a sudden be jobs for them when they got back to Boston. So, oftentimes, it was just a frustrating situation. I'm not sure what the school
could have done in the overall picture that would have changed any of those realities. This leads me to another area. I would like to see a little more in the way of formal follow-up plans with kids when they leave the program. It's so easy to get wrapped up in the kids that are presently there.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. I think when I first got there, there were some real control problems. Sometimes I think the kids didn't feel safe. And, for these kids coming from environments where they had never felt safe, it made the problem even more urgent. Then you came back to run the program again and you said, "O.K., this is going to stop, and I'm just going to tell you how it's going to be sometimes. I'm not going to ask you how you felt about this or that, I'm just going to tell you that what you did stinks. I'm just going to tell you that it's wrong, period." And, that's what those kids needed to hear. They needed somebody who could be tough; they needed somebody to say no. They needed to see the boundaries. They were scared shitless themselves of being in control and they were looking for an adult who wasn't. So, I think the kids started to feel real safe when you started running the show again.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. My Maple Valley experience affects every relationship in my life. It has a lot to do with my being the man I am. In the future I may be in a parenting role and I've had the benefit of experiencing some of what that's like at Maple Valley. Maple Valley gave me the kind of feedback that enabled me to get past some of my blind-spots. And, I think that in the future I'll generally be able to do better in dealing with kids. The staff were always learning a whole lot about themselves at the same time we were trying to help kids. We were in this kind of "fishbowl" working together. One of the most surprising things that I learned when I was there that I didn't expect when I first came was how much the kids taught me. Right now I'm working as a property manager. I work with people who are renting houses and apartments. I've learned a lot about contracting with people in this area, what they can expect from me and what I can expect from them; also, realizing how important the whole idea of commitment is in working with people at all levels, and recognizing again how important it is to be clear with people in all those ways. I'm a more sensitive man than I used to be. Recently, I had an incident where I was working with a woman who was having a real crisis in her life. We were sitting there talking the week before this all happened and I told her that she had been behind in
her rental payments for over a year and that something had to change. So, I went back a week later to straighten it out and she told me a real sad story about what's going on in her relationship. After hearing what she had to say—I wasn't thinking about myself or what the business implications were or that sort of thing—but I was really aware that I was talking to another human being who was having a hard time. I was able to work something out that was satisfactory with my employer's interests and, at the same time, something that would be helpful and realistic for her. Maple Valley has taught me ways of dealing with people and groups that I've taken with me wherever I've gone. No matter what I'm doing, I'm going to work with people so the skills are always useable. It's become so easy for me to tell when I'm working with an individual or group that's really off-track or completely dysfunctional. I'm not only able to point out to people what they're doing wrong, but I'm also able to steer them in a more positive direction. I learned a lot about respect at Maple Valley.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. Maple Valley didn't change the world that these kids went back to.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I feel real lucky and grateful that I got to spend that time there and believe that I'm a better man because of it. I had a chance to be human and screw up there and learn just like everybody else. I know that I grew there and that I was helping some other people grow as well. It was a school for me too.
1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I think that personalities played a big part in controlling and maintaining that environment. This was unique compared with most of the systems I had worked in before. In other places it would have been the "system" that kids dealt with. But, at Maple Valley, it was more than the personalities, and not just Mitchell and Mark. Initially, it was them but that phenomenon really carried on into lower level staff people. So the established norm was that the kids expected you to be a powerful person and they were testing up against that to see if that was so. These kids felt so powerless in their own lives that I think they really looked to make the staff into very powerful people. I left Maple Valley with an incredible sense of my own personal power. Kids would literally attempt to destroy you as they tried to find out who you were and who they were. The whole dynamic of power and control was a major learning that I got from Maple Valley; the way that it got played out there was just incredible. Also, being at Maple Valley was a continuation of a care-taking pattern that I have lived with most of my life; taking care of people and kids. If you get invested and involved and you care, which you have to do to be effective in that environment, you can't be a bureaucrat or a technocrat because you are a father or a mother or some combination of those things. You are a multi-faceted role to those kids: a friend, a counselor, a power person which adds up to being as close to a good parent as one can be.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. I always had a very fond relationship for Mark and Mitchell and that drew me to the school; I always felt that I could learn a lot from them. I was also ready for a change in my life. I had worked in more high-stress bureaucratic environments before and was ready for a chance to do direct care. The position of Supervisor of Residence offered me the opportunity to do both administrative and direct service work. So, I was able to make a shift that was sort of intermediate in that I still functioned as a supervisor with my staff while also working very directly in a "hands on" capacity with the kids.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your...
life? If so, how?

3. Recognizing my own personal power represented a learning that I walked away with from Maple Valley. I learned about the use of power in very meaningful ways, in interpersonal relationships and in groups. I learned a lot about my own ability to project personal power. Walking into Maple Valley where there were a number of adolescents "acting out," it was really quite clear. And that is, these kids are looking for someone to be in power while at the same time they're challenging every fragment of power they can see. So I had to walk in and know that I was empowered--period. As long as the kid smells that you feel like you are in power, you are in power. And this learning has been useful to me in all kinds of situations. I never fully realized the magnitude or impact of using my personal power to influence a situation.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. I think that one of the most useful learnings had to do with learning how to give kids better and better feedback in order to help them in their decision-making process; even at those times when they seemed to be clearly "off a wall." Being so personally connected to the kids in that process really taught me a lot about parenting. Of course, this was happening while I was part of raising a little child which made for an interesting relationship; learning something about the three-year-olds and the eighteen-year-olds. It was important to adjust your input to them according to where they were at the moment or what they were generally able to receive. You can't deal too abstractly with a three-year-old. And sometimes, with Maple Valley kids, you also needed to be very concrete. "You need to go to your room now, and in half an hour we'll talk about it." And, it was important that you learn to diagnose the kids and the situations very quickly rather than working off some programmed plan.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. I really don't have a context for that. There were really no expectations that went unfulfilled. I learned a great deal. Maybe I could have learned something about limit-setting which for me is a constant problem; just where to set my own personal limits. It's particularly difficult to set those limits with very hungry kids.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?

6. It was providing a very real learning atmosphere for kids who did not have any foundation, who in many cases didn't have loving experiences in their lives. They got to learn something about
limits and boundaries--what works and what doesn't--what's good for them and what isn't. Many of these kids came to the school with so many mixed and distorted messages of who they were. And, they were teenagers which made it even more difficult for us to help them to resolve these issues. It was important to give these kids a sense of what healthy family life, which most of them never experienced, might be like; to give them honest, compassionate and intelligent loving. I think that that is what Maple Valley was trying to provide. We were trying to teach these kids how to get their needs met in the context of the natural "trade-offs" of relationships. They had to learn the mechanisms whereby they could start getting their needs met.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. I think that Maple Valley was successful in that. The problem with identifying success is that sometimes you don't get to see the results for years. The school was successful in providing the right environment. You can't teach anybody beyond his/her capacity to absorb what you're giving. Every one of these kids who walked in there and who invested himself in any way, came away with a piece of that atmosphere. The staff, for the most part, were capable of making those kinds of connections. Most of those kids never had an adult or any other human being look at them "eye to eye" and make honest contact. "I really do care about you," and "You're not going to act-out this way because I'm not interested in watching you beat yourself up." That had never happened with most of them. A lot of those kids made their first meaningful connections at Maple Valley which was scary as hell for some of them. I believe that most of the kids that came to the school would be able to use their Maple Vally experience somewhere in their lives.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. I think the major problem with the program when I was there and continues to be a real problem, is the physical plant. You have a situation with twenty-five or so very needy kids all competing for the attention of the staff and each other; many operating with the belief that their needs aren't going to be met, which is, of course, what they're accustomed to. Once you start to go beyond seven kids in that kind of living situation, regardless of how many adults are present, the geometrical pattern is set. You end up just "shoveling shit against the tide." This kind of scene was particularly true in the evenings. The kids were just so needy. Sometimes no matter how creative the response to the kids' needs was, there were just too many of them to be effective at anything for too long. I think the school needed little satellites away from the main campus. I think then we would have had a much more manageable situation. But,
that's the physical plant and I don't know how you're going to change it unless you buy or build more places.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. Being an evening staff person, sometimes it felt that the academic program was overemphasized in that it was our job to help kids deal with the consequences of not dealing appropriately with their classes. But, in reality, it's hard to see how academics could have been overemphasized; these kids needed more than what they got academically. Most of those kids came to the school with big holes in their academic skills. The obvious problem was that many of the kids had such huge emotional difficulties that academic learning had to be carefully worked into that context. I never sat in any classrooms, so it was hard for me to know exactly what they were getting. I know that some kids were sliding and some kids were grasping the concepts, the same as in any school system. Also, I think that it was particularly hard for the kids to go to school in the same place that they lived. I think if the kids lived in the small units I was talking about earlier and had to go to a different place for classes, it would have been easier for them. It would have cut down on the social scene and there would have been fewer distractions.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. I don't think it could ever be overemphasized. I think at Maple Valley it was the main learning these kids needed to have. What most of these kids knew and experienced about interpersonal relationships was clearly dysfunctional. This is where Maple Valley was so strong. I just don't think these kids could have had too much of it.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. I was in the unique position of being able to play a role in any decision I wanted to take part in. Being a night person, I wasn't there during the day when many decisions were made and I didn't want to make that time investment. But, I did have access to decision-making at every level, except in the area of finances which was fine with me. You and Mark made those decisions which sometimes translated into the school's survival. I know there were some people at different points who felt they didn't have access to decision-making. I felt that most of that really reflected the individual's lack of their own sense of personal power more than any structural deficit. I think that at Maple Valley, far more than in
most institutions, you had access to power and decision-making if you made the investment. Of course, this was within certain limits. The bottom line financial decisions were going to be made by you and Mark as they should have been. But in terms of programming, if you wanted to invest your time, it was available to you. I believe that those staff people who complained about it generally didn't feel that sense of power in other areas of their lives. I think that the kids had as much input as they needed to have. They certainly had far more input into decision-making than at any other school or institution they had been to. And, they were made to feel like their input was important. They knew that staff listened and took seriously their concerns and appropriately fostered and supported their challenging of the "system." Sometimes it was more the perception of power than power itself, but I think that's O.K. because they didn't have the capacity to run the program.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. I think the school was on target in terms of its commitment to personal growth. I think where it missed the boat was in the whole physical plant issue I talked about before which made the emotional management issues that much more difficult. The reality was that the physical plant was the best we had to work with given the big picture—the fiscal and political realities. Coming from a large family and having lived the experience with a lot of kids around, I think we could have fostered a plan where we had a system of surrogate management where the oldest took care of the youngest, the second oldest took care of the second youngest, and so forth. I really don't know if that kind of thing would work at Maple Valley. It worked for my family. It might represent some sort of option. I think that there might be some good connections in that kind of relationship for kids.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. During my time at Maple Valley, there were two major program changes. One was in providing more structured physical activities for the kids which was real helpful with the management of their free time. I think the refinement of the privilege-level system was also a good thing. The bottom line business in human relationships is that, "You do such and such and I'll do such and such." All the loving and caring really take a back seat to that reality. The privilege-level system really helped the kids to focus in a very concrete way. It helped the kids to see that they couldn't have the freedom they wanted without demonstrating responsibility.
14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. I'm involved in nursing school and going for my R.N. My experience at Maple Valley was part of my process of knowing that I wanted to be in direct service and also how I might do that in a satisfying way. I wanted to be involved in a more physical capacity with people and maybe work in a psychiatric unit someday; but, the main thing is building a professional role that would meet my needs and also give me more flexibility in my life.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. I don't think that Maple Valley didn't do anything it set out to do. Given the constraints and realities it had to work with, it did the best it could within that.

16. Any additional comments?

16. I think that Maple Valley is a very special kind of situation; that with some degree of ongoing modifications, it's going to continue to survive. In just a pragmatic sense, there's got to be a place for those kids--and Maple Valley is quite a place. It was one of the most rewarding and one of the most difficult work experiences of my life. If you really care about kids, it's a real tough situation to work in--and, if you don't care, you can't survive. I don't think that any staff or kid who walked out of there wasn't touched by that experience.
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1. When you think of Maple Valley now, what stands out the most about your experience there?

1. I think about both difficult times with kids—confrontations that were real—World War II battles. And, I think about the opposite of that—very warm, close times with kids that were very touching, that I still remember. And something as corny as hearing a tune on the AM radio that I would have hated except that I connect it with a certain kid and something poignant that occurred. And, I think about meeting with you, Mitch and Mark and Annie and Fred to try to sort out and to try to deal with the kids better. And, of course, I think about particular kids.

2. Why did you come to Maple Valley?

2. Well, I graduated from UMass, and by the time I graduated, I became interested in counseling. I was very interested at that time in "tasting" the field of counseling. I applied to a number of different places in the area and got an interview here. At first, I was a little reticent about accepting a job here because it was the first place that interviewed me. But, I really liked the people in the interview. I had had some limited experience in the field and was struck by the lack of energy and enthusiasm that I encountered in some places, and limited caring for the work. And even in the interview here, I was struck by the fact that here were intelligent people, hardworking people, ambitious people—in the sense of wanting to make things better at counseling, at teaching and in a general sense. I was interested in counseling and this place, right off the bat, struck me as a good place to "taste" it and to get a feel for it.

3. Has the Maple Valley experience had any lasting effect on your life? If so, how?

3. Yeah, it really has. I've told you this before. Last summer when I was out west working as a dishwasher, even in the kitchen I found that my ability to communicate with people, to assert myself and to help others assert their own feelings, was really helpful; helping people to more effectively communicate with their supervisors—with hopes of improving things. This situation was a real sweatbox and I felt that I could express my own feelings effectively and help others to do that. This felt really important.
That situation initially struck me as completely unrelated to my Maple Valley experience, but even there, it helped. It still helps. In my relationships, sometimes a light bulb would go off in my head and I would think back to something I discussed with someone here. My ability to understand what relating to people is about—I have a much keener understanding of what manipulation is all about now. I've just started another job working with deinstitutionalized mental patients and I found that what I learned here carries over very well. It's been a lot of help and I think that the people I'm working with value my experience.

4. What was your most useful learning while at Maple Valley?

4. Well, I touched on theory—on structural developmental theory— and that seemed like extremely appropriate theory for working with kids. It's even appropriate now in working with thirty-year-old kids. That, I valued. The most valuable thing I learned from here was through interacting with the staff, particularly with you and Fred and Mark and Annie. And, what I learned was to be confident in myself; that no matter how upsetting it gets, you can stand back, look at it and come to understand some positive direction to go. I guess that's not very clear and it's very general but that feels like the most valuable thing I learned. It's kind of like getting a scientific perspective on dealing with people's feelings. The art can be incredibly complicated and confusing. So, it was important that I was able to gain confidence in myself—to be able to stand back and look at things—without having to necessarily solve the whole mess—but with gaining some kind of constructive direction to go in. I think that's the most valuable thing I learned.

5. What do you wish you could have learned that you did not while at Maple Valley?

5. To the extent to which I admit that I really liked the supervision I had, the other side of that coin is that I wish I could have had more. It was very good and I never felt like I "sucked people dry" here by any means. So I guess I would have liked more of everything. I'm sure I could have enjoyed and benefited from more supervision around counseling kids and people. Interestingly, with the work I'm doing now, I'm kind of on the brink of doing supervision myself with the staff on an informal basis. Over the next few months I may be moving more into a formal supervisory relationship. So I think back on my time here and wish I had had more of an opportunity to get some supervision about giving supervision. That would have been helpful. But, while I was here, it didn't seem particularly necessary.

6. What do you think Maple Valley tried to accomplish?
6. Well, I saw that as different for different kids. In a general sense, the school was trying to get kids, first of all, to get some control over their behavior; to both add some behaviors to their repertoire enabling them to express, for instance, their anger in an appropriate way, and to delete some—especially those behaviors related to physical or verbal abuse. Related to that was to help them to whatever extent they could—and it was different for different kids—to understand their feelings better and to begin to work some with that. And, for most of the kids, to move beyond the blatantly abusive family lives they had. To help them to establish more caring relationships. Sometimes I felt that the most important thing that kids could learn from being at Maple Valley was that there were people in this world whom they could trust and care about.

7. Do you think Maple Valley was successful in the above? Why or why not?

7. Well, there were certainly kids here whom I saw that weren't success stories. And those kids typically didn't stay very long. And there were kids whom I saw here who were success stories. I don't think that I could give you the statistics—how many kids out of how many kids were successful. Clearly, we were successful with some kids and that felt valuable. It's tough because sometimes you tend to see the kids who weren't successful because they did more outrageous things. But we were successful, nevertheless.

8. In retrospect, what programmatic changes might you have made?

8. Well, there are some specifics that stick out in my mind. I would have tried to build in some more formal supervision time for everyone. I really valued the supervision that I had but it did inhibit it some that I had to seek it out on my own time. Where I work now, we have this supervision time—you can take those two hours off somewhere else—and that's wonderful; if you could try to work in something like that. I really enjoyed it more when we had more time and were more able to not to have to limit our discussion to the "nuts and bolts" types of things and could more freely extrapolate about a particular kid's situation and maybe spend more time on theoretical aspects of a given situation. Also, by the time I left—and the program was moving this way—I felt more of a need to have single sex dorms. Clearly, kids simply could not handle the situation.

9. Do you think academics were over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

9. I really don't feel like an expert on this subject at all. I worked evenings and had only a little exposure to academics. As far
as I know, academics were stressed here in an appropriate way. When comparing academics here to the way they were in my high school, I was impressed with the fact that it wasn't simply reading, writing and arithmetic. In the course of their classes, kids got to talk about relationships—boyfriends, girlfriends or whatever—and got to talk some about asserting themselves, expressing their anger in appropriate ways, and that kind of thing. As far as I know, no one learned how to bring about a nuclear reaction in chemistry class. But I always had the impression that to the extent to which kids could handle it, they had enough. It has a lot to do with your perspective on what the kid needs. If they're behaving inappropriately most of the time, then that's what they need to focus on; and, if they don't know how to divide four digit numbers yet, you just have to sacrifice that some.

10. Do you think personal/interpersonal development was over or underemphasized? Why or why not?

10. No, it wasn't overemphasized. I enjoyed the extent to which it was emphasized here.

11. What do you think about the decision-making structure at Maple Valley by students? by staff? by leaders?

11. Well, let's start with the students. One idea I heard from time to time and maybe it's happened since, is the notion of a student government. At the time, it seemed really unclear as to whether or not there were enough students to deal with it in a constructive way. This always struck me as a goal—something nice to work towards with kids. The idea of giving them more of a formal stage to voice their ideas and complaints in a constructive way. This might be used as a more viable vehicle for the kids to express some of their dissatisfaction instead of expressing it in more destructive ways. As far as the staff's involvement in the decision-making process is concerned, it generally struck me as democratic which is something I really enjoyed about it. Working at Maple Valley, I felt that I had a say that was as valuable as anybody else's. I knew that, if there needed to be a quick decision or in some cases where final decisions were made by you and/or Mark, or people higher up in the organization than me, that I had a voice that was valued in decisions. And I've come to find out that that is by no means the general case with most organizations. So I felt good about the decision-making process here.

12. Where was Maple Valley right on target—where did it miss the boat?

12. Well, I really felt that it was generally on target with the way it dealt with kids. I think toward the latter part of my time
there, we began to see more difficult kids, kids who needed more structure and supervision. I think some of the kids who had been more typical of the earlier student group might have been falling through the cracks too often. The program began to shift away from kids who didn't need as much structure. On the other hand, in some cases, certain kids were too tough in that there wasn't enough structure here for them. In instituting this whole idea of structure, staff not only had to decide what the "right" balance was for the kids, but also how we felt about it. Again, the only place where I worried about the idea of "missing" kids was in the cases where the population had gotten tougher and for those kids, they just might have "fallen through the cracks." Where it hit the mark was that there were a hell of a lot of kids who fell right in between there; kids who could respond to moderate structure and kids who eventually could internalize the necessary controls.

13. During the course of your involvement at Maple Valley, what program changes did you see occur? Do you think they were positive or negative? Why?

13. The biggest change I saw was in instituting more structure. Those changes—I realized a lot of this in retrospect—hitchhiking through Montana—were really appropriate. But some of the new rules conflicted with my own personal tastes. So sometimes I had difficulty in implementing those things. There were times when even after completely discussing an issue and agreeing with the program need for a change, I still had personal difficulty in carrying it off.

14. What are you doing now, and how did Maple Valley influence that?

14. Specifically, I'm working as a residential counselor again. I'm working with deinstitutionalized mental patients. I was afraid when I first started working there that the group would be very different than the group I had been working with at Maple Valley. And, they definitely are. However, I found that the things that I learned at Maple Valley have carried over. The number of experiences when I felt that I haven't been helped by my experience here are very limited. But, even in working with a psychotic patient, one has to get a clear picture of where to head, what the direction is. I learned how to do this at Maple Valley.

15. What didn't Maple Valley do?

15. When I left Maple Valley, it was really for a couple of reasons. One was that I wanted to travel and see the world. The other was that I was having difficulties with the kids in establishing the kinds of relationships I wanted. I knew how to set
limits and do those things, but it wasn't getting me where I wanted to be in a lot of situations. I continued to have a lot of difficulty in dealing with kids' anger when it was directed at me. And, I wondered if maybe my ego was a little too fragile to work effectively with the tougher kids. That was one thing that caused me to leave here. As far as what Maple Valley didn't do, I suppose one thing I could add again was to have built in more structured and formal supervision time for the staff. But that's really it. And I think beyond that, maybe there could have been more workshops in how to deal with tough confrontations with kids. But, I think it's really important for me to say that I don't feel that that was any shortcoming on the part of Maple Valley. It was really more of a personal issue with me.

16. Any additional comments?

16. In bits and pieces I've probably said most of it. As I look back on it, it certainly was a valuable experience. I grew a lot in both personal and professional ways. And, when I got this new job, my salary and status was a little higher than in the beginning. I knew that growth was recognized. They think that I'm experienced and I am worth it. I learned a lot of that at Maple Valley. There was an alive group of staff at Maple Valley and the discussions weren't always about kids—we connected in a personal way that was wonderful.
Making things happen at Maple Valley School

By ROXANNE WEDEGARTNER
Recorder Staff

WENDELL — The Maple Valley School, little more than three years old, is building a $60,000 addition, designed by Tulio Inglese of the New Environmental Design Center in Amherst.

The 1,300 square-foot addition will be a combination classroom and dormitory. Two large rooms will provide living space for six students and one large room with a loft will provide classroom and library space. A greenhouse for use in science classes is also incorporated into the design.

SIGNIFICANT GROWTH in the last three years has prompted the decision to expand the private school, say staff member Mark Rosen. The small alternative school started by Mitchell and Betsy Koch and located in a large, rambling red farmhouse, began its program dedicated to the philosophy that education should take place in a democratic atmosphere where teachers and students have an equal voice in their education. Today, Maple Valley School, a tuition-funded school has been fully accepted by the Wendell School Committee as a legitimate private school and by the State Department of Education, as a facility fully capable of handling special needs students under Chap. 76.

It now has an enrollment of 32 students, ages 9-18, most from the area and more than half are boarding students.

"WHEN WE BEGAN, we believed right from the start that we would not try to be an underground operation, that we would seek out the community and try to conform to all state standards as far as our whole program is concerned. We wanted to begin with the idea that what we were doing was not strange, but represented an alternative," says Rosen.

When the school first opened, it advertised out-of-state for students through word-of-mouth and letterhead mailings. The school has been accepted by communities and the state department of education.

"STAFF BURN-OUT has been something of a problem but I think we are this year involved in a way to take care of that," said Rosen.

"ACADEMICS," SAYS ROSEN "are only a part of the students participation in the community. We try to get them involved in all aspects of life here." The school has done so through encouraging students to pursue an area of interest through an apprenticeship program with area businesses. This summer several students and staff members took a two-month cross-country tour in a converted bus.

Maple Valley School has a staff of seven full-time teachers who maintain a year round program and rotate shifts so that someone is present at the school at all times to provide guidance to the students. The constant presence of staff members at the school for the last three years has been an interesting challenge," says Rosen.

"I know last year, Mitch and I were right here upstairs all the time and it took its toll. Now we set up so that at the end of the day we can go home. We're fresher the next day," he added.

"STAFF BURN-OUT has been something of a problem but I think we are this year involved in a way to take care of that."
WENDELL — Some learning problems have little to do with academics. That is what 25-year-old Mark Rosan believes. And that is why he helped found Maple Valley School five years ago.

"When I was in school," he recalled, "the five students between classes was where the action was. Something was missing. What was addressed was my head — my intellectual needs. But I had emotional problems about myself as a human being. Nobody talked to those. Even though I got As all the time, I was unhappy; I felt socially inadequate."

Rosen, a Brown University alumnus, wanted with four colleagues to establish a boarding school that would address those kinds of problems for students ages 13-18.

"We wanted to create a place where the emotional, social and interpersonal areas could be given the same as intellectual skills. We want less to fall into Wendi," he said.

The barns and farmhouse they converted into classroom and dormitory in July 1973 opened that September as "a strictly private operation," with 12 boarding students, as well as five staff members who did everything from teach to cook meals.

The students, Brown said, included those who had been successful in traditional schools as well as those who had problems. The focal point was decision-making.

"Looking back to my life," Rosen said, "the big decisions have had little to do with academics — how to make friends, how to decide what I want, how to relate to people."

Decision-making, he said, is part of a process that also includes developing self-awareness and learning to accept full responsibility for one's choices.

Will Ratliss, who became director last July when Rosen decided to step down to oversee academic programming, said, "Developmentally they're at a stage where they no longer accept parental ideas without question. They want to make their own decisions."

For the first time, they have the perspective and mental framework to make sense of the world by themselves.

"The kids are faced with decisions here every day," Rosen said.

Special courses include photography, wood working, arts and crafts, animal behavior, camping and outdoor exploration. There is also a women's studies course for the school's female students.

Maple Valley now has room for 20 resident and 11 day students, most of whose costs are paid through Chippewa and various state programs. Some boarders come as far as Washington, D.C., and Montreal, although all students are from Massachusetts. Day students are from Somerville, Natick and the surrounding area. There are two full-time teachers, two administrators, a part-time psychologist and four support personnel.

"We're here around the clock," said Ratliss, an Amherst College and University of Massachusetts graduate. "We have no curfew, and the school is open 24 hours a day."

Through contact with adults, Rosen explained, "they learn about the world, and they're ready to move into adulthood."

One popular course, said Ratliss, is a "person class" which teaches the students about themselves.

"We're very much geared to helping kids look at themselves and other people."

A required activity is "emergency meetings," which Ratliss said, "can be called by anybody in the community who feels his rights have been violated or a law has been broken. All students and faculty have one vote, so punishments and solutions are made democratically by peers."

The school, Ratliss said, has been doing more to prepare students for transition after graduation, through apprenticeships, vocational training and orientation of students into the Wendell community.

"We do everything we can to maintain neighbor relationships with the Wendell community," Ratliss explained. "We give kids a feel for what it is to live as a part of a community, what the feelings of the neighbors, what different lifestyles are, to make preparations for what they want to do when they get out of here."

Ratliss said the school prides itself on its teacher-student interaction.

"Being a teacher here," Ratliss explained, "involves more than sitting behind a desk and dealing with the students, faculty members rotate working until 11 p.m. and weekends.

Through contact with adults," Rosen explained, "they learn about the world, and they're ready to move into adulthood."

One popular course, said Ratliss, is a "person class" which teaches the students about themselves.

"We're very much geared to helping kids look at themselves and other people."

A required activity is "emergency meetings," which Ratliss said, "can be called by anybody in the community who feels his rights have been violated or a law has been broken. All students and faculty have one vote, so punishments and solutions are made democratically by peers."

The school, Ratliss said, has been doing more to prepare students for transition after graduation, through apprenticeships, vocational training and orientation of students into the Wendell community.

"We do everything we can to maintain neighbor relationships with the Wendell community," Ratliss explained. "No give kids a feel for what it is to live as a part of a community, what the feelings of the neighbors, what different lifestyles are, to make preparations for what they want to do when they get out of here."

"Students" school is open 24 hours a day. The school is open 24 hours a day. The school is open 24 hours a day.

"If someone doesn't want to be at Maple Valley, Maple Valley will not work," Ratliss stressed.

"If kids are referred to us by public agencies," he said, "there's obviously some reason why that child hasn't been successful in a traditional learning environment. We deal with kids who are intellectually able and who in fact may be doing work. Their home scene may not be working out, or maybe they're getting into legal trouble. There are not necessarily academic, family or court problems but it may span all of them."

Since it opened, the physical plant, on 14 acres, has expanded to include a new classroom-dormitory building and director's office. And, Rosen reflected, the staff has gained experience.

"Maple Valley works," he asserted. "It's developed capability and accountability. I'm tremendously proud of that; our ability to address a wide range of needs that other systems cannot."

"From being very personal in its inspirational beginnings," Rosen said, "the school is expanded to include a wider range of people. The first year, he noted, staff members earned $10 a week. Now, he said, they are making "decent wages" but often work more than 50 hours a week. Despite that, he said, the school is "an exciting place to be."

When the school was founded, Rosen said, "I don't think we had specific, long-range goals. We had in survival our days. We didn't know what it would look like."

Today, Rosen said, "Maple Valley isn't an experiment anymore."

"People have a tendency," Rosen said, "to look at Maple Valley as a special school, as an experimental school. We see ourselves as another way of educating kids."

Text by Richie Davis
Photos by Chuck Blake
What the students have to say

WENDELL — The thin 11-year-old girl sat on the porch of Maple Valley School's six-building, old red farmhouse with no trim, sketching a large maple tree on a side of the road. She shivered once or twice from the cold.

"In public school I was one in 1,000. I felt it. I wanted to be noticed and to make a difference. Here if I left it would make a difference.

"I was really rebellious against adults. I don't see them as people. When I get here, I become friends with adults. They didn't see that authority over me; I had it over myself. The way I dealt with my own life and other people is different now because of the way they deal with people here. It's a lot more open and honest."

Inside, there was singing and guitar playing, reading and conversation in the large but boxy dining hall.

Some Maple Valley students say the school has helped them grow as individuals. Others say they're bored. Some say there's too much flexibility for certain peers.

If there's a consensus, it's that there's a tremendous difference between Maple Valley and traditional education — and the students prefer the alternative approach.

Some of the students are referred to the school because they have problems in a traditional setting; others choose to come despite the fact they are doing well academically in public schools.

"I couldn't stand public school," said one 11-year-old student. "All through junior high school I was trying to get out. I was an A and B student, but I didn't like the clique. You didn't learn about people, about how to get along. All you would learn was math and English. There was no personal growth. I decided there were better things in life than going to school." 

"I didn't like adults," she added, "they were always trying to put you in your place, trying to set you straight. I just wanted to make myself what I wanted to be. Here the adults are my friends."

One girl, who aspired to keep the bright sunlight from hurting her eyes, spoke about the opportunity at the school to "learn anything you want to." To illustrate her point, she explained that when she wanted to learn to play the violin, the school found someone in Amherst who could teach her and arranged the lessons.

An Amherst girl, who plans to graduate one year ahead of the traditional schedule, compared Maple Valley with other alternative schools she has attended.

"Instead of a structured program," she explained, "this is a free school. It works a lot better with humanistic, personal growth. The staff really cares for each kid individually. There's more living, more caring, more parenting; it's a family-type situation."

"You're given freedom and cared about, but not told what to do. The adults give you-guidance."

A 16-year-old student who was referred to the school after getting in legal trouble, said, "I hadn't gone to school for two or three years. They threw me back into seventh grade. Everything I was learning I knew before. Here the teachers can teach you better; they take time so you can really learn. Next year, I'll be getting my diploma. I want to go to college, if I can, and become an architect."

Students who had the perspective of time as well as how the school has changed.

One Amherst boy noted a tremendous improvement in programs and other elements.

"It's becoming more confident about itself," he said.

Another student, who said, "I love Maple Valley an awful lot," nevertheless planned to return to public schools next year.

"I've been here a long time. When I first came, it was almost like a family. There weren't as many 'names' (by becoming students, for instance, toward staff members). It's not so new; it's just really different. We're getting different kinds of people. Maple Valley can never be the same; it's the people who go here."

"If you know what you want, this school can help you. For some people it can be too much freedom — they get carried away. Some kids wouldn't be good here."

"I'm coming up for expulsions," admitted one student. "I might get expelled for not acting the way I should. I'd like to be here, but if I wasn't pressured to be here," he said, explaining that the alternative is being put under "lock and key" by the state. "I'd like to be here. There are good people here; I like the program."

A dark-haired girl explained, "A lot of boys here act out anger and violence. But it's learning; it's growth. They have to learn to do things in a way that are responsible to society."

"In the end," explained her friend, "the school really changes people's lives. Some people, though, left the same way they came in. There have been a lot of problems with violence and destruction in the past year. Some people wanted to change but they didn't have the will to change themselves. So they were expelled before they came to the change."

Irrationally, in this alternative school designed to be work against it, boredom is a complaint of some students.

"I'm anxious to get out," said one student about to graduate, "it's boring because at the end of the day, at 4 o'clock, there's nothing to do. Some kids can go home or can go to people's houses, but most of the kids here aren't friends with the kids in town."

"They need a gym," he said; "someplace to work out. They've got all this energy. It comes at the end of the day and they start letting it out by punching holes in the walls."

The school, he added, is trying to provide some kind of gym.

Although cold fever and the lack of a gym were problems during the winter, he said, there is much less disruption than in years past.

Yet he said, "It's a disruptive thing and it isn't. It's part of learning. Maple Valley can work for anybody at all. If they don't want to come here it doesn't work. But there's never anybody who doesn't belong here. It's really open, so there's room for everybody."
"Alternative' and 'basic' education merge at Maple Valley

This is the last of a four-part series on the issue of minimum competency standards in area school systems.

By RICHIE DAVIS
Recorder Staff

WENDELL — How do you measure "alternative" education in a time of "back to basics?"

As much as anyone was an educational battle cry of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the "Alternative" schools of the late 1970s and early 1980s now seem to be "Back to Basics.

Two years ago, the Maple Valley School was in its infancy, and its 12-year-old co-founder, Mark Rosen, emphasized that the school's approach is not soft, but flexible.

"Maple Valley over the years has been labeled as unstructured," he said. "We've always been structured. The content has to be done with limits and boundaries.

Rosen is on the push in the past decade for open-classroom approaches, "to get kids involved and make them feel," because of poor teacher training and lack of understanding about the need for limits.

Maple Valley, a day and boarding school for students aged 13-18 who have difficultly in traditional learning situations, focuses on decision-making skills through small classes and other means.

The success of the school is its ability to "weave" its way through the academic program, not as a substitute, but as a way to help the student develop feelings of self-worth and self-confidence.

"We've had kids who were doing well in traditional schools and then they hit a wall, and Maple Valley helped them," Rosen said.

Rosen and his staff are pleased with the school's progress, and they are proud of the students who have "come through the door and come through the program and come out the other side.

The school's academic program includes those students who have difficulty with traditional learning and those who are academically challenged.

By RICHIE DAVIS
Recorder Staff

WENDELL — Maple Valley School is a boarding school for students aged 13-18 years old which has been established for seven years. The school is operated by the State of Massachusetts, and is open to students from all over the country.

The school is located in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts, and is one of the few schools in the state that offers a full-time boarding program.

The school is run by a board of trustees, which is composed of five members, including the school's principal, a teacher, and two parents.

The school's curriculum includes subjects such as English, mathematics, science, social studies, and physical education. The school also offers a variety of extracurricular activities, including sports, music, and drama.

The school is not a public school, but is a private, non-profit organization. The school is funded by tuition and contributions from parents and other supporters.

The school's mission is to provide a quality education to students who are in need of a more structured and supportive learning environment. The school's philosophy is to provide a supportive and nurturing environment, where students can develop their skills and achieve their full potential.

The school's program is designed to help students overcome academic, social, and emotional challenges. The school provides a supportive and caring environment, where students can feel safe and supported.

The school's goal is to help students develop the skills and confidence they need to be successful in all areas of their lives. The school's success is measured by the students' academic achievement, social development, and personal growth.

The school is committed to providing a safe and supportive environment for all students. The school's staff is dedicated to helping students achieve their goals and become successful and confident individuals.

The school is proud to offer a high-quality education to students from all walks of life. The school is committed to providing a supportive and caring environment, where students can develop their skills and achieve their full potential.

Greenfield, Massachusetts — Saturday, May 27, 1978

Maple Valley adds space
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The school's goal is to help students develop the skills and confidence they need to be successful in all areas of their lives. The school's success is measured by the students' academic achievement, social development, and personal growth.

The school is committed to providing a safe and supportive environment for all students. The school's staff is dedicated to helping students achieve their goals and become successful and confident individuals.

The school is proud to offer a high-quality education to students from all walks of life. The school is committed to providing a supportive and caring environment, where students can develop their skills and achieve their full potential.

Greenfield, Massachusetts — Saturday, May 27, 1978

Maple Valley adds space

BY RICHIE DAVIS
Recorder Staff

WENDELL — Maple Valley School is a boarding school for students 13-18 years old which has been established for seven years. The school is operated by the State of Massachusetts, and is open to students from all over the country.

The school is located in the town of Wendell, Massachusetts, and is one of the few schools in the state that offers a full-time boarding program.

The school is run by a board of trustees, which is composed of five members, including the school's principal, a teacher, and two parents.

The school's curriculum includes subjects such as English, mathematics, science, social studies, and physical education. The school also offers a variety of extracurricular activities, including sports, music, and drama.

The school is not a public school, but is a private, non-profit organization. The school is funded by tuition and contributions from parents and other supporters.

The school's mission is to provide a quality education to students who are in need of a more structured and supportive learning environment. The school's philosophy is to provide a supportive and nurturing environment, where students can develop their skills and achieve their full potential.

The school's program is designed to help students overcome academic, social, and emotional challenges. The school provides a supportive and caring environment, where students can feel safe and supported.

The school's goal is to help students develop the skills and confidence they need to be successful in all areas of their lives. The school's success is measured by the students' academic achievement, social development, and personal growth.

The school is committed to providing a safe and supportive environment for all students. The school's staff is dedicated to helping students achieve their goals and become successful and confident individuals.

The school is proud to offer a high-quality education to students from all walks of life. The school is committed to providing a supportive and caring environment, where students can develop their skills and achieve their full potential.
Class of '79: one for a celebration

By MARYLYN M. MORIN

Douglas A. Johnson of Wenden held the wedding of the year.

By MARILYN M. MORIN

Douglas A. Johnson of Wenden held the wedding of the year.

School teaches sense of worth

By DIAMARE JONES

WENDELL - When Freda Prater, Louise C. Parson and Rick Moulgl graduated from the Maple Valley School on March 17, they realized the school was about to close.

The School teaches a sense of worth.
Two years have passed since the conclusion of this study. This period might be characterized as a time for consolidation and expansion from an organizational perspective. A summary profile of these movements follows.

In a sense, the past two years represents an extension of the Later Years experience (see: Chapter IV) in that it clearly reflects the basic tenents of the program's integrated theory and approach to psychoeducational programming. That is, the program's theoretical and practical evolution—as defined in the Later Years chapter—continued to be viewed as comprehensive in nature and functional in practice. It is for this reason that this most recent period does not represent a distinct programmatic stage in and of itself; that is, one which is defined by sharp differences in theory and practice from earlier periods as well as within a stage itself. This period can be more accurately understood as a process wherein the Maple Valley organization underwent significant structural changes and adjustments quite unrelated to the type of theory/practice paradigm which underlies this study.

Since 1981, the leadership has directed its energy toward facilitating and guiding the program's movement through a series of broader organizational transitions. Specifically, this process may in part be understood through the examination of two distinct yet parallel themes. On one level, it was the view of program planners
that as of the summer of 1981, Maple Valley was overly dependent on the involvement of particular individuals fulfilling specific programmatic role expectations. On another level, and occurring simultaneously, critical personnel changes were underway within the program's leadership. The leadership determined that the school's survival and growth required a movement away from a more charismatic style of leadership and exercise of personal power toward a more "organizationally balanced" system in which the program's viability would be rooted in a more even distribution of organizational power. Thus, various methods have been employed and tested in an attempt to find this organizational equilibrium. At present, the "jury is still out" with respect to the basic validity of the aforementioned premises and hypotheses. However, the leadership remains firmly committed to ensuring the program's survival independent of the continued involvement of specific key individuals.

In addition, during the past two years, important efforts have been made toward refining the "integrated model" outlined in the text of the study (see: Chapter V). In the area of curriculum development, the teaching staff has placed more emphasis on constructing learning units within developmental parameters. Also, program staff have continued to work on the development of a more diverse and comprehensive range of daily activities.

At another level, the Maple Valley organization has continued to develop in terms of its emerging role as a viable and progressive human service agency in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. During
these past two years, the organization has not only worked to consolidate gains made in the previous era but has also directed its resources toward the development of new services for adolescents and their families. Toward this end, the organization has developed a new short-term residential program for adolescent males aged thirteen through nineteen. This program, the "Center for Child and Family Resources," has just completed a remarkably successful first year of operation. This program is designed to respond to children and families in the midst of crises by helping to stabilize the situation in such a way as to promote the reintegration of the adolescent into the most natural and least restrictive life setting. A full range of services is provided including diagnostic assessment, family therapy, outreach, health care, vocational and life-skill education. At a more comprehensive level, the Maple Valley leadership remains firmly committed to an organizational model based on the provision of a "continuum of services" for adolescents and their families. In this regard, the leadership intends to expand the organization through the development of a number of programmatic models currently on the "drawing boards."

In summation, and as noted in the Prologue, it is primarily a function of the extraordinary level of demonstrated commitment on the part of key individuals that the Maple Valley organization has survived and prospered. In the years to come, the organization's viability will, as it has in the past, largely depend on the continued level of investment and commitment from other talented and
competent professionals willing and able to make life-giving contributions.