DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 737   AA 001 032

AUTHOR   Mosley, Doris Y.; Flaxman, Erwin
TITLE   A Survey of Inservice Desegregation Workshops.
INSTITUTION   Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on
                the Urban Disadvantaged.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE   Mar 72
NOTE   58p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   Curriculum Development; Educational Innovation; Human
                Relations; Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes
                (Training Programs); Integration Effects; Intergroup
                Relations; *Interpersonal Relationship; Parent School
                Relationship; *Program Evaluation; Race Relations;
                School Community Relationship; *School Integration;
                Sensitivity Training; Student Teacher Relationship;
                *Surveys; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS   Elementary Secondary Education Title IV

ABSTRACT
                The description and evaluation of the ESEA Title IV
desegregation workshops in this survey is the product of analysis of
reports found in the ERIC system and in the document collections of
the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged and the
National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational
Opportunity. Of the more than 300 reports available, constituting the
most complete record of inservice attempts to deal with the
educational problems of school desegregation, 80 were used to produce
data using a computer-programming process for data analysis. A
workshop was considered "positive," "typical," or "negative"
depending on how it met such criteria as: realistic objectives;
carefully articulated planning procedures; participant input into the
planning; clear and appropriate program design; full evaluation
revealing participant reactions; consistency among objectives,
design, and evaluation; planning or implementation for followup; and,
planning and implementation for disseminating outcomes and materials.
The 80 selected programs comprised 36 positive, 25 typical, and 19
negative programs. Findings included the following: most of the
workshops were sponsored by universities; permanent workshop staff
ranged between five to ten university personnel; and, the most
popular areas of content were racial-cultural understanding,
interpersonal-desegregation and general interpersonal relationships,
and racial-cultural curriculum innovation. (Author/RJ)

A SURVEY OF INSERVICE DESEGREGATION WORKSHOPS

Doris Y. Mosley
Erwin Flaxman

ERIC Information Retrieval Center
on the Disadvantaged

Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, N.Y.   10027

March, 1972

INTRODUCTION AND THE THEORY OF SMALL GROUP WORKSHOPS

Sec. 404. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through
grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for
the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for
special training designed to improve the ability of teachers,
supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary
school personnel to deal effectively with special educational
problems occasioned by desegregation. Individuals who attend
such an institute on a full-time basis may be paid stipends for
the period of their attendance at such an institute in amounts
specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including al-
lowances for travel to attend such institute.

Sec. 405. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, upon application
of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole
or in part, the cost of--

     (1) giving to teachers and other school personnel in-
service training in dealing with problems incident to desegre-
gation, and

     (2) employing specialists to advise in problems incident
to desegregation. (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

Faced with the complex problems of school desegregation, the Federal

Government has readily provided financial support for inservice education of

school personnel. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 clearly articulates

the Federal commitment to inservice education as a machinery for re-educating

school people to plan curriculum and instruction for minority or economically

or educationally disadvantaged children and to confront the tensions of social

differences between students and faculty which the racial balancing of school

populations has surfaced. Recently, with the increased effort to stimulate

more desegregation, the Federal Government again has built into its Emergency

School Assistance Program opportunities for continued inservice education. Like

most organizations, the Government believes that individuals can be educated into

accepting changes they may personally resist; it has supported the civil rights

laws, judicial decisions, and administrative fiats of the 1960's with funds for
massive training programs to bring about the attitudinal and behavioral changes
which could make school desegregation work.

That universities and school districts eagerly used Federal money to hold
workshops, seminars, institutes, training programs, and conferences on the
problems of school desegregation is not very surprising. There is a sizable
body of research and a tradition of practice that suggests that instruction,
attitude and behavior change, and decision making resulting in revived interest
and changes in task orientation could be brought about through inservice work-
shops.* For at least ten years prior to the concentrated school desegregation
efforts of the 1960's, schools had been using workshop methods to train teachers
to use new methods and materials. Workshops would then seem to have been an
almost inevitable choice for a machinery to train personnel dealing with the
"methods and materials" of school desegregation.

Workshop methods have been popular for a number of reasons. Workshops
provide opportunities for equal participation by every member of the group,
regardless of prior status. Each member of the group agrees to the goals and pro-
cedures of the workshop, which studies the actual problems and meets the specific
needs of the workshop participants. Workshop procedure is informal and free
of traditional academic practices and demands on the participants. Leaders,
experts, and consultants are used to meet the needs of the participants, as
defined by them, rather than to teach some content organized to serve specialist's
need for expression. Although a leader usually preplans the content of the
workshop, the participants often modify the work as other issues emerge during
the workshop. The content is not limited to a body of traditional knowledge
(usually accepted and well-tested theory and practice); because the workshop

---

*The term workshop will be used generically throughout this paper to apply to the
various forms of small-group learning structures. For an outline of their dif-
ferences, see Appendix A.

deals with innovations or changes, it draws upon novel resources, often the participants themselves.

At the heart of workshop practice is group work, no matter how many experts are involved in the workshop activity. As social researchers have unquestionably proved, groups are inevitable and ubiquitous, and they mobilize powerful forces which produce effects of utmost importance to individuals--both positive and negative. Depending upon individual conditions, group activity can facilitate or hinder learning:

(1) In groups, individuals are stimulated by the presence of others, and this tends to increase the drive to do well what one has done before rather than to learn something new.

(2) Because of the number of unique individuals in a group, there are greater resources available to a group than to an individual; however, not all resources are usable, and there is often duplication and problems communicating what each individual can uniquely contribute to the group.

(3) Groups can draw upon especially able people, more able than a particular individual, to solve problems that the individual could not solve alone, and thus the creativity of the group can be greater than the creativity of the average member.

(4) Group activity tends to cancel out the errors of the individual members--where one member is overly cautious, another is too zealous--and to correct an individual's mistakes. Social criticism often reveals errors or

misconceptions that individuals working alone do not recog-
nize--it is easier to correct other people's mistakes than
to recognize one's own.

(5) Group experience stimulates new ideas, but at the same
time it exerts pressures to conform to group norms and
inhibits individual initiative and judgment.

(6) In groups an individual can learn from the experiences
of others; there are models to imitate, and one is not
left learning through trial-and-error. Through the
observation of the problem-solving abilities of others,
an individual can more efficiently learn a task and
at the same time receive group support.

(7) Some factors, intrinsic to the nature of groups, can
make group performance less effective than their individual
members would be working alone: conflicting goals, interests,
and habits; increased communication and coordination
difficulties as the size of the group increases; distraction
and overstimulation and excessive dependence on others,
to name a few.[1]

However, despite the reservations noted above, all existing research on group
influences upon individual learning suggests that working in a group or class
with others makes individual learning easier and more efficient.

Desegregation workshops adopted many of the techniques of the small-group
learning and added to them lectures, demonstration teaching experience, community
field visits, etc. It would seem that every traditional learning method was
used to confront the massive problems of school desegregation.

But, importantly, the desegregation workshops have differed from most other learning experiences because they have been conducted in an atmosphere of widespread conflict, which may have distorted the learning experience and made it less useful. For many, these workshops have fittingly been seen as an opportunity to solve some of the instructional and human relations problems created by school desegregation, but they have also been held to get momentary relief from the legal and social pressures of the Federal Government, community groups, and social influentials.

To understand past practices in inservice desegregation workshops in order to highlight both unsuccessful and exemplary practices, the authors have examined a large body of Title IV workshop reports, which will be summarized in the next section. These workshop reports offer a body of knowledge about the design and effectiveness of holding small-group learning experiences to deal with the multiple and complex intellectual and human relation problems of school desegregation in an atmosphere of social change. This survey has been conducted to help administrators and other program planners in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of inservice workshops. To do so, this paper will point to critical variables in workshop effectiveness, judging from past practices, and will develop prototypes for successful workshops based on the present state of knowledge. It will also make some suggestions for future workshops.

II.

SURVEY OF INSERVICE DESEGREGATION EDUCATION WORKSHOPS

Description of the Survey

The description and evaluation of Title IV desegregation workshops in this survey is the product of an analysis of reports found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), a national information retrieval network, and in the document collections of the Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged and the National Center for Research and Information on Equal Educational Opportunity, both housed at Teachers College, Columbia University. The Title IV workshop reports constitute the most complete record of inservice attempts to deal with the educational problems of school desegregation that is now available. More than 300 reports were available, and 80 were used to produce data. (For a brief bibliography of representative reports, see Appendix B; for a sample of the data gathering instrument, see Appendix C.)

A workshop was considered "positive," "typical," or "negative" depending on how closely it met the following general criteria:

1. Realistic objectives, achievable within the time and circumstances of the workshop.

2. Carefully articulated workshop planning procedures, including screening of participants.

3. Participant input into the planning of the workshop.

4. Clear and appropriate program design, given the time and circum-
    stances of the workshop; the use of appropriate methods or
    materials for achieving objectives or innovations for opening up
    new areas of thought; the overall quality of the workshop content.

5. Full evaluation (including appropriate subjective and objective
    measures) revealing participant reactions, progress toward
    achieving objectives, and strengths and weaknesses of workshop
    procedure and design; participant and staff evaluation of training
    staff.

6. Consistency among objectives, design, and evaluation.

7. Planning or implementation for followup to determine improvement in
    the school situation as a result of the workshop.

8. Planning or implementation for disseminating workshop outcomes and
    materials.

Positive workshops met many of the above criteria. Typical workshops
either contained some strong areas and some weak ones relative to the criteria,
or could be said to meet these criteria "somewhat," or less well than the
positive ones. Negative programs had many areas of weakness or gaps relative
to the stated criteria, or met them only in small part.

The 80 selected programs contained 36 positive programs, 25 typical
programs, and 19 negative programs; more positive programs were studied as an
aid in creating successful models. A computer-programming process was used to
analyze the data.

Summary of Findings

Despite the effort to distinguish differences among positive, typical,
and negative programs, the workshops differed only in degree of success in

meeting the survey criteria. What is more, there were gaps in the reports themselves; all too often there was insufficient information about what actually occurred in the planning and implementation of these workshops to make valid judgements about success or failure according to any criteria. It is likely that the reports were written by workshop planners or directors in haste, for the most part to meet contractual obligations, but as is the case in reporting other social action efforts, the result is a body of incomplete and unclear data which must be used in making intellectual and policy decisions about continuing or changing past practices. It is possible, however, to make some generalizations about these workshops:

1. Most of the workshops were sponsored by universities, and were held from three to four weeks, five days weekly. Staff planned the programs, with no participant input, and workshop objectives tended to be unclear and unrealistic.

2. Permanent workshop staff ranged between five to ten in number, mostly university personnel. Training staff numbered ten or more, with university personnel and educational administrators being the most commonly used staff. Slightly more than half of the workshops included any kind of evaluation of the training staff, usually subjective and objective reactions. Most workshops served from 50-100 participants, who were elementary and secondary teachers and principals. Few workshops used criteria in choosing participants; nomination by the school board was the one most frequently used.

3. The most popular areas of workshop content (in decreasing frequency) were: racial-cultural understanding; interpersonal-desegregation

relationships among administrators, faculty, students, and community; general interpersonal relationships; racial-cultural curriculum innovation, and upgrading of teaching skills. Most programs combined standard and especially developed materials. By far the most frequently used learning activities in workshops were lecture and small group discussion, and to a lesser extent audiovisual materials and social activities. Least popular learning activities were sensitivity training, research papers and activities, practice teaching, role playing, and retention tests.

4. The most common evaluation technique was participants' evaluation of the workshop content and procedure, using staff-made open-ended questionnaire forms. More than half of the workshops reported followup activities, but less than half used narratives, observation, or attitude testing to determine whether the participants' attitudes or behavior had been altered by the workshop. Less than half reported dissemination activities. Evaluation techniques in most workshops were "somewhat" appropriate, but in many workshop reports the information was too incomplete to determine whether objectives, design, and evaluation matched. In general, however, where the reports included complete information, there seemed to be little conscious effort to match the evaluation to the objectives or design of the workshop.

Critical Variables in Workshop Success

Several features of the workshop are significant enough to examine more closely. What follows is not a condemnation or stamp of approval of Title IV workshop practices. Our aim is not to comment on the overall

success of these workshops--for the most part this can only be speculation since the reports lack important data--but rather to isolate critical variables in workshop success, many of which workshop planners themselves have identified, so that there will be a greater recognition of the elements involved in workshop planning and implementation.

Planning

Most Title IV workshops seemed to have been planned in the minds of the organizers and "benevolently imposed" on the participants. Despite the emphasis in the workshop activities on improving communications among educators, students, and community, putting together the workshop was exclusively the task of someone away from the problem the workshop would deal with. The result, it seems, was that participants were often more knowledgeable about the workshop problem than the planners and their training staff, having been, as they often put it, "on the firing line," while the workshop leaders merely speculated about these problems. In one university-sponsored desegregation institute, the first week of activities consisted of a discussion of the need for the workshop. Significantly, this workshop was exclusively the idea of the project director. Being somewhat removed from an immediate problem frequently allows for a wider perspective, and the many university personnel who planned desegregation workshops were likely knowledgeable about the problems of desegregation and keen observers of school problems, but without conducting some field research they could not actually know the dimensions of the problems they were planning workshops to solve. Ideas for workshops are rarely the participants',given the way workshops are funded; thus, it would seem essential that planners conduct some field research to be better acquainted with the local problems of the workshop participants.

An analysis of school personnel needs by a staff member of the Office of Education—funded and university-based South Carolina Desegregation Consulting Center may be typical of an outsider's perception of school desegregation problems:

> Most school personnel want to do their best for all persons, regardless of race, but in many cases they do not know what is best to do or how to go about it. The leadership qualities needed to deal with desegregation problems are slowly being developed by administrators and teachers in South Carolina. Through the experience acquired over the last year of operation, the Center has categorized educational needs, occasioned or accentuated by school desegregation in South Carolina as follows:
>
> 1. Time. School personnel need time, away from their routine duties, to identify specific desegregation problems; to examine alternative solutions to those problems; and to come to some agreement as to how to solve the specific problems. Inherent in the problem of time is financial resources. Most districts do not have adequate financial resources to pay teachers for attending necessary inservice sessions.
>
> 2. Skills. In most cases, local school administrators and teachers have not had the opportunity to develop the necessary skills to deal with desegregation problems. Leadership and problem solving skills have been found to be priority needs.
>
> 3. Information and understanding. Typically, it has been found that local school personnel need first-hand information about: (1) how people (individually and in groups) relate to one another; (2) people of the opposite race; (3) the power structure, individual and group, which exerts an influence on the community; and (4) curricular reorganization, materials and techniques. The lack of information has precluded, in many cases, a rational solution to problems related to school desegregation.[2]

One cannot fault the philosophical intent behind this analysis, but translating these observations into behavioral goals would likely require extensive observation of the specific problems of school personnel before a workshop were held to deal with them.

A careful field analysis of local needs can also guarantee that the individuals who participate in workshops are those who should. Too many workshop reports pointed out that participants were not always those who could most profit from the workshop, and in some cases they were openly resistant to the workshop activities. One workshop director openly stated in his report that his participants so seriously lacked problem solving and critical thinking skills that his program of research and discussion of desegregation problems was consistently thwarted; these teachers thought that the workshop would give them hard and exact information about how to teach and how to manage their classrooms, and thus they were always at odds with the training staff about the goals of the workshop. With the increased use of role playing techniques and sensitivity training, the workshop planner has an even greater responsibility to make sure that the participants will be amenable to take part in such workshop activities. The problem of finding the right kind of participants is a critical part of workshop planning; a number of workshop planners bemoan the fact that they did not more carefully establish criteria for attendance at the outset and did not more carefully screen out undesirable participants. But this realization came at the end of the workshop, after failures because of a poor choice of participants. In some cases, however, delays in funding made careful choice of participants impossible; often a workshop was put together in a few weeks with whoever was available. Future desegregation workshops, held under less hurried conditions, however, should consider using screening criteria at the outset to insure that the participants will be amenable to the workshop program.

Keeping out participants who should attend perhaps might be more serious than bringing in those who should not. School personnel having the greatest

difficulty do not always seek help, especially older teachers and principals concerned about their status, and school boards for the sake of their own image seem to send school personnel who positively reflect the school district. Here again a few visits to a school could help identify those individuals who could profit from a workshop experience who might not have volunteered nor have been asked to participate.

A serious deficiency of many Title IV workshops was the absence of non-school people among the workshop participants. Workshops which deal with the community conflict surrounding school desegregation, for example, limited themselves to bringing in community spokesmen to lecture to school personnel but had no community people participating as well. One striking exception was a six-week desegregation workshop in the Northwest, which for the most part wanted to upgrade teachers for working with disadvantaged youth, but had as an attendant goal an attempt to develop increased understanding of the dynamics of institutional change at the community level. Workshop planners invited teachers, principals, college professors and students, educational consultants, civil rights workers, ministers, parents, barbers, union representatives, and Job Corps trainees to come as participants. The apparent success of this workshop could have resulted in part from the hetereogeneous mix of the participants: dealing with community in the flesh is likely to be a richer learning experience than dealing with community in the word.

Another important planning issue is the time sequence and magnitude of the workshop. There is no evidence from the study that there is an ideal time sequence, although there is evidence that participants balked at the intensity of some of the six-week summer workshops, especially those in which they had to spend long hours on research projects. (This, however, might have resulted

from choosing the wrong participants.) Most important is that the time sequence be sufficient to carry out the goals of the workshop. One might say that skills development workshops would be more effective if extended through the school year, thus allowing for more practice and demonstration and on-going feedback that the summer workshop can ever permit. Interpersonal workshops may be more successful if participants were removed from the school settings and their everyday lives and live together for a while; this is a workshop experience that should occupy all of the participants' waking hours, even for only a weekend.

Objectives

The potential for workshop success can be determined at the outset by its objectives. Most of Title IV inservice workshops had unachievable objectives, judging from the way they are outlined in the reports, even in the six-week period of some workshops, let alone in the two or three days of many others. In some cases there was no difference in the stated objectives of the workshops, despite the differences in duration and intensity, magnitude, etc. Overall, there seemed to be an inability to conceptualize objectives that can be trans- lated into cognitive or behavioral goals; for the most part, planners seemed to feel that a workshop could right every educational wrong, but this meant that goals which could be reached were ignored in the grandiose efforts of many workshop planners. It is possible that the reports of the workshops do not accurately state the workshops' objectives, that in the haste or pressures of planning, no care was taken in formulating or recording objectives, and that during the actual workshop, goals became clearer; but even if this were the case, the fact that there was no effort to state workshop objectives in terms which could help in planning content or activities suggests that there was no

clear notion of what a workshop could accomplish in a circumscribed period of time. To many, these workshops could perform miracles, and any educational fad could be used to bring these marvels about.

The following list of objectives of a 15-day workshop for elementary school teachers and counselors, sponsored by a Midwestern university, is an example:

1. To develop the participants' ability to raise the level of mathematics, reading, and communication skills (including speech) in the integrated school environment.

2. To develop the participants' ability to appreciate the sociological, psychological, and economic characteristics developed in Negroes by their subjection to these stereotyped environmental influences.

3. To develop the participants' ability to overcome stereotyped ideas of race relations possessed by their students and develop an understanding of the problem involved.

4. To develop the participants' ability to guide and counsel students so that the individual student may be developed to the fullest potential.

Looking at Objective #2, one is struck by the mammoth task of making non-blacks realize how blacks have been affected by stereotypes held about them. As stated, Objective #2 also suggests that the development of blacks has conformed to these stereotypes, and thus raises complex epistemological issues. Do non-blacks see blacks in stereotyped ways? Do these stereotypes actually fulfull themselves as blacks conform to them? Or do non-blacks only see what they want to see, regardless of what is actually the case? Or, do blacks realize that non-blacks will believe what they want to believe and

thus make no attempt to change it? Do blacks have stereotypes of non-black

beliefs? In what way do stereotypes really affect attitudes and behavior?

It may well be that the workshop planners meant only to inform the workshop

participants of some of the social characteristics of blacks, using objective

scientific data and field observation, and thus challenge the participants to

examine their stereotypes, but the objective as reported suggests a much more

complex problem which could never be handled in a workshop of any length and

probably requires a great deal of study and self-examination before one could

seriously confront it. A great deal had to be accomplished in the brief time of

this workshop; it is likely that little serious sustained attention could be

given to the nature of stereotypes in any case.

Further examination of this list of objectives shows that as the

objectives are stated, the participants would have no role in meeting the objectives

nor would there be gradations in the accomplishment of the goals. Participants

(and other learners) generally "develop" their own "abilities"; the staff

(or teachers) generally serve to facilitate what learners do for themselves.

Modifications or classifications of the objectives, such as "the beginning

level appreciation of the sociological, psychological, and economic character-

istics, etc." or "improved ability to guide and counsel students" would be more in

line with what can actually be achieved in a workshop.

An improved statement of some of these objectives might read as fol-

lows:

A participant experiencing successful outcomes of this workshop will

show:

1.   Increased ability to improve levels of mathematics skills in a

desegregated classroom environment.

  2. Increased ability to improve levels of selected language skills in
    a desegregated classroom environment.

  3. Increased ability to aid students in recognizing stereotypes held
    about persons of a different racial group.

Such statements can serve as much clearer, more specific guidelines for the
design, planning and evaluation of the workshop. If the university planners had
realized all that was involved in meeting their objectives, they might have
understood that the objectives were not achievable in any appreciable depth in
15 days,

Design

    The most critical factor in workshop success is a match between the
objectives and content and activities. In many of the reports of the Title IV
workshops, however, there was little indication that content and activities were
chosen with the objectives clearly in mind; in some cases, for example, no dis-
tinction was made between activities for improving interpersonal skills and those
for upgrading teaching techniques. Most workshops consisted of lectures, small
group discussions, and social activities, regardless of the objectives. It would
seem, for example, that too many invitations were sent to outside experts to come
to the workshop with cookbook answers for the participants' interpersonal and
pedagogical problems. There is nothing inherently wrong with expert analysis or
opinion except too often extensive use of experts decreases the chances for
bringing about behavior change because the participants become passive and do
not take part in arriving at solutions to their problems.

    Choosing activities to meet workshop objectives is difficult. Role
playing techniques, for example, work best in workshops where the resolution of
conflicts among school personnel is the objective of the workshop; if a desegre-

gation problem does not result from conflict in the school, role playing is a

useless workshop strategy and may even cloud efforts to find a better solution

to the problem. Before using such techniques, again there should be a careful

analysis of the local problems. Sensitivity training, which in the past few years

has become a popular workshop technique, also requires careful examination before

using it. Sensitivity training tends to challenge social roles, and if the goal

of a workshop is greater effectiveness for the teacher in fulfilling her role as

teacher, then her "real" feelings may be irrelevant. The workshop activity clearly

is a function of the objectives and goals of the workshop.

Careful planning and formulation of workshop objectives can suggest the

appropriate activities. The planning of the previously discussed workshop in the

Northwest showed that de facto school desegregation can be reduced by greater

understanding of community structure and conflict. The specific workshop

objectives were:

1. Increased understanding of the dynamics of institutional change at the
   community level.

2. Greater familiarity with strategies for the resolution of community
   conflict.

3. Greater familiarity with case histories of desegregation.

The participants attended a political science seminar in order to actually learn

about the dynamics of community structure and to obtain the necessary skills to

analyze their own community. One must assume that the planners felt that giving

the participants a greater repetoire of analytical skills and information was more

important than their merely acting out particular roles, for example.

In an attendant problem area, the improvement of teaching strategies for

working with the disadvantaged, the planners established the following objectives:

1. Better conceptual understanding of the black subculture and its differences from other ethnic subcultures in family structure, community organization, etc.

2. Better understanding of the perspectives of disadvantaged youth

3. Better understanding of the use of special teaching materials

4. Better understanding of the effects and use of teacher aides in the classroom

5. Better understanding of the value of innovative scheduling and curriculum

Again, two seminars were held, one on the black subculture and the other on teaching techniques, with panel discussions and personal consultation with welfare mothers and Job Corps youth. There was also small group work in which participants prepared group term papers which were presented for critique by the larger group, and each participant had to develop his own specific teaching strategies and materials and had to prepare action blueprints. The activities clearly were based on traditional classroom approaches to learning, although the workshop had a sense of urgency because many of the participants were actively involved in the community; thus the intellectual discussions were not carried out in a vacuum. Regardless of one's opinion of the overall effectiveness of such approaches to learning, this workshop planned and carried out activities which met the articulated objectives of greater intellectual understanding of the complex problems of school desegregation. This match suggests that the workshop may have been quite successful. Significantly, in evaluating it, plans were made to test the amount of intellectual content that the participants retained. Evaluation was also in terms of the workshop objectives.

Evaluation

Evaluative techniques and efforts in Title IV workshops were such that one
cannot accurately say that a particular workshop was a success or failure. This
is due to the absence of clear objectives to evaluate. Pre- and post-attitude testing
(or any kind of attitude testing) was done in relatively few of the programs.
However, some of these few programs used as many as six non-staff (perhaps stan-
dardized) attitude surveys. Few of these instruments were included in the reports,
so it is difficult to comment on their quality.

Educators understand the difficulty in evaluating changes in human behavior;
they cannot quantify these changes, which always seem to be prone to subjective
evaluation. For this reason, it may be that evaluation is avoided until the last
moment instead of being planned along with other aspects of the workshop. Evaluation
of any sort is obviously difficult for people who are not trained in testing and
measurement. But why simple techniques, like attitude testing (even with its
disadvantages), videotaping, and demonstration teaching with group evaluation, were
not more widely used is not clear. These techniques, and simple narrative reports
of observation, yield respectable objective and subjective data about human behavior,
which can be simply used in the absence of more refined techniques. What is critical
is that there be some feedback,no matter how rudimentary, on the ways in which
participants were affected by the workshop.

Educators planning or leading these workshops are not research scientists. It is not their task to determine whether or not role playing, for example, is an effective strategy for reducing conflict, or whether role playing as opposed to small group discussion has a more lasting effect on the participants' behavior, or whether role playing is associated with particular changes in some behaviors and not associated with others. These are the tasks of social psychologists but they do have the obligation to evaluate their own workshop practices, their own planning and implementation.

Followup and Dissemination

Followup contacts were planned by nearly all workshops but varied widely in practice as described in the reports. Most programs had a one-time followup approximately three, six, or nine months after the original workshop. Many gave additional lecture or small-group input in a three-day followup sessions, although there were few classroom observations of participants and thus there is little firm evidence of behavioral change as a result of the workshop. Often educational administrators (rather than participating teachers) gave information about differences in school districts following a workshop; some teachers, however, reported personal change. In some instances, followup was difficult to arrange and was dropped. One program, however, designed nine or ten followup contacts with participants in the region. Each participant had developed an "action blueprint" which could be discussed with the visiting project staff. As the staff moved within the region they carried with them information from place to place, and each of the participants knew what his peer was doing to implement his action blueprint. However, there seemed to be no organized pattern or single followup technique which was potentially most successful. It is possible that funding limitations made any kind of followup difficult, but budget analyses

were not included in most reports, so one cannot be sure. Whatever the reason, information about lasting changes in teacher behavior as a result of these workshops is limited.

Dissemination of information during or following workshops was virtually neglected by more than one half of the programs in the study, although many participants themselves expressed the desire for dissemination. Again, budgetary considerations could have hampered this effort. However, one major means of dissemination was the project report itself, which was in too many instances poorly organized and unclear. For purposes of plain information, there is an abysmal lack of solid narrative about Title IV workshops. In this study the poor dissemination seemed related to the narrow, closed-end planning of some workshops: where objectives were not clearly articulated and activities not targeted, there was poor evaluation and dissemination.

Careful dissemination and followup is important because it increases the impact of the workshop on the participants and the community. Staff should look for and encourage participants to return and share with others who did not attend the workshop or discuss the ideas among themselves. Schools should be encouraged to provide time for this sharing. This activity helps to produce participants who can actually train others and serve as permanent resource persons in the community. Another dissemination technique is to repeat the same workshop periodically, such as each year. It becomes cheaper each time and can be taken over by local persons who can keep it going as long as there is interest and need. Staff turnover alone can provide a fresh group of participants, aside from those who missed the previous workshop or those who wish to repeat the experience. These activities will spread and deepen the impact of desegregation workshops.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Our review of the successes and shortcomings of these Title IV workshops suggests that some practices are crucial. We have discussed them in the preceding section, but for the purposes of clarity, we make several recommendations:

1. Workshop planners should conduct preliminary field research to determine the specific problems to be dealt with in the workshop. Field research, as we consider it, consists of interviews, observations, and the reviewing of such data as student's records, newspapers, etc. Depending on the outcome of this field study, planners can appropriately design their workshops: formulate objectives, choose and screen participants and training staff, develop a program, consider evaluation techniques, etc. At the outset, a prototype of the workshop is created; thus, the implementation becomes more systematic.

2. Workshop planners should formulate realistic objectives which can lead to participants' behavioral change. To be realistic, they must be able to be met in the time of the workshop. Workshop planners should articulate the philosophical assumptions on which their workshop is based, but should be careful that the objectives of the workshops are not based primarily on the staff's or the planner's philosophical position but rather on the behavioral needs of the participants.

3. In implementing the objectives, there should be an on-going review to guarantee that the workshop program is continually functioning to satisfy the objectives. There should be a capacity in the workshop design for altering the design as need arises.

4. Before, during, and after the workshop, planners should continually
    evaluate both the effect of the workshop on the participants and the
    quality of the workshop itself. Common sense and logical means of
    evaluation, such as empirical observation and narration of workshop
    events, would provide enough crude data to measure the effectiveness
    of the workshop.

5. If workshops are to improve, then practices must be better dissem-
    inated. Workshop planners should seek funds to repeat them in their
    schools in order to perfect a format that is related to the interests
    and problems of the schools. One way to deal with the financial
    problems of conducting a number of workshops is to train some
    participants during a workshop to be trainers at a future workshop;
    in this way the initial workshop has a built-in diffusion effect.
    Workshop planners must also take greater care in recording the workshop
    events: this is critical if knowledge of desegregation workshops is to
    be disseminated. With more accurate knowledge about past practices,
    future workshops will unquestionably improve.

III.

PROTOTYPES AND PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The preceding analysis of Title IV workshops suggests that systematic planning is crucial to workshop success, no matter how exemplary individual practices might be. We propose the following models for planning and conducting a successful inservice desegregation workshop not to insist that these concerns are the most important in the desegregated school, but rather to suggest how at the outset a workshop can be planned to increase the potential for overall success.

Prototype I

<u>Hypothetical Situation</u>: Teachers in a previously all-white high school have found that there are more discipline or classroom management problems in their classsrooms since a group of low-income black children have been bussed into the school. Proposed solutions have failed, and teachers, parents, and students have become more anxious and tense. The teachers especially feel that they are not able to maintain control in their classes and bemoan the changes that school desegregation has brought about. A workshop in interpersonal relations is proposed as a solution.

<u>Planning</u>: A field research committee consisting of a parent, a teacher, and the assistant principal interviews students, parents, teachers, and administrators to gather data on conflicts in the classrooms, and reviews the issues and events surrounding the decision to bus the black youth into the school. Their findings conclude that an interpersonal workshop would in truth help to reduce classroom tensions, and they submit a tentative outline for a design of the workshop. The field research team plus other teachers, administrators, and representatives from both the bussed and receiving communities constitute a

workshop planning committee which develops a final format for the workshop and appoints the training staff. It is decided that the workshop participants will be teachers alone (no students or parents) because of their pivotal role in classroom management. Teachers having the most severe discipline problems are given first opportunity to participate, and are strongly encouraged to attend the workshop. Beginning young teachers are given the next opportunity to join, and then all others interested in joining the workshop. Given the nature of the participants, the planning committee formulates the following workshop objectives: (1) increased understanding of the genesis of behavior problems common to desegregated classrooms and schools, and (2) increased competence in handling selected discipline problems. Three-and-one-half days of school time are planned for the workshop.

Design:

Day 1. Participants meet in large and small groups.

    a. Outline and discussion of the workshop objectives which suggest a pro-teacher, supportive approach to the change.

    b. Brief addresses by speakers of both communities to give the participants a sense of the non-school environment of their students.

    c. Small group discussion of the analysis of classroom problems conducted by the field research team.

Day 2. Participants choose to take part in one of four small group activities. Group A continues the problem analysis of Day 1 but expands it by integrating reports of other research and observations which have been made available to them. The task of this group is to come up with a full analysis of the etiology and treatment of discipline

problems endemic to their school.

Group B views and discusses videotapes and movies taken in their classrooms or elsewhere which suggest the ecology of the classroom, especially its relevance to classroom order. The task of this group is to isolate critical factors in the classroom environment and their effect on the relationship between teacher and student.

Group C role plays with each other and/or students invited to attend the second day of the workshop in situations which illustrate the conflict in the classrooms. The task of this group is to come up with an explanation of the affective responses of teachers, administrators, students, and parents to problems of discipline.

Group D visits parents or students in the community and spends time interviewing them to find out how they would like to deal with some of the tensions in the schools. The task of this group is to gather more data relevant to the problem and to test whether the perceptions of students and the community are significant in finding solutions.

Day 3.   Participants meet in small and large groups.

    a.   Each small group prepares a report or demonstration which is presented to the workshop participants in a large group meeting.

    b.   Based on these presentations, each participant develops a number of behavioral strategies that can be implemented in the schools.

Day 4.   Participants meet in a large group.

    a.   Critical examination of other participants' behavioral strategies (efficacy, feasibility, sensitivity to "real" issues as perceived by the other participants, etc.).

b.   On-the-spot evaluation of the workshop and announcement of plans

for followup and dissemination.

The training staff for such a workshop ideally should consist of individuals

trained as discussion leaders and in role playing techniques. A few

individuals should also be available as nonparticipant observers who can provide

on-the-spot commentary on the overall direction of the workshop and can record

the events as they occur.

Evaluation and Followup: Knowledge about whether the workshop intervention

brought about the desired behavior change can be obtained in several ways:

1. At an appropriate time (3 or 6 months) after the workshop the field

research team could conduct another study of the overall situation in

the schools to determine whether any positive change has occurred;

thus, there would be pre- and post-workshop comparative data.

2. An inventory or checklist measuring teachers' perceptions of the causes

and solutions to discipline problems could be administered to the

participants before and after the workshop to determine whether they

see the complex causes of classroom disorder.

3. Observations of teachers before and after the workshop could determine

whether teachers have a greater behavioral repertory for dealing with

behavior problems as a result of the workshop.

4. The capacity of teachers to formulate behavioral strategies and to make

an effort to implement them in the classroom could be determined

during the workshop and through on-the-spot interviews; the teachers'

efforts, regardless of the immediate success, would be a positive outcome

of the workshop.

Dissemination:

1.. Videotapes and recordings of the workshop role-playing sessions
   and of the interviews in the community should be made and disseminated.

2. Tapes of interviews with the participants before, during, and after the
   workshop should be made and disseminated.

3. A narrative report of the workshop should be disseminated, particularly
   to surrounding school districts and to state and national information
   services.

4. The report should be analyzed locally to identify practices which can
   be imitated in future workshops in other schools. This type of dis-
   semination will have the greatest impact.

Prototype II

Hypothetical Situation: A group of teachers in several desegregated schools
have found that their students are having learning problems that they feel
unable to help them with. The methods and materials they have used in the past
no longer seem to work. Having some knowledge about, but no first-hand experience
with, individualized instruction methods, which they feel can be successful
in teaching educationally disadvantaged children, they recommend that individu-
alized instruction be instituted in their schools. The school district
administrator agrees to investigate this possibility and makes available the
time of a specialist in curriculum and instruction on his staff to conduct a
study.

Planning: The C and I specialist and some interested teachers and principals
interview teachers, observe classrooms, and gather student data to analyze
the students' learning problems. This group agrees with the recommendation that
individualized instruction methods and materials, with some changes in class-

room structure, should be introduced in a few target schools as an experiment.
The temporary committee agrees to stand and is given the task of gathering
available information about individualized instruction and for drawing up a
plan for a workshop to train teachers. The committee arrives at the following
workshop objectives: (1) increased understanding of the concepts underlying
the techniques of individualized instruction, (2) increased skills in planning
and carrying out individualized instruction in the classroom, (3) recognition of
conflicting feelings and personal pedagogical problems in using individualized
instruction methods. (Despite the eagerness of some teachers, the committee
feels that the radical change and challenge of switching teaching methods
could present personal difficulties to the teacher, which should be dealt with
at the outset; thus, Objective #3 would be a goal of the workshop.) The
workshop is open to all teachers in the target schools. It is decided that it should
be held for a week of orientation in the use of the techniques before school begins,
and that one day every other week during the school year should be given to
inservice training.

Design: During the week of orientation, in large and small groups varying in
size or composition, the following activities take place:

1. Addresses by specialists and teachers who have had experience in the use
   of individualized instruction. The speakers do not hide the short-
   comings of the technique or muffle negative reactions, but the
   addresses stress the positive aspects of individualized instruction
   to support the teachers' efforts.

2. Demonstration in the use of the techniques and materials and in models
   for classroom organization, preferably conducted in traditional classrooms
   and with the supplies and materials which the teacher will be using.

3. Analysis of videotapes showing successful and unsuccessful use of individualized instruction methods.

4. Examination of innovative materials lent to the workshop by various commercial producers, and supervised instruction by peer teachers in developing special materials for the students each teacher will be meeting the following week.

During the school year, the following activities take place:

1. During the first week of school, a peer teacher spends at least half a day in each classroom when individualized instruction is being introduced.

2. For one day every other week the teacher is observed in her classroom and is given immediate feedback, visits the classroom of another teacher, is given free time to develop materials or read about research or practice in this area, or meets with other teachers in a small discussion group.

The training staff for this workshop should consist of individuals who have had intimate experience in the development or use of individualized instruction or materials. It is desirable that many of these individuals be peer or master teachers; outside experts should be used to train the teachers but at the same time they should be training future trainers. They should identify some teachers who can assume leadership or resource roles.

Evaluation and Followup: Observations, teacher interviews and videotapes could be used to evaluate the success of this workshop effort. If to a great extent (1) teachers express their fears and concerns about employing innovative practices, (2) participate fully in the orientation activities, (3) are self-critical and offer their peers constructive suggestions for improvement, (4) modify existing

methods and materials as they are faced with actual classroom situations,

(5) introduce individualized instruction without disorienting their students,

(6) can implement suggestions for changes in their practice easily without

personal stress, etc., then the workshop can be considered successful. There is

no need in evaluating the workshop to do anything more than to gather unrefined

observational data.

Dissemination: The activities of this workshop can be disseminated throughout

the school year through the interaction of participating teachers with others

in their schools. In addition, at the outset videotapes or audiotapes should be

made of teachers using individualized instruction methods during the week of

orientation and the school year, for the experiences could be used in subsequent

workshops. If this school district plans to introduce individualized instruction

on a large scale, it has a body of further training materials if care is taken

to adequately record these initial experiences; this is probably the most

targeted dissemination that this first workshop could have.

Prototype III

Hypothetical Situation: An inner-city district superintendent has found a great

deal of discontent among principals and teachers in the elementary schools in his

district. Because of mandates from the central board of education, he has had to

transfer some of them to other schools to achieve racial balance; principals' and

teachers' professional organizations have been meeting to formulate strategies to

oppose further transfers. In other communities, parent organizations are meeting

to form pressure groups both to oppose and demand pupil transfer. Throughout the

previous year, although the district schools have received the newest teaching

materials and class sizes have been reduced, more and more teachers have voiced

discontent about their feelings of powerlessness teaching in big-city schools

where decisions that intimately affect what goes on in their classrooms are made

without consulting them in any way. What is more, although unarticulated, there

seems to be divisiveness between teachers and principals: teachers attribute

discipline and other problems to poor principal leadership, and principals feel

that teachers are responsible for the increase in behavior problems and the low

reading scores of the schools during the past year. Among the teachers themselves

there is a feeling that the school administration resists any changes, especially

if they are initiated by the teachers.

Planning: The district superintendent asks the teacher resource training and

human relations divisions of the central board to make funds and personnel available

for bringing together teachers and principals to join in a workshop to try to

understand the etiology of some of their problems and to develop behavioral

strategies to solve them. A professor specializing in the problems of urban

education volunteers to help plan and conduct this workshop. Several specialists

initially interview teachers and pricipals to discover their problems and to see

how they relate to the larger problems of the school system and outside society.

These field interviews suggest that both the teachers and principals are unsure of

their proper roles in this period of rapid and social and educational change

and that many of them feel plagued by forces over which they feel they have no control.

It is decided that small discussion/workshop groups of teachers and principals

will meet every Thursday afternoon for three months to discuss a number of

readings on educational and social problems written from various perspectives

(historical, professional, participant etc.) and to analyze some hypothetical

problems resembling their own, as revealed by the field interviews. The

objectives of the workshop are (1) to stimulate the participants to intellectually

understand the etiology of contemporary educational problems and to be aware of the

resources available to them to further this increased understanding, (2) to disclose

and exchange their feelings and experiences in the schools and critically examine
their own and others' behaviors as they begin to perceive them through the dis-
cussion of the readings and hypothetical problems, (3) to develop behavioral
strategies based on a better perception of the forces that affect their behavior,
which will allow them to meet their goals as educators with less conflict or
confusion about their own power to control what happens in their classrooms and
schools.

Design: Each small group consists of ten principals and teachers from the same
school and one leader, whose role is only to stimulate the discussion and the
development of behavioral strategies. The readings are distributed prior to the
meetings, giving the participants adequate time to think about them. During the
early meetings the leader encourages the participants to think critically
about the ideas in the readings without making direct application to their own
situations, but in the later meetings as participants gain greater intellectual
understanding of their problems, he should encourage these applications. Toward
the end of the series of workshop discussions, the participants should begin to
discuss their own behavioral strategies for dealing with their problems, by
themselves alluding to the perceptions gained by thinking critically about the
readings. The participants correct or modify other participants' planned
changes in behavior according to their different perceptions of the nature of the
problems being discussed. Non-participant observers are present at many
of these meetings to provide feedback to the groups and to record the nature of
the interaction.

Evaluation and Followup: Observations and teacher interviews can be used to
evaluate the success of this workshop effort. If the workshop is successful, the
participants (1) will find in the readings issues they want to discuss, (2) suggest

an increased understanding of the etiology of contemporary educational problems,
(3) offer opinions that are not exclusively based on prior personal experience,
(4) interact meaningfully with other participants in developing behavioral
strategies to deal with school problems, and (5) be willing to test new strategies
in the school or classroom and be able to evaluate the outcomes. During the
workshop,observers, group leaders and participants should keep a written account
of their observations both to record changes in participants' perceptions and
have data for making any changes in the workshop design.

Dissemination: This type of workshop can be built into the ordinary activities
of a given school. A participant at this initial workshop may be interested and
talented enough to continue these activities with the participants and other
personnel in the school. New readings could be identified and time made available
to discuss them. The new workshop leader would use her skills in guiding the
discussion so it is not merely a gripe session. There could be an agreement to
systematically introduce small changes in the school, using the discussion/workshop
meetings to informally evaluate the outcomes. As new problems emerge, new intel-
lectual resources could be identified to help solve them. And the cycle of dis-
cussion, critical examination of the issues surrounding the problem, and the
formulating and testing of behavioral strategies would begin again.

PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Some of the responsibility that has fallen on the desegregation
inservice workshop in truth belongs on the teacher education institution.
Teachers themselves feel that their colleges and universities have never pre-
pared them for teaching in desegregated schools. They feel that colleges are
too far removed from the realities of public school teaching and that many of
the now-common urban education courses do not prepare the teacher in the use of
the methods and materials that the teacher finds herself having to use in the
desegregated schools. But even if higher education ideally could forecast and
prepare teachers for the changes that will occur when teacher education students
enter the schools, and this is not likely, the problem of teacher renewal must
be left to inservice education. In no profession can one stop learning, but
teachers and other educators have been faced with rapid change in the last ten or
fifteen years which they have not been prepared for, and they have not been able to
find the concentrated inservice training to help them to adjust to this change. The
problem may be that inservice training in skills development has tended to be
fragmented, what Commissioner of Education Marland calls the appropriation of
funds which allows educators "to tinker with bits and pieces of innovation."
The reports of the desegregation inservice workshops held under the 1964
Civil Rights Act are clear proofs that funds have been used to jump on edu-
cational bandwagons for a brief time without adequate investigation and plan-
ning for the introduction of innovation, without sensitive and carefully
observed instruction in the use of the innovation, and without systematic
evaluation over a long period of time after the successful introduction of the
innovation into the classroom. There may be a question about whether desegre-

gation workshops should concentrate on skills development so single-mindedly,
but in the past they have and it is likely they will continue to do so in the
future, so the problem of planning for the best use of available funds is critical.

Inservice training should ideally be taken out of the summer institute.
It should be conducted in training and resource centers during the summer and
school year, depending on the needs of the local educational community. Such
training and resource centers have multiple values:

(1) The critical planning and field observation that must go into
the decision to introduce innovation into the schools, or to
identify what the teaching problems in a particular school district
are, and who are having these problems, can best be done within a
visible and on-going structure. One cannot emphasize enough
that the problems of many workshops have been the result of
careless planning and implementation.

(2) In the training and resource center for teachers, methods and
materials can be slowly and carefully introduced and the teacher
can return to her school to implement them and be able to return
to the resource center with feedback on the success or failure
in their use. A problem of the summer institute or workshop,
or even the sporadic year-long inservice efforts, has been the
unavailability of a systematic plan of feedback and modification
in a real world teaching situation.

(3) Inevitably, this training and resource center will allow a far
greater exchange among school personnel, the kind of colleague
criticism and advice that other professions allow but that
teachers who spend most of their days with children seem to be
deprived of.

(4) This training and resource center ideally should have print and
nonprint information that school personnel can use for reference.
In inservice workshops, many teachers voice the problems they have
in not knowing about innovations in the field and in not finding
avenues for obtaining information about them. The training and
resource center can function in one way as a communications link
between the producers and interpreters of educational knowledge
and the consumers of it.

(5) The activities of the training and resource center should be
completely sensitive to the information and training needs of the
teachers in a school district at a particular time and should
change as their needs change. Thus, if the problems in a school
district result from desegregation, and teachers are finding
themselves unable to cope with learning and interpersonal
problems which usually accompany this change, the training and
resource center would concentrate on solving these problems
whether they be disciplinary problems in the classroom, cultural
differences between teachers and students, feelings of teacher
failure, lack of access of knowledge about innovation in methods
and materials in teaching minority children, etc. Because these
problems are interrelated, the existence of a single structure
for dealing with facets of them can easily solve them in a more
comprehensive manner.

The training and resource center can function as an information center, a training
workshop structure and a meeting room. Because it is a visible on-going insti-
tution, efforts to solve some of the problems of desegregation can become

more intense and last longer. The social and educational problems
of desegregated education are complex. In the past, short-term workshops
tried to deal with them, but because there was no way for them to possibly study
and coordinate inservice efforts to meet their massive objectives, they met
failures that this model for a resource center can potentially avoid.

From the outset a relationship between the training and resource center
and the local university and college should be established on an on-going basis.
Whenever necessary or possible, university staff should be utilized as specialists
in working with the center in teacher training, resource planning, development
and evaluation, etc. But one would hope that the relationship would be reciprocal,
that the linkage between the university and the inservice teachers would allow the
university to become more aware of the realities of public school teaching, and
that this awareness would be reflected in curriculum and other changes in teacher
training within the university. Thus, the training and resource center would be
able to draw upon the expertise of the university, and the university would be able
to receive systematic feedback from practical applications of the ideas and
techniques that it is researching and teaching. Staff for the center can be
drawn from both the university and the local school district. At the present time
there seem to be more teachers than are needed in the classroom and many
university people are now finding themselves without jobs; given the interest
of the Federal Government in developing teaching renewal centers, it would seem
that now master teachers could be taken out of the classroom and put into
research and resource centers without loss to the schools or universities.

But the critical issues for the desegregation workshop in the future may not
exclusively be skills development, nor the improvement of interpersonal
relationships or racial-cultural understanding. The rapid social and educational
change which accompanied racial desegregation has made school people unsure

of their social and school roles. Too many of them feel they are plagued by forces over which they have no control and which affect their classroom behavior. The problems of school people today have to do with relationships between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, and teachers among themselves; they have to do with feelings of powerlessness and alienation in the school and society; and inservice education has never confronted these problems. To use the analogy of sex education, much inservice education has dealt with the mechanics of sexuality (birth control, prevention of venereal disease, etc.) and not the nature of passion. The training and resource center may be the place that such problems can be dealt with. As we outlined in the Prototype III above, a workshop on these problems should be on-going. School people need a supportive atmosphere where they can examine and consider some of the complex problems of being an educator. "Renewal" can not only be learning new teaching techniques; educators have to be renewed spiritually as well as mechanically.

Regardless of the workshop--summer institute, year-long training in a resource center, sensitivity training, etc.--the fade-out of the experience is enormous because of the contradiction between the workshop experience and what goes on in the school. Unless the school supports and reinforces the workshop learning, sending individuals to workshops for a period of time simply does not bring about the desired behavior change. The school as well as the learner has to be willing to change.

Footnotes

1. Excerpted in M. Deutsch and H. Hornstein, _The Social Psychology of Education_ (Teachers College, mimeograph) from G. Watson, _Social Psychology: Issues and Insights_ (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966).

2. University of South Carolina, Columbia. School of Education. _Special Training Institute on School Desegregation for School Personnel in South Carolina,_ 1968-1969. (ED 045 753)

APPENDIX A

The following distinctions among varieties of small groups is excerpted from William L. Carpenter, Twenty-Four Methods and Techniques in Adult Education, Washington, D.C.: Educational System Corporation, 1969.   ED 024 882.

Seminar*

The seminar is a group of persons engaged in specialized study led by a recognized authority in the subject being studied. It may be used to study a subject in depth, and may be a single session or a series of sessions.

Some Advantages

1. A recognized authority is available to guide discussion and to assist the learners.
2. Detailed and systematic discussion and inquiry can take place.
3. All members of the group have the opportunity to participate, over time, in the discussion and in formal presentations.

Some Limitations

1. It may be difficult to find the right person to direct the seminar.
2. Members may not want to spend all the time required for preparation of reports.
3. The presence of an expert may inhibit participation of some members.
4. It may be difficult to find all the source materials desired.

Procedure

1. Responsibilities for the giving of reports are assigned, and these are prepared in advance of the seminar.
2. Reports are made, including the use of visuals and written handouts, if needed.
3. All participants discuss the report, and question the reporter.
4. Evaluation and followup as needed.

* p. 41.

Discussion Group*

A discussion group is made up of persons who meet together to informally discuss or deliberate on a topic of mutual concern. It may be used (1) to develop a nucleus of leadership for community service or informal education, (2) to identify, explore, and seek solutions for problems and to develop plans of action, and (3) to change attitudes through discussion and the examination of information.

Some Advantages

1. Group discussion permits full participation.
2. It can establish consensus democratically.
3. It pools the abilities, knowledge, and experience of all to reach a common goal.

Some Limitations

1. Group discussion is time consuming, particularly if the group includes persons of widely different backgrounds.
2. A bossy leader or a few members may dominate the discussion.

Procedure

1. Should be governed by the group itself. Generally, the leader will preside and moderate the discussion.
2. A group may meet as long and as often as is necessary and convenient.
3. A change of leaders may be made to utilize special individual abilities. For example, different leaders may be used in the deliberative, planning, and action phases of the group's work.
4. The group may appoint a recorder to keep track of its deliberations and to report on its progress from time to time.

* p. 19.

Workshop*

The workshop is a group of persons (10 to 25) sharing a common interest or problem meeting together to improve their individual proficiency to solve a problem, or to extend their knowledge of a subject through intensive study, research, and discussion. It may be used (1) to identify, explore, and seek solution of a problem, and (2) to permit extensive study of a situation, including its background and social or philsophical implications.

Some Advantages

1. Provides the opportunity for preparation for specific vocational, professional, or community service functions.
2. Permits a high degree of individual participation.
3. Provides for group determination of goals and methods.

Some Limitations

1. Requires a great deal of time from participants and staff.
2. Requires a high proportion of staff to participants.
3. May require special facilities or materials.
4. Participants must be willing to work both independently and cooperatively.

Procedure

1. Arrangements for physical facilities made well in advance of the workshop.
2. Resource persons and resource materials lined up well in advance.
3. Workshop is conducted.
4. Evaluation and followup as needed.

*p. 49.

Institute*

An institute is a training meeting for individuals who are interested in a specific field. It may be used (1) to bring the participants up to date on new developments, and (2) to provide periodic review of instruction and inservice training.

Some Advantages

1. Intensive training in a short period generally free of interruptions.
2. Adults in similar circumstances come to know each other better.
3. All participants can play an active role.
4. A variety of techniques may be used and demonstrated.

Some Limitations

1. A considerable amount of preplanning is necessary.
2. Facilities must be available for the total group and for subgroups.
3. A time suitable for all expected participants may be difficult to arrange.

Procedure

1. Arrangements are made for the various facilities needed.
2. Correspondence and other publicity necessary to insure attendance.
3. An opening session with a keynote address by a competent speaker.
4. A repeat of the general session followed up by small-group sessions.
5. Evaluation and followup as needed, including a printed report and other training materials.

* p. 27.

Conference*

A conference is a meeting of people in large or small groups. The participants
are usually a close-knit group who formally consult with one another. It may be used
(1) to discuss a narrow technical area in depth, and (2) to develop plans for promoting
a new idea.

Some Advantages

1. Participants usually have a high interest in the area being discussed.
2. Participants usually attend because of their own desires to do so, and are not
   required to attend or delegated by their local organizations, as are participants
   at institutes and conventions.

Some Limitations

1. It is hard to predict attendance.
2. Advance arrangements must be made for conference facilities, eating facilities,
   and housing accommodations.
3. Evaluation of the results is often difficult.

Procedure

1. Arrangements for physical facilities made well in advance of the conference.
2. Program participants lined up well in advance of the conference.
3. Publicity and promotion to insure attendance.
4. Small group meetings or a combination of general sessions and sub-group meetings.
5. Evaluation and followup as needed.

* p. 15.

Appendix B

The workshop reports in this bibliography are available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
Leasco Information Products, Inc. (LIPCO)
P.O. Drawer 0
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

They can be ordered in microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC). Microfiche is a 4x6 inch sheet of film requiring special readers to magnify the print. Hard copy is a paper photo copy or facsimile of the original document.

Each microfiche copy (MF) of a document is $0.65. The hard copy (HC) price is determined by the number of pages the document contains. The schedule is as follows:

No. of Pages	Price
1-100	$3.29
101-200	6.58
201-300	9.87
301-400	13.16
401-500	16.45
Each additional 1-100 page increment	3.29

All orders must be in writing, stating the ED numbers, type of reproduction (MF or HC), and the number of copies desired. There is no handling charge. Book rate or library rate postage is included in the above prices. The difference between book rate or library rate and first class, if requested, or foreign postage (outside the continental United States) will be billed at cost. All orders under $10.00 must be accompanied by payment.

Selected Desegregation Workshops

Auburn University, Alabama, School of Education. Special Training Institute
     for Educational Leaders and Other Community Leaders to Work on Problems
     Arising From Desegregation of Public Schools. 1966. 115p. ED 056 113

Clark College, Atlanta, Ga. A Report: Institute for the Preparation of
     Counselors and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership
     in Desegregated Schools, June 20-July 22, 1966. 1966. 85p. ED 056 124

Clark College, Atlanta, Ga. Institute for the Preparation of Counselors
     and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership in
     Desegregated Schools, June 12-July 14, 1967. A Report. 83p. ED 056 117

Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.; Institute for Service to Education, Washington,
     D. C. Teacher Education and School Integration: A Conference Series.
     Final Project Report, July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969. 1969. 116p.   ED 045 749

Florida State University, Tallahassee, Department of Educational Administration.
     [Institute Training Programs on Problems of School Desegregation:
     Interim Report, Final Report, and Following Conference.] 1966. 40p. ED 056 106

Hampton Institute, Virginia. The Nongraded Approach to Curriculum for
     Administrators and Teachers of the Disadvantaged. Interim Report.
     1966. 127p. ED 056 120

Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas. Desegregation,
     The Learning Process, and Changing Values in Human Relations. Institute
     Interim Report. [1966] 62p. ED 056 123

James Sprunt Institute, Kenansville, N. C.: Duplin County Board of Education,
     Kenansville, N. C. Leadership Development and Human Relations Seminar,
     1969: Second Annual Teacher Desegregation Institute. 1969. 141p. ED 056 128

Kansas City School District, Mo. An In-Service and Advisory Assistance Program
     Relating to the Problems Councident with and Incident to the Process of
     Desegregation of Schools in the Kansas City, Missouri, School District.
     1967. 263p. ED 056 108

Knoxville College, Tennessee. A Training Institute to Improve the Effective-
     ness of Seventy-Five Secondary Teachers of English and Reading in
     Desegregated Schools in the East Tennessee Region. 1967. 25p. ED 056 110

LaGrange City Board of Education, Ga.; Troup County Board of Education,
     LaGrange, Ga. A Workshop Designed to Alleviate the Fears, Prejudices,
     and Misconceptions of Personnel in the LaGrange City and Troup County
     School Systems.... 1970. 37p. ED 056 131

Las Vegas City Schools, N. M. Team Teaching, Employing a Variety of Methods
for Spanish/Anglo-American Integration. Title IV Final Report, 1969-70.
1970. 52p. ED 056 130

Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. "Education and Race Relations"
Inservice Training Course: Final Technical Report, Summary Statement
of the College Coordinator for the Television Course, Report on
Dissemination Efforts, and Evaluation. 1967. 47p. ED 056 107

Nelson, Robert J. Human Relations Workshop Leader's Guide. 1967. 96p. ED 056 129

New Mexico State University, University Park, Dept. of Educational
Administration. Interim Report for an Interdisciplinary Institute for
In-Service Training of Teachers and Other School Personnel to Accelerate
the School Acceptance of Indian, Negro, and Spanish-Speaking Pupils
from the Southwest. 1966. 93p. ED 045 740

Northeastern Illinois State College, Chicago, Center for Innter City Studies;
Illinois Univ., Chicago, College of Education; Illinois Commission on
Human Relations, Chicago, Education Services Div.; B'nai B'rith, Chicago,
Ill., Anti-Defamation League. Final Report of the Institute of
Administrative Leadership in School Desegregation and Equal Education
Opportunity. 1969. 76p. ED 056 114

Orleans Parish School Board, New Orleans, La. Final Report for an Institute
to Prepare Newly Graduated and Experienced Teachers for Work in
Desegregated Schools. 1970. 145p. ED 056 132

Paine College, Augusta, Ga. A Special In-Service Training Institute for the
Preparation of Teachers for Effective Service and Leadership in De-
segregated Schools. Final Technical Report. 1967. 15p. ED 056 116

Pennsylvania Military Colleges, Chester. Special Training Institute for
Problems of School Desegregation; Intergroup Relations Institute for
Secondary School Personnel. Interim Report. 1965. 39p. ED 056 109

Richmond Public Schools, Va. Inter-Racial In-Service Program Designed to
Increase the Educational Opportunities of the Children in the Richmond
Public Schools...[1965-1968]. 1966-1968. 276p. ED 056 111

Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. A Training Institute on
Problems of School Integration for School Board Members, Principals and
Teachers in the East Texas Area. Final Report. 1969. 92p. ED 056 126

Stanford University, California. Intergroup Workshop for Special Training on
Problems of School Desegregation. Interim Report, Final Report and
Follow-Up in Participating School Districts. 1965-66. 57p. ED 056 127

University of California, Berkeley. Leadership Training Institute in Problems of School Desegregation. 1967. 311p. ED 056 121

University of California, Riverside, Extension Division. Approaches to Desegregation: The Superintendent's Perspective; A Dialogue on April 27-29, 1969, University of California Conference Center, Lake Arrowhead. 1969. 118p. ED 047 023

University of Delaware, Newark, School of Education. Institute for Administrators, Counselors, and Teachers on Selected Problems Occasioned by School Desegregation and Integration. 1966. 30p. ED 056 105

University of Florida, Gainesville. Problems in School Desegregation: Two Summer Institutes for School Leaders. 1965. 32p. ED 056 115

University of Missouri, Kansas City, Center for the Study of Metropolital Problems in Education. Final Report of the Special Institute on School Desegregation: An Institute to Help Educators Maximize Educational Opportunity, August 2-13, 1965. 1966. 39p. ED 056 118

University of Missouri, Kansas City, Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education. Report of the Special Institute on School Desegregation: An Institute to Help Educators Maximize Educational Opportunity, August 2-13, 1965. 1965. 43p. ED 056 125

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Learning Institute of North Carolina, Rougemont. Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation, June 20--August 12, 1966. 1966. 23p. ED 019 347

University of Seattle, Washington, School of Education. Tacoma School District No. 10, Title IV In-Service Education Program: An Evaluation. 1969. 28p. ED 045 751

University of South Carolina, Columbia, School of Education. Special Training Institute on School Desegregation for School Personnel in South Carolina, 1968-1969. [1970] 106p. ED 045 753

University of Tulsa, Oklahoma. "Into the Main Stream...; " Institute I-- The Changing Community, June 7-July 2, 1965. 1965. 65p. ED 056 119

Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, College of Education. Problems Incident to De Facto School Segregation: An Action Approach. Final Report of Institute Training Program. 1967. 126p. ED 056 112

West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon. A Communication Institute for Elementary Teachers Serving Disadvantaged Children. 1966. 58p. ED 056 103

West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon. Institute on Human Relations
    and Attitudes in West Virginia as These Affect Public School Education....
    1968. 44p. ED 056 104

Yeshiva University, New York, N. Y., Graduate School of Education. Report on
    the Teacher Institute on Special Instructional Problems in Recently
    Desegregated P.S. 30 and P.S. 80, Queens, New York City. Final Report.
    1965. 24p. ED 056 122

APPENDIX C

File No. _____

Targeted Communications Data Sheet

Title IV Inservice Institute

1. Name of Program _____

2. Institutional Sponsor _____

3. Source of Funds _____ Amount _____

4. a) Date of Program _____

   b) Duration and Intensity _____

5. Goals or Objectives of Program (Summarize) _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Indicate Who Generated the Program--Participant or Staff _____

   _____

7. Indicate Whether the Program Was "Open-Ended" _____

   _____

8. Number and Background of Permanent Project Staff

   Number   Background

   _____   _____

   _____

9. Number and Background of Training Staff

   Number   Background

   _____   _____

   _____

10. Indicate Whether Description and/or Evaluation of Training Staff Is Included

    Yes _____   No _____

    Nature _____

11. Number and Background of Participants

    Number   Background

    _____   _____

                    _____

12. Criteria for Selection of Participants _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

13. Design and Content of Program

    ☐ Materials (especially developed or standard)

    <u>Activities</u>

    ☐ Lecture   ☐ Sensitivity training

    ☐ Small group discussion   ☐ Field visits

    ☐ Role playing   ☐ Individual assignments related to
                                              content:
    ☐ Social activities to foster
      intergroup relations   ☐ Research papers

    ☐ Laboratory sessions to become   ☐ Reading library references
      familiar with materials or
      techniques   ☐ Quizzes or written examinations

    ☐ Practice teaching or other   ☐ Preparation of reports or
      student contact   proposals for future application
                                                of workshop content
    ☐ Consultation services
                                             ☐ A/V aids: films, tapes, movies,
    ☐ Other (explain below)   etc.

    _____   ☐ Physical facilities used as
                                                fostering learning & com-
    _____   munication at workshop

14. Evaluation of Project

    ☐ No evaluation   ☐ Open-ended

    ☐ Questionnaire

☐ Participants

· ☐ Staff

☐ Observation

☐ Narratives

☐ Attitude testing

    ☐ Pre- and post-testing

    ☐ Post testing

☐ Followup

☐ Dissemination activities of
   participants to influence
   others

☐ Description of instruments

☐ Appropriateness of evaluation pro-
   cedures and instruments in terms
   of the program's objectives

15. Degree to Which There Was a Match Between Program Objectives, Content and
Evaluation _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

17. Refer Back to This Report

Yes _____   Positive _____

No _____   Negative _____

    Neutral _____