ED 055 056   SP 005 291

AUTHOR   Gollub, Wendy L.; Mulhauser, Fritz
TITLE   Cambridge Pilot School. First Year Report.
INSTITUTION   Cambridge School Dept., Mass.; Harvard Univ.,
                Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau
                of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE   Sep 70
NOTE   106p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS   *College High School Cooperation; *Decentralization;
                Organizational Change; *Pilot Projects; *Program
                Evaluation; School Organization; *Secondary
                Education

ABSTRACT
        The Pilot School described in this document is a
joint venture of the Cambridge public schools and the Harvard
Graduate School of Education, to experiment with decentralized
alternatives to the usual pattern of secondary education. The first
section is a chronology of the school's history and operations during
the first year; the second describes evaluation procedures used at
the end of the year, their purposes, design, and a critique of the
methods; the third presents the results of 60 interviews and 20
written commentaries by the school staff, students, parents and
teachers in the two regular Cambridge high schools, and discusses
goals for the school held by different groups, likes and dislikes
about the school, effects of the school on students, critical
incidents recollected by the staff, and suggestions for the future;
the fourth includes additional data on achievement test scores,
attendance, drop-outs, and rating scale responses; and the fifth
summarizes the data, discussing agreed-upon strengths and weaknesses
of the school, and divergences and disagreements. The final section
offers some speculative interpretations of the opinions expressed
about the school and offers some suggestions for future deve'
(MBM)

CAMBRIDGE PILOT SCHOOL

First Year Report

by

Wendy L. Gollub
and
Fritz Mulhauser

Staff Members, Cambridge Pilot School

Cambridge, Mass.
September, 1970

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Cambridge Pilot School is a joint venture of the Cambridge public schools and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, begun in 1969 to experiment with decentralized alternatives to the usual pattern of secondary education. This report of the first year has been c)iled by two staff members from their own recollections, from conversations with other staff, and from a large body of data collected at the end of the school year. The first section is a chronology of the school's history, written by Fritz Mulhauser. The second section, by Wendy Gollub, describes in more detail the evaluation procedures used at the end of the year. The third section, written in collaboration, presents the results of sixty interviews and twenty written commentaries by the school's staff, students, and parents, and by teachers in the two regular Cambridge high schools. The fifth section summarizes the data, and the last gives some speculative interpretations. The interpretations were written by Fritz Mulhauser, based on conversation with Wendy Gollub, Marilyn Bernstein, and Diane Tabor.

The authors wish to thank all those whose efforts made the report possible. Student and parent interviewers and respondents, staff who filled out lengthy questionnaires, and Cambridge teachers who gave time for interviews, all contributed to a rich mass of data. Responsibility for selection and emphasis in this report rests with the two authors, of course, and interpretations given have only been checked informally with a few other staff.

1

Thus the report is in no sense a presentation of "the staff's view of the year." We hope that the obvious shortcomings in this first exploratory description of reactions can lead to more careful attempts to document the school and its effects in the coming year.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL

1. History

January to May, 1969 Plans for the school originated among students and faculty at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Department of Social Studies. One professor and several students had worked for some time on curriculum projects, and had been disappointed in the negligible effects such projects seemed to have on the general atmosphere of schools, on the students' overall ideology, or on the roles teachers chose to play with students. The original group was considering a number of alternative ways of making a larger impact on secondary school environments, and drew up some general ideas after some weeks of conversation. Four essential components of a more desirable school environment were identified:

1 A self-contained political process based on a decision-making system consented to by all those functioning within it.

2. A third setting in addition to the academic and the political, where personal clarification and catharsis could occur without judgment being passed.

3. A reordering of values to give attention to other talents and life aspirations than those usually rewarded in highly verbal, college-oriented school settings.

4. An extremely flexible academic program within which to explore various teacher-student relationships, use of non-school resources, new curricula, etc.

For over a year before these ideas were discussed, another group of HGSE faculty had been working with the US Office of Education drafting a proposal for a program under the TTT section of the Education Professions Development Act. Funds to be

awarded for "Training Teachers of Teachers" seemed to these

faculty as one of the few possible sources of support for

clinical or external work at Harvard. Their proposal aimed to

set up "sites" within existing schools, on the model of the

teaching hospital, in which novice teachers, experienced

teachers, graduate research students, professors, and school

administrators would function as a team to accomplish a number

of goals within one institution--goals which generally are

separated into different institutions:

      Instructing youngsters   (now done in schools)
      Training new teachers   (chiefly done in 4-year colleges)
      Staff development for teachers   (summer sessions or special
            university courses)
      Graduate research and training   (done in universities)
      Professorial research   (done wherever possible)

Wh n it became clear that Harvard would receive federal support

for two or three such sites, the Social Studies group began

to consider becoming one such site in an urban location.

While the group had coalesced around some ideas which might be

called political theory or philosophy, rather than structural

rearrangements as described in the Harvard TTT proposal, the

site idea seemed one way the group could be supported in any

actual realization of its ideas.

      Thus the initial staff nucleus began with certain aims--

centered on changing the whole atmosphere and decision-structure

of a secondary school--which were not exactly the same as those

of the funding agency, and which had to mix also with the aims of

any specific school system with which the group worked. In

addition, the university itself is often divided with respect to

the value of extensive student and faculty commitment outside

the academic environment. From the university point of view, the primary goal of external work should be the training of advanced students, not simply the operation of a particular school program. Professors would naturally be expected to be a part of the plan, but their role was not fully explored in the early discussions as only one was involved at the start. Plans to publish or disseminate the results of any experiments, or to train others than the directly-involved staff were also not discussed, since the viability of the basic concepts was not clear to the original planning group and since specific linkages with a cooperating school system had to wait till a site was located. The tensions of competing goals held by Washington, the university, different staff members themselves, and the host school system became clear at several points during the year, especially proposal-writing and site-visit. But as much of the rest of this document will show, internal staff disagreement over goals was most prominent.

With the assurance of funds, and with some basic ideas as a starting point, the planning group opened discussions with the school administration in Cambridge in February, 1969. General relations between the university and its surrounding community fluctuate, but the Harvard air of national educational superiority has been doubly infuriating, no doubt, to those concerned about the quality of education of Cambridge citizens who may never attend the university. Although the school system has begun many changes in its curriculum such as Black Studies, English-as-a-second-language, an award-winning program for retarded students, and a city-wide community schools program, all

have been done with little help from the mammoth educational
resources of Harvard. A recent report on relations between
the city and the university conducted a survey which showed that
few faculty sent children to the local schools, prefering
instead to patronize expensive private schools and ignoring
the need of city schools for support in bringing about change.
Thus the planning group was happy that the administration
seemed to be interested in the concept of a sub-school based
on the altered environment described above. It seemed that the
two educational institutions might work together for once. But
as the staff learned of the disappointing record of broken promises
between university and community, it realized that there would
be great suspicion of any project connected with Harvard, and
realized, too, that the proposed change in the concept of school
was enough in itself, regardless of its sponsorship, to arouse
community feeling. Earlier innovations had perhaps had more
universal approval.

However, after several meetings had begun to explore basic
questions of the form of a sub-school, where it might be located,
how students would be selected, and how the school would relate
to the other two high schools, the superintendent urged that a
proposal be drawn up for approval by the School Committee. This
document stated a very broad rationale and a hope that Harvard
and Cambridge could work together to carry out the ideas:

> Those proposing the sub-school believe it is important
> for two main reasons. In the first place, the sub-school
> concept embodies several significant educational trends.
> The events of recent months at colleges and high schools
> across the country show that if we ignore student voices,
> we do so at some risk; the dilemma facing all educators
> is thus how to teach responsibility in the use of power
> and rationality in the settlement of disputes. Without

these, student revolutions will be anarchic and destructive and will alienate faculty and community, whether liberal or conservative. Practice in responsible self-government on genuine issues may be a start in the right direction. Further, the sub-school is congruent with the idea of developing a campus high school which we understand has been discussed in recent months.

It is essential in any large unit--factory, school, army, or university, that individuals have some feeling of common purpose and shared goals, and the growing size of schools particularly in urban areas is making achievement of the humanistic values of education more and more difficult. A house plan or other such system of decentralized units within the campus seems desirable both to make possible the sense of unity and to allow more easily for flexible arrangements and adaptations. In both school systems and individual schools, it is becoming more and more apparent that size can inhibit change and growth and cannot allow many significant choices for students. We view the sub-school as a chance to test the alternative; to see whether small size can allow both student participation and choice in a flexible setting.

In exploring such ideas, it seems appropriate that schools and universities work together, and the second main reason for this proposal is the mutual benefit for both Cambridge and Harvard in establishing a closer working relationship. The responsibilities of research and training in the university--and those of schooling in the community--are both important, but we may be able to find ways in which they can be carried on cooperatively rather than in isolation, and to this end Harvard is willing to make a three-year financial commitment. This sub-school we hope can be a model of a way in which two independent institutions can work on common concerns--a model which could be applied in other urban areas which have both school systems and nearby schools of education.

The proposal was accepted, but as it included few concrete details of program or structure, much work still remained.

May to July, 1969 After the unanimous School Committee vote, the original staff nucleus began recruiting additional staff, both from the public schools and within Harvard. The sub-school staff agreed to teach all the English and social studies for the first year students, and two Cambridge teachers who were to be released part-time during the school year joined in the planning for a new Humanities course. In addition, since most freshmen seemed also

to take French and mathematics, a teacher of each from Cambridge was hired by the sub-school full-time, paid through regular Cambridge channels by the grant. The rest of the staff were recruited from experienced teachers in various departments of the Graduate School of Education. Most of the TTT grant funds were earmarked for student scholarships, and this restriction is understandable in light of Washington's training objectives. It made it impossible, however, to hire many non-Harvard staff, and thus impossible to have as wide a range of staff backgrounds, styles, and talents, as would have been desirable. The professor did generously release funds from a personal unrestricted grant, which permitted hiring two non-Harvard staff.

Several features of the late months of spring, 1969, were important for the school's future. In the first place, officials in the Cambridge schools began to conceive of the school as a curriculum development site. This came about when the Harvard staff asked to be responsible for a double-period English-social studies course, and when the administration asked that staff draw up a curriculum outline to include in the school committee proposal. This was a definite shift in emphasis from the goals of earlier months. The series of meetings which followed the approval of the sub-school were concerned with schedules, rooms, selection of students, and other necessary details, and this effort also deemphasized the broader, more philosophical aims of restructuring the authority system in a school.

The second point is that staff were added as the details of starting a new school were being worked out, rather than as the

ideology was being conceived. Thus some of the staff had much more
background of shared assumptions than others, and newcomers
were immediately involved in what needed to be done rather than
with debating what general direction things were to take. The
process of adding staff was by accretion, as each individual in
the group recruited among acquintances for individuals who might
fit loose criteria. Candidates were invited to meet the whole
group, however large it was at that point, and decisions on
additions were by consensus regardless of how long various
members had been involved. As responsibilities arose, they were
taken by volunteers; no explicit administrative structure
developed. There were generally few formalities of procedure,
and the pull towards consensus operated on almost every decision,
not just hiring. This beginning, while perhaps in keeping with
some of the original goals of the sub-school such as rethinking
all patterns of authority, set a mode of operating that caused
much concern to staff through the summer and throughout the
academic year.

Since the school year was ending, plans had to be quickly
drawn for recruiting and selecting the new school's sixty students,
at the same time as the exact nature of the sub-school alternative
was still being decided. A brochure was distributed to all
eighth graders in the city's public and parochial schools, which
mentioned small classes and greater student responsibility. If
students were interested, they simply sent in their name. At
three public meetings, staff tried to answer parents' questions
as best they could. Close to twenty per cent of the public school

eighth graders volunteered for the "Pilot School," as it came

to be called, or about 130 students. Selection was made

according to sex, race, post-high-school plans, and which of

the two high schools the student wanted, in order to guarantee

a complete cross-section of the city's ninth grade. In cases

where a large number of students were alike on those variables,

a grade average was determined and equal numbers of students

were selected from top, middle, and bottom strata of the grade-

average distribution. No teacher or counselor recommendations

were sought, and random choices were made within the various

categories set up. Table I gives further data on the sixty-one

students who began the regular school term in the Pilot School,

fall, 1969.

The first meeting of staff and students came in July,

when the whole group met for a four-week planning workshop.

Students were informed in the brochure that they would be paid

as "consultants" during the summer, for help in planning the

first year of the school. Money proved a strong initial attraction

for some, many of whom came later to enjoy the school for other

reasons. The four-hour daily sessions were structured in some

accordance with the early statement of different contexts to be

tried in school: a large-group town meeting which finally failed

to function as a decision-making body, some academic and task-

oriented smaller groups, and ten randomly-composed "home groups"

of six students and two staff, whose goals were just to get to

know each other and talk over things that concerned people.

The task groups attempted a number of ambitious projects, including

among others the drafting of a government for the whole school

Table I
Statistical Data
1969-70 Pilot School Ninth Grade
N = 61

		Boys	Girls
High School	Rindge	17	
	CHLS	18	26
Age (as of 9/69)	12.0 - 12.11	1	
	13.0 - 13.11	9	8
	14.0 - 14.11	21	16
	15.0 - 15.11	4	1
	Over 16		1
Race	White	23	20
	Black	10	6
	Other non-white	2	
IQ	Mean	110.4	109.4
	Standard deviation	14.5	14.6
	Range	85-144	1 -137
Grades Repeated	One	4	3
	Two	1	1
Number in AT ("Academically Talented") elementary school classes		6	3
Elementary school	Agassiz	--	
	Fitzgerald	12	
	Fletcher	4	
	Harrington	5	
	Houghton	1	
	Longfellow	3	
	Morse	--	
	Peabody	14	
	Putnam	1	
	Roberts	5	
	Russell	4	
	Thorndike	2	
	Webster	5	
	Parochial schools	5	
		61	

for the coming year, planning an English curriculum, painting
and refurbishing five rooms in the Rindge Tech building which
the school would occupy in the fall, producing a weekly news-
paper and daily leaflets, and trying alternative ways of
learning social studies.

In retrospect, many staff have commented that the goal
of altering the school atmosphere was achieved very early,
as students rapidly lost their fear of adults. The whole rest
of the year was an attempt to encourage students to take ad-
vantage of that altered environment. Many of the group goals
seemed far from achieved by the end of four weeks, but consid-
erable personal contact between everyone at least insured that
the first few weeks of school would not be as hectic and mech-
anical as the tasks of scheduling and orgnization often make
them. No English curriculum emerged, although students read
and recommended a number of books and published a magazine of
their writing. A lengthy constitution was drafted, debated, and
passed but without much enthusiasm except from its authors. A
staff and student council was elected, but failed to act very
usefully. Home groups were mixed, but many had good trips and
talks.

Within the staff itself, a number of strains became evident
during the summer session. About six additional staff had joined
just for the summer as part of a Harvard Summer School course,
so the total staff was over twenty. Yet the decision-making
mechanism of consensus persisted both historically, from the
earlier days of five- and six-man meetings, and ideologically,

as part of the commitment to altered authority patterns and participation. One result was a great deal of time spent on minor matters, with little energy left to discuss many difficult issues which divided the staff. Another result was an inability to mobilize people for a quick decision on anything in a crisis. Individuals felt their creativity sapped by several hours of tense meetings almost every day. At the close of the summer, after a week of meetings of the staff alone, a plan emerged for a coordinator or administrator for the opening of school in the fall. Several staff had repeatedly voiced the hope that the school could function with rotating temporary meeting-leaders and assignment of administrative activities to short-term sub-committees. Yet so many things had to be thought of, that most staff accepted the coordinator idea despite reservations about recreating a discredited feature of current systems. Two staff agreed to serve in the position, for six months each. Throughout the summer the focus had been on the large staff meeting, and little or no delegation had occurred. Nor had any plan for such delegation been drawn up for the fall. This was a legacy to the school year which continued to be a source of difficulty for many months, but accurately reflected the deep concern of many staff that various traditional authority patterns (central power or unchecked delegation) not be established without careful thought.

A continuing and unresolved issue was the role of the professor who had nourished the project with absolutely essential contributions of time, ideas, and even funds, from the very start. With incisive insights into the school's problems, and with a

ever ending stock of reconceptualizations of the operation,
he was a leading figure in staff gatherings regardless of the
formal leadership. Although the theme of "changed authority
relationships" is mentioned throughout this account, to some
extent those relationships within the staff were both complex and
unexamined for most of the year. The professor took a more
limited role by participating in no staff meetings at all in
the last part of the year, and several staff remarked by June
that that had led to significant changes within the staff
structure and meeting process.

2. Operations during the school year 1969-70

The students of the Pilot School were divided roughly as
follows:

	Rindge boys	CHLS boys	CHLS girls
college-prep	12	13	14
non college-prep	5	5	12

The practical implications of this pattern were that students
desired a great variety of courses, which Pilot School staff
could not completely handle. Thus individual combinations
of Pilot School courses and Rindge and CHLS courses had to be
worked out. In general course schedules followed the programs
(college, business, technical) which students and their parents
had elected at the end of eighth grade, even though tracking was
a feature of schools which most staff disliked.

Some individuals were in the Pilot School for the whole day,
except for gym and health at their school; others returned only
for the Humanities double period. All students ate lunch either in
the Pilot School rooms, or in the Rindge cafeteria. Students were
eligible for all sports and extra-curricular activities in their

high school, and were offered additional after-school activities within the Pilot School. Staff kept the school rooms open until five every evening, and many stayed to play ping-pong or dance. There were no study halls in the Pilot School. Within the school the staff was free to devise whatever curriculum structure, grading policy, discipline policy, student role, etc. seemed best--or at least there were no official constraints at the start. The administration of the Rindge building housing the school was warmly hospitable despite the inconvenience the school caused. Offices in both the School Department and in the Cambridge High and Latin School were also generally helpful in adapting policies for an unusual and confusing situation.

Without explicit setting of priorities, certain areas of school life came to receive the bulk of staff attention, usually because they recurred each day. Despite the early formulation of reasons for having a sub-school, the staff had grown far beyond those in the original compact. To most, the survival of the school seemed to depend more on getting through the day than on consistently applying an ideology. Meetings which attempt to clarify goals have to be very carefully organized in order to convey the impression that ideas are genuinely desired and that the situation is open to influence. At the same time, things cannot be so open that participants flounder in procedure without ever completing the task. No group of staff attempted to structure such a meeting, perhaps because they were afraid of being perceived as trying to railroad someone's pet plan. Even if this was not the reason, goals never were discussed. Staff

differed throughout the year on the priority that should be assigned even to the goals everyone agreed on, such as student involvement in decision-making, natural behavior by adults, or innovating in curriculum.

The first coordinator saw his role first as doing as much detail work as possible personally, and for larger issues setting up meetings and preparing an agenda. He did not see himself as leader of the school, executive of every decision made in meetings, or procedural policeman making sure that every gathering was as productive as possible. If the staff were satisfied to debate an issue for three hours without reaching a decision, and couldn't agree on delegating authority to a sub-group, then that was the way things were left. If people did not voluntarily carry out a decision made by the staff, he did not make it his task to call them to account or monitor performance.

The second coordinator did alter the job description somewhat by drawing up a chart of specific responsibilities which staff then volunteered for, by changing staff meetings from afternoons to evenings and discouraging lengthy discussions, and by being in much closer touch with teachers in Rindge during the second term in the spring. As a forceful and pragmatic math teacher from Rindge, he was a contrast to the younger, less exper-ienced, and less self-confident Harvard staff member who had been the first reluctant incumbent. The greater sense of organization he projected was appreciated by the staff, and without the daily contact between the second coordinator and his Rindge coll-eagues the school might not have survived the year. Most staff

ended the year, however, still wondering what kind of administra-
tion would best serve the school's unique needs; the two known
examples no doubt became background for a continuing conversa-
tion.

Thus throughout the year the staff operated without setting
specific goals, but with a general consensus on a desirable atmos-
phere or mood for the school. Staff were often in conflict
over how best to implement this consensus in specific cases,
such as taking Humanities class time to discuss some matter of
school rules and discipline when a small group had arranged to
leave the building on a trip--or setting limits for behavior
without destroying the teacher-student relationship which had
been built. Most decisions during the year were reactive, brought
upon by crises and made after the fact, and were rarely the
result of very much prior planning or testing.

One general philosophical issue which reappeared in many
specific forms could be described as "push vs. pull." A few
skeptics came to believe that no intervention could have much
effect on fourteen-year-olds, but the rest of the staff divided
on the best method. One faction felt that growth comes through
expecting a lot and demanding certain standards of behavior and
performance from students. Others were positive that such "demands"
would lead to continued experiences of failure to measure up,
and damaging results to the youngsters' sense of self-worth. Some
felt also that too often such standards were narrowly culture-
bound and irrelevant for many children of the '70s. The latter
group worried all year that demanding behavior of students would

destroy the accepting atmosphere which they wanted at the heart
of the school. They acted on the assumption that humane adult
models (themselves) would in time be emulated by students
without the pressures which the first group sought to institu-
tionalize. However since there was never very much discussion
in these terms, both descriptions are inferences from much
confusing or contradictory behavior. In any case, positions as
such rarely operated; most often decisions were made based on
immediate circumstance rather than philosophical consistency.

In such a context, often atheoretical and pragmatic, it is
difficult to trace the development of specific programs neatly
related to specific goals. And no brief and selective account
can be a true description of the "treatment" accorded an experi-
mental group. It can only be a record by the present authors
of what in retrospect seem to have been the things which con-
cerned people the most, what they spent the most time trying to
perfect and implement, and which may accordingly have affected
the students. The other sections of this report will be trying
to test the accuracy of this sketch for different populations,
to pinpoint just what were the concerns of parents, staff, students,
and outside observers, and what each would themselves identify
as the "Pilot School treatment."

Humanities Course

By far the most energy distributed among parts of the formal
program went into the double-period required English-social studies
course called Humanities. The School Committee proposal contained
a course outline, a group had worked in the summer considering

the English component, numerous conversations had taken place

between the Pilot School staff and the Curriculum Directors

in Social Studies and Language Arts for Cambridge, and still it

seemed that every day was a new bit of "existential curriculum."

Six or seven staff worked with a group of thirty students in

the morning, and a different set of staff worked with the other

half of the school in the afternoon. Logistic problems of

coordinating the work of so many adults--many of whom were not

in the school the whole day--loomed from the start. Generally,

such difficulties were avoided by instituting more or less perma-

nent subgroups of more manageable size. Three days of each

week were given over to staff-planned reading, writing, films, or

discussion. The same time-blocks on the other two days were

"electives," offered both by the in-house staff and by outside

volunteers. These diverged from the ordinary academic subjects

and included art, pottery, film, women's liberation, and many others.

A more complete list of the year's electives is in the appendix.

Since some students' schedules were relatively fixed (they

could take specific courses at only one or two times in the day),

the afternoon and morning sections of Humanities included

definable subgroups of the school. More girls who took the CHLS

General Business course were in the morning, while more boys

who took Rindge shop courses were in the afternoon. Also more

black students were in the afternoon than in the morning. The

result, according to many informal staff analyses, was very

different class moods, and very different sorts of attempts to

solve teaching problems. Much of the following applies to both,

but there were distinct differences in the reactions of the two

classes to almost every event or activity in the school.

The first term of the non-elective part of the course was on the general theme of "The End of Childhood," with readings about other cultures designed to raise questions about youth as a different world. Feature films "Rebel Without a Cause" and "Huck Finn" were shown; students read Huck Finn, Richter's novella Light in the Forest, and selections from Kroeber's non-fiction account of a California Indian, Ishi in Two Worlds. The subject matter was not directly related to the typical historical content covered in ninth grade world history, so several times a week one staff member gave what was called the "history pill"--a short reading, lecture, or quiz on historical material, to the whole school at once during the lunch hour. This gathering proved very unruly (perhaps an interaction between time and topic), and was re- placed in the second term by history instruction in the first twenty minutes of every Humanities class. This was more success- ful, but few staff had much enthusiasm for direct teaching of historical data, and the issue was put aside by offering several history electives and resolving to include more history in the regular content of the class in general.

The second quarter dealt with some history of the black struggle in this country, using materials prepared by Education Development Center. Beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which seemed ancient enough to many students, the changing black self-image and group image were explored through songs, films, readings, and dramatizations. Everyone saw the feature film of Lorraine Hansberry's "Raisin in the Sun" and put on a

section in class; they heard records of Malcolm X, interviewed members of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, and tried (unsuccessfully) to buy services over the telephone for a Roxbury address. Everyone saw "Nothing But A Man," and some went on to examine national press reaction to the Mont- gomery boycott. Others looked at modern-day violence in toys, media, and comics, and one group went to the other extreme in a study of Gandhi and non-violence.

For one dramatic day in this term, students played a grim game that many remembered to the end of the year. Called "Segre- gation Day," it gave absolute power to brown-eyed people, and all others had to obey their will. The office became a fortress as blue-eyes and greys stormed the door to get back their lunches and books imprisoned by the brown-eyes. Blue-eyed staff knelt to shine shoes for brown-eyed students, and tension and hostility rose throughout the day as the taste of power went to some brown-eyed heads. Other students were really shocked at the fanaticism developed in the course of five hours and urged the staff to end the game. Everyone made it through the day, but barely, and a number of broken friendships took days to heal. Obviously there was much meat for further consideration.

The third term centered on community--at the school, in an Israeli kibbutz, in a commune in Boston, and in Nazi Germany. Students investigated a typical German town which slowly was won over by the Nazi party, and they examined the responses of children and adults in a hypothetical family in the town. Some general concepts of political structure and decision-making were pre-

sented as analytical tools for studying any community.

The last term was radically decentralized, with each small group charting its own course. Some had completely individualized plans for each student; others chose group topics but allowed considerable leeway with individual projects. Some experiments included having each class member keep a daily journal, making videotape newspaper reports, and studying fantasy, science fiction, and the future. Some groups used a contract system in which a student set his goals at the start of his work. One class examined initiation rites, and saw the Shirley Clark film on Harlem, "The Cool World." Others not in this class saw it also, and many later expressed vivid memories of it.

Throughout these four terms, electives met two days per week, and the material just discussed occupied the other three. A number of efforts to coordinate all the Humanities sections were tried, at first with rotating pairs of staff from morning and afternoon, later with one boss over all. Neither worked very well, and perhaps led to the final term which saw little common effort among the ten or so groups. Term tests were given to all students in the morning, since groups had done much comparable work, but they were sometimes impossible in the afternoon.

Unfortunately, the Humanities hours were the only times when the staff could count on having all students present in the school. Thus matters which concerned everyone had to be brought up then for consideration and this often dislocated the academic schedule. At first, the attempts to reconstruct

the government that was designed in the summer took place in Humanities. Then after a demonstration of great disinterest in such matters of permanent structure, ad hoc discussions of particular issues continued through the year in class. Humanities groups planned school outings, including a whole day's break in the schedule in the winter called Community Day. Students developed in class a system for finding the facts when several boys were suspended for stealing and vandalizing. (This important incident is discussed in detail later.) New teachers were interviewed by students during Humanities time, and advisors talked to their students about course planning for the coming year. This mixture of purposes--academic, governmental, logistic--caused great frustration to individuals who had particular stakes in any single area, as none received the attention it deserved.

The difficult matter of grades came up quickly at the start of the year, and out of much discussion came a modified grade system. Humanities was evaluated by staff and students together, to arrive at a letter grade (not the numerical grades used elsewhere in the high schools), and comments were added each quarter by both elective and Humanities teachers. Electives were not graded. The most common procedure for arriving at the Humanities grade was to ask a student to grade himself on his independent work and on his participation in the several group settings he had joined. Then the teacher graded him on each dimension, and the two sets of grades were averaged. A term test usually counted a small part of the grade also. Some sections experimented with

eliminating grades altogether.

It is hard to convey the variety of activities and patterns of organization in the Humanities course that were tried during the year. Almost all of the electives met extensively outside of school, and some had that as their express purpose. Humanities sections,too, met in teachers' houses, in libraries, or in Harvard rooms. (At the end of the year many students remarked on the physical difference it made not being "cooped up" all day in the building.) Volunteer teachers included several parents, a Cambridge mother, Harvard graduate students, Boston Museum School art students, members of the black community, and undergraduates from other neighboring schools. A series of special events was planned for Malcolm X and Martin Luther King's birthdays, during the Cambodian invasion, for the Jewish holidays, and so on.

An issue which cuts across subject-matter lines and which affects the whole social life of a school is grouping. Staff adopted an experimental attitude towards all methods of grouping students within Pilot School classes. French and Algebra teachers had completely heterogeneous classes, and solved the inevitable difficulties with tutoring, special class sessions after school, use of language labs, computers, tapes, and other hardware, and by other individual arrangements. In Humanities classes, work was usually in groups of six to eight at most, with two teachers, so this rich resource of staff made individual attention possible. Some students in large groups begin to fidget and become bored quickly, even attempting to disrupt things so as to bring some excitement into things or end the meeting. The afternoon session

of Humanities found it difficult to do anything productive
in the large group of thirty, and eventually ceased meeting as
a whole altogether. With a somewhat different mixture of students,
the morning section kept the large-group meeting as a useful
part of its schedule through the year. Small groups were
shifted and reformed on many grounds: student interest, teacher
style, student friendship, or random assignment. In the afternoon,
for the last quarter the staff assigned students according to
attitude toward school, in an attempt to build some solidarity
among like-minded students and gear academic work to each
group's interests. There was much doubt, however, that even
these groups had realized any greater cohesion, and some students
resented being segregated even though they recognized that they
couldn't always work well with others.

The school was fortunate to have the services of an artic-
ulate black lawyer part-time during the year, who led a section
of afternoon Humanities just for black students. This group
began to share many feelings which would never have surfaced with
exclusively white teachers, and when racial lines were decisively
drawn in confrontations at CHLS in the spring, the class provided
a place where students could begin to discuss the hard issues
of divided loyalties and friendships.

The issue of what to do with the few severely disturbed
students remains difficult for a staff which is generally opposed
to the usual type of "cooling out" used on these individuals.
The school has not fully faced the need to think up alternatives
for the most resistant students. By having a wider range of

elective courses in the second year perhaps the problem of large groups may be avoided, but the staff still will be groping for methods of helping very diverse students realize their potential without damaging their self-image.

Parent Involvement

Throughout the year, staff tried to be in contact with parents, to solicit their advice about school policies and approaches to education, and to find ways they could actually help with school operations. During the 1969 summer workshop parents visited twice in the evenings at Longfellow Hall at Harvard, mostly to ask questions about what were then very tentative plans for the year. When the first quarter was over in November, parents were invited to the traditional parents' night to meet with teachers. The coordination of these events has been difficult, as some parents want to see CHLS and Rindge teachers--which either shortens Pilot School time if it occurs on the same evening, or makes a burden on parents if Pilot School schedules an additional night. Several formats were tried. A general stand-up mill-about social style seems to encourage casual chat, but makes it hard for parents to speak seriously to a teacher about a child's work. Large-group meetings are also difficult to organize productively, particularly when many parents have concerns other than those being raised at the meeting. Towards the end of the year several meetings were held in Longfellow again, where many small rooms could be used for group discussions. One particularly successful meeting of parents, students, staff, and some outside visitors from Washington, dealt with evaluation

of the year's work. This group shared many ideas about the
purpose of the school and of education in general, and after-
wards several parents volunteered to help with the evaluation.
One purely social night was a splendid pot-luck supper, with
a groaning twenty-foot table of gourmet dishes.

Parents helped the school in many ways during the year.
Two electives were offered by parents whose professions inter-
ested students (architecture and nursery-school teaching). Others
helped informally by driving to the five or six roller-skating
parties in the fall, or coming to dances at Longfellow. Two
parents were even willing to join a four-day trip to a confer-
ence on alternative schools in Toronto, and cheerfully drove
twenty students and six staff over a thousand miles. A news-
letter which came out five times during the year helped keep
parents informed of doings at school and of opportunities to
help out. The staff goal of parent-involvement produced con-
flict for some students who resented any interference by their
own parents, but who also needed help with transportation or
other kinds of support in carrying out projects.

Through the year the general aim of all staff work with
parents has been to change the pattern of contact and expecta-
tion. Most parents dread a call from the school, because in the
past it has rarely come for any reason except bad news. Through
the advisor system (see below), the newsletter, meetings,
home visits, written comments, and so on, staff have tried to
make parents feel that they have easy access to the school, that
their calls and visits are welcome, and that the staff does not

regard them as obstacles to education.

Advisor System

A third aspect of school organization which concerned everybody was the counseling or advising of students. During the summer a girl who had been hired to direct the Pilot School counseling interviewed every student at length about previous school experience and about hopes for high school and beyond. She was not planning to teach any courses, and thus it appeared that the school was to continue the pattern of separation of those who know most about youngsters (the teachers) from those who counsel them (the guidance staff). It was perhaps fortunate for the school that this staff member decided at the end of the summer to accept another position, for this guaranteed that the work would have to be spread among many others. The concept of "faculty advisor" had been discussed earlier, but now the decision had to be made to go ahead with such a plan and involve the whole staff in the counseling process.

Each member of the staff was the advisor of four or five students, and was to be in contact with the family and with other teachers in order to have at all times a complete picture of the student at school and at home. As non-specialists, few staff were expected to enter into psychological counseling, but were just to be available if the student wanted a listener, if the parents wanted to know anything about their child in school, or if the staff wanted to focus their concern for a particular student. The relationship was carried out with varying degrees of involvement and commitment. Students could change advisors, but even so

many reported at the end of the year that they had often con-
sulted someone other than their official advisor. But some
staff did work closely with students and parents, visiting in
the homes, talking with CHLS or Rindge teachers, and inter-
vening to help the student when necessary either in academic
or personal matters. Advisors would call parents occasionally
just to let them know some good news from school, and these
parents often responded by initiating contact with the school.
Without any supervision, responsibility will vary greatly, and
so for next year the staff has decided to release one person
half-time to coordinate the efforts of advising the 120 students.
This person will not be the counselor for the school, but will
help individual advisors become effective on their own.

Staff-student Government

During the summer, students and staff started the day with an
informal gathering to have donuts and coffee, to hear announcements
about the day, and to share some "ritual" event. When matters
came up such as deciding where to go on an all-school outing,
staff asked this gathering what was its will, and a "town meeting"
was born. Further efforts to make this body the official source
of decisions were made by the governance task group, which wrote
some elaborate procedures to allow anyone to call a town meeting
if he could gather enough signatures. (It was typical of all dis-
cussions of governance in the summer that since nobody was really
sure who had the power, or since nobody wanted to come right out
and say that the staff did, it was never clear to whom such a
petition for a town meeting should be presented. If the meeting was
itself the original source of power, who else could authorize

it to sit? The staff because their academic meetings would be interrupted by such a special town meeting? The council--which was itself a creation of town meeting?)

On the occasions when town meeting met, discussion was either painfully slow or dominated by staff. One or two students, drawing on experience perhaps as elementary school class presidents, attempted to preside; but after fighting hard in elections for moderator, most students were content to ignore him completely as soon as their man was elected. Since on many decisions before the meeting, staff had different opinions, arguments among the adults often waxed, insuring that students would be lost in a hail of words. After several such battles staff vowed to exercise "massive self-restraint" in meetings; they soon broke this promise, however, and again bewildered the students. Students who did follow what was happening and had ideas to express were often afraid of being ridiculed by other students who only wanted to break the tedium. There was nearly universal agreement by the end of the summer that the large meetings had been a failure.

The governance group also produced a constitution which would have placed power over all school affairs in the hands of a staff-student council. Ratification took a long time, and so did election of representatives, as these processes were handed over to the home groups. The result was that staff continued to exercise power throughout the summer, even though most members were hospitable to the council and town meeting ideas and would have been glad to see them work. The council did finally get organized and did take up several issues such as behavior in the building and attendance. But the behavior got worse, and the town

meeting preempted the council by decreeing that there was no attendance problem, so both matters were without solutions.

The staff was not itself a smoothly-organized governing body either, and when it became clear that immediate action would never be forthcoming from the long meetings, a plan was presented for a staff council of five. This way of speeding up the process of getting action met with resistance, on grounds of general ideology (too much centralized power), and personal feelings of exclusion. Much time was spent in discussion to arrive at acceptance of the idea, so the council did not enter office until the summer was almost over. This group went on, however, to propose the idea of coordinators for the school year, as an alternative to the large-group frustrations of the summer.

Despite the objective failure of the summer workshop to produce an effective government, either for staff and students together, or for staff separately, the weeks did give everyone valuable experience to build on. Students were more aware of their reactions to big meetings, as home groups had analyzed the town meeting failure many times, but had also worked together in smaller units to produce some satisfying plans and products. Home groups arranged and took many trips, task groups did end up with papers, magazines and leaflets, and the school trip to Kingston State Park was a great success. So there were some good experiences and effective decisions despite the seeming trail of procedural failures.

Students who cared about the constitution tried again in the fall to get a council started, but were attacked from several

directions in early meetings. Some students thought the whole thing a waste of time; others questioned the right of this self-proclaimed group to call an election. A third group wanted the whole constitution redrafted in view of the failures in the summer. Staff were not convinced of the rightness of any particular plan of action, and did not attempt to force the matter to a resolution. The meetings ceased and the ideas dropped. One staff member did continue to meet with a few students to talk about governance, and this group made one suggestion which was eventually acted on--hire a secretary. But power reverted inevitably back to the staff, the only group with the skill and the taste for lengthy talk-sessions.

Students were always welcomed at staff meetings, and contributed to discussion and votes without exception, but only a few came regularly when meetings were at school in the afternoon. When the time shifted in February to evenings at Longfellow Hall, more students began coming, perhaps as an excuse to leave the house after supper. For the first four or five months, few rules or policies were decided which affected students in ways they cared much about, or so it seemed by meeting attendance. Later in the year a number of episodes provided tests for staff and students in working out ad hoc governmental arrangements. Money was stolen at school and food machines vandalized at Longfellow during a school dance; four boys were suspended by the coordinator when he received some specific names from another student. There was great dissent at school among staff and students, and Humanities classes began four days of discussion by telling the coordinator to invite the students back until a better process could be worked out. Students

in afternoon Humanities (where the accused had many friends)
worked very hard to develop a fair judicial process. Careful
jury selection, the right to challenge the jury, and provision
of adult counsel, were features of the plan worked out and
ratified by the whole school. Eventually each student appeared
before a hearing panel of students to tell his story. The panel
seems to have had enough credibility that it was taken seriously
and students told full stories before it. Its penalties seemed fair
and imaginative. Later many in the school, both involved and
uninvolved, pointed to the incident as an important bit of pro-
gress in the development of shared responsibility and community
feeling. One student even said: "The thing I really like about
the school is the way people are concerned about each other.
Like when I got in trouble, instead of just callin' the cops
and tellin' them "He broke the place up" everybody took some
responsibility and it all got worked out."

A planning retreat held at a farm in Harvard, Mass. for staff
and students produced another milestone, the "Red Tag System."
Until that time (March), the only offenses of which the school
took official notice were class cuts, and after a student got a
certain number, he met with his parents and his advisor for a
conference. There were problems with deciding just what was a cut--
coming in half-way through a class? being asked to leave the class
by a teacher? not being allowed to join the class because homework
wasn't done? Staff were inconsistent, too, in noticing cuts. In
order to make a few rules very clear, and to have violations rec-
ognizable on the spot, the retreat group made a list of events
which would cause a student to be given a red tag

immediately. These included cutting, lateness, failure to
do the daily cleanup, and a few others. After ten red tags,
there would again be a parent conference; after thirty, sus-
pension would be considered. This plan was accepted back at school
by the rest almost as drawn, except that morning Humanities
decided to give red tags to staff, too, since many were late
to class often. This whole system survived well, until a rash
of very disruptive actions within the school towards the end of
May caused a lowering of the ceiling to five tags before sus-
pension and the institution of a dangerously arbitrary offense
called "disturbing the peace." Of course, behavior by disturbed
individuals could not be judged on the same basis as that of more
completely responsible students, so occasional adjustments were
made, but were always carefully explained to any student who
asked and no attempt was made to hide or deny the distinction.

As the planning for the 1970 summer session and the recruiting
of new students came on the agenda of staff meetings in the
spring, student attendance at meetings rose. At times twenty
or more would be involved in the discussion. Many wanted to work
with the new students, and helped out by recalling what had and
had not worked the previous summer. Students themselves devised a
procedure for selecting twenty sophomore staff from over forty
volunteers. Another issue which concerned the students was new
staff. All candidates came to school for a day or more, spoke
with students and visited classes. After sessions with candidates,
students gave their impressions and reactions to the staff, and
these were used later in making decisions. For particular jobs,
taff-student committees interviewed applicants and made recommenda-

dations to the central hiring committee. Before selecting
teachers from Cambridge, all students were interviewed to
find out their subject-matter preferences and interests, and
this data was fed into the hiring process.

In the spring, as staff was reacting to daily crises,
advising, seeing parents, and teaching the Humanities course,
there loomed the large problem areas of planning for the coming
year and selecting new staff. The second coordinator without
warning appointed a four-man subcommittee with total power to
deal with both issues. As in the summer, this produced a general
reaction against centralized power, particularly in such sensi-
tive areas. But most people reluctantly agreed that to hammer
out plans and staff decisions in the full meeting would be both
divisive and time-consuming. The subcommittee first chose two
administrators for the coming year, and they joined in all
later deliberations of what came to be called "The Sacred Six."

Thus by the end of the school year there still was no formal
government which explicitly shared power with students, despite the
importance of that goal in the early thinking. A great deal of
informal consultation took place, however, and some formal delegation
of authority as in the discipline panel. Informal arrangements
never carry guarantees that things will stay that way, but since
staff generally smother students in a blanket of paternalistic
concern, such a guarantee has hardly been demanded. Some staff are
concerned that the students' naturally spirited dissent and
rebellion may have been coopted by the solicitude of the staff;
that liberal reforms may buy safety from more devastating and
wholesale demands. This is a possibility which will demand more

serious attention as the students resolve the personal issues
which are the focus of interest for them just now, and advance
to a more mature concern for how the institution is serving
their other interests.

Our own governance at the Pilot School was shown to be
weak during two major disruptions of normal activities at CHLS
in the spring. The first was over racial matters, the second
over the invasion of Cambodia. In both cases CHLS changed its
schedule, set up meetings, and allowed a certain amount of
unexplained absence from school--all in an effort to respond
flexibly to the situation. The events demonstrated that the
relationship between the Pilot School and the rest of the system
was unclear, for when classes were cancelled or school dismissed
at the other school, there was no unambiguous implication for
the Pilot School. Should CHLS-enrolled Pilot students be able to
go home? What about Rindge-enrolled Pilot students in that case?
If black Pilot students could go to meetings at CHLS, why did it
seem that Pilot School whites weren't welcome at their correspon-
ding sessions? Could Pilot staff attend CHLS faculty deliberations?

Since Rindge Tech was never disrupted in the same way as
CHLS, classes went on as usual there; a milling, confused mass
of Pilot School students just released from CHLS could be counted
on to disturb Rindge administrators anxious to keep things cool
and orderly there. Perhaps hoping to work cooperatively before
any crisis, the Rindge faculty and students began a series of
meetings in the spring to discuss a ten-point student list of
student ideas for improving the school. One idea which was

acted on was to establish a Rindge Parent-Teachers Association
which could help press for other changes in the building and in
the curriculum. One demand that troubled the Pilot School was
that all users of space in the building who were not directly
a part of the Rindge Technical High program be asked to leave.
This would include the Cambridge School Volunteer Program
office, the Follow Through Program, the Rindge Achievement
School, the Medical Records Technician Program, the Junior and
Senior Opportunity Program, the Thirteenth Year School, and the
Pilot School. Some speakers at late-spring Rindge PTA meetings
even suggested that the Pilot School might have been responsi-
ble for discipline problems with Rindge boys during the year.
Some staff and students attended several meetings with Rindge
teachers and students over a proposed discipline code for the
building which it was suggested should apply to the Pilot School
as well.

The events of the spring showed that although the Pilot
School students had developed a strong sense of "home base,"
and had a genuine desire to keep going when other schools were
disrupted, still the staff had not thought clearly enough about
such crises to have contingency plans. Relations with Rindge
and CHLS were hard enough--in getting students to class on time,
in keeping in touch with teachers so far as possible, and trying
not to disturb the school's hosts in Rindge--that the added
strain of disruptions was doubly hard at the Pilot School. Just
how much autonomy the school had was never clear; in the fall, for
example, some words had to be deleted from several readings by
black authors at the request of the school administration. The

spring further demonstrated that the issue was unresolved, and that even if a working internal government could be constructed, there would still remain hard issues of "foreign policy." Many staff felt, too, that the crises showed the need for time and places to deal with strong student feelings. The planning for the second year has included such non-academic, non-political settings as a first priority.

Informal Interactions

These have been aspects of the school which were its formal structure: academic work, parent and advisor roles, and governmental system. The picture of Pilot School life should not be concluded without reference to the informal side of school--the weekends, after school, and other times when staff and students were together, and the non-academic interactions within the building during the day. For the latter, the "office" was the focus. Here, in a former chemistry lab, staff and students met throughout the day to conduct private and public business, raise gerbils, buy soda from the school ice-box, play records, paint the walls. entertain visitors, announce red-tag totals, and so on. Staff resigned themselves to having to find other places for quiet work, but the benefits for the school of having an informal relaxing spot were far greater. It is rare and beautiful in a school, many staff came to believe, to find a room in which everyone feels comfortable.

The outside-school activities were seemingly endless, both in their variety and in their demand on staff time: roller skating, dances, a camping trip in the fall, a trip to Washington, the

Toronto trip in the spring, a New York trip at the start of the summer. Paragon Park, Kingston State Park, the zoo, the Museum of Fine Arts, the Red Sox, the Globe, staff houses (very popular), student houses, a Fort Hill commune, the banks of the Charles, the top of the Prudential, the Haymarket, the Riverside car line, Boston Redevelopment sites, the aquarium, hockey games, ice skating, a pantomime show and master class, a feature film in Boston, the United Nations, Plimoth Plantation, Concord's "rude bridge," East Cambridgecourtrooms, bookstores, art shops, Boston University Medical Center, and on and on. In school and out, the staff tried to be their natural selves, with their enthusiasms and their quirks, their (conflicting) hopes for the school and their (conflicting) expectatations for the students, out in front. The remainder of this report will be able to answer the question of what effect the effort may have had.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

During the second half of the year, a panel of twelve students were interviewed by other students about various aspects of school life, and staff wrote essays on the same subjects. Summaries of each round were circulated to anyone interested. These modest efforts were an attempt at "formative evaluation," or feedback of information while a process is going on for help in making decisions. By June, it was clear that even the total of these reports still would not give an outsider a picture of what happened during the year, or of how participants and observers felt about the whole year's effort.

In order to enlist wide involvement in the process of gathering data for such a summary, the school hosted a very successful meeting of parents, students, staff, and official visitors from Washington. For several hours everyone discussed how the effects of the year could be measured and by what standards those effects should be judged. Based on that input, and armed with many offers of help, the specific plans were drawn up by an evaluation team led by Wendy Gollub, and including Marilyn Bernstein and Diane Tabor. The following pages give a more detailed account of the methods used in gathering data.

1. Purposes

The evaluation we designed had three main goals. First we wanted to find out to what degree the first year fulfilled the expectations of students, parents, staff, and teachers in the regular high schools. What goals did people have for the school,

and how effective had the school been in achieving them? Second, we wanted to describe the effects of the school on different people. Had they changed? Did they value these effects? Were there new conflicts in their lives? Third, in order to make improvements in the school, we wanted to locate its strengths and weaknesses from different points of view. Which aspects of the school are worth continuing? Which should be modified? And finally, we wanted to broaden the perspectives of all those concerned about the school by involving them centrally in the process of evaluation. Since the school was founded on a desire to involve parents, students, and teachers in the design of an alternative school, it seemed crucial to enlist the resources of all in assessing the school's first year.

To meet these objectives, we relied on the reported perceptions and opinions of students, staff, parents, and teachers at CHLS and Rindge. It can at least be argued that the sum total of subjective and personal impressions different people have actually constitutes the school's reality. Given limited resources and no evaluation staff, we had to rely almost exclusively on such reports. The only "objective" measures of the effects of the school are achievement test scores and attendance statistics, and a summary of these is included in section IV, below.

In short, this first-year evaluation was designed to collect people's reactions to the school, and their diagnosis of its strengths and weaknesses. Hopefully the results will feed into and nourish the further development of the school.

2. Design

The evaluation team decided that students, parents, and CHLS and Rindge teachers would be interviewed, and Pilot School staff would fill out questionnaires, about their reactions to the school's first year. The process of getting this data is described below.

During the last days of school in June, twenty students were interviewed by other students. The interviews were conducted by five student interviewers trained in the skills in an elective course offered in the Pilot School earlier in the year. Before the interviews, interviewers met to familiarize themselves fully with the questions and the intent of each; they were encouraged to probe until they felt the questions were "really answered." All interviews were taped. Interviews lasted between twenty minutes and an hour; most were about half an hour. Of the twenty interviewed, twelve had been interviewed by the same interviewer several times earlier in the year.

The students interviewed were a stratified random sample of twelve, selected from the same strata originally used in selecting students for admission to the school (sex, race, and previous level of achievement). These twelve were the panel who had been involved all year in the evaluation interview process. For this final round, eight more students were added to the sample who were recommended by staff as "unlike" the other twelve. Individuals familiar with the whole year's interview responses by the twelve noted that the involvement in the interview

process had sharpened the students' verbal skills considerably
over the months, so to that extent the responses were much more
articulate than would be the case with uninterviewed students.
There is no reason to believe, however, that the content of the
students' views was changed greatly by the year's interviews.
Table II gives further data on the sample of twenty students.

<div align="center">

Table II

Data on students interviewed

N = 20

</div>

		Girls	Boys
High School	CHLS	7	7
	Rindge		6
Race	White	4	9
	Black	3	4
Course of study chosen at end of 8th grade	College-prep	4	10
	Non-college	3	3

Ideally, the student sample would have been compared to a control
sample selected from among the volunteers for the school who were
not selected to be in the school. Unfortunately there were not
enough students in the original strata to select a control group.
Also, it will be more important to have a control group when
more specific hypotheses are being tested; a control group is
irrelevant in collecting people's reactions to a stimulus that
only they have seen.

The student interview schedule included several open-ended
questions to tap student goals, likes and dislikes, and future

recommendations. All interview schedules included a series of

rating scales for measuring the school's progress along several

dimensions. (Copies of all interview schedules are in the

appendix.) Since the rating scales offered quantifiable results,

the analysis was straightforward. The open-ended questions were

analyzed by the evaluation team as follows: several individuals

read the responses and determined categories for making

sense of the data. Then others coded the responses into the

categories. Frequently an answer consisted of more than one

statement, each of which fit into a different category. In such

cases, each statement was scored.

The parents of the twenty interviewed students were them-

selves interviewed, by other   rents or their own children. That

gave parent and child data from twenty families. All the inter-

views were supposed to be conducted by parents who volunteered

to spend the time to familiarize themselves with the schedule,

but five had to be done by students when some parents could not

make arrangements. Parents wrote answers verbatim as they heard

them, since finding tape recorders for ten parents proved too

big a task. Most interviews were conducted with the mother, although

this was not at all by design. Interviews lasted between one-half

hour and two hours; most were slightly over an hour. Several inter-

views had to be done by telephone.

The parent interview contained similar questions to those

asked the students, and in addition asked about any changes in

the student. The data was analyzed in the same way.

Since the Pilot School operates within the regular public

ol system, and since Pilot School students took courses at

both CHLS and Rindge, it seemed important to solicit the
views and reactions of individuals in the wider system.
Eight teachers each from CHLS and Rindge were interviewed
by Cambridge teachers from the Pilot School staff during
the last week of school. Four in each school had taught Pilot
School students in their classes, and all the individuals
selected were believed to have critical or at least unknown
reactions to the Pilot School. Selections were made by the
Cambridge teachers on the Pilot School staff. As with parents,
responses were written, as close to verbatim as possible.
In addition to the standard questions, teachers were also
asked about the contacts they had had with the Pilot School,
their thoughts about its continuation, and their ideas about
its relationship to the regular public school system.

The staff of the school were questioned on the same subjects
also, but since many staff preferred to write their answers,
a questionnaire form was used. (Also, transcribing the reminisc-
ences of fifteen talkative adults would probably have taken
all summer.) Responses ranged from two to eight typed pages;
most were about four. The questions paralleled those asked the
other groups. Although return rates of all other samples were
perfect, only twelve out of fifteen staff questionnaires were
returned.

3. Critique of the Methods

Weaknesses The present report is based almost exclusively
on a single type of data--retrospective self-reports by partici-
pants. The possible biases and shortcomings of such information
are easily stated: no standard for value judgment, distortions

of chronology and emphasis, <u>post</u> <u>hoc</u> fallacies, and so on.
No group of "regular" students was used as a comparison with
the "experimental" group, nor were any pretests given even
to the Pilot School students. The difficulty of choosing a
more rigorous methodology, however, is that if we had begun
to ask the staff "on what specific claims would you like to
have the school evaluated," the answers would have been hope-
lessly broad or conflicting. In the first year it seemed best
to focus on what people thought happened, and to try to aim for
more specific studies beginning in the second year. There
must be a careful and complete record of actual activity in
the school before one can even begin to hypothesize about the
aspects of the program which may be important to students.
During this busy year, few people had the sort of time necess
ary for that sort of observation. (Some efforts in this direction
have already begun in the second summer session.) No attempt
has been made here to differentiate student responses to the
school along lines of aptitude, background, or any other "indep-
endent" variable. This can come next year, now that the staff has
some idea of what are the student responses and their range and
probable antecedents. A final problem with the present technique
is the time necessary to transcribe and analyze the interviews.
More economical measures will be needed as the school expands.

    <u>Strengths</u> By relying on open-ended questions in interviews,
we demonstrated an important attitude: trust in the perceptions
and judgments of those being asked, those directly involved in
the school. To be sure, those closest to a situation sometimes

have the narrowest vision, but that can be checked in later efforts. For a start the evaluation team accepted the school's ideology, and simply asked people's reactions. Direct questions are the only method, too, that yields immediate, non-inferential data on things people would like to see changed, an important question to ask if "involvement" and "participation" are to be made real. The anecdotes and detailed responses people have shared with us offer a rich source of potential hypotheses to be investigated in future reports.

One feature of the method seems particularly strong. All those interviewed were speaking to another of nearly equal status, in contrast to the usual situation where either authorities like teachers interview students, or uninvolved people like "researchers" have to be told a great deal of background information in order to make a point significant or clear. A further advantage of this method is that the procedure is intuitively understandable; this is not the case with more sophisticated psychological or sociological tests or puzzles. This was important because we wanted people without any experience to understand and participate in the evaluation process. The questions to which we shall want answers in the future may not be susceptible to this simple process, but it seemed best for the first year.

Several times during the year, visitors embarrassed staff by asking what test battery would be given to evaluate the school. It is interesting to speculate whether "hard" quantitative analysis at this point in the school's life, would have been as fruitful as the interviews--for instance, in making clear

the discrepancies among the goals which various groups
articulate, or in demonstrating the complexity of the author-
ity issues within the staff and students.

III. RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS

This part of the report is intended to be simply a pre-
sentation of the data derived from interviews and question-
naires. It includes a description and summary of responses
to each question and some illustrative quotations. Staff,
students, parents, and CHLS and Rindge teachers discussed a
variety of topics, and these are the organizing themes of
the following pages: 1) the goals and purposes of the school;
2) people's likes and dislikes about the school; 3) changes
they observed in Pilot School students during the year;
4) incidents that were critical in the school's development;
and 5) suggestions for next year. Since the authors were
closely involved in the school, it is always tempting to
begin to analyze a pattern of responses; these next two major
s tions are not meant to do that, but are meant as data
which can be used in many ways to draw conclusions. The final
section is the authors' own interpretations.

1. Goals for the school held by different groups

Everyone was asked about their own reasons for being connected
with the Pilot School, or their perception of the school's pur-
poses. Students were asked why they volunteered, parents why
they allowed or encouraged this; staff were asked why they wanted
to work in the school. Outside teachers were asked what they
thought the school was trying to do. In the forms used, the
questions asked are not strictly comparable, and this may help to
explain the different emphases placed by different groups on

particular categories of goals.

Student reasons for entering Students were asked "Why
did you come to the Pilot School," and intervie rs probed
with "What did you hope to get out of the Pilot School?" If
a student gave several reasons and goals, each was coded.

Reasons for joining the school	# of mentions
Interesting, different, new, experiment	13
To make money in the summer	7
Wanted more choices, freedom	4
Mother wanted me to go	3
Wanted more individual attention (know more teachers, small groups)	2
Thought it would be better preparation for the future	2
Thought it would be fun	1

The most frequent response seemed to indicate a desire for
a change--any change.

Examples:

> I thought it would be good, and I wanted a change.
> And I didn't like school--regular school was boring--
> so I came.

> I just wanted something different--you know. And
> the money.

Generally boys offered specific reasons for joining the school
more readily than girls; that is, several boys had more than
one reason for enrolling in the school. No students mentioned
the opportunities the school afforded for participation in
decision-making; only five mentioned promises of a different
relationship with teachers, smaller groups, or more freedom.

CHLS and Rindge teachers' view of goals When asked "What
do you think are the purposes of the Pilot School?" teachers
offered a variety of answers, very few of which mirrored the

"official" Pilot School ideology.

Goals	# of mentions
Develop new techniques and curriculum	5
Motivate kids; help them achieve fully	5
Find an alternative to the system	4
Work under unrealistic conditions	2
Develop ways of relating to students	2
Start on a coed high school	1
Don't know	2

The most general answers were given by teachers who had not taught Pilot School students: "to make learning more meaningful" or "to improve motivations." Two claimed that the school was an attempt to do what every teacher wanted to do, but couldn't because of the realities of public schools:

> I remember it was an experiment--to work with smaller classes. A type of education which is more progressive and permissive, the kind we would like to have in CHLS, but our classes are too large. The students get more non-book education. Believe me, this is ideal education.

Four viewed the Pilot School as an attempt to develop an alternative or supplement to the current system:

> My impression is that the Pilot School is designed to give a new dimension to education, trying to find the strengths and weaknesses of the present system--eventually to evolve as a supplement to what we've got now.

Teachers rarely mentioned goals such as increasing student responsibility, encouraging and capitalizing on diversity, or changing the teacher-student relationship. The pattern of answers indicated very ineffective communication from Pilot School staff, students, and parents.

Parents' goals in sending child Parents were asked "Why did you want your child to go to the Pilot School?" Most felt that the experience would include more individual attention and smaller learning groups, and was desirable on that ground

alone.

Parent reasons		# of mentions
Individual attention		18
My child needs attention	6	
He will have many teachers	5	
He works best in small groups	4	
Anti-conformity idea (lots of activities, something for everyone)	2	
Student will be treated as an individual	1	
Child made own decision		7
School is new and different (unspecific)		5
Keep out of trouble in summer; seemed better college preparation; trust anything Harvard does; no real reason--he could withdraw if wasn't any good	(each)	1

Examples:

He is basically shy and tends to get lost in a large class. We felt the smaller classes and the lower pupil-teacher ratio would benefit him and help bring out his personality.

She needs special attention--being treated as an individual rather than as one of a herd. I'm sick of the old rubber-stamp image.

I didn't particularly want him to go. It was his decision.

Parents' responses were difficult to categorize, since many seemed to skirt the question. Interviewers did not in every case probe consistently until the parent had entirely responded. For instance, "I thought he could withdraw if he didn't like it," does not really answer the question, but no further response or clarification was requested by the interviewer. Thus the results have to be considered in light of this variation in questioning technique.

<u>Staff reasons for joining</u> When asked why they "wanted to
be a part of the Pilot School?" staff gave three general types
of reasons: broadly ideological, personal, and Cambridge-centered.

<u>Staff motivations</u>		<u># of mentions</u>
Ideology		16
Want to involve students in decisions		
and change teacher-student relation	7	
Want to apply ideas to a range of		
different types of students	4	
Want to create an informal atmosphere	3	
Want to involve parents	1	
Want to improve curriculum	1	
Personal reasons		14
Wanted to work with a stimulating		
group with shared values	6	
Personal growth; "thought I could		
get a lot out of it"	4	
Dislike university	1	
Wanted to mix university and school	1	
Like small classes and no boss	1	
Needed to break my teaching routine	1	
Cambridge-centered		4
Help the high schools change, or		
create an alternative	3	
Bridge CHLS and Rindge	1	
Do something different		3

Examples:

I had helped hatch the idea of the school originally when
we started with the idea of an ombudsman service for
students... But I liked the prospect of the school and
I liked the people who were working on it--a congenial
and stimulating group to work with.

I wanted to be part of a team that I felt was in sympathy
with some of my ideas about school--who felt some unan-
imity of purpose, would be intellectually and socially
stimulating. (I wanted to get away from bureaucracy,
defensiveness, etc.) I felt I was at a point in my own
development where I had some new ideas to try out, and
thought I might be useful to the school.

I wanted to be in a situation where I could get to know
students more personally, and as a result be better-equipped
to understand their performance, or lack of it, in partic-

ular subject areas. This...and trying some new approaches
to (my subject) would not have been possible (in my
former job). Another attraction was the idea of working, in
a sense, alone. I.e. being responsible to myself. I always
hated having to teach to please others, for example not having
small groups because I was afraid I might disturb others
around me. At the Pilot School I feel much freer and I know
that if the kids are too noisy someone will just come in and
in a kind manner tell us to shut up, instead of brooding
about it.

After teaching five years I found myself becoming very set
in my ways. I felt the Pilot School would provide me with
an entirely new environment and scope on education which
I ` lt would revitalize my attitude and approach to teaching.

Staff members mentioned specific aspects of school life they

hoped to affect, like changing curriculum and teacher-student

realtionships. They seldom mentioned joining the school because

they wanted to produce certain specific effects on students.

The focus seemed to be on the adult characteristics of the

setting--the group goals, the stimulation, the challenge of

making something go.

2.Likes and dislikes about the school

    Everyone was also asked about features of the school they

liked and disliked. Without probing for anything specific, inter-

viewers elicited spontaneous answers that indicate features of

the school prominent in people's minds. Due to an oversight the

staff was not asked the same question; instead their answers

to "Did the year work out as you had hoped?" were coded as likes

and dislikes, since they fell e   into those categories.

    Parents Often during the year observers and staff made

hesitant statements about "how parents would react" to particu-

lar school policies or innovations. The twenty interviews

 real a great fund of confidence in the staff, and only very

scattered and unsystematic dislikes.

	Likes	Dislikes	No dislikes
Number of things mentioned:	35	19	7

Favorable comments took a very general form—the teachers' attitudes toward the students, the efforts to communicate with parents, and some vague ideas about how the students got along in school together. The lack of specific answers may reflect an information gap; students often reported little or nothing about their day at school, out of a desire to keep school their experience, private and unshared. The parent newsletter was begun partly because many parents reported they rarely heard about school through the most obvious channel.

Parent likes		# of mentions
Teacher behavior		20
Take interest in students	11	
Consult parents often	7	
Report progress often	2	

Academic items
    (small group classes, projects,
    trips, special bits of curriculum)
		5

Student role in the school
    (relaxed, involved in decisions,
    chance to test themselves, groups
    work together)
		5

General school atmosphere		5

Dislikes ranged across a broad spectrum. Some seemed very specific to a parent/child combination, and very few parents agreed in criticizing particular aspects of the school's practice.

such circumstances:

> The people, the teachers, the atmosphere... It just
> seems that everything is busy all the time. When you
> come into a room you feel it, right? Not sitting always
> in one place, going places, I really think I'm going to
> get an education out of this place.

> I like the way everything is taught. The teacher really
> cares if you learn something. She's not just concerned
> with the kids who are smartest and are gonna learn anyway.

> When you're free to follow your own things, to make choices,
> its really your responsibility to learn. They're not going
> to yell at you; you got to learn for yourself. I like the
> way we learn here--and we do learn.

There was no pattern to the dislikes; they ranged from

complaints about the Rindge stairs and the trek to CHLS, to the

clean-up requirement, specific classes, or the lack of some

particular bit of personal attention. Only one person mentioned

the Red Tag system, and no class or teacher was mentioned more than

once. Only one person out of the twenty was troubled by the "dis-

organization" at school. Two mentioned they disliked incon-

sistency of staff in handling different students:

> Some kids get away with murder, and when somebody
> else does the same thing, they get yelled at. Maybe
> the teachers are afraid of those certain kids and let it
> happen. They get second chances and everything. When
> things happen kids should go right to the teacher and
> talk to her about problems with those kids; some say they
> will, but they don't. I mean these kids will have to
> buckle down some day. The Pilot School has given an
> awful lot of attention to these kids, but next year they
> better tell them out and out flat, buckle down. If they
> can't, get out.

The staff did in fact worry all year about how to handle disruptive

students, and their efforts were far from consistent; it is

only surprising that more students did not comment on this. Cer-

tainly they talked of it a great deal during the year.

Rindge and CHLS teachers Before discussing what the
teachers liked and disliked, it seemed important to look
at the extent and nature of their contact with the school.
Only half the sample actually had Pilot School students in
their classes; that was the way the sample was chosen. We
asked all teachers, however, "What contact have you had with
the Pilot School?"

Nature of contact	CHLS	Rindge
Have students in class	4	4
See kids around in halls	1	6
Know Pilot School teachers	6	2
See the attendance records		1
Visited classes		1
Hearsay	1	
No contact at all	1	

Most teachers knew of the school through students or else
only very casually. The Pilot School teachers that they knew
were the ones who had previously taught in Cambridge. The
contact thus appears sparse; this fact should be kept in
mind when interpreting the remarks of the teachers.

The two main likes were the effects on students, and
that the school fills a need and seems successful.

Teachers' likes	# of mentions	
	CHLS	Rindge
Effects on students (enthusiasm, friendliness, attitude and involvement in class)	4	3
Generally seems successful; fills need	2	4
Atmosphere (informality)	2	1
Individual attention	1	2
Students taking responsibility	1	1
Positive influence on Rindge		1
Field trips and fun activities for learning	1	
None; don't like anything	1	

Changes students see in themselves		# of mentions
Generally positive references		26
Academic skills and learning		10
Learned more than last year	3	
Studied harder than last year	3	
Learned specific skill	2	
Became interested in Black Studies	2	
Social skills		14
Feel easier hanging around kids	4	
More relaxed, grown up, quieter	4	
Talk more openly	2	
More interested in boys	2	
Got to know and like teachers	1	
Met many new people	1	
General attitude: feel better towards school	2	
Feel have not changed during the year		5
Any mention of negative change		1

Some examples:

Well, if you really want to know... I think this is stupid, but, I became race conscious. I really wasn't like that when I was in gr   ool. Like you know, you never studied about a   ke that. It was always history, never you   ck and your father was a slave. All I knew was that a black person's ances- tors had to be slaves. But here we found out that the first black people weren't slaves; they were the same as every other white person. The school had a lot to do with it.

I think I've learned to talk more openly; I'm not afraid to say something--like against a teacher. I can tell them and get it off my chest. And I've really made myself do things I wouldn't do. Yeah, the school helped me change; it gave me a lot more freedom and things I could do.

I know if I was at another school I'd be grouchier and start a lot of fights, cause I don't like being cooped up.

Well I used to stay in and everything. But kids told me I really changed; now I like to come out and talk to people and be friendly with the kids. I used to be afraid to. The Pilot School did it; I would never know kids in the same way at other schools.

How have others changed this year?		# of mentions
Generally positive references		14
Specific skills learned	3	
Better feelings about school	2	
Helped people grow; gave responsibility	2	
Made people more responsive to		
more things	1	
Other unspecific ("school helped")	6	
Generally negative references		7
People more rebellious, rowdy	3	
Took advantage of freedom; didn't work	3	
Confused by being on their own	1	
Mixed, or no change in others		5

Some examples:

Oh lots of changes. Like some kids who always thought
school work was the most important thing in the world;
maybe that won't be so important now. More knowing about
people and their attitudes. I think its taught us all
how to talk--as you can tell, its taught me a lot! I
think people know how to express their ideas better; this
year they've been asked their ideas all the time. Remem-
ber in the beginning of the year and in the summer? And
now people like to respond to things. That's pretty
amazing. And good.

It made some wild. A couple. But its given them a sense
of responsibility. Its really put some kids in their
place by giving them responsibility.

I think the school has made other kids...uhh what's the
word...rebellious. They learned all the different ways
you can take advantage of teachers, how you can get
away with things.

On this second change question, the response was more mixed.
Students seem to fear that others, not themselves, are abusing the
system which is benefiting them. It is probably hard for them to
speak of negative changes in themselves and hard to admit that
they too enjoy the rowdyism and carrying-on which they attribute
to others.

Rindge and CHLS teachers' observations   Only half the
sample interviewed had direct personal contact with students
on which to base an estimate of changes. Also it is difficult
to separate remarks about students' inherent differences
from others, from statements about changes over this year in
particular.   The following count is based on any remark about
differences made in response to questions about how the first
year went, likes or dislikes, or "Do Pilot School students
seem different from others?" Almost all the specific changes
mentioned referred to social behavior.

Changes noticed	# of mentions	
	CHLS	Rindge
More involved, interested	1	3
More mature		2
More friendly		2
Less scared of teachers	1	
More polite	1	

Of these remarks, only three were made by teachers who had
taught Pilot students. We noted under likes and dislikes
w.   one teacher reported about "willingness to participate
orally." This teacher added that "although the interest
and enthusiasm are there, the students seem to lack the self-
discipline to accompli h what enthusiasm initiates."

Another group of teachers denied that the school's
students were different, or attributed any differences entire-
ly to home background.

Students are no different	5
Special group was selected, with unusual family backgrounds	4

An interesting comparison is between the views of those who

taught Pilot School students and those who have not:

	Pilot students are no different	Pilot students are special
Have taught Pilot students	4	1
Have not taught Pilot students	1	3

Representative comments in each group:

The special status of Pilot School students makes them better achievers automatically. And the parents are highly motivated, so that affects the kids also.

In many cases I believe there was an academic influence in the family.

Well, as far as I see them here, I don't think they're any different; the ones that are good are very very good; the ones that are bad are horrid!

It seems there is a tendency to have an overbalance of AT ("Academically Talented") students, as opposed to others. There should be more of a cross-section, give everyone a chance, not just AT. Very often it is other students who need this far more than the AT.

Four individuals commented on negative changes they had observed. In addition to the comment reported before that students didn't follow through on things, three more people discussed harmful effects on students' behavior:

I think it has adversely affected the conduct of a small minority, especially a few girls.

I feel kids do not achieve under these conditions. Girls are the worst offenders! Some are too much inclined to take liberties and do not observe the proprieties.

Students are destructive. Do they have too much time on their hands? Doesn't the faculty direct them?

Of these four, two had taught Pilot students; two had not.

4. Critical incidents recollected by staff

Staff were asked to list "turning points you think were important in school life, and why." Eleven staff listed 61 diff-

erent episodes, several of which were the same as those

mentioned spontaneously most often by students when they

were asked what they remembered most about the year. (These

common items are starred below.)

Incident	# of mentions
*Thefts at school and Longfellow, and the judicial process	9
Disturbances at CHLS in the spring	5
Ed Sarasin becoming the second coordinator in February	5
Toronto trip to "Alternatives" meeting	4
*Community Day	3
Formation of staff subcommittee for recruiting and planning	3
Staff-student retreat in Harvard, Mass.	3
Pot-luck supper for parents	3
Christmas party at school; pinata-breaking	2
Paragon Park trip at end of school year	2
	42

Each of the remaining nineteen items was mentioned by only

one staff member, and the list seemed not to share a common

factor nearly as clearly as does the above list. In explaining

why these eleven major incidents were critical, again and

again staff pointed to group factors--morale, cohesion, or

teamwork, either among students or staff separately, or in

concert. Also, many of the events represented the school's

successes in collaborative decision-making. The theft incident

was thus important not for its effects on those directly impli-

cated, but because it was "a turning point in identification

with the school and in shared responsibility"; because "we all

worked together to resolve it"; or because "it was the real

start of student voice, responsibility, and maturity." The springtime disturbances, both racial and political, "forced us to think about the goals we shared, and to wonder if we were going in the right direction" (to isolate students from the ferment at the other schools). The disruptions caused Pilot students "not to lose faith with the sy em as so many other students did, because here they had something else to identify with." The staff became aware in the crises "that there was no contingency plan for our own operations, and that when noone was decisive there is a scary breakdown in the social order." The school year "ended 'early' and as a result we missed a sense of really finishing up a solid last quarter." The second coordinator "changed the style of our group opera- tion," "gave us more perspective on ways to organize ourselves," and "infused a different spirit in the group." The Toronto trip, despite the failure of the conference, and helped by a breakdown of one of the vehicles, "was a fantastic group-building experience," because different kids "lived and breathed close together for a while." Similarly, Community Day "brough. students together with real power and responsibility" and "made everyone feel a part of the school." It "made us a community through the planning and the day itself." The formation of the subcommittee left many "feeling uninvolved, in less authority." Even though "most people agreed about its efficiency, there were many hard feelings." The selection of new coodinators led to "high hopes for good group management for next year." This list of comments on the group-spirit variable could be repeated over and over for the retreat, the pot-luck supper, the parties and

trips, etc. Only Segregation Day was mentioned as a source
of private insight and non-group benefit--and not even by all
three of the staff who touched on it. The "critical incident"
question thus shows again the intense staff preoccupation with
group functioning, as did their reasons for joining the
school and their likes and dislikes.

5. Suggestions for the future

Students and their parents were asked late in the inter-
view to comment specifically on the diversity of student pop-
ulation, the effort to involve the whole school in decision-
making, the nature of teacher-student relationships, parent
involvement, grading, courses for next year, and relations
between the school and the rest of the high school system.
Their remarks often identified strengths and weaknesses in
these areas and included suggestions for improvement. Teachers
in the high schools were asked generally how they felt bout
continuation of the school and what might be altered in the
relationship. Staff were asked to project some goals for the
coming year and assign priorities. This data is presented by
group, rather than by topic, since the questions again were
not always parallel enough to be comparable.

Staff goals for 1970-71 As might be expected, the staff
wrote dozens of pages of goals for the school and often refused
to say which were most important. A major task for next year
will be to sort out the tremendous variety of things people want
to do. The various orientations can be seen in the breakdown:

Areas to receive attention in 1970-71		# of mentions
Internal Pilot School changes		35
Alter students' activities	22	
Alter staff organization	13	
Cambridge system goals		7
(Relations with Rindge and CHLS)		
Recommendations about work with parents		3
Goals involving still wider constituencies		2

In the second and third categories, people hoped that
relations with parents and the two high schools would be
improved and made to serve the interests of all parties.
If individuals failed to mention it under goals, it was men-
tioned elsewhere--that a major effort in the second year
should be directed towards involving and communicating with
teachers and administrators in the schools. The fourth
category contained two recommendations: one that staff
begin to expl re the possibility of other "pilot" units in
other high schools, and another that other universities
should be drawn into the project with both faculty and
student help solicited.

By far the greatest attention, however, was focussed
on internal matters, but with a wide spread of concerns. Thirty-
seven different goals were suggested, and with few overlapping
categories.

Staff goals		# of mentions
Student activities and behavior		22
Develop a functioning governance system	5	
Work harder to help students meet		
their responsibilities	5	
Keep working to get different kinds of		
students doing things together	2	
Develop better strategies for students		
we have been missing	2	

(Student activities and behavior -- cont'd.)

Develop a more challenging curriculum   2
Help students develop genuine self-
   respect through valuing a wide
   range of talents in school; encour-
   age students to do the same   2
Get students into the community more;
   have them be more independent; get
   them to like school more   (each) 1

  Staff organization   13
     Have more efficient administration to
        release more staff energy   5
     Keep better track of goals and perfor-
      · mance; force staff to back off and get
        perspective occasionally   3
     Work to improve communications within
      · staff, clarify disagreements over goals,
        become more sensitive to each other,
        avoid total ego involvement in decisions 4
     Stay committed; don't accept all the con-
        straints of the system   1

When ask _ :o give advice to next year's staff, the current

group of veterans repeated their concern for parent and

school-system relationships, and urged early meetings with

both groups. Suggestions, in contrast to the goals section,

fell much more heavily on the side of staff organization

than on ideas for working with students. Mentioned once each

were:

   Staff must spend time in the school informally, not
            just teaching
   Coordinators must persist in getting people to follow
            through on responsibilities and commitments
   Harvard staff should get off the high horse of academia
            and be genuine colleagues of all staff
   Have clear agreements on jobs, to avoid overloading a few
            conscientious, compulsive types
   Share information about what different staff are doing
            (essential in a larger school)
   Work in teams for support on tough jobs or visits
   Let each other know when good things happen

> Staff talk less and LISTEN more
> Use the present evaluation; learn from past mistakes
> Reconceive teaching as a working profession, not just a
>   place to experiment

Only four staff made suggestions which involved students, as
contrasted with ten who made the immediately preceding comments.
The ideas about students next year ranged from the very
general (have patience with them, keep the informal atmosphere),
to the very specific (keep the five-red-tags-and-you're-
suspended system, get a safe place where students can keep
books safely, keep the present attendance system, throw out
kids the school isn't helping).

    Parents' recommendations After parents shared their likes
and dislikes they were asked to comment on a number of specific
areas of school, and make suggestions for change.

    All twenty seemed satisfied with the fact that the school
is composed of a deliberate mixture of students. Many commented
that this is an important part of one's education. Some agreed
that trying to increase student responsibility is a valuable
goal, and that some progress had been made. Most parents showed
little interest in this goal, however. Twelve of the twenty
thought the school should change in this respect next year. Six
wanted teachers to "tighten the rules"; "teachers should let
students state their views, but then staff should have the final
say." Six others felt the opposite, that the rules should be
relaxed, that the Red Tag system could be abolished because
students would and should learn to behave without such a set
of sanctions. Regarding behavior, some specific ideas were

not permit so much student use of telephone; abolish the Red
Tag system; start off with more discipline at the start of the
year, ease up later if possible.

Most parents expressed great satisfaction with the teacher-
student relationship when asked specifically about it. They
viewed it as friendly, relaxed, and educational. Three exp-
ressed dissatisfaction; two would prefer that teachers return
to the use of last names rather than first, since they felt
teachers should command that type of respect, and a third
felt that in general teachers were too friendly with students.
No parents suggested changes in the staff, however.

The amount of contact with parents was generally approved
of, and most respondents appreciated staff efforts to get to
know parents and include them in school functions. Suggestions
for next year were that staff should give parents who tend not
to be involved more specific invitations to do things for the
school, and that staff should ask much more often for help than
last year. One parent did complain that parents were treated
well by staff in meetings and home visits, but were ignored or
excluded when staff conversed with a student on the phone or
en route to a school party or trip.

Nineteen parents expressed great enthusiasm about the system
of grades and comments. They found the comments added much more
meaning to the grades, and wished that they could come more
frequently. Some wished that students were involved in self-
evaluation more consistently in all courses, rather than in
Humanities alone.

Course offerings seemed satisfactory, although here
again some nervousness about the amount of traditional work in
English was apparent. Parents hoped that next year there
would be more consistent attention to exercises in writing,
grammar, and daily assigned reading. A few parents suggested
adding courses within the school: plastic and woodworking
shops, science, more foreign language choices, and more
different English electives. One parent would have liked to
see the drama group actually produce plays; the group this
year worked exclusively on improvisations.

Parents knew very little about relations with the two
high schools. Six of those who did thought it needed attention,
since there seemed to be negative reactions. One said that
inevitably the Pilot School would never fit into the system;
another thought the fit could be improved only with great
effort.

Finally, parents were pleased about the advising system
as a form of guidance. Many commented from experience with
other children in schools that Pilot School ninth graders
had much more contact with people who could advise them. Five
saw a need for changes in the system; three wanted students
to be able to choose their advisor, and two wanted more contact
than they had had this year, particularly during "ordinary"
(as opposed to crisis) times for the advisee.

Student suggestions for the future Specific probes were
used, identical to those for parents. Frequently the responses
were similar also.

Most students said they liked helping to decide their own

grade, especially for activities such as group participation. Four would have liked some say over their grade in all classes, but one contrary individual stood by teacher grading in foreign language and math; one other suggested having groups of students grade each other in all classes. Letter and number grades were equally popular. In general, the twenty were far from radical. Only one suggested abolishing grades and having only comments, and another suggested experimentation with pass/fail marking or all letter grades.

While most students favored the advisor system, several remarked that it hadn't meant much to them personally, as their advisor was no help or unavailable.

Responses to advisor system	# of mentions
System is good or great	9
It would be all right if people were better matched at the beginning	5
The system has not really been implemented	4
Don't need it; enough nice teachers around	3

Four wanted to choose their advisor; four others wanted to be able to change during the year. Four more wanted more frequent contact, perhaps on a regular schedule.

Responses to the staff were favorable, for the most part. Eleven made broad generalizations about warm relations or friendliness; four said "some good, some bad." Two were only able to muster an "OK". Bearing out the earlier remarks concerning other students' taking advantage of the environment to get away with murder, three responses noted that "tough kids treat teachers unfairly." About future staff, there were two

requests for more black staff, and one request for more
women.

On the topic of student responsibility, there was
broad sentiment that progress had been made:

Student responsibility for behavior		# of mentions
Doing well, or at least much better		12
Students could be doing better		4
If staff tried harder	1	
If kids tried harder	2	
If staff let students do		
fun jobs	1	
Some students just can't take responsibility		4

Student examples of taking responsibility may not have
been those the staff would have liked, but included planning
parties and trips, running the tonic business, organizing
Community Day, interviewing for the evaluation, taking care
of school property.

For next year, five asked that school rules be enforced
more consistently to encourage students to take their respon-
sibilities more seriously. Five disliked the Red Tag system
at this point in the interview, but three liked it. Three
wanted the school to "tighten up" and have more rules next year.

On relations with the other high schools, eighteen students
reported their view that they were either just bad or terrible.
The other two didn't really have any idea of what the re-
lationship was like. Two of the eighteen felt the students had
brought a bad reputation on themselves; six others believed
jealousy to be the reason why other students didn't like the
school. Only one said that rules should be firmer in order to

improve relations. Only one blamed teachers for being short-sighted in their views of the school. It is not surprising that a large majority of the students had a sophisticated sense of the complex relations between the Pilot School and its hosts, because this had been a constant subject of conversation for the whole school all year. Students were probably very tired of hearing about it, in fact.

Nineteen answered about parent involvement that they thought parents were treated well. A few wanted parents to teach more, enroll in courses, and visit around the school during the regular days not just on special events. The predictable minority did express again its feeling that the school belongs to students and teachers and that their parents were definitely not welcome. Only three felt this strongly, however.

Fifteen students responded with great enthusiasm to the idea of having different sorts of students in the school. "Different kids means different ideas," was one view, and in general a variety was appreciated in making school "less boring." Only one mentioned that having a completely hetero-geneous group in his Humanities class had inhibited many from expressing themselves or others from going as fast as they could. Another admitted that he was often mad at being unable to understand the language of other students. But there was only one selection recommendation emphasizing less diversity, and several students who complained that certain individuals threatened the school's survival were not willing to exclude them.

Four miscellaneous suggestions came to light, and in their non-political, non-academic content may reflect students' most basic hopes:

1. Get a smoking room for the school
2. Buy new ping-pong paddles and balls, and arrange for a watchman for the equipment
3. Have more time to be with other Pilot School students socially during the d...
4. Have a shorter school day, or school only four days a week.

CHLS and Rindge teachers' ideas about the future. Teachers were asked "Should the Pilot School continue next year?" and only one individual turned out to be flatly opposed. Six others thought the school should continue only if some changes were made.

Should the school continue	CHLS	Rindge
Yes	4	4
No	1	
Noncommittal	1	
Yes, if only		
It does not increase in size	1	
It gets out of Rindge		3
Students have less freedom next year		1
It accepts more low achievers	1	

Teachers were also asked about the relationship between their school and the Pilot School; everyone agreed the situation was uncomfortable and communications inadequate.

Relationship	CHLS	Rindge
Generally bad	6	4
Hopeless	1	1
Will always be unstable as sub-school		1
Its OK, but could be better	1	2

Some excellent concrete suggestions for improvement were

offered:

	CHLS	Rindge
Invite the teachers to visit	2	
Initiate more contact of all kinds	2	1
Give out information	5	2

Have a Pilot mailbox so that non-
   Pilot teachers can reach students
   and staff
	2	

Move out altogether		2

All these require the Pilot School to take some initiative;

teachers seem to agree that if the Pilot School wants a good

relationship with their schools, then it must make the

effort. It may be significant too that Rindge teachers made

fewer suggestions for improving the relationship. This

question adds further documentation to an already clear

picture: the school is isolated and unknown, and should begin

at once to communicate to those around it its purposes and

methods, and its desire to remain a part of the local

educational system.

IV. OTHER DATA

1. Achievement test scores

All students in the Cambridge grammar schools take the
Stanford Achievement Test Battery in March of their eighth
grade year. Several entire days are devoted to these tests.
Since the system of course-choice has recently been revised
in the high schools, the results of these tests are now
being used, along with teacher recommendations, and in conn-
ection with counseling by both elementary and high school
guidance staffs, to place students in ability groups for
math, English, foreign language, etc.

At the end of May, 1970, the Pilot School retested all
sixty of the school's first ninth grade class with two parts
of a different form of the same Stanford test. The Para-
graph Meaning test was chosen as a test of reading compre-
hension; through it the staff wanted to test the effects of
the unusual Humanities course on reading skills. Also the
Arithmetic Concepts subtest was given to look at the effects
of a strong, focussed effort by the school's algebra teacher.

The table shows a comparison of the test scores in both
years. Each number is the average of the grade-equivalent
test scores of all the students. "Grade equivalents" are ex-
pressed in grade level and month; thus the first figure of
9.4 means that before entering the school the average of all boy
Pilot School students on the Paragraph Meaning test was at
the ninth-grade, fourth-month achievement level. The level is

dete mine by a comparis with students all over the
country, not just in Cambridge. A score by the boys of
10.9 in 1970 on Arithmetic Concepts means that they
achieved, on the average, at the level usually found across
the country in students in the last month of the tenth
grade.

Table III

Achievement Test Scores

Paragraph Meaning	1969	1970
Boys	9.4	9.6
Girls	8.7	9.5
Arithmetic Concepts		
Boys	9.8	10.9
Girls	9.2	10.8

In view of a number of questions, these scores should
be interpreted with great caution. In the first place, data
is missing on some students at each testing, so a full
picture is not available. Secondly, the testing situations
were not comparable, and these can affect performance a great
deal. As eighth graders, students may have been worried about
the importance of the tests, and may have been fatigued by
taking several in a row; both feelings were reported by
students during the discussions about past tests which Pilot
School staff conducted before the 1970 testing. Some students
interrupted individual projects to take the tests in the ninth
grade, and this has been found to depress performance on other
tests. In addition to leading general discussions about memories
of test-taking, Pilot School staff went over the test instruc-

in detail with half the students several days before the actual testing. For many students, the test was not completely challenging, as it is intended for use from the seventh grade to the ninth; thus even if students scored at the tenth or eleventh grade levels, they were not using all their ability.

2. Attendance data

The following table shows Pilot School attendance by quarters for the year, in terms of percent of students present. These figures were computed from Pilot School records. For comparison, figures on five randomly-chosen Rindge Tech freshman home-rooms are presented. These figures were taken from a weekly bulletin compiled by a teacher in Rindge which was circulated around the school.

Quarter	Pilot School	Rindge home-rooms				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	96.5%	85.6%	83.5%	78.8%	78.4%	88.3%
2	94.0	80.9	76.0	70.8	70.9	79.5
3	94.0	86.1	77.5	76.2	73.9	80.9
4	91.2	84.0	66.8	66.8	63.7	66.0
Year avg.	94.0	84.1	75.1	72.6	71.0	77.6

(Average for all five classes: 76.0)

These figures indicate that Pilot School students attend school more regularly than non-Pilot School students in the same building and of the same age.

3. Drop-out data

At any point in the year, any Pilot School student could transfer to his or her "home" school, either Rindge or CHLS.

From the beginning, the School Department had been most anxious that this option remain open, and had urged the staff to keep in mind the risks a student transfer would face if the Pilot School program were extremely different. The staff pledged to parents and students that they would make such a transfer go smoothly through special tutoring if necessary.

As it turned out, only one student elected to transfer during the year. At the end of the year, all students were interviewed about their year's work and their plans for the tenth grade; again it was made clear that the transfer option was still open, and the staff pledge still in force. No students elected to leave the school. Two students will not return in 1970-71 because their parents will have moved from the city.

4. Rating scale responses

All respondents to the year-end interviews and questionnaires were given a scale of "movement" along several dimensions and were asked to judge how far the school had come on each. The scale was from -4 ("far backward") to +4 ("far forward"). Below are the dimensions, in descending order of amount of movement. No systematic differences between parent, student, or staff responses were found, so the analysis lumps all together for a total average amount of "motion."

Dimension	Average motion score
Getting kids to like school	+ 3.1
Staff listening to kids	3.0
Students getting along together	2.6
Staff and students getting along	2.5
Students and staff working together on problems	2.3

Involving parents	2.2
Students taking responsibility	2.2
Staff getting along together	2.1
Making and sticking to rules	1.3
Concentrating on school work	1.1
Getting along with Rindge and CHLS	- 0.2

In general, people seem to have felt that the school made
progress in every area but one. Some slight variations in
the last three low scores might be noticed. First, no
parents and only one staff member joined in the low score
given to "Making and sticking to rules." Every parent and
all but one staff person gave a positive or at least
neutral response. Second, most parents did not join in the
low estimate of "Concentration on school work." Only one
appeared on the negative side of the ledger. There was
much more agreement about the final dimension, relations with
the schools, as has been shown in other responses already.

V. SUMMARY OF THE DATA

1. Agreed-upon strengths and weaknesses of the school

Parents, students, staff, and observers liked many of the same characteristics of the school, and valued some of the same student outcomes. In each group, most people mentioned approvingly the quality of relationships between people in the school. Informality, availability, and commitment were words used often.

Parents liked their relationship with the staff as it came about through advising, all-school meetings, newsletters, and informal conversations. Parents and students agreed that trips, extracurricular activities, academic work in small groups, and the wide variety of electives in the Humanities course were worthwhile, positive features of the school. They also appreciated the extra dimensions the school added to the grading process--student self-evaluation and staff written comments. Attendance records supported the frequent comments of parents and students that attitudes toward school had changed dramatically over the year. Many saw the attendance as a reflection of a growing spirit of belonging to something, not being just one more cog in a vast machine.

There was general agreement, too, about weaknesses in the school's first year. Only parents didn't comment on relationships with the two high schools; everyone else stressed that this was an important and neglected area, and that much attention would have to be given to it in the coming year. Two main features

of the school's own program were criticized. Staff felt

acutely that internal friction and disorganization had pre-

vented them from working at anything like full effectiveness.

Staff joined some parents and many students in feeling that

not enough academic demands had been made of students, or

at least that more should be made in the coming year.

2. Divergences and disagreements

The interviews and questionnaires uncovered many areas

of disagreement, or at least lack of consensus, among the

school's observers and participants. Foremost was the

matter of goals for the school. CHLS and Rindge teachers

mentioned such general aims as increased student motivation,

greater achievement, increased relevance of the studies.

They rarely mentioned increasing student role in decision-

making or creating multiple kinds of schools within the

general Cambridge system. Pilot School staff on the other

hand, mentioned specific goals from the school's original

ideology; these included altered teacher and student roles,

seeking a mixture of students, and encouraging that diversity

to be an educational input. They seldom mentioned specific

effects these variables would have on students, but rather

proposed creating an atmosphere which would presumably foster

a wide range of good results.

Parent and student responses had different emphases. Both

stated personal needs which they hoped the school would ful-

fill. Parents wanted school to be better for their particular

student, not necessarily to promote change in the rest of

the system or to experiment with educational techniques at the boundaries of current practice. They hoped for more individual attention, and a more interesting course of study; the simple announcement that the school was to be "new" and "different" seemed a sufficient drawing card.

When probed specifically on the subjects, parents, staff, and students disagreed about the importance of selecting and capitalizing on a heterogeneous student group, trying to increase student decision-making, and bringing parents extensively into the school. On the first, some parents gave support to the "real-life" importance of being able to know and empathize with many different people. Others valued the goal, but wanted to exclude from school those students who required disproportionate amounts of attention or who threatened the school's future by making a nuisance of themselves. A majority of the students wanted to keep everyone now in the school, despite the problems they raised for each other such as poor communication, rowdyism, or distraction from studies. Staff responded to the diversity matter by criticizing themselves for not being able to create a government that would contain all the frictions of the school. The CHLS and Rindge teachers more often than not neglected to mention the diversity of the Pilot School population, and in some cases showed inaccurate knowledge of the actual composition of the school.

Even more disagreement was voiced on the goal of increasing the students' role in decision-making. Parents seldom

expressed interest in this goal, although some reported that their children had become more responsible during the year. Students themselves rarely mentioned any manifestation of "student power" as one of their own goals. In response to a specific question about taking more responsibility, they dutifully said they had improved a modest amount. Although CHLS student protest and involvement was at a new height during both the black-white and Cambodia crises at CHLS, teachers seemed not to know of the Pilot School's experiments in bringing students into the decision structure. Pilot School staff continued to value this goal highly. Most felt only a little progress had been made, but their memories were often of the vivid times when students and staff had really worked together to make something happen.

Everyone commented on an issue related to responsibility—the making and enforcing of rules. Half the parents thought the school too easy and wanted firmer demands made on students; the other half who spoke wanted less formal rules and an even further relaxation of this year's atmosphere. Staff and students varied even further; some believed the rules had not been enforced so that the past year was no guide for the future.

A final goal disagreement has been noted several times. Staff feels strongly that a successful school program is built on close work with parents to build up confidence and mutual respect. While students in general can accept this, particularly when they need parent help to do something, there remains in many students a feeling that school is their time, to be as secretive about as they please. It may represent or offer a kind

of privacy that they cannot achieve under watchful eyes at home. Staff will have to be careful not to become allies in many students' battles with parents, and to be open and fair to both sides.

Not surprisingly, given their various goals, individuals differed in valuing the effects they perceived. Everyone agreed that students' attitudes toward school improved, but there the consensus ended. Outspokenness and lack of fear of adults were commented on as both "refreshing" and "mature," as well as "disrespectful" and "rude." Some teachers in the high schools described the students as "fresh" or "impolite," and interpreted their manner as "talking back to teachers." Another teacher seemed to like whatever had produced in the students a greater "involvement" and "willingness to partici- pate orally." Students described similar changes in themselves, and generally valued a growing ease of manner as a social benefit.

Some people commented that some students had blossomed or "come out" socially, and seemed less retiring. While many saw this as positive, there were some parents anxious that the school not reinforce exclusively the students' social natures. To some the bustle of activity in school--trips, films, etc.--was not academic enough.

The general issue most obvious in these disagreements is that diversity means value differences, and that the staff will have to think much more clearly about its aims and its effects if it is to avoid simply blundering along satisfying everybody a little and noone enough.

VI. SOME SPECULATIVE INTERPRETATIONS

Throughout the interviews and questionnaires, the various groups articulated their vision of the good school, and it is perhaps not unusual given the range of people involved to find so many different frames of reference used in those visions. In the past year a great many teacher, student, parent, and community values have been attempting to mix fruitfully in the operation of a school for young- sters. School policy is traditionally a battleground for competing analyses of the past and alternative pictures of the future, but the Pilot School by its insistence on authority and diversity as central matters has brought clearly into focus many of the traditional conflicts that are often camouflaged in more technical debates over budget or curriculum.

Staff wanted to work with an exciting group of people and do different sorts of things than they had been accustomed to in their previous school experience. They also wished to translate some cultural and political values into school policy. The parents wanted more concern for individual students and better preparation for the future than they believed the existing classrooms provided. Students wanted "something diff- erent," some kind of "more exciting" life in school. Within each of these broad groups, of course, there were further cul- tural and age differences. (This variety of values makes it hard for any one "evaluation" to speak to all those who wish to

make a simple judgment of the school--good or bad.) In
looking back over a whole year, each group and sub-group
judged achievement in its own terms. The staff was concerned
about the adults' cohesion and process, parents about the
subject matter and the staff's attention to individual
students, students with the range of things to do and the
staff acceptance of most of their behavior.

The interesting question about this diversity is how
the strains it produces are handled. During this first year
it would appear that the staff held so many goals for the
school--goals in behalf of parents and students, as well as
personal ones--that priorities which people agreed on were
never fully acted on and that conflicts between individuals
which blocked the sorting out of more controversial goals
were rarely brought out in the open. Thus shifts in staff
assignments, arrivals and departures of powerful individuals,
changes in organization, and rare events which were truly
cooperative, were often mentioned as the critical incidents.
These unresolved matters of diversity within the staff must
have created a tension for everyone when they were in such
contrast with the goal not just of fostering diversity among
students, but also of creating a system to manage their con-
flicts in the open. Staff and students viewed the major success
of the year as the "teacher-student relationship"--an individ-
ual relationship, not a group-process event. Within the staff
sub-groups never seemed to be permitted any autonomy, and some
recommended more delegated teamwork for next year. This year
the focus was on the staff as a whole, just as it was on the

students as a whole, and most of the staff disappointment focussed inward on itself.

The goal was to build something which would involve everyone in deciding school matters. Yet the staff ignored the very unequal abilities to tolerate and participate in long, talky meetings, and the fact that sub-groups may not even value participation in the first place. If a measure of community is a constantly-active participatory governance system (and this seemed implied in many staff responses), it is certainly ironic that the initial solicitude and permissiveness of the staff removed immediately many of the issues that would ever draw students into a governance system. If all students, or most, were actively involved in such a system, it is not clear that the school could stand the politicization of every issue--a result noticed in many recent communal and participatory experiments elsewhere. It simply saps the little creative energy people have to be constantly haggling over things. Isn't total involvement as undiverse a pattern as widespread apathy?

In retrospect, two things stand out about the whole ideology and the way it was implemented: first, the tremendously narrow cultural framework which most of us on the staff brought to the project, and second, how little cumulative insight or perspective on itself the group encouraged through the year. Most of the staff probably believe more or less that institutions should be controlled by those who are affected, that governments should be responsive, and that schools should share some of these characteristics. The pattern of attack and

counterattack on many college campuses was mentioned in the first proposal, and no doubt prompted the staff to seek alterna- tives to such confrontations as were already becoming common in secondary schools. It is no doubt true that students in high school and in the ninth grade do have interests, in the political sense, and that these are often or even commonly ignored by schools; the issue is whether these interests can ever be supported by schools, and if not, to what extent the offer of participation will ever be seen as worth accep- ting. Within the Pilot School, staff thought it would wel- come students' exercise of as much power as they desired, and offered many opportunities for them to do so. But how did students perceive the rules of the game?

The staff seems to have been very inaccurate in judging both students' capacity for and interest in such a role. Con- stitutions and town meetings were a flop; what did students take charge of? Selling tonic and planning trips away from school. The faculty has one set of goals and notions of the issues which will be fed into a governmental process; the students another set altogether? Probably not, and this is not to say that the Pilot School staff should stop trying to be responsive to students on matters of school policy, "since kids only care about that trivial stuff." Rather that perhaps the staff was educated this year to the gap between our hopes for the world and the current stage of development of those in whom we placed the hope.

Students may have been asked to do too much this year all

at once:

1. Resolve their identity adequately to permit interest
   in some kinds of public knowledge to surface and be
   recognized

2. Change motivations for exploring that knowledge from
   extrinsic to intrinsic

3. Realize that to be fully satisfying the conditions of
   learning must to some extent be shaped by the learner
   to fit his own purposes

4. Acquire the skills of focussed listening and discussion,
   efficient organization, and empathizing with others,
   in order to govern the school and arbitrate the
   different claims on its resources.

When many individuals are blocked throughout their lives

at step one of this awesome sequence, it is no wonder that

the Pilot School didn't move all its students all the way

this year. Only future years can give an accurate measure

of how many students can be involved in school policy

decisions--or indeed of the prior issue of how many care to

do so--and if they are involved in a genuinely open-ended

environment, whether the school will be anything like what

we know today. If students must accept the staff's whole

attitude toward education before it begins to govern, that

raises ethical questions; if they need not, do they need that

staff or the institution at all?

Even the effort at getting "the whole school" to work

at setting goals implies an amount of participation not yet

achieved. Thus it will be difficult to define the task

simply as finding a mechanism to consider the competing pres-

sures on the school (community, parents, university, etc.)

and discard some goals in favor of a select few that everyone

can work towards. If the process seems too painful, and if

diversity is a value to be cultivated, perhaps radically diff-

erent kinds of goal-culture can flourish side by side?
Would heavier academic demands on students alter the teacher-
student relationship which other students seem to prize
so much? An unauthoritarian school may be so, only at
the price of low standards. Many experienced teachers feel
this to be true.) If "similar" students or staff chose
each other as working partners often, would this self-segre-
gation and uneven participation violate the community norm
held by many staff? Many students value the social aspects
of school experience above all others, and   appreciate
staff only to the extent that they facilitate informal
student socializing; do staff want to defend this use of
school to parents or community, on grounds of student
autonomy or pluralism?

The second major point mentioned before is related to
all this, since if we as a staff had been more willing to
stand back and listen to ourselves, look at the school, and
reconsider our operations at intervals, we might have been
able to avoid the sense of disappointment which comes so
strongly from the staff questionnaires. The evaluation mech-
anism was there all year, yet we did not use it or alter it
to make it serve us. Having set some extremely ambitious
goals, we were locked in, somehow unable to change course or
reflect for fear that would be a sign of weakness or giving
up. Of course there have been many explanations, most with
considerable truth--time problems, interpersonal matters
which might have wrecked the staff if opened too directly,
uncertainties about the school's autonomy within the system,
the press of keeping up the daily business with sixty

active students. Still, if the school is to avoid the
disease which drives so many away from established schools--
rigid continuation of unexamined practices--a more tentative,
experimental attitude will be needed for next year. One
trial must lead to reflection, reconsideration, change,
and retrial.

A final note on the school's environment--the School
Department, CHLS, and Rindge. Staff, students, and parents
all commented on the difficulties between the Pilot School
and its hosts, and the Cambridge teachers drove the point
home forcefully. Everyone agreed something has to be done
quickly to change the current pattern. But the questions
of what, and how, once again implicate broader issues of
governance and diversity. If it seems that certain changes
must be made in order to convince observers that the school
is no threat, then this would bring into sharp focus the
issue of the autonomy of the school's own governmental
process. Should some school body be asked to agree with
such proposals? Should staff consider the long-range sur-
vival of the school and take on itself to decree changes?
Some staff would be upset if students, for their part, dis-
agreed with such changes or if they no longer wished to be
in a school that operated in such a changed way. Other staff
feel strongly about the original concept of the Pilot School
as an alternative--perhaps as one among many alternatives--
within a larger system. If changes seemed necessary which
brought the school closer to being a copy of the existing
system, some staff might feel than an important basic goal

was compromised. The universal agreement to "work on" this subject should not mask its complexity.

None of this should be read to say, "End the school." Staff, students, parents, and community are struggling with problems which have tormented both theorists and activists for ages. The effort to turn ideals into practice is always difficult, and it may be one criterion of excellence that an institution which is aware of its shortcomings and aware of the complex issues needing solutions, is resolved to go ahead anyway. It must be clear, though, that diversity, decision-making process, and desired outcomes are interwoven in a manner which few of us yet understand. Perhaps the task of goal-definition, with all its difficulty, can begin again now that we have had a year's experience.

APPENDIX

1. <u>Electives offered within the Humanities class</u>

Art games and design
Linguistics
Music appreciation
Pottery
Jewelry making
Ancient history
Modern European history
American colonial history
Stained glass
Moving around in the world
Field trips
Architecture
Macrame (needlecraft)
Nursery-school teaching
Black fiction
Basketball
Do-it-yourself history
Drama
Women's liberation

Short fiction
Photography
Psychology of learning
Creative writing
Essay writing
Typing
Film
Adolescent psychology
Sports
Law
Health elective
Portrait painting
Oil painting
Sketching
Anthropology
History of Cuba
Interviewing
Cooking

2. <u>List of joint staff-student activities and decisions</u>

Initial summer session devoted to planning for opening of
school; staff and students plan together; students paid as
consultants

Student and staff governance group in summer drafted model
constitution and judicial system for government during that
period

Town meeting government experiment during first summer

Open staff meetings throughout the year

Students plan and carry out redecoration plans for Rindge Tech
rooms (painting, carpeting, etc.) during first summer

Staff remains after school during regular school year, at
student request so that school facilities can be used for
recreation

Many elective courses offered at student request by teachers
from university and community

Students and staff invite outside visitors to join classes
(G.E. strikers, members of the black community, Asian scholars,
film-makers, artists, etc.)

Students choose courses with help of faculty advisor (no sep-
arate guidance staff)

Staff suspension of students challenged; alternative procedure worked out by staff and students

Retreat for planning 1970-71 program included both staff and students; this meeting also revised the discipline and attendance procedures

Planning meetings for 1970 summer program attended by many students; students plan selection process for choosing summer student staff

Students ask to be involved in recruiting the 1970-71 ninth grade class during spring, 1970; travel to every elementary school and speak about the Pilot School

Pilot School grading process includes students' own self-evaluation and conferences with two or more teachers before arriving at grade; student self-grade weighed equally

Beginnings of individual "contract" system for independent work; student sets own goals, monitors progress, and determined own need for adult help

Students initiate and plan school-wide Community Day during winter doldrums; whole day of group activities (eating, trips, sports, viewing of films of 1969 summer) designed to reunite a weary school

No required study halls; students plan own use of time when free

Grades supplemented by written comments; comments not sent home until seen and approved by student; this policy applied to all communications with home

Students interview other students every two weeks as part of on-going school evaluation

Students interviewed candidates for teaching positions at the school; offered recommendations to hiring committee

Students write contract for all students (9th and 10th grade) for summer work, 1970

Students set up and operate tonic business during school year, work with staff on purchasing, paying bills, etc.

School discretionary checking account takes a student signature and a staff signature to withdraw funds

Curriculum workshops, summer 1970, include students in planning next year's courses and activities

3. <u>Interview schedules used in collecting the data</u>

<u>Staff</u>
1. Why did you want to be part of the Pilot School?
2. Did the first year work out as you hoped? How?
3. Some say the development of the school is best described in a series of critical incidents (e.g. thefts, new janitor). List incidents or turning points that you think were important in the school's life. Briefly say why each was important.
4. What do you think should be the main goals for the school next year? Show your priorities.
5. What words of advice can you offer next year's staff? What have you learned that might benefit them?

<u>Students</u>
1. Why did you come to the Pilot School? What do you want to get out of it?
2. Did the first year of the school work out as you hoped? How?
3. What do you like about the school? Why? What else?
4. What don't you like about the school? Why? What else?
5. You didn't mention:
   --having all different kinds of kids
   --trying to get kids to take more responsibility
   --the way teachers and kids treat each other
   --the way the Pilot School fits into the Cambridge system
   --the way parents are treated
   --the advising system
   What do you think about these? Do you like them or not? Why?
6. How do your parents feel about the Pilot School? What do they like or dislike?
7. How do you think you've changed this year? Did the school have anything to do with it? What?
8. What has the school achieved for other kids? (Has it helped some, hurt some, had no effect, confused them, etc.?)
9. In what ways would you like the school to be different next year?
   --staff
   --the way its organized
   --rules
   --advising
   --grading
   --the way parents are involved
   --courses offered

<u>CHLS and Rindge teachers</u>
1. What contact, if any, have you had with the Pilot School?
2. What do you think is the purpose of the school?
3. How do you think their first year went?
4. What do you like about the school? Why? What else?

5. What don't you like about the school? Why? What else?
6. Do the Pilot School kids seem any different in any way from other students? How? What do you think made them that way?(the school, selection factors?)
7. What do you think the teachers are like in the Pilot School? Do you know how they were chosen (from CHLS, from Rindge, from Harvard)?
8. From what you know, how do Pilot School kids feel about the Pilot School? What do you think kids like about it? What do you think they dislike?
9. Do you think the Pilot School should continue? Why or why not?
10. What do you think about the school's relationship with CHLS and Rindge? Is it OK? Should it be changed? How?

Parents

1. Why did you want your child to go to the Pilot School?
2. Did the first year of the Pilot School work out as you had hoped? What is your child getting out of the school? (social academic)
3. What do you like about the Pilot School? What else?
4. What don't you like about the Pilot School? What else?
5. You didn't mention:
   --the deliberate mixture of all different kinds of kids
   --trying to get kids to take more on making decisions
   --the way teachers and students treat each other
   --the way the Pilot School fits into the Cambridge system
   --the way parents are treated in the Pilot School
      (meetings, pot-luck supper, newsletters, written
      comments, helping the school)
6. How does your child feel about the Pilot School? What does he like? What does he dislike? Did he tell you about any specific incidents at school? What?
7. Has your child changed one way or another during this year? How? Did the school have anything to do with it? What?
8. How would you like the school to be different next year?
   --staff
   --organization
   --rules
   --grading
   --parent roles
   --courses
   --advising

(All interview schedules included the rating scale.)