Abstract
        This project was undertaken to encourage
and aid developing predominantly Negro colleges in the
South in adopting new approaches for improving curricula
and instruction. The chief means for doing so was a
conference cn innovation in November 1967 attended by
representatives of the administration, faculty, and
students of 27 institutions. The Southern Regional
Education Board planned the conference to encourage
participants to consider innovative practices, identify
hindrances, and develop plans for implementation. On the
basis of participant interest, 5 areas were chosen for
workshops. Lively discussions indicated the problems
involved in change, including the "generation gap."
Although provision was made for assistance in carrying out
plans formulated at the conference, only 2 schools
requested such aid within the next 6 months. As a result of
an interim survey taken in June 1968, the project deadline
was extended to June 1969 and 4 promising programs were
selected for special assistance. At the closing evaluation
conference, participants reported over 90 innovations under
way at their schools. They suggested continuation along
with improvement of similar projects. Discussions indicated
that while there is a deep interest in innovation at many
developing colleges, inexperience, conservative factions,
and lack cf time and money hinder progress. (DS)

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-0569
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070569-1715

A CONFERENCE AND FOLLOW-UP CONSULTATION
TO FOSTER THE IMPROVEMENT OF
CURRICULA AND INSTRUCTION
IN DEVELOPING COLLEGES

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

June 30, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report

Project No. 7-0569
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070569-1715

A Conference and Follow-up Consultation to
Foster the Improvement of Curricula
and Instruction in Developing Colleges

William R. O'Connell, Jr.

Southern Regional Education Board

Atlanta, Georgia

June 30, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SUMMARY

This project was undertaken to encourage and aid developing colleges in the South to try new approaches to improve curricula and instruction. The chief means for so doing was a conference on innovation with representatives of administration, faculty, and students participating. Objectives were to get participants to 1) consider innovative practices, 2) identify hindrances, and 3) develop plans for action leading to improvements on their home compuses.

The carefully-planned conference was shaped by staff during the session in response to needs and interests shown by participants. Following an opening exchange of lists of interests, workshop groups labored over specific problems, then presented findings to the larger group. An in-the-round session with the students "it" gave air to faculty-student and student-faculty complaints. New workshop groups dealt with concrete topics previously brought up. Then, after each institutional team met to draw up specific plans for back home, these ideas were presented to the entire group for reactions and suggestions.

Conference evaluation forms indicated that participants valued the chance for in-depth sharing of problems and possible solutions, and the interaction with students.

Provision was made in the project for assistance in carrying out plans formulated at the conference. When only two schools requested such aid within six months, a questionnaire asked if participants saw any results of their participation and reminded them of the possibility of help. The schools had at least 30 activities underway at least partly due to the conference; fewer ways SREB could help were listed. Since it was still believed the schools could use help, an extension to the project permitted picking six projects mentioned in the midpoint survey which could be assisted with the small project funds remaining. With such aid in the form of consultants, seminar funds, etc., the six projects were undertaken and are starting to show valuable results both on the campus and in the larger community.

An evaluation conference reassembled the participants to share project-related experiences and restimulate efforts at innovation. Participants reported over 90 "innovations" underway at their schools, covering a wide range. Many were special interdisciplinary or remedial programs, others dealt with extra-campus activity, still others involved consortiums, new media of instruction or administrative changes involving students. Discussions of the process of change pointed to the frustrations that call attention to the need for innovation, the emotional factors hindering it, and the steps toward communication, often following a crisis, which make it possible for new ideas to be heard. Another student discussion session showed that the generation gap had narrowed only slightly since the first conference, even though many joint

activities between faculty and students were reported from the campuses.

Asked for recommendations, participants stressed the value of these types of conferences in reinforcing new ideas they held, and asked for continued help in carrying out innovations. They also wanted funding organizations to permit less time to lapse between awarding of a grant and arrival of the first check, but more time to be permitted for fruit of a project to ripen.

Unquestionably, there is deep interest in innovation at many developing colleges, but this interest must be carefully nurtured. Inexperience, conservative factions, lack of time and money all make it hard for innovators to carry out ideas. Progress toward change is slow and results are difficult to measure. Continued interest, understanding, and sympathetic encouragement are necessary to permit ideas to flourish. Such continued interest in assisting new ideas in the developing colleges can probably lead to proportionately greater results.

INTRODUCTION

In the past several years the Bureau of Research of the U. S. Office of Education has provided grants for a series of conferences on innovations in higher education. There have been conferences on innovation in liberal arts colleges, in large universities and in state colleges. This project has operated under a grant for a conference on innovation in developing colleges as part of this larger emphasis of the Bureau of Research.

Generally, faculties and administrators of developing colleges have been so preoccupied with heavy teaching loads, with the necessity of finding financial support, and with the importance of living within severe budgetary limitations that they have had little time, energy, or motivation to reach out in new directions. As a consequence, curricula in these institutions have tended to be conventional and out-of-date, and the teaching methods often stereotyped and threadbare.

Keeping curricula in tune with the enormous expansion of knowledge and the burgeoning career opportunities, especially for the Negro graduate, has been a major problem for the developing college. Too often the curriculum has been expanded by the addition of courses resulting in more fragmented disciplines. Effects of this proliferation of courses have been loss of unity in liberal education and costly multiplication of small classes. The expansion of the curriculum too often has occurred without the replacement of obsolete areas of knowledge by current information. A static curriculum in a period of dynamic explosion of knowledge is an anomaly, yet is has existed on far too many campuses for too long.

Likewise, many developing colleges have felt the impact of the shortage of college teachers. These colleges are affected more acutely than other types of college by the teacher shortage because they are seldom able to financially compete for the best teachers available.

This project was designed to encourage improvements and new curricula directions in developing institutions through innovative approaches to the solution of major problems. The primary focus was on improving curricula and instruction, though attention had to be given to interrelated topics such as planning, administrative structure and communications, when considering the development of innovations in these areas.

CONFERENCE ON INNOVATIONS

The Conference on Innovations was the major activity of the project, though a program of follow-up assistance was planned to encourage the further development of ideas generated in the conference. The objectives of the conference were to get teams of

3

institutional representatives to 1) consider innovative practices
in higher education, 2) identify problems that might hinder the
development of innovative activities in their own institutions, and
3) develop plans for action leading to improvements through the best
and most up-to-date approaches. In addition, and almost as impor-
tant, a secondary objective was to help the participants, through
the process of the conference, gain insights into the dynamics of
the groups within which they had to work on their home campuses,
and see ways they individually might stimulate colleagues to accept
the need for educational change.

Planning the Conference

The planners of the conference were committed to the idea that
change does not take place without the involvement of all signifi-
cant influences in an institution. In keeping with this belief,
participants were selected to represent administration, faculty, and
students.

A second assumption was that learning takes place in a setting
wherein the participant has an opportunity to formulate his own
problems and seek out his own solutions.

The conference was designed to bring about an atmosphere in
which participants could freely explore their specific concerns in
a structure permitting maximum interchange of problems, ideas, re-
sources, and proposals for action.

Participants, in two- or three-man teams composed of faculty
members and administrators, were invited from 18 institutions.
These participants were carefully selected because of their demon-
strated interest in innovation, their ability to promote the adoption
of innovation and change in their own institutions, or their evidence
of having already contributed to such an effort. Faculty-administra-
tion teams at the conference came from: Concord College, Dillard
University, Florida A & M University, Fort Valley State College,
Houston-Tillotson College, Jackson State College, Johnson C. Smith
University, Lander College, Miles College, Morris Brown College,
Philander Smith College, Salisbury State College, Siena College,
South Carolina State College, Tennessee A & I University, Virginia
State College at Norfolk, Warren Wilson College, and Xavier Uni-
versity.

This group of participants included 28 faculty members of whom
14 were department chairmen; eight, academic deans; and seven, other
administrators--one registrar, one dean of students, one president,
and directors of special programs or institutional research. Aca-
demic fields represented by the faculty group included education,
English, philosophy, sociology, social science, business, nursing,
biology, chemistry, foreign languages, history and mathematics.

In the fall of 1967, students were not being heard with the interest they have been able to engender in the past two years. The conference planners felt, however, that any consideration of improving the educational experience could no longer take place in isolation from the student point of view. To promote maximum freedom of exchange and, hopefully, the development of dialog between the generations, nine student participants were invited from other institutions: Fisk University, Guilford College, Howard University, Morgan State College, Southern University, Texas Southern University, Tuskegee Institute, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and West Virginia State College.

These students were nominated by their deans as persons who could be expected to contribute to the conference and its objectives. This expectation was more than met.

In order to provide appropriate resources (in the form of consultants with various kinds of expertise) a first reading of possible areas of interest was taken through mail and telephone surveys of the participants' concerns and expectations of the conference.

Pre-Conference Survey of Areas of Concern and Interest

By letter, each administration and faculty participant was asked to discuss with his conference team partner or partners, the questions:

1. What innovations or educational experiments are currently underway in your institution?

2. What educational innovations or changes do you feel are most needed in your institution?

3. What are some of the specific kinds of changes or innovations in which you would like to be involved?

The items considered important under each of these headings indicated areas of concern and interest to which the participants would expect the conference to address itself. The report of each team's interest was to be given by telephone with all team members on extension phones. It was possible for the conference coordinator to discuss these points by telephone with 16 of the 18 teams to obtain a pre-conference reading of expectations. This personal contact with so many conference participants helped establish a rapport which proved extremely valuable in building group spirit for work at the conference. The responses included many general and specific ideas in the following categories:

1. An interest in new technologies in instruction and new learning approaches and devices.

2. Interinstitutional cooperation in curricula building, and sharing of resources in development and implementation of new programs.

3. A concern for programming innovations to reach special kinds of students, particularly those needing remedial and developmental work in order to achieve at the "college level."

4. Curricular reorganization with special attention to the utilization and effectiveness of "core" courses and interdisciplinary courses and sequences.

5. The place of travel and work-study programs in curricular improvements.

6. Preparation of college teachers to participate in and accept the curricula and program changes which are inevitable and desirable.

7. Administrative mechanisms which can promote innovation and make effective and creative use of the total institutional resources--administration, faculty, and students--with particular concern for the relationships between these three elements.

With this as background data, the planning committee was able to anticipate the general interest areas and possible demands which might be made upon the conference consultants. These data gave renewed support to the idea of developing a well-planned but unstructured conference which would allow the content to flow out of the deliberations between participants and consultants.

On the basis of the telephone conferences, responses to the general questions mentioned above, and the competence of the consultants, institutional teams were assigned to five workshops built around these general areas:

1. Interinstitutional concerns and programs.

2. General education, core, and interdisciplinary courses.

3. Student involvement in learning and administration.

4. General administrative concerns.

5. Teacher education.

The student participants were randomly divided among all five workshops.

6

Consultants for the conference were: Dr. Herman Branson, professor of physics, Howard University (now president of Central State College); Dr. James I. Doi, professor of higher education, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan; Dr. Patricia Gurin, study director, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; Dr. Samuel Nabrit, exeutive director, Southern Fellowship Fund; and Dr. Doxey A. Wilkerson, associate professor of education, Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Yeshiva University. The conference leader was Dr. Charles Seashore, research director, Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences, National Training Laboratory; and the conference observer-recorder was Dr. Carl Bramlette, assistant director for mental health, Southern Regional Education Board (now professor of management, Georgia State College). Conference directors were Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, of SREB (now retired), and the present project director.

The Conference

The conference was held in Atlanta, Georgia, November 5-8, 1967. In the opening general session Dr. Herman Branson set the stage for the deliberations. Speaking informally he reminded the conference that we are living, in 1967, in an educational system full of anachronisms. The institution is burdened with structures ("four years to get a degree") established in medieval times ("that's how long it took to learn everything that was significant to know") and with procedures ("rote memory") that no longer fit the real world ("we must be concerned with learning about the nature of knowledge and with validating knowledge, not with the accumulation of facts!"). The explosion of knowledge ("in 1955 there were 900 articles in the Physics Abstracts; in 1966, there were over 3,000 articles") demands a new approach to prevent today's expert from becoming obsolete tomorrow ("You cannot be a Leonardo da Vinci in 1967."). Dr. Branson challenged the participants to be concerned about complacency ("thinking that we've got the problem solved is out of place in the current world") and about the waste of our current resources and energies on outmoded curriculum and methodologies ("energy is our most important resource"). He called upon the conference to look closely at the concept of motivation ("You must know how to get students involved to the extent that they perform worthy of their best efforts.") and to deal honestly with their own attitudes and beliefs (quoting Voltaire: "So long as man believes absurdities, he will commit atrocities!").

To provide the total conference with information about the participants and their current concerns, buzz groups representing homogeneous groupings of administrators, faculty, and students met for a short session and reported as follows:

1. Administrators are concerned about financial problems; faculty recruitment and retention; increasing enroll-

ment and the motivation of students; overcoming
inertia and improving instruction and the pur-
poses of the institution, particularly as it
becomes involved in the urban situation and
with problems off the campus.

2. Faculty are concerned about their own per-
formance in the classroom and the conditions
affecting their performance (too heavy teaching
loads, inflexible class schedules, class size),
about their aims and methods (teaching or re-
search and publication, subject matter or in-
tellectual habits and learning sets, knowledge
of facts or critical thinking), and about stu-
dents (how to make teaching relevant to the
student and his needs). Faculty were also
calling for increased interinstitutional co-
operation and continued preparation of
themselves for change.

3. Students, while somewhat critical of outmoded,
traditional approaches in the classroom, are
primarily concerned that educational experiences
be made relevant to societal problems and to the
role they play in society. They stress a dis-
regard for lectures, formality, accumulation of
facts (or things) and state a desire to under-
stand and know the reason why. (This latter
was in some contradiction to sentiments ex-
pressed in a later session where a disdain of
history and background of problems was expressed
with a need for "action now" and a desire to "do
something--even if it's wrong!").

Before the opening session adjourned, participants were en-
couraged to express some guidelines for their subsequent discussions.
They began to set standards for the conference with such suggestions
as: "don't pick on new ideas...let's not be too idealistic but stay
with what we can do...don't become defensive...we shouldn't end
without some follow-up."

Workshops of Institutional Teams

Sunday evening and Monday morning and afternoon provided some
nine hours for meetings of the five workshops. Participants were
noted to be hard at work in their assigned groups during these
periods. Brief accounts of the content of these discussions were
extracted from written minutes and verbal reports of leaders and
recorders:

1. Interinstitutional Concerns and Programs

   A theme running through the discussions of this
group concerned an interdisciplinary, "think-approach"
course for freshmen. Approaches dealing with the re-
lationships among areas of knowledge seemed to have
relevance for both the humanities ("Great Issues in
Humanities") and the sciences (mention was made of a
course developed at Clark College.).[1] The creative
development of such courses could make good use of
interinstitutional resources. The participants felt
that such courses should involve students early in
their college careers.

2. General Education, Core and Interdisciplinary Courses

   In an attempt to identify common concerns and prob-
lems, this group ranged over a wide variety of topics
from use of new media, how to improve the teacher's
image, the place of community service in curricula, and
how to produce a climate for change, to discussions of
the institutional purposes in today's world. They
stressed the need for continued evaluation of all as -
pects of the educational endeavor and suggested the
development of a full-time person or faculty group
whose primary task would be the development of new
ideas and resources, innovation initiation and
evaluation. Although the comment was made, "the students
have raked us over the coals," the group was apparently
attuned primarily to faculty concerns ("how do we inte-
grate inexperienced faculty with experienced?").

3. Student Involvement in Learning and Administration

   These participants very early began to wrestle with
problem areas which have deep emotional and attitudinal
components: what is the role of the student in the in-
stitution? does he have a voice and can it be heard?
who is better able to define the needs of students--the
student himself or the "more experienced" faculty?
"student power" is with us, how do we handle it? Per-
haps it is not too far from the truth to say that there
were two subgroups in the workshop: one, made up of
both students and faculty, wanting more involvement by
the students in all affairs of the institution ("The

_____

   [1]Subsequently, conference time was arranged for interested
participants to visit the director of the science program at
Clark College in Atlanta.

total college family must be involved in the life of the campus!") and, the other, made up mostly of faculty, frightened of student involvement--a fear that students will not know when to stop and will take over the establishment ("They should participate only on basis of actual need! Take over by any one part of the family is undesirable!"). There was apparent agreement that students should run (more or less) their own affairs-- club activities, etc.--and that they should sit on some or all institutional committees--in either full partici- pating and voting status, or as advisory members (the latter is "hypocrisy"--we want de facto representation on committees."). Suggested innovations for more effec- tive student involvement included salaried student of- ficers for student government and activities, student evaluation of teachers and courses ("the consumer should measure the product"), increased informality in teacher- student relationships, and student participation in prob- lem solving and innovation.

4. General Administrative Concerns

This group quickly focused and remained with a central theme: leadership development of students. Though there was difficulty in determining just what leadership is, the discussants were committed to the notion of student involvement--in teaching, in planning, in administration--as a means of learning. They called for closer student-faculty relationships. Although suggesting that the student be admitted to full voting status on institutional committees, they also held to the idea of upholding the "teacher as a model for a life of dedicated service." There was even the suggestion that students could be called upon to help identify and motivate incompetent faculty. Participants agreed that there was a common need for more effective coun- seling programs.

5. Teacher Education

Teacher education for the disadvantaged was the focus of this group's discussion. Current innovations were reviewed. The group felt that attitudes toward the disadvantaged ("what does it mean to be culturally de- prived?") were real barriers to seeing the potential for learning in such students and breaking away from the "cult of the IQ." Our middle class values ("the success goals of society") also hinder our relating to some stu- dents. Strangely expressed was the feeling that current curricula and certification requirements in public edu- cation are too rigid and stifle innovation.

By late Monday afternoon it was becoming apparent that all groups were deeply concerned about (some might say "hung-up on") the area of student involvement in educational institutions. The participants were wrestling with how to achieve meaningful communication between students and faculty, how to deal with "student power" demands, how to motivate students to participate, and how to make education meaningful to the student's world and concerns. The Monday evening session was plar ed to allow the whole conference to deal with these issues.

Second General Session: Student-Faculty

The specific objective of this general session was to provide a setting in which the students could "let down their hair" and share with faculty and administrators "the gut issues--where we are living at the moment."

By this time the conference had achieved--in the participants' own words--a "listening, open, relaxed, informal, permissive, non-threatening and informative" atmosphere. Inevitably there were some experiences of frustration and "groping" and some "waste of time," however, the conference leaders felt that the time was appropriate for in-depth sharing of attitudes and feelings.[2]

The conference met "in-the-round" with students in the center circle. The setting served to separate the students from other participants while lending group support to each of them. The interchange which then occurred was best described by an early remark: "most students turn on faculty, not to them!"

This session can best be reported by an abbreviated transcript of what transpired:

Faculty: Some students are wasting precious moments trying to run the college. Others are devoting their resources to the learning process and preparing themselves to become professional. If you are going to graduate school, you are in a tough situation if you haven't prepared yourself.

Student: We don't want to run the university, but we would like to have a voice in what is being taught. We are not

---

[2]Throughout the conference, the staff (conference directors, chairman, consultants and the observer-recorder) met frequently (late evening or at breakfast) to evaluate progress and set the next steps.

being prepared for graduate school. Faculty is concerned with their problems, not ours. You (faculty) are trying to cast us in your mold and don't even try to find out what we want.

Faculty: You are being cruel and unfair. I do spend time with my children! But scholarship is a serious business and I believe I know what the student needs.

Student: Part of the problem lies with the system. What we are supposed to learn is not relevant to the world. A Ph. D. doesn't necessarily mean success. We may learn more outside the classroom. The system has got to provide more! And students have to accept leadership in order to change the system. You (faculty) are trying to determine for us--we should dedermine for ourselves and have an opportunity to explore!

Faculty: You (students) want to run the university. But you don't seem to realize that running a university is a multi-million dollar business and you have to grow up first!

Student: Whenever students project a new idea, faculty thinks they're trying to run the institution. My only concern is that the voice of the student be heard! Your attitude (addressing previous faculty speaker) is that of the traditional Negro administrator. We didn't create the problem, but we've got to clean up the mess!

Students are dynamic; the faculty is rigid! If you are not willing to accept students, then why were we invited and why are you here? When you go back, your students are going right on suffering!

Student: You (speaking to faculty) said students today are incompetent. You think that way because you were treated in college that way. But this generation is not willing to accept the role of the castout!

A university is not a factory--it is concerned with people, not products!

Faculty: There are things at your level for which you are just not ready. I do not believe that the faculty should dominate the student group, but I do believe the process should be progressive and orderly.

I do not perpetuate the past. I think your state-
ments are irresponsible. You are talking when you
should be listening!

Faculty: Students should be heard. It is true that students
are not ready to run the university, but they can
articulate to administration their concerns. Ad-
ministration needs to respond and be held accountable.
In order to give students an opportunity to grow,
there is an arena where student participation is
necessary. We should capitalize on the gift of
bright students!

Faculty: My strongest support for change and innovation comes
from my students.

Faculty: A liberal education entails the ability to make
choices. It does not mean doing what comes naturally
without thought. I try to share with my students the
reasons for everything that I do!

Faculty: I would like to make a plea for a more positive
psychology in our session. Not everything we do is
bad!

Students are the consumers and should be heard. They,
not the administrators, should evaluate the product.
But scholarliness itself can be training for leader-
ship and scholarliness is the business of the uni-
versity.

Faculty: But Negro faculty is doing to Negro students the same
thing as white man has done for years--withholding
from students those things which faculty feels the
student can't profit from. And teachers use this as
a crutch for poor teaching.

Student: During the demonstration at _____, a
faculty member tried to persuade me from participat-
ing. But I feel that when you are young and in school
you can be liberal. When you become older and stable,
you cannot rock the foundation on which you are sit-
ting. As a student, I have no foundation to rock--
except yours! I am free now! We're free now! We
don't know what we will become, but we do know that
you have created more problems than you have solved!

Faculty: Negro students think Medgar Evers was the first martyr!
They are not aware of the martyrs down through the
ages. Let us agree that we have much to do, but let
us never pretend that others before us did not con-
tribute. Somebody did build this institution.

13

Student: Flowers don't solve problems. I am not concerned
with what happened 20 years ago. The problems are now!
There is a generation gap and you don't understand us
anymore than we understand you. Everybody seems to
have to say, "That's not what I said!"

Faculty: Ours is perhaps the most defensive of professions.
We don't cherish criticism. Our defensive procedure
prevents our being open to fresh currents coming up
from below.

Faculty: But there is a long term view that is important here.
It takes a man a lifetime to become a human being. A
college is a community of scholars with the differ-
ence being that faculty has more experience. Stu-
dents do need sometimes to take advice.

Faculty: I commend student involvement and encourage more of
it. We should remind ourselves that we wouldn't be
meeting in this hotel except that the 1961 A & T
Greensboro students took a bold step. Civil rights
acts are traceable directly to student involvement.

Faculty: But this generation of students would call that genera-
tion Uncle Toms!

Student: Yes, our concern is with Human Rights, not Civil
Rights!

And so, the session was filled with charges, countercharges,
defenses, accusations, self-blame and recrimination and attempts at
understanding and reconciliation.

As the conference chairman put it, "This session has demonstrated
that real dialog is difficult and that debate has an emotional com-
ponent. We are agreed on the need for innovations, but there is
obviously disagreement on the degree of involvement of students."

It is popular today to assert that the younger generation can-
not communicate with anyone over 30. This interchange certainly
highlighted the generation gap. There was much talking at each
other, with only minimal attempts at real understanding. Despite
attempts to smooth over some rather intense feelings, the session
left many participants--both faculty and students--troubled. It
achieved its purpose of bringing to the surface and out in the open
attitudes and feelings which had been hidden but which had definitely
blocked in some ways the discussions in the workshop groups. This
sense of frustration did serve as a common bond for the majority of
participants. Throughout the remainder of the conference attempts
at understanding and communicating continued with informal sessions
of small groups in the halls and rooms, between sessions, at meal
times, and late into the night.

Workshops of Special Interest Groups

On Tuesday, new workshop groups were constituted to reflect new interests and to allow participants to have interchange with a new group of persons if they wished. These special interest workshops dealt with topics previously identified in the others--aims and purposes, interdisciplinary approaches, interinstitutional programs, student life, evaluation of instruction, etc.--and added at least two new interests--human relations training (obviously stimulated by the Monday evening session) and a special grouping for directors of self-study programs. These workshops, seemingly influenced by the previous experiences, were "reality" oriented--"but what can we do now?"

There was an active interchange of concrete proposals and descriptions of action programs. The effort at "more honest communication", at "getting in touch with each other," and at "understanding" continued to be apparent in all Tuesday special interest workshops.

Back Home Plans

On Tuesday evening each institutional team met separately to draw up specific back home plans. These were presented on Wednesday, in the original workshop groups, for reactions and suggestions from other participants. These plans were to become the program for conference follow-up.

Some of the proposals made by the institutional teams were:

--To develop interdisciplinary study programs, including seminars at the freshman lveel and independent study at all levels.

--To have the discussion method used more widely in the classroom, especially at the freshman level, and to have videotape equipment introduced for self evaluation by faculty members and student teachers, and possibly for portions of classroom lectures.

--To develop supplementary course materials, so individual students needing remedial instruction in specific areas will have it available.

--To establish a program to evaluate the college's success in terms of career fields its graduates enter, thus establishing a "feedback" to the curriculum.

--To set up an institute for interdisciplinary studies to prepare faculty members teaching in the general education programs, especially at the freshman level, to make maximum use of the interdisciplinary method.

The impact of the students' contributions to the conference was indicated by three proposals made for innovations:

--To establish a policy of involving students in planning for all areas of the institution's activities.

--To initiate a system of "feedback" so graduates and students can evaluate the institution's academic program.

--To enhance the intellectual atmosphere of the campus by inviting to the campus the students who attended the conference and a "master teacher" the students select from their home campus for a week-long series of seminars and small-group discussions.

Conference Evaluation

Conference evaluation forms were completed by all participants just prior to the closing session. They indicated overall approval of the conference format and proceedings and expressed a high level of satisfaction with the work accomplished. Singled out for particular praise was the opportunity that the conference provided for in-depth sharing of common problems and possible solutions. Although students brought into the conference concerns which were sometimes abrasive to administrators and faculty, most participants were enthusiastic about the value of the students' participation.

An administrator commented that one of the most helpful aspects of the conference was "the chance to communicate and interact with open and articulate students at the gut-level."

It is inevitable that a conference format which allows for this high degree of freedom to participate also allows for airing of some personal and seemingly irrelevant concerns. Some desired more formal presentations and more participation by the consultants. But like a "play within a play" the majority of participants considered this conference on innovations in higher education an innovation itself.

PROJECT ASSISTANCE

The second phase of the project was a period of assistance to the conference participants after they returned home and began to plan specific projects. Individuals or teams from the institutions were to write the project directors specifying the kind of assistance needed while briefly describing the project they wished to undertake. During the six months following the conference, until June 1968, only two specific requests for assistance had been made. The two projects assisted during that time are described below:

16

Pre-Professional Social Work at Fort Valley

Fort Valley has long offered a program in undergraduate, pre-professional social work but realized the need to revise and update their program. A professional social worker had been appointed to develop field work experiences for students as part of the program and needed help in defining the experiences that should be included and the procedures to follow in establishing such curricula experiences.

Requests came to SREB for funds to provide consultation in the development of this program. The first need identified was for the professional social worker to gain greater understanding of educational programs and planning. Travel funds were provided for this faculty member to visit another program that Fort Valley considered similar to the one they hoped to develop. The faculty member spent two days on the campus of Florida A & M University and was able to clarify ideas and develop plans for further program development back home. As a result of that consultation visit, Fort Valley made plans for more extensive consultation in the form of a conference held just after the end of the 1967-68 academic year. In the conference, faculty, students and outside consultants discussed the development of programs along the lines Fort Valley had decided to move and made definite plans to establish the new program in the fall of 1969. This SREB project arranged for and paid the costs of one consultant and the college secured additional consultants with funds from other sources.

Business Curriculum Revision at Tennessee State University

During late spring of 1968, arrangements were made with the chairman of the business department at Tennessee State University to provide funds for a consultant to the business faculty workshop in the early fall of 1968. During the 1967 conference, this department chairman had expressed concern over the fact that he had difficulty in helping his faculty understand needed changes in curriculum, especially with many new career opportunities available for Negro college graduates. Because they were in the process of designing a new building and working toward the possibility of becoming a school rather than a department of business, the consultant helped them lay careful plans for thoroughly redesigning the curriculum for the future.

INTERIM SURVEY

At the end of the 1967-68 academic year, six months following the conference and halfway through the scheduled period for follow-up activities, a simple survey was conducted of all conference participants. The purpose of this poll was two-fold: first, to find out if the conference participants felt they could point to any

results of their participation; and second, to remind them of the possibility for help from this project as a stimulus to further development of innovations. The two major points were stated as questions with space for open-ended answers. Responses from 12 of the colleges which participated in the November 1967 conference indicated that the conference had been of definite value to them. A thirteenth school responded that, due to administrative changes including a new dean and president, no definite results could be reported at that time, but that there was a probability of more positive action after the new administration took root.

The participants were first asked, "What activities have been undertaken in your institution that may be attributed wholly or in part·to your participation in the Conference on Innovation in Developing Institutions?" They reported at least 30 activities that could be so attributed. Nearly half of the new ideas were in the area of curricular revision. Eight different colleges reported efforts at changing their academic program in one way or another. Four schools were attempting interdisciplinary courses: two for freshmen, one honors program, and one course in community development. Two institutions were taking steps to eliminate learning deficiencies; one of these founded an educational development center for college students with disadvantaged backgrounds. This center makes use of an audio-tutorial laboratory using programmed materials of all kinds.

In addition, one college had undertaken a complete curricular evaluation. Another made plans for field work experiences for pre-professional social welfare majors; a third has established an interdepartmental audiovisual center. Still another school started new programs in early childhood education and foods and nutrition. And a fifth college was working with students to include international and intercultural materials in existing courses. Two institutions attempted to obtain grants enabling them to make use of new media--instructional television and computer-assisted instruction. Although neither proposal was funded, both schools reported continuing interest in using the new media.

Probably the single most striking result attributed to the conference was the increased awareness of students. Five institutions mentioned new attempts to involve the student. Four had put students on most or all policy and procedural committees; one even included students in the making of admissions decisions. The fifth college had established a special committee composed of all elements of the campus community for the purpose of improving student-faculty communications. Although other influences besides the conference were mentioned, several colleges stressed the importance of the conference in helping them form new attitudes. As one respondent put it, "your conference gave us greater understanding of student viewpoints."

A different kind of result was reported by two schools which made new uses of personnel. One reported assigning faculty to dif-

ferent courses. They also obtained consultants on curricular revision and sent faculty members visiting other schools for fresh ideas. The other institution sought a special person to report new developments in federal funding and assist in the preparation of grant proposals.

Finally, more than one college stressed that the conference played a key role in reinforcing existing attempts. One respondent said the conference, "reinforced to a great degree the work we already felt it was our responsibility and need to pursue."

In response to the question: "How can SREB be of assistance to your institution in promoting, planning or conducting activities that have grown out of the Conference on Innovation in Developing Institutions?" various general ways in which SREB could help were suggested. Three schools mentioned need of consultants--one for the planning and conducting of a new freshman program, one to plan programs in medical technology and social work, the third for its self-study and for involving students in decision making.

Three colleges asked for information. One sought a list of foundations that might support computer assisted instruction; a second wanted to know how other schools manipulated cooperative courses with other institutions. The third college asked to be kept informed of programs that might be helpful to them.

Perhaps surprisingly, only three institutions mentioned the specific need for money. One wanted funds for social work education, a second mentioned the need to secure funds from foundations and the Office of Education and a third pointed to the need for massive funding for its proposed freshman program for disadvantaged youngsters.

In addition, four schools asked for help in developing new programs, but did not specify the kind of assistance they wanted. Included in these were programs for pre-school teacher training, science for non-science majors, integrated teaching of humanities in cooperation with another college, interdisciplinary freshman programs and interdisciplinary community development programs. Another school suggested holding a conference to develop programmed materials for disadvantaged students.

PROJECT ASSISTANCE: NEW DIRECTIONS

As a result of this interim survey in the summer of 1968 and the scarcity of requests for assistance during the previous academic year, the first conclusions were drawn about the progress of the project and about the need for changes in the approach being followed.

There was no doubt that the conference had an impact on many of the campuses. But, few specific plans for action had been fulfilled.

The accomplishments reported above were stimulated by, and carried out with help from the GREB staff.

The situation at that point led to the tentative conclusion that, left on their own, faculty members within these colleges are unlikely to carry very far new ideas for improvement. The lack of action seemed due to a combination of factors. For one thing, most conference participants were faculty members, not administrators, and, certainly in some instances, they were hesitant to go to administrators with ideas not clearly formulated, especially if they might imply the need for additional finances. In some cases, unfortunately, there seemed a scarcity of new ideas.

Developments up to that time suggested the need for more outside stimulation and intervention than had been supplied. What seemed to be called for was an outside worker who could get to know the college well and work with the faculty team to encourage ideas, help identify sources of information and assistance needed to develop these ideas, and provide financial resources to supply specialized consultation help as needed.

In order to further develop this idea and provide more assistance to the colleges, the project expiration date was extended from December 30, 1968, until June 30, 1969.

The plan for the exgension period was to select approximately six projects suggested by interests identified in the "mid-point survey." From the survey forms returned, it was possible to pick out ideas that seemed clearly formulated and possible to assist with the small funds remaining in this project.

During the early spring of 1969, the project director visited a number of these colleges to discuss activities that might be undertaken. In some colleges, time remaining in the academic year did not permit them to take advantage of this opportunity, and consequently, some very good ideas had to be dropped. The activities that were developed with project assistance were as follows:

Early Childhood Education at Xavier University

The department of education at Xavier University in New Orleans is actively involved with its immediate neighborhood. The director of special projects in that department had participated in the 1967 conference and sought assistance for her efforts to improve education of prospective teachers of young children. Through an assortment of programs promoted with a great deal of energy this Sister has brought together a variety of approaches to working with the early elementary grades in the local public school and with younger children prior to their entry in the public schools. With a philosophy of using any and all ideas that further the educational progress of the children in this community she has in an orderly fashion put

together Montessori methods and approaches, a "Workshop Way"
method developed by a colleague, and small group instruction for
young children in a type of ongoing home head-start. To man these
experiments, and an early morning recreation program which pro-
vices additional educational and social development experiences for
the children, she has the assistance of a Teacher Corps, A VISTA group
assigned to the community, many student teachers and other volunteers
from Xavier University.

Assistance was requented in further develop some of these ideas
through innovative programs that would further combine these
activities with participation by the families in the community. The
major effort to be undertaken in the late spring by this faculty
member and her colleagues in the department of education was to look
more carefully at the projects going on and develop them to the point
that they could be fully incorporated into the training of the under-
graduates at Xavier University. While the undergraduate students
have benefited from contact with this particular program and these
innovative activities, there had not been a thoroughly planned ap-
proach to incorporating many of the findings and ideas into the
traditional educational program for elementary teachers. The assis-
tance provided to further perfect some of these ideas was given with
the understanding that these concepts and ideas would be translated
into newer opportunities for the education majors at Xavier.

Administrative Planning at Lander College

Lander College in South Carolina is perhaps the only municipally
supported four-year college in the U. S. It is a former church-
operated women's college and a former junior college. It soon, per-
haps, will become part of the state higher education system and re-
ceive state funds.

During the recent period of growth and development, the ad-
ministrative staff has changed and many new people have joined the
faculty. One of the major concerns of the Lander team at the 1967
conference was for the development of long-range planning techniques
and effective means to coordinate the many approaches to curriculum
building and change.

With funds granted under Title III of the Higher Education Act
of 1965, Lander had been able to secure consultants to help evaluate
and change curricula in every division. In so doing, however, there
was confusion as to the means for maintaining total institutional
direction. At the beginning of the effort to deal with massive
curricula change, a steering committee had been formed, presumably
to coordinate the changes and "steer" the course of the institution.
Procedures and communication seemed to have broken down and the
steering committee was neither directed nor allowed to function. In
the spring of 1969, this was the most pressing problem with which
Lander wished assistance.

21

A two-day meeting of the steering committee and the president of the college was planned to take place just after the 1969 academic year closed. SREB provided assistance with meeting costs and arranged for a consultant.

The conference was held to explore with the steering committee its role in the development of Lander College. Through a day and a half of discussions with the consultant plans were made to develop procedures that could make it a more effective committee, and a number of factors were identified to guide the committee when setting goals for its work as a coordinating body with responsibility for developing long-range institutional purposes and plans.

Teacher Education at Norfolk State College

A joint seminar for education students at Norfolk State and Old Dominion Colleges in Norfolk, Virginia, had been established in the spring semester of 1969. One of the Norfolk State team members at the 1967 innovation conference had been deeply concerned about developing an interinstitutional program that would help prospective teachers become better prepared for teaching in integrated schools.

For a year and a half she had worked toward the establishment of such a program. Through contacts with faculty at Old Dominion College, this faculty member was able to promote the idea of a joint senior seminar which was established on a volunteer basis for faculty and students of both the traditionally black and traditionally white institutions. The fact that the Norfolk State professor was a white teaching in a black school may have helped get the idea started, but once the idea caught on, race and institutional connection made little difference.

The joint senior seminar for approximately 125 student-teachers met four times during the spring semester, dividing the sessions between the two participating schools. In late spring, SREB, with these project funds, provided assistance for a final day-long meeting of the seminar and a half-day evaluation-planning meeting of the faculty and student planning committees.

This assistance provided a capstone event for the seminar which gave the students a final opportunity to prepare for their teaching positions and to work together as an interinstitutional group. Planning for the day-long event was done by student committees with only assistance from their faculty advisors. In response to student requests, speakers and consultants from Atlanta and New Orleans who could describe the use of new approaches and ideas in teaching at the elementary and the secondary levels were provided by SREB.

As a result of this joint seminar in 1969, plans have been made for more formal relationships between the two institutions and more joint efforts toward preparing teachers for the area schools.

Students were given an opportunity to play new roles in planning and directing their seminar experiences and faculty members found new relationships among colleagues and students within their own institution as well as with those in the other institution. For many faculty and students this was the first experience at jointly working on a mutual project with persons from a college traditionally serving members of another race.

Interinstitutional Humanities Project

At the 1967 conference, representatives from several institutions expressed interest in jointly working on the problem of improving interdisciplinary teaching in the humanities. Since this activity would involve two or three institutions, no one individual had taken responsibility for further developing the idea. In the spring of 1969, representatives of four institutions were contacted to confirm their continuing interest and to arrange for a meeting of institutional representatives.

In early March eight faculty members from divisions of humanities at Miles College, and Dillard, Shaw, and Xavier Universities met in Atlanta with a humanities consultant and the project director. In the sessions which took place on a Friday evening and all day Saturday, the participants shared information about new approaches in the humanities such as ungraded seminars, a humanities core using traditional and contemporary materials, an English-art seminar which would include creative expression, and the use of contemporary literature to stimulate and relate to the young black students in these programs.

It was inevitable that any discussion of the humanities in 1969 would also spill over into questions about programs of Black Studies and the relationships of white instructors with black students. This consideration took up a great deal of time at this conference as the various participants described efforts to include black literature, African music and art and black history with their more traditional humanities materials. Much of the discussion also centered around some basic philosophical questions about the place of the humanities in the black college and the fundamental purposes of providing work in the humanities for all students.

A very important part of the discussion regarding the problems of relating the humanities to black students centered around the fact that, by chance, of these eight teachers of humanities in these four black colleges, only one person was black. As a result, the group concluded that another meeting should be held for this group and additional representatives from each of these institutions. It was agreed that each institutional team would invite a black colleague and student who were interested in exploring the possibilities of developing Black Studies programs, and have the expanded conference meet with some time devoted to dividing the group

into two workshops—developing resources for improving the humanities for black students and developing programs of Black Studies. All of those attending the March meeting agreed that each should search out and bring to the next meeting lists and/or examples of resources that would help improve and enrich interdisciplinary humanities programs.

The second humanities meeting was held in New Orleans, where most of the participants were from, and included the additional participants as planned as well as a consultant for the Black Studies workshop. A faculty member and student from Johnson C. Smith University also met with the Black Studies group since this institution had been part of the 1967 conference and had asked for assistance from this project to explore some of the issues in Black Studies.

Again, the group met on Friday evening and Saturday. Friday evening was devoted first to getting acquainted at dinner and sahring experiences and concerns in informal discussions. Following dinner, the 20 participants met together for a general session to review the purposes of the meeting, set the tentative schedule for the sessions and define the goals of the two groups. For the last part of Friday evening the group divided and the two workshops began. The Saturday schedule had been tentatively planned for all participants to lunch together and then hold a joint, general session to close in mid-afternoon. However, once the groups began working separately, they did not come together again.

The Black Studies group decided not to rejoin the other conference participants at the end of the day and preferred not to leave their meeting room for lunch, thus eliminating any possibility for dialog among all conference participants. This was an unfortunate turn of events, since one of the major purposes of the meeting was to allow some dialog between those most vitally concerned for the development of Black Studies programs in these colleges and their colleagues who are teaching, and seemingly will continue to teach the basic humanities courses. It was doubly unfortunate that, as in the earlier meeting, only one of those persons working in the humanities resources workshop was black, while all those in the Black Studies workshop were black.

The humanities group again shared various techniques they had tried for improving their classes and identified many resources for enriching interdisciplinary humanities courses. One participant brought a tape-narrated slide presentation, prepared for this meeting by his students, illustrating the black man in various forms of art expression and present day advertising. Another brought to the meeting a set of records and film strips that illustrated various religions of the world which he had found effective in his freshman courses. All participants were prepared to share lists of books and bibliographic resources for including African and black American history, literature, and music in their courses. Following the meeting the project director collected a few additional lists

from the conference participants and sent them to all who attended the meeting.

The Black Studies group, by the nature of their subject, had to deal with more nebulous and abstract topics for discussion. The chairman's report indicated that they began by discussing some objectives of Black Studies:

The students stressed the depth of self awareness they gained from learning about themselves and ideas more relevant to their circumstances in life. The penetration into our heritage as a key to group awareness and unity was greatly emphasized. The question was posed: "Is Black Studies academic enough; will the students get the necessary skills?" To this question the answer was given that what we mean by academic should be redefined to include community participation. This led to the general consensus that Black Studies would necessarily need drastic changes in methodology.

At the next session the group discussed concrete problems in Black Studies, including lack of time to grapple with definitions and directions of such studies. They decided too much time is spent defending need for these programs, while some faculty and students remain unconvinced. Methods of involving faculty members, such as discussion sessions, were also discussed. Later, the involvement of each school with Black Studies was described; only one, starting a major this fall, had more than nominal commitments. Reference lists for Black Studies materials were shared. Participants were unable to set definite plans for a further conference. As the chairman reported, "this meeting was a necessary but inadequate beginning of dialog, since we needed more time."

The meeting did not provide for the exchange of ideas nor the dialog hoped for between these blacks and whites who work together, and the atmosphere at times was strained and somewhat tense. However, there seemed to emerge certain results that will be of help to these individuals as they continue to push for change and improvement in their humanities courses and as they work to coordinate efforts with the emerging programs of Black Studies.

CLOSING EVALUATION CONFERENCE

The final activity of the project was a review and evaluation conference held in June, 1969. This was a dual-purpose conference. First, it was planned to reconvene the 1967 conference participants for the purpose of sharing experiences that related to this project's activities with the goal of restimulating these people for continued efforts at innovation and change; and, second, to identify specific results of this project and recommendations that could be made for future assistance to developing colleges.

25

Nineteen faculty members and administrators and three students from 13 colleges participated in the conference. Colleges represented were: Concord College, Dillard University, Florida A & M University, Fort Valley State College, Jackson State College, Lander College, Morris Brown College, Norfolk State College, Siena College, South Carolina State College, Tennessee State University, Warren Wilson College, and Xavier University. For this conference each college was invited to send a student with their faculty representatives. Because the academic year had ended, some of the college representatives who wanted to bring a student could not make the arrangements.

Opening Session Reports

At the opening conference session, a representative of each institution was asked to make a short general report on significant innovations on his home campus. There were more than 90 innovations reported in the 13 schools. Almost all show a concern for the student and for his learning experience.

Nearly every school reported special programs for freshmen. Five were providing new remedial programs--some interdisciplinary, some taught by students. Four were trying interdisciplinary or core freshman programs. Still others had special programs for freshmen emphasizing reading, writing, logic, and listening skills. And a few schools reported instituting non-credit assemblies for freshmen to help them adjust to the campus environment.

At least eight schools were making field work experience or cooperative work study arrangements available to their students. Although many of these programs were in the social sciences, other attempts were being made in fields ranging from fine arts to medical technology.

There were a great many interdisciplinary approaches, in spite of the participants' complaints that they were impeded in such efforts by the departmental structure and bias of their institutions. In addition to the freshman interdisciplinary courses mentioned above, schools were trying interdisciplinary Black Studies, minors and new degrees in humanities or fine arts, English courses with materials from other fields, and seminars in such combined fields as math-biology or theology-biology-psychology. Two schools were studying general education--one was considering dropping their program, the other adding it.

Other new approaches to learning included project-oriented courses, independent study in every field, junior-year-abroad programs, use of computers, and a language learning center using short wave radio.

26

In further attempts to benefit their students, a number of the institutions either instituted new subjects or reorganized the administration of certain fields. New courses included one on the contemporary college student and internal relations, one on religions of the world. New programs included teacher aide training, a minor in nursing, and a major in food management. One changed its business program from a division to a school; another dropped credit requirements and substituted skill requirements in such courses as applied music and physical education. Still another school started requiring all elementary education students to have a subject field major.

About half the colleges represented made important administrative changes during the period since November 1967. Two schools have undergone major administrative overhauls. Two schools have new faculty committees, and five schools now include students on some or all committees. At one institution courses have been initiated at the suggestion of students. And, in an attempt to improve their dealings with agencies and private foundations providing grants, one college has engaged a contract staff.

It was overwhelmingly evident that these colleges do not consider themselves isolated ivory towers. About two-thirds are involved in consortia or other cooperative arrangmments with other institutions, and about half reported innovations involving interaction with the community.

Consortiums ranged from use of a common computer to classes with joint enrollment which rotate from campus to campus for their meetings. Subject fields of consortia include student teaching, Black Studies, speech and hearing, chemistry and engineering, nursing, urban studies, and teaching of the cerebral palsied. Two programs in which students enroll at one college for two years, then transfer to another for professional work were reported--one in nursing, one in engineering, Many of the cooperative arrangements include more than two institutions; most involve both black and white colleges; several were interstate in nature. Some programs involve two or more colleges and a local school system or other outside organization.

Of the ten innovative programs reported which deal with the outside community, most involve teachers or childhood education. Three schools were working on Head Start and similar programs of teacher training; one is establishing a student teaching center in cooperation with two colleges and a county system. There were teacher seminars and tutorials, including one program for special education teachers. Additionally, one institution was sending student volunteers into the community to a school for boys, another was making courses available to prison inmates, and other persons outside the campus. Still another school was undertaking a study of the community and had some challenging recommendations to make concerning government by community council.

There is ample evidence that these 13 developing colleges are not afraid to veer from tradition in their development if this means

a chance to improve learning opportunities for their students or to enhance the greater community. There is equal evidence that the concept of innovation varies widely and the specific innovations tested vary as much or more than do the schools themselves.

Second Session: The Process of Innovation

The second session of the conference was devoted to reports of specific activities conducted with assistance from SREB. The six projects summarized earlier in this report were described in detail. Planning procedures, difficulties encountered, achievements, disappointments, and new directions were discussed at length by the entire conference.

Following this session devoted to specific accomplishments, the conference turned its focus to the process of innovation. The conference chairman encouraged representatives to tell what they had learned about the process of innovation: what stimulates it, how it is developed, and what findings can be shared with others. Participants indicated that initially the need for innovation becomes apparent because of frustration, which may arise for a number of reasons. (Students may be frustrated by inefficiency, as when a registration process is unnecessarily tedious.) Students and staff alike may be frustrated by failure due to inappropriate demands. (One participant pointed to an incident at his school in which good students who were not science majors regularly received poor grades in required, but, unnecessarily technical science courses.) Faculty, students, and administrators all may feel the boiling frustration of unequal treatment when, for example, one department receives large grants while others are struggling to carry on basic programs. Most importantly, however, frustration arises when there is interference with human and emotional needs. When the student requirement to be independent, to regulate his own life, is blocked, or when faculty members feel the campus is so impersonal that a manual on "Living in Anomie" is needed, then there will be frustrations which may lead to innovation.

The hindrances to innovation are frequently identical to the forces which necessitate it. With the exception of lack of funds (a common obstacle), these too are mostly emotional needs. Participants pointed to the security of the department and to the insecurity caused by nondepartmental plans. Additionally, nearly everyone has fear of the unknown. This helps keep the departmental structure in effect since most teachers and administrators were educated under the department system. The need for administrators not to feel threatened or excessively challenged in their jobs was also brought out. (Registrars, for example, sometimes resist procedural changes even when better registration methods are found.) Another frequent obstacle is the need of administrators to maintain some part of the status quo. Charged with implementation of an academic program, deans and others feel they must retain enough traditional structure to assure that the process education is carried

on. Finally, participants found many ways to express the need of most persons on campus to avoid punishment in the form of criticism, rejection, or disciplinary action. One representative wryly said that people find rocking the boat does not win success. Another commented that asking the dean for permission to try something new "is like asking a girl for a kiss--you just know you'll be refused." Still another pointedly remarked that faculty members need to feel their judgment is trusted.

In many instances reported, something new was tried only after a crisis occurred. When it finally became apparent to everyone that something had to be done, steps were taken to change the situation. In most cases the first step was to open channels of communication. While a necessary procedure, this could almost never be done within the existing framework of the institution. Many innovations reported were themselves new means of communication. One school established faculty-trustee and student-trustee committees which permit interaction without going through regular channels of dean, president, etc. Others put students on existing committees. At one college, faculty members set up and paid for a sensitivity program for faculty and staff as an extra-institutional activity. (This program "helped people see common human needs.") Frequently students, not administration, initiated administrative change, which was true at one school which now has a more efficient registration process. (Students, frustrated by seemingly endless registration lines, found a better system and persuaded the dean to try it.) At some colleges, however, less peaceful pressures are applied by students.

Many representatives reported the value of exchange of ideas in instituting change--exchanges between students and faculty, faculty and administration, blacks and whites, administration and such outsiders as accrediting agencies. (Sometimes it was found that "the rigidity of the establishment is in our minds," thus permitting new ideas to be tried.) Sometimes confrontation led to joint student-faculty involvement in making changes. (When evidence of excessive numbers of non-science majors failing laboratory science courses was shown to the right people, the requirements were adjusted.)

The special role of the consultant in communications leading to innovation was brought out. While faculty resent and are angered by critical consultants, they are stimulated by self-criticism ("Be sure the consultant is one who can help us identify and plan solutions to our problems.").

Student Discussion Session

Throughout the conference the three students had been active participants, but in the closing session they were given the opportunity to speak to the conference. This was a "free-form" panel that led to open discussion and dialog between the students and the

other participants. Then, as in the 1967 conference, there was much "talking at" one another, leaving serious question as to whether any real communication had taken place. In some respects the setting was very like a college committee or faculty senate with student representation. Given first chance to speak, students commended the group for its concern for the student and indicated that differences, especially when openly discussed as at the conference, are necessary and desirable for learning. Then, in response to faculty cries of, "What is it that you want?" the three asked for the right to seek identity, learn for themselves, and make their own mistakes.

Faculty challenged the hippie-like garb worn by many students and some popular instructors. The students (in conservative, conventional dress with traditional hairdos) responded that what covers a person's back is less important than what he has to give, and that clothing indicates identity. The faculty countered that adolescents sometimes confuse identity with identification.

Students pointed out that some adult-made rules, such as those for dress, are silly and unnecessary. Civilization requires accepting rules for the sake of the larger society, stressed the faculty ("for the sake of peace and productivity let's have some rules."), and the individual is less important than the group, like it or not. The youngsters then asked to make their own rules as individuals within a group. A somewhat disgruntled participant pointed out that on his campus students would not even live under rules they themselves had set up.

A student reminded the group that the young have always challenged experience ("No college student accepts older values. Didn't you challenge?"). There was agreement that the democratic classroom of today permits more dissent than did classes the older group attended as students ("We can question a professor if we think he has made a mistake and tell him he didn't say it right."). The three young representatives saw this trend as good, while some of the faculty were not as sure. They recalled their own need to avoid jeopardizing grades by angering the teacher ("I knew by a lift of the professor's eyebrow when I'd said enough, and I was trying to get a C and get out."). While the students claimed not to be concerned by grades ("Today we don't care. Even if disagreement means a D."), other responses made by them ("that's unfair grading!"), as well as the attendance of one of them at summer school, indicated otherwise. There was consesnus that the grading system is, "probably a necessary evil."

In conclusion the students wanted to emphasize the need for their involvement in setting some directions ("We learn by experience and by mistakes. Let us make our own rules. If I find they're not good enough for me, I'll listen to what you have to say."). Still, the session closed with a teacher complaining about the eroding position of the older generation ("You won't listen to us or let us teach you what we know!").

30

The limited communication across the so-called "generation gap" in sessions like this one is somewhat confusing and disappointing. The quality of activities reported in the project involving faculty and students illustrates better working relationships and more communication than the dialog just reported. It was also expected that better communication would be illustrated in this conference than in 1967 since this time faculty participants had chosen students from their own institutions. Discussion sessions prior to this one had been lively and filled with many divergent opinions, but with no evidence of battle lines between the generations.

The formality of a session structured to focus on student views here, as in the first conference, seemed to elicit cliches that each group felt the other expected them to say. It was almost as if participants were playing roles in a "confrontation drama" speaking rehearsed lines in a setting removed from that of the earlier, and later, conference settings.

Outside this session of the conference, and apparently on these campuses, there is much greater communication and positive cooperation between faculty and students toward commonly accepted goals. Certainly among those who have participated in this project structured confrontation sessions seem no longer necessary, and could even be detrimental. In this conference the two hours appeared almost as an interlude for stimulating sparring between those who felt compelled to perpetuate "the generation gap".

What is needed now is more opportunities for joint student-faculty participation in efforts to improve the collegiate experience. The activities reported in this project illustrate efforts that promise success through cooperation and transcend superficial differences between the generations.

Project Evaluation: Participants' Views

As an aid in reporting and evaluating this project, participants at the June 1969 conference were asked to share what they considered the results of their participation in the 1967 conference. Perhaps the most basic point was that an evaluation of this kind of effort can not be made entirely objectively, and that the impact of the project will continue to spread and to influence these institutions. As expressed by many of these faculty members, the 1967 conference gave them a secure platform for discussion and exchange of views and the confidence to take that discussion to their own campuses.

The greatest number of results could be traced in the area of student-faculty relations. Many commented on the impact of the first conference in focusing on the need for more student involvement. A large number of the "innovations" reported pointed to many attempts to improve relations between faculty and students and to encourage joint participation in academic affairs. A number of new

31

types of student internships have been attempted since the 1967 conference. The reinforcement received at that conference seemed to provide an impetus for the development of such experiences, as well as stimulate the appointment of students to faculty and administrative committees.

Difficult faculty attitudes toward change and innovation were mentioned by many conference participants. They indicated that their participation in the 1967 conference had helped them deal with faculty attitudes that needed changing on their campuses. One person said she became willing to pace change as a result of the conference, having previously been impatient to make things move much faster than was realistic. Another college team reported having prepared an eleven page document, following the 1967 conference, that helped to change some faculty attitudes toward an interdisciplinary approach to teaching in all fields. This document called attention to the need for more student-faculty dialog and later led to better communication on student life and in the classroom.

Another team reported that the conference had made them more sensitive to identifying chief problem areas in their major effort to revise the curriculum. Consequently, they began to listen to students' ideas and interests and then planned new approaches to the education of freshmen. The team said some ideas had been formulated before, but the conference provided them with reinforcement and confidence that their goals were sound. As a result, a new freshman program has been introduced and a senior humanities seminar has been developed.

All conference participants urged that anyone trying to determine results of this project keep in mind that the greatest impact probably cannot be pinpointed at this time; innovation takes a great deal of time, and progress appears slow. But changes are being made, and efforts to measure them must be deferred.

To those of us conducting the project these were encouraging statements. We believed at the beginning that specific examples of results would be hard to find so soon. Since one of our goals was an attack on attitudes toward change, it appeared that we had, at least partially, reached that goal when the participants responded as just reported.

Another striking example of attitude change relates to the need for funds. Certainly many activities require more resources than are available to some of these individuals. But there was much more enthusiasm in this closing conference than in the first for "taking the bull by the horns" and doing what one can with or without additional resources.

In 1967 the pervading air was "if we had the funds we could do it," and there was recognition that just keeping up was a serious problem of management for the college. The developing colleges had

suffered from inadequate funds for so long that most faculty members were reluctant to suggest changes. The design of the first conference, and an underlying goal of the entire project, was to elicit the question, "What can I do in my own area to get necessary change started?"

Of course, federal efforts through Title III, greater state appropriations and many new cooperative institutional programs have relieved the financial situation considerably. Attitudes of participants have noticeably changed, as illustrated by their recent efforts and accomplishments. We believe participation in this project has helped these attitudes since, as participants reported, the first conference provided them an opportunity to talk about interests and concerns, to share ideas and misgivings, and to gain confidence in their ability to do things back home. A number of activities reported illustrated this new attitude, the most dramatic probably being the joint seminars at Norfolk State College, a new activity undertaken with no additional funds.

Quite probably participants will find even more ways to improve their programs by trying new techniques and using new approaches entirely at their own command.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is keen interest in improving curricula and instruction among faculty and staff members of developing colleges. As evidenced by the fifty or sixty individuals involved in this project, there is also deep understanding and recognition of the problems facing developing colleges, of the need to find new ideas and new ways to most effectively bring about change. Undoubtedly, there are hundreds of other dedicated and sincere persons devoted to providing the best education possible for their students. Most often the stimulation of curriculum change and the infusion of innovations is aimed at the institution as a whole (as in large grants to institutions for complete curriculum revision.). Some programs of assistance are aimed at improvement of a particular discipline or professional field in a number of institutions (such as the development of innovations in business administration, engineering or the teaching of English which come to institutions through committee publications or consultants).

There has been enthusiastic support for the approach used in this project. The goal has been to give individuals recognition for their ideas, and support and encouragement to carry out their convictions. This approach, as opposed to asking the institutions to designate representatives has been well accepted, and we believe in its value as one of many ways to encourage change in the developing colleges.

An individual faculty member in a small college can easily feel isolated and lonely trying to develop new ideas. An opportunity to

33

meet with others in similar circumstances is valuable for the stimulation and reinforcement mentioned so often by the participants in this project. All these persons carry a heavy load of teaching, advising, and often of administrative and committee responsibilities. Too often funds are not available for travel and participation in professional associations or more general conferences. Even that kind of participation seldom gives the small college faculty member many chances to help and develop projects or conferences that speak to his individually felt needs.

On any campus, especially the small, developing college, the faculty member must work with colleagues in various disciplines and find ways to relate his own professional expertise to all others. This project conference brought together representatives from many fields and with a variety of responsibilities. In one sense, the conference simulated the faculty and staff mix found at any college retreat for planning of educational change. The enthusiasm for this mix was gratifying and the realistic exchange it generated was highly successful.

We believe additional activities of this kind would be most valuable to developing colleges and should be expanded to establish a number of small groups such as this one to give many more faculty members this kind of opportunity. Bringing these individuals together for a well-planned, but unstructured conference in which they take some responsibility for the content of the meeting can help them find out what is going on elsewhere (in other developing colleges as well as across the country by an exchange with suitable consultants), point out ways in which they can make use of new ideas (for example, how student internships can enhance learning in the social sciences), and focus on techniques that will help develop understanding among faculty members on the same campus.

The number of follow-up projects formulated and completed was somewhat disappointing. It was not expected that participants would be so reticent in seeking assistance that would enable them to carry out their plans. The project was not originally designed to exert as much influence in the development of new ideas as finally proved necessary. Only in hindsight could the importance of these people's heavy work loads, inexperience at innovating and need for continuing reinforcement (as hindrances to change) be realized. What originally appeared to be "needling," in retrospect would have been seen by participants as helpful concern.

It became apparent after the mid-point survey that the project director would have to take a more agressive part in encouraging follow-up activities. By then (spring 1969) it was too late for activities to be carried out before the close of the academic year, except where efforts had already begun and could use a boost.

However, the continuing relationship between the project director and many of the conference participants provided encourage-

ment and stimulation that helped the conference have a more lasting impact. We believe such an approach is good and could be valuable to many developing colleges if planned for a longer period of time to allow this additional activity to fit into the demands already being made on these colleges. Outside assistance provided through a cooperative project of this kind if valuable when it cuts through the red tape of carefully developed proposals which prolong the time before a project can begin and necessitate elaborate reporting of progress and results. An outside agency which provides an institutional worker who can meet with those interested in proposing an activity, gain some understanding of the institution and the project to be undertaken, and provide the assistance in a short time can be an effective influence for change in developing colleges.

An outside agency seems imperative if there is to be any effort to research the effects of innovations in developing colleges. First, there is still need to help generate the development and institution of innovative programs before the research can be undertaken. Second, as pointed out earlier, the basic responsibilities of innovative individuals in developing colleges seldom allow them time to design and undertake objective research on their own programs. Only with a restructuring of the work load, which would require funds to release faculty members from part of that load, would this even be probable. On the other hand, an outside agency could assist the innovators develop and get projects started and then conduct the necessary research on both the process and the results. Results and research would both be more effective under these circumstances since a number of cooperative projects could be developed, the most appropriate outside assistance be provided, and comparative results be analyzed.

There is a project in operation under the auspices of the Southern Regional Education Board that could offer some suggestions as a model. This is the computer experiment being financed under grants from the National Science Foundation and designed to assist small colleges use computers for instructional purposes. The project staff assists individuals in the colleges to determine how they want to use the computer, develop appropriate curricula, and learn the methodology. At the same time, there is a built-in research plan involving the college participants to evaluate the various approaches being used among the colleges, and to report the results for the benefit of a larger audience. Such a plan seems feasible for use with faculty from a variety of fields in a project on innovations.

An additional technique that could be helpful in assisting developing colleges to innovate is that of reverse consultation. Faculty or faculty-student team visits to other schools where new ideas are being tried could bring fresh winds back to the home campus and help clear away stale conservatism among cautious faculty and administrators.

35

As we have said, the many individuals at developing colleges who do seek to initiate change are isolated, overworked, and unfamiliar with methods for getting aid. They are eager for recognition, encouragement, and assistance, but are unlikely to take the first step toward getting these. An organization that can bring such people together away from their campuses, help them to share experiences and keep up on new developments elsewhere can provide a valuable service for the individuals and their colleges. If the organization can further give assistance worked out with the staff person to fit the individual case, the possibility of visible, albeit hard to measure, results is greatly enhanced. We believe that informal, personally given aid can be more helpful than grants requiring much sophistication of the innovator and providing him with little emotional support. This project gave several forms of such encouragement and aid--through conferences, personal contact, consultants, and limited funds for special uses. More such efforts, and others like them in purpose but varied in method, should be undertaken if desirable changes in the developing colleges are to occur.