DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 339 SP 002 201

By-Egerton, John

Central Missouri's Inner City Project Tells a Near-Parable.

Pub Date May 67

Note-6p.

Journal Cit-Southern Education Report; v2 n9 May 1967 p26-31 (Southern Education Reporting Service, 1109 Nineteenth Ave., South, Nashville, Tennessee)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40

Descriptors-Achievement, Conventional Instruction, *Disadvantaged Groups, *Educational Innovation, Ethnic Groups, Field Trips, Individualized Programs, Minority Groups, *Program Descriptions, Psychology, Seminars, Sociology, Special Programs, Student Teaching, *Teacher Education, *Urban Education, Urban Teaching

Identifiers-Central Missouri State College, CMSC, ICTEP, Inner City Teacher Education Project, Kansas, Kansas City, Mid Continent Regional Educational Labor, Warrensburg

In response to a challenge by the Kansas City Public Schools superintendent, Central Missouri State College (CMSC) instituted the Inner City Teacher Education Project (ICTEP) to prepare teachers in teaching and understanding disadvantaged children. Originally a spare-time program of field trips and seminars, it was developed in 1965 into a full-time 5- to 6-month block with four instructors and 24 students involved in conventional teacher education courses, a thorough study of ethnic groups, minorities and the poor, at least nine hours of psychology and sociology, field trips to the inner city, and inner city student teaching. Because ICTEP was a departure from standard teacher preparation with excellent results (favorable reports from Kansas City and winner of the 1966 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Distinguished Achievement Award), the program raised serious questions about the relevance of conventional teacher education, causing great dissension on the CMSC campus. The number of students participating in the program decreased, and in 1966, six of the seven most closely involved with the project resigned. However, one of those who resigned, Dr. Grant Clothier (who joined the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory), is planning a project patterned after ICTEP for fall, 1967 (see SP 002 249). (SM)

CENTRAL MISSOURI'S INNER CITY PROJECT TELLS A NEAR-PARABLE

By John Egerton

Last month, Southern Education Report published the results of a survey of teacher-education institutions in the Southern and border area designed to show how future teachers are being prepared for work with culturally disadvantaged children. The survey showed that less than one college or university in six has made any substantive changes in the past five years to improve the preparation of teachers for this purpose, and only two in five report any intention or any desire to do so. Virtually all of those questioned conceded, however, that the institutions that train teachers have a special responsibility to help improve the education of the disadvantaged. Several colleges in the region do have promising programs for training teachers to work with the disadvantaged, and some of their student teachers and graduates are in the classrooms of inner-city schools. The following article describes one of these programs—the Inner City Teacher Education project of Central Missouri State College. Letters from readers of Southern Education Report commenting of the results of the survey appear on pages 32 and 33 of this issue.

The public school system of Kansas City, Mo., needs between 200 and 250 teachers every fall to fill vacancies and new positions in its inner-city slum-area schools where culturally disadvantaged children predominate.

Only a small number of the people who fill those posts—perhaps two dozen at best—are specially suited by either training or experience to deal with the kinds of challenges the inner-city school presents. Like every other American metropolis, Kansas City has a large and growing number of school children whose social, educational, physical and economic handicaps combine to present educators with what is probably their most serious problem. But most of the educators come from a middle-class culture, and the inner city is to most of them a foreign, unfamiliar and forbidding land.

Still, Kansas City may be better off than most urban centers. It does have a few young teachers—about 30—whose college preparation was specifically designed to equip them with some of the skills and insights their present assignments in the city's poor neighborhoods require. Next fall, they will be joined by some 15 other new teachers who have had the same kind of preparation. All of these teachers are graduates of the Inner City Teacher Education Project (ICTEP) at Central Missouri State College (CMSC), located some 60 miles east of Kansas City in the little town of Warrensburg.

The story of ICTEP is almost a bricks-and-straw parable of the plight of teacher education in contemporary America. Its strength is in the demonstration of what can be done to make relevant the preparation of teachers for the inner city; its weaknesses are shown by the small numbers of teachers it produces, the reluctance of other colleges to try similar experiments, and the resistance to the program on the CMSC campus.

In spite of its small size and its chilly reception by old-line professional educators, ICTEP has caused quite a stir both in Warrensburg and in Kansas City. In fact, there is some evidence to indicate that its success is the main thing that keeps it small and angers its critics. Whatever the case, ICTEP is getting smaller instead of larger. In the 1965-66 academic year, its first full year of operation, it turned out 54

graduates for the inner city; this year the number is down to 30, and projections for next year indicate that the number will be reduced still further.

Central Missouri State College graduates well over 500 new teachers a year, and a sizable number of them—perhaps as many as half—are hired by school systems in and around Kansas City. It supplies more teachers to inner-city and suburban schools in the metropolitan area than do the University of Kansas, the University of Missouri at Kansas City and the University of Missouri's main campus in Columbia combined. Last fall, 258 CMSC graduates were hired by school systems in Kansas City and its suburbs.

It was because of this relationship between the college and the Kansas City public schools that the Inner City Teacher Education Project came into being. Kansas City Supt. James A. Hazlett raised the issue in 1964 when he publicly chided the area's teacher-education institutions for not preparing teachers to teach disadvantaged children. Dr. D. W Tieszen, dean of instruction at CMSC, replied that his college was ready to do whatever was necessary to meet the city's needs. As if on cue, one of his faculty members, Dr. Grant Clothier, stepped forward with a program he said was designed to do just that.

As director of student teaching for CMSC, Clothier headed a corps of faculty members who supervised the college's student teachers over a large area of Missouri. He and his staff and members of the Kansas City school administration had been thinking and talking about a program to aid the inner-city schools for more than a year, and when Hazlett and Tieszen brought the question into the open, Clothier was ready to move.

With the permission of the college administration, he and four other members of the faculty (including two sociologists and a psychologist) organized a series of seminars and field trips for 13 volunteers from the senior class. Since all of the faculty members already had full-time responsibilities and all of the students were enrolled for a normal load of courses, their activities in the 10-week winter term which began in December, 1964, used up most of their nights, weekends and holidays. Their subject was the nature of poverty and cultural deprivation; to get this introduction to it, the students gave up a week of Christmas vacation

Mrs. Virginia Trimble, one of the original 13 volunteers for ICTEP, works as a student teacher.

and all their spare time to spend 21 hours in multi-disciplinary seminars, five days in the Kansas City slums and many more hours in reading.

When the term ended, the 13 students (10 females and 3 males; 10 whites and 3 Negroes) were assigned for the spring quarter to do their student teaching in three of Kansas City's poor-neighborhood schools. At the same time, 15 more students volunteered for the series of seminars and field trips.

Clothier and his small staff spent the summer of 1965 further shaping and polishing the program. When the fall quarter started, they had developed the spare-time seminar and field trip program into a full-time professional block of instruction for credit, and 24 students enrolled in it. The 15 students who had participated in the instructional program the previous spring were assigned to the Kansas City schools for student teaching, and the 13 original students, having graduated, were hired to teach in the inner city, most of them in the same schools where they had been student teachers.

The first cycle of the program was thus complete. ICTEP had become a formal option for teacher-education majors. Three members of the education faculty were assigned full time to the project, and others from sociology, psychology and reading combined to add the equivalent of a fourth full-time position. Dr. Clothier, while still serving as director of student teaching, also directed the new program.

From the beginning, ICTEP was a radical departure from the customary pattern of teacher education at CMSC. It recruited interested students in the latter part of their sophomore year and steered them into course work that included a minimum of nine credit hours in psychology and sociology. It brought the students into early and continuing contact with the inner city and its sociological makeup. And it gave them, during almost all of their senior year, an opportunity to concentrate most of their time on the task for which they were preparing.

The term spent in the professional block is particularly illustrative of ICTEP's unorthodox design. With the equivalent of four full-time professors and a maximum of 24 students, informality and a spirit of teamwork prevailed. Since they were enrolled in no other courses, the students could devote full time to the program. They took six to eight one-day field trips to Kansas City (a full week's stay in the inner city was tried experimentally during one term). They visited schools, homes, courts, health centers, welfare agencies, community service centers and other institutions. In the classroom and in their readings, they were immersed in as thorough a study of ethnic groups, minorities and the poor as the 10- to 12-week term allowed.

The instructional program also included educational theory and foundations, school organization and administration, general methods and materials of instruction, and the evaluation and use of tests and measurements. Its major emphasis, however, was on understanding the inner-city child and his environment and on fostering in the students a positive attitude toward the children they would be teaching. Since the instructors in the program also supervised the inner-city student teaching which followed it, the result was a five- to six-month period of instruction,

observation and practice that closely approximated individualized preparation for a task which previously had been given no more than passing mention.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that ICTEP stirred up a few waves on the campus. It was a departure from the standard procedure for preparing teachers, and favorable reports on it from Kansas City inevitably raised questions about the relevance of the dominant teacher-education program and its need for alterations.

In February of 1966, ICTEP won the Distinguished Achievement Award of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, a coveted honor given annually for "excellence in teacher education." It was a signal achievement for the college, but it also heightened the internal dissension that had welled up around the program, and within four months, Clothier had resigned and all but one of the other half-dozen men who had been most closely involved in it had followed him.

Clothier joined the staff of the Mid-Continent Reg-

Dr. Grant Clothier, Dr. Fred Rietbrock, Albert Sargis, Dr. Robert Marshall, Dr. Eugene Hill.

ional Educational Laboratory in Kansas City. The lone ICTEP faculty member who remained at CMSC, Dr. Robert B. Marshall, now runs the program with one other full-time faculty member, Dr. James A. Hudson; a sociologist, Dr. Kenneth Kelly, teaches a two-hour section of the professional block. This spring, there are 16 students doing practice teaching in Kansas City, and only eight students are enrolled in the professional block.

It is difficult to say with certainty what precipitated the breakup of the ICTEP staff or what is the cause of the program's decline. Clothier and Marshall are philosophical about it; they refuse to discuss the troubles in specific terms. But some graduates of the program, other students still participating in it, other faculty members at the college, and administrators in the Kansas City schools generally say ICTEP was a threat to convention that led to bitter faculty political disputes and generated jealousies and insecurities involving a large number of administrators and professors. There is evidence that some members of the education faculty have advised students not to volunteer for the program, and more than one student said her friends and some of her professors "thought I was a nut for getting into it." One graduate of ICTEP who now teaches in a slum neighborhood of Kansas City said, "Most of the education faculty at Warrensburg has been away from the classroom so long they don't have any idea what's going on here. The ones who do know and are concerned are considered boat-rockers, and they don't last but a year or two."

Some people in Kansas City believe the ICTEP experiment will soon be terminated; one woman was under the impression it had already been concluded. "*What* inner-city teacher education program?" she asked in surprise, when questioned about it. "I thought that was all washed up." But Dr. Warren C. Lovinger, CMSC's president, denies any such intention. "I am very much in favor of this program," he said. "It's making a fine contribution to one of the major problems of our time, and it is definitely going to continue. All of us in teacher education are going to have to give this first priority."

Dr. Lovinger spoke with pride about the national award the project had received. He also said, in answer to a question, that the present size of the program is "just about right." "We're more interested in perfecting it than expanding it," he added. "We must be selective in the students we admit to the program. This can't be done on an assembly-line basis. Other institutions are going to have to get into this, too. We want this to remain a separate program here. It will have no particular effect on our regular teacher education program."

The man who seems least concerned about the size of ICTEP or the animosities its presence has generated is Robert Marshall. Crew-cut, bespectacled and soft-spoken, he is absorbed in a program that he believes in wholeheartedly, and if he hears any static about it, he seems to ignore it. "I'm not inclined to get too excited about things I can't do anything about," he says.

Marshall has been at CMSC for five years (he was a teacher, principal and superintendent for 18 years before that), and he has been closely involved in ICTEP since it began. He likes to talk about the program, but he is no drum-beating evangelist. With those who share his enthusiasm and commitment, he is quiet, patient and proud; to skeptics and detractors, he gives a shrug and a smile. These are some of the things he says about the program:

"I'm convinced that this is the most effective way to prepare teachers, regardless of where they're going to teach. The ones who are most enthusiastic about it are the ones who have been closest to it. If you want to find out what this program is all about, talk to the kids who are in it. They know more about it than the

administration or the faculty or even I do. I don't expect the administration to have this as their primary interest. They have a lot of other things to worry about. Sure, some of the faculty are negative about it. They feel threatened by it; they've said it couldn't be done; they've said we weren't prepared to teach the kids, and they've said the kids don't have enough experience and maturity and won't be able to succeed. But this has been a staff-stimulated program from the beginning. The nucleus has been inside this college, not something imported or imposed. And the administration has at least had to be permissive in order for the project to succeed at all.

"We have succeeded. It doesn't concern me that we can't pinpoint the reasons for positive changes in our new teachers. What's important is that change has taken place. We don't try to train people; we got rid of that notion early. Attitudes and understanding are the core of this thing. Formula teaching is a faulty approach. Our professional block brings these kids together four hours a day, five days a week, in a small group. We use team teaching to present an interdisciplinary program, we play down the importance of grades and exams, but we have no magic formula, no sure-fire gimmicks. Hudson and I aren't looking for status and prestige. We just want to teach. If we can turn out a dozen or two good teachers a year who are ready, willing and able to teach in these inner-city and deprived-area schools, that's okay with me. I've got a lot of pride in what we've been able to accomplish. The enthusiasm of the kids is enough reward."

That enthusiasm is apparent. Conversations with graduates of the program now teaching in Kansas City, with student teachers there and with students in the block program at CMSC bring out such comments as these:

"I learned more in that program than in all the rest of my time in college. . . . It takes more than a burning zeal and a missionary spirit. They used to tell us, 'If your idea of helping the poor is giving quarters to beggars, this program is not for you.' . . . I'm down on conventional teacher education programs—the wrong courses, the wrong skills, the wrong emphasis, and a lot of wasted time. It's a lot of Mickey Mouse stuff, too theoretical. . . . I wouldn't have made it in the inner city without that program. . . . You have to have open, imaginative people like Clothier and Marshall to make a success of a thing like this. . . . Most college students can't understand why anyone would want to do this. They think it's dangerous, that you can't teach these children because they won't or can't learn. But the switchblade image is overdone. Some of those things do happen, sure, but they happen everywhere else, too. . . . I know I've meant a lot to these kids, and they mean a lot to me. You have to take on some of their culture, instead of trying to change it to your own. There's never enough time, and there are plenty of problems—discipline and motivation are the biggest —but these kids *can* learn. . . . I wouldn't trade this experience for anything."

These young people are also highly complimentary of most of the veteran teachers they have worked with in the inner city. "When you get here, you rely on these people or you're lost," said one of them. "They're calm and patient—two of the most important qualities —and they know how to keep kids motivated and interested." Said another, who was the first white person in a junior high school: "It would seem that the school has the responsibility to compensate in whatever measure it can for the 'education' that many minority-group children have already received from their larger society. This almost insuperable task is faced by the Negro teacher every day, and whatever success is attained is a tribute to his or her efforts, example, personality and integrity, both as a teacher and as a human being."

Carl Thompson, who was principal of one of the inner-city schools during the first two years of ICTEP, recalls that the CMSC students, both as practice teachers and, later, as members of his faculty, were "much better prepared than the usual new teachers." "They helped the morale of our older teachers, kept them on their toes and gave them a lot of extra help and support," he said. "One of the best things was that as student teachers they were there all day long, not just a couple of hours. The colleges could prepare many more such people. They could also train mothers from the neighborhood to serve as teacher aides, and they could help a lot of liberal-arts graduates to become teachers. But they don't do much. They don't get off the college campus and into the city. The ICTEP program was different. It's a good program, realistic. It did a lot for our school."

Supt. Hazlett is equally sold on the program. "Central Missouri is the only college in this area which has really tried to take a systematic approach to the problems of teaching in the inner city," he says. "They've done a fine job, and we'd like to encourage them to do more, even to the point of [our] paying some of the costs. But I'm afraid college professors of education are still personally disposed to counsel their students to go elsewhere, to the suburbs, where the pay is often better and the job is much easier. I think that's wrong."

One measure of the success of ICTEP is the number of teachers it has actually provided for the inner city. A survey last winter showed that 73 students had entered practice teaching under the program, 68 had graduated and been certified to teach, 60 had gone directly into public-school teaching and 32 were on the faculties of inner-city schools in Kansas City. It could not be determined how many of the 28 who were teaching elsewhere had assignments in schools of the disadvantaged. Of the 73 who entered student teaching, only two flunked out or dropped out and failed to graduate.

One of the most remarkable things about the inner-city teacher-education project is the fact that it has been strictly an indigenous effort with a small budget, a minimum of organization and no funds or strategies from foundations or the federal government. CMSC has paid faculty salaries and most housekeeping ex-

penses, the Kansas City schools have contributed supervisory and advisory personnel and a little travel money, and the students have paid their own way. Aside from one $1,500 foundation grant for a one-week field trip to Kansas City, there has been no outside financial help for the program.

Dr. Clothier gives the students most of the credit for ICTEP's success. "Most of them were white, middle-class, gentile, Protestant Republicans," he recalls. "Who can say what it is that makes such kids responsive to a program like this? I don't think anyone knows a way to pick the right ones. We used to say, 'Don't march to Selma, march to Kansas City and teach in an inner-city school.' And they did. We got the right ones, the kids who really responded to the challenge. I don't know what it was that made them different, but they were."

Clothier has not forgotten the problems of inner-city teaching since he moved to the regional laboratory in Kansas City a year ago. In fact, his major efforts there are directed to the development of a co-operative program in which 13 Missouri and Kansas liberal-arts colleges will join with the lab, beginning next fall, in an inner-city teacher education venture patterned after the Warrensburg program.

With small grants from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Danforth Foundation, plus tuition rebates by the colleges, the laboratory and the Kansas City schools will give about 30 students from the 13 colleges a full semester's experience studying, observing and practice teaching in the inner city. The colleges will contribute some faculty help for supervisory purposes. In most respects, the program will closely parallel what CMSC is doing, with one exception: housing will be found in Kansas City for the entire laboratory group, and they will live there during the full 16-week semester. The students will be given credit at their home college, the same as if they were enrolled there for a full load of courses. Clothier holds open the possibility that the University of Missouri at Kansas City and other large public institutions in the area will eventually join in the co-operative venture or start such programs on their own.

It is another small step in the direction of change. Dr. Robert Wheeler, assistant superintendent for urban education services in the Kansas City school system, believes there is still a long way to go. Are colleges today providing well-prepared teachers for the inner city? "The answer is a resounding 'No!' This effort by the liberal-arts colleges is encouraging, but it's only a small drop in the bucket. Colleges generally are behind the public schools in their perception of this problem and in their commitment to solving it. They're still talking about theory, when what we need is 200 or 300 new teachers every year who have had a long exposure to the problems we face. Why are colleges and universities still thinking of this as a kind of add-on, optional, voluntary thing? It has to be a specialty, and it has to be a lot bigger than what Central Missouri is doing or what the liberal-arts colleges are going to do.

"There's at least this, though," he said, brightening a little. "We've got the lab involved, and that's better than the colleges, which are just one step further removed from the problem. Now if we could just get Central Missouri State College and these liberal-arts colleges to do more, and get the University of Missouri at Kansas City, the University of Kansas and a few others to join in and make this one big co-operative program producing about 300 teachers a year, then we'd really have something, wouldn't we?" ○