ED 087 644   SO 006 305

AUTHOR   Chesler, Mark; And Others
TITLE   The Educational Change Team: An Effort to Develop a
                National Facility to Generate and Implement
                Information and Resources Relevant to Secondary
                School Crisis and Change. Final Report.
INSTITUTION   Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY   Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; National Inst. of
                Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.; Office of
                Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of
                Research.
PUB DATE   Jul 72
CONTRACT   OEC-0-70-3322
NOTE   112p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS   Adoption (Ideas); Change Agents; *Conflict; Conflict
                Resolution; Consultants; *Educational Change;
                Educational Research; Information Dissemination;
                Institutional Role; Intervention; Models; Networks;
                *Political Issues; Program Development; Secondary
                Schools; *Social Change; Summative Evaluation

ABSTRACT
                The final report of a research effort, interracial
and multidisciplinary in nature and designed to deal with the
politics of change in professional systems, outlines a) a diagnosis
of American high schools and consequent change strategies, b) its
goals and objectives, c) program outcomes, and d) issues facing the
Educational Change Team and others engaged in controversial aspects
of school change. The Team conducted basic research to discover,
document and illuminate the issues of racism and control of youth
which appear as the major institutional conditions leading to
educational failure and political crisis in schools. It also
conducted a variety of developmental programs to generate alternative
models of aspects of secondary education and to design new materials
and resources helpful in the change process. A series of regional
consultant teams were identified and trained to provide direct
assistance to school systems in crisis (Network on Educational
Unrest). Further, the ECT trained groups of students, teachers,
administrators, and community members in new ways of dealing with
school conflicts, and created and disseminated various materials
pertinent to school crisis and change. Relevant publications
available by or from the ECT, a bibliography of school conflict and
change, and a list of Team staff members are included in the report.
(Author/KSM)

July, 1972
School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

*Bob —
Here is the final copy.
Thanks very much for
your help on earlier
drafts. See you.
Mark*

ED 087644

SP 006 305

The Educational Change Team
An effort to develop a National Facility
to generate and implement information and
resources relevant to secondary school crisis
and change

Prepared by:
Mark Chesler
Bunyan Bryant
James Crowfoot
Lucille Schaible
Simon Wittes

U.S. Department of
Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Contract # OEC-0-70-3322

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Abstract

The Educational Change Team (E.C.T.) was funded primarily by the United States Office of Education from March, 1970 to April, 1972. A 6 months grant to plan a three year program of action, research and development activities was followed by one year's funding to create a "National Facility to Generate and Implement Information and Resources Relevant to Secondary School Crisis and Change." The second and third years of this design never were funded; an extension and terminal grant was made. ECT's program received complementary support from the Ford Foundation and the National Institutes of Mental Health.

The final report of the Educational Change Team outlines (a) its diagnosis of American high schools and consequent change strategies, (b) its goals and objectives, (c) program outcomes, and (d) issues facing the Team and others engaged in controversial aspects of school change. Racism and the control of youth appear as the major institutional conditions leading to educational failure and political crisis in schools. The Team conducted basic research to discover, document and illuminate these issues. It also conducted a variety of developmental programs to generate alternative models of aspects of secondary education, and to design new materials and resources helpful in the process of change. A series of regional consultant teams were identified and trained to provide direct assistance to school systems in crisis (Network on Educational Unrest). Further, the ECT trained groups of students, teachers, administrators and community members in new ways of dealing with basic school conflicts, and created and disseminated various materials relevant to school crisis and change.

Final Report

United States Office of Education contract #OEC-0-70-3322
Mark A. Chesler, Principal Investigator

(and portions of)
National Institutes of Mental Health Grant #1 R01 MH18014-01,02
James E. Crowfoot, Principal Investigator
Ford Foundation Grant #680-0566A
Mark A. Chesler, Principal Investigator

The Educationa¹ ˜hange Team
An effort to develop a National Facility
to generate and implement information and
resources relevant to secondary school crisis
and change

The final report of an interracial
multidisciplinary, action research effort
designed to deal with the politics of change in
professional systems

School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

July, 1972

Acknowledgments

iv

Table of Contents

List of Figures

I. Introduction

The Educational Change Team (E.C.T.) was funded primarily by the
United States Office of Education from March, 1970 to April, 1972.
An initial 6 months grant was made in March, 1970 to plan a three year
program of action, research and development activities designed to
respond to secondary school crisis and unrest. After completion of
the six months planning phase, the U.S. Office of Education granted
ECT a year's funding (September, 1970 to October, 1971) to create a
"National Facility to Generate and Implement Information and Resources
Relevant to Secondary School Crisis and Change." The second and third
years of this design never were funded; in October, 1971 an extension
and terminal grant grant were made for 6 months to facilitate preparation of
reports documenting our experience. ECT's program, covering a period
of approximately 2 years, also received complementary support from the
Ford Foundation and the National Institutes of Mental Health.

The early termination of USOE funds meant cessation of partially
completed programs and forward progress; it also affected plans to
fully diffuse and implement our programs and functions in other
educational institutions. The Team has closed down most of its
operations, but some research and development activities funded separ-
ately will continue for a few months.

Throughout ECT's 2 years the nature of the American educational
system was examined through intensive research and intervention into
life in public schools. Through close contact and collaboration with
educators, parents, community organizers and students of a variety of
social class and cultural backgrounds, ECT also gained confidence in
its developing conceptualization and implementation of strategies to
bring about school change. Team members often were frustrated by their
own inadequacies and the resistance to change evidenced by many educators,
parents, students and local and national policy makers. However, we
also were enthusiastic and optimistic in hopes for the future. At
times it seemed possible to change the trends in high schools from
disruption and violence to reformation and increased quality education

-1-

for all students. This seemed possible if backed by a national effort from the U.S. Office of Education, with a clear diagnosis of high schools as well as options for change endorsed by local and national policy makers. Another essential component seemed to be a concerted push from educators, students, community organizers and educational consultants affiliated with the Team and like agencies. The closing of the first condition should not alter the relevance and importance of the second.

The following brief history of the Educational Change Team outlines the evolution of (a) its diagnosis of American high schools and consequent change strategies, (b) its goals and objectives, as well as changes in these patterns and programs over time, (c) program outcomes, and (d) issues facing ourselves and others engaged in school change. We hope this report may provide insights for others involved in the key problems of change in American education.

II. The School Scenario

Patterns of serious interracial and intergenerational conflict are common in high schools across the nation. Overt conflict and disruption in the conduct of school affairs are now commonplace and many schools are local foci for unresolved controversy, anger and despair. Frequently these conditions have led administrators to close schools and declare an educational crisis. Even where serious disruption has not occurred, alienation from learning and mutual distrust in one another have characterized interracial and intergenerational contact and interaction in many schools. Often the roots of these conflicts lie within the structure of the school itself; at other times they are rooted in, or promoted by, factors in the local and national community. The number and severity of such incidents publicizes the deep-seated failure of our schools.

In many communities white students and minority students or white educators and minority students are engaging in multiple forms of resistance, rejection or warfare. The racist structures of American education create and perpetuate these lines of social unrest. Our schools have inadequately served minority communities by failing to provide black students and brown students with the technical skills and social and economic opportunities garnered by most white, middle class students. The control of the educational profession by whites insures that some white interests are served, but that same control derogates black and brown and other minority interests to a secondary level. Professionalism, which carries with it an assumption of expertise steeped in tradition, promotes the dominant culture's values and traditions of expertise and achievement. Thus, educators do not see the schools' failures with minority students as the profession's problem, but rationalize it as the fault of students or parents.

Protests against white cultural coercion and the estrangement of minority students and communities from their schools often focus on key educational or political symbols. The absence of black and brown, poor or urban foci in the curriculum is a source of concern, as is the flag,

anthem, cheerleading system, student government, or other representa-
tion of the institution. The financial structure of local schooling
also reflects the racist and class biases of public services, providing
costly but unequal services to the poor and minority community.
Staffing patterns and the attitudes of teachers and administrators
indicate their inability or unwillingness to eradicate racism within
the educational system. Students unprepared for intergroup association
and constrained by racist educational structures, often act on the
above concerns by fighting with each other. Thus, they attack the most
accessible targets of cultural difference and conflict rather than the
basic racist structures themselves.

There also are many examples of school disruptions which apparently
are neither triggered by nor focussed on racism or racial relations.
These phenomena, which are marked by confrontations between students and
adults regardless of race, may be occurring in even greater, though
less newsworthy, fashion. Many students chafe at the restrictive
controls and narrow curriculum presented in school. The locus of
authority in the hands of adult professionals has denied students any
serious influence on the course of their schooling, and makes it hard
for them to modify the school program to meet their own concerns.
Petty regulations, coercive policies regarding style and fashion and
fake student governance systems also reflect youth's exclusion from
influential roles in high school.

These obvious symbols of exclusion and impotence are further
exacerbated by the mutual distrust and sometimes disrespect and fear
that characterize student-staff relations in many schools. Disat-
isfaction with the competence and concern of some faculty members,
and the vitality of the instructional process, are other key issues.
White staff members may be particularly out of touch with minority
students, but they are often out of touch with white students as
well. Faculties trained in isolated schools of education often find
themselves frightened and anxious in the modern urban or suburban
classroom. The organizational structures that force an overwhelming
reliance on an adult, credentialed staff perpetuates patterns both of
racism and of youth exclusion.

Although information on the larger scope of school crisis is incomplete, there are many indications that it is pervasive and continuing. Recent newspapers and magazines continue to report and wonder about student action and administrator reaction and protests and disruptions occur in cities and towns throughout the nation. Unlike the relatively contained crises on college campuses, public school outbursts often have engulfed whole communities in bitter and prolonged dispute. Some high schools have undergone a series of disruptions; particular buildings have had to close as many as three times over the course of a school year.

In many cases the crises at different schools take very similar forms. High schools are quite alike across the nation and youth are subject to fairly similar educational environs. To the degree that the mass media publicize student demands and tactics they help transmit information to student groups in many separate locales. We have here no isolated or temporary episode, but a fundamental reaction by youth to the defects of the institution society has established for their safekeeping and advancement.

Tension and disaffection in school takes many forms. The most visible and attention-getting ones involve the disruption and actual breakdown of order, or threat of breakdown, which results in school closings. Such overt disruption of school life undeniably represents a crisis. But the very definition of a crisis--by school administrators--in terms of the breakdown of "normal" day-to-day school operations is inimical to the broad understanding which might make imaginative and profound solutions come to the fore. For many students who experience racism, irrelevance, failure and even brutality in their school encounters, crises and disruptions have been a continuing part of their educational life. But apathetic failure or passive conforming seldom looks like a crisis to the faculty and administration. Only when these frustrations become collective and students escalate or explode the issues in threatening proportions do educational managers see a crisis. Thus, a comprehensive view and treatment of school "crises" necessitate a response to a variety of student, teacher, administrator and community frustrations.

Usually failure and frustration are not recognized until the common
signs of crisis have already appeared--a boycott is underway, a school
is closed or police are brought in, facilities are taken over, or
youngsters and adults have been injured in fighting. By then, emotional
turbulence and polarization of opinion have heightened the prior
feelings of helplessness and fear or anger. Under such conditions it
is hard to do anything but "cool" the crisis and restore order. This
is exactly what is not needed in the long run; it is illusory to
think that issues, energies and passions will then fade away.

It is our conviction that a more useful perspective demands exam-
ination of the situation to locate forces that can be mobilized,
encouraged and organized for meaningful change in school. Our perspective
on school crises is to see them not as threats but as opportunities,
opportunities to acknowledge failure, to take stock, to mobilize new
resources and to begin meaningful although overdue school change pro-
grams. While a crisis often generates panic and repression, skilled
interventions may help create more imaginative responses and effective
changes in schools.

The maintenance of order without recognition of the inevitability
of differences and conflicts is impossible in a complex heterogeneous
institution. Conflicts between various groups in school are natural
and normal; they are an inevitable result of the nature of different
interests, values, group characteristics, etc., and usually represent
differences in group goals and roles. They are also the result of a
school's interaction with a rapidly changing society, and the strains
and pressures that result from such interdependence. Even a well managed
high quality educational organization.can expect differing priorities
and preferences between professionals and lay persons, teachers and
administrators, educators and students, blacks and browns and whites,
college bound students and non-college bound students, etc. Sometimes
groups with differing priorities and conflicts form coalitions and col-
laborate with one another successfully. At other times and places,
and with certain issues, the normal and healthy conflict among such
groups begins to create serious personal or organizational stress.
The inability of different groups and the school organization to accept

and articulate natural conflicts, and the inadequate means for coping with them, leads to system overload and potential breakdown. When established procedures are able no longer to adjudicate different interests or handle strong stress, the system may break down and a state of crisis said to exist. The crisis or breakdown itself is only a symptom of system stress; for healthy organizational change conflicting groups must be aware of each others' demands, and make room for compromises, and must be able to negotiate or unilaterally implement change.

These observations have profound implications for any future change attempts. Many change efforts assume that if organizational members understood each others' needs and could communicate with one another, the problems of inefficiency and satisfaction would be resolved. However, this "consensus" orientation to organizational life fails to deal with important and legitimate differences in group goals. It is falsely assumed that clarity will lead to agreement and to universal dedication to the organization's mission. Since our experience indicates inherent conflict between many organizational groups, we have come to believe that while open communication may be healthy, it does not resolve differences or conflicts. In some cases it may even intensify them. In our view, it is necessary to enable different groups in schools to organize and to express their interests clearly and emphatically, so that they can apply pressure and negotiate with other groups for the betterment of their common life.

The prevailing consensus of good work and satisfaction keeps many managers blind to real dilemmas in their organizations. Thus most school systems, and indeed most social organizations, are not prone to undertake meaningful change without new pressures or obvious conflicts of some sort. In recent years student-generated, minority-led or community-initiated protest and disruption have created substantial movement for change in our public schools. They have also created panic, fear, anger and oppression on the part of some adults, educators and students. Crisis and pressure may contain the seeds for change, but positive change does not necessarily follow; retreat or repression are as likely. Part of our concern is to help students and adults, majority members and minority members, discover how to make

use of their disaffection to inhibit oppression and injustice, to eradicate
racism, and to attain a higher quality educational system.

A response to crises as opportunities for beginning meaningful
educational change may lead to longer range change designs of a funda-
mental character. Buf if crisis in schools is to be seen as an opening
to meaningful educational change then three strategic perspectives
(and attendant models and techniques) should be developed and employed
sequentially. These perspectives are immediate alternatives in crisis,
middle-range strategies for school change and long-range models of
change. Our view of change is that within each time perspective plural
approaches are necessary: different goals, strategies and models are
relevant for different circumstances.

It is crucial that short range alternatives exist to guide pro-
ductive responses in the midst of crisis. Highly charged feelings of
anger and threat, righteousness and terror confound all parties'
intent for school change. Interventions into school crisis should aim
at the stabilization or reduction of escalating tensions so that
attention can be paid to underlying issues. All immediate efforts
must be followed by plans for and progress toward continuing change
and reform. Otherwise, crisis reduction without ongoing change fails
to address continuing problems in school structures and operations.
Interventions in the midst of crisis hold the beginnings of meaningful
change, but all too often such beginnings come to an end with the
reduction of crisis and the press of daily routine. It is essential,
therefore, that post-crisis perspectives, strategies and models of
middle and long range change be developed more fully and implemented
rapidly.

Middle range strategies may have staying power over time and hold
promise for the initiation of fundamental change in schools. The aim
in these strategies is not the de-escalation of tension nor the
initiation of dialogue, but rather the creation or utilization of new
resources and structures. Common examples include workshops and
training sessions that teach new problem-solving skills, techniques
of organizing student and community groups, teacher or administrator
retraining programs, and classroom or organizational substance and pro-
cedures that encourage greater reciprocal influence among all parties

within and without the school. So, too, are measures that may raise the awareness of racism present in students, staff and school operations and that can begin to counter its institutional impact.

Long range strategies are based on images of possible and desirable future models of educational systems. These strategies require fundamental change in schools but they also hold the promise of major increases in educational quality and community growth. Many of these models and strategies are yet to be fully conceptualized and developed, but some important examples follow:

1. New systems of values and organization which eliminate racism in financing, in staff selection and training, in school organization and operation, in curriculum and instruction and in peer interaction.

2. New internal decision-making structures in which students, faculty and local administrators have more direct control over management of their common life. As well, new patterns of external community influence so greater community resources can be available to the school, and vice versa. These innovations also call for retraining participants for their new roles and creating new representational systems.

3. Revision of the secondary school curricula so it may be a positive element in the creation of new learning systems. This demands curricula for the needs of a wider variety of students than are now being effectively served, curricula open to more independent and flexible definition by individual students and faculty, curricula for teaching and learning about realities of race and ethnic relations, for dealing with the politics of school life and students' needs for training in change, and for more effectively linking life inside the school and life outside the school.

4. Development of new roles and the scrapping of some old roles in order that the learning system can be fundamentally alerted. This demands rearranging time and content priorities in order that learners can act as teachers of their peers, that teachers can act as co-learners, and that principals can act as educational leaders, etc.

5. Free schools or "counter" schools which operate outside of the traditional educational structure. By their example these systems can have major impact on typical schools.

The choice of immediate, middle or long range strategies to be used in a particular local situation is impossible to foretell in advance. That decision can best be made by local educators and their clients, perhaps assisted by various consultants. There is no single strategy that is automatically best or preferred.

This is the general diagnosis of current school conditions made by the Educational Change Team. It was our intention to re-examine, refine and further develop this analysis so it eventually could be shared in useful ways with educators and students. Further, we sought to create new resources that could clarify, support or apply alternative change strategies so the broadest possible repertoire could be available in local change efforts. Our designs to accomplish these objectives are discussed in the next chapter.

III. The General Objectives and Design
of a National Facility...

The need to provide new ideas and human resources to school admin-
istrators, students, community members and other parties to school
conflict is crucial. School systems are in vital need of new resources
and expertise that will help them design and implement creative pro-
grams for educational change. The focus of aid to schools needs to be
on changing underlying conditions of school life, not on merely
stabilizing or reducing disruptive circumstances. In this context
it is shortsighted to engage in typical procedures of making new
ideas and resources available only to school administrators; they
are, after all, only one of the several parties in conflict. School
administrators need assistance, but so do faculties, students and
members of the communities. Procedures and legitimacy must be
developed for providing multiple service to these different parties,
sometimes as they collaborate and sometimes as they conflict with
one another.

Beginnings of the Facility

As a result of these views we suggested, in mid-1969, the establish-
ment of a National Facility to provide information and resources relevant to
secondary school crisis and change. The general objectives of the
proposed Facility included:

1. The development of new insights, conceptual
   schemes, theories, hard data and empirical
   generalizations that help us understand
   the basic school conditions that underlie
   the phenomena of unrest and crisis. It is
   important to understand what dissatisfactions
   and grievances relate to wholesale disorder
   and crisis in school. Once developed, such
   information and perspectives can be disseminated
   to all parties involved in the high schools
   and educational policy-making in ways that
   are understandable to each of them.

-11-

2. The development and utilization of responses
to crisis that can help a school move beyond
fire-fighting to the design and implementa-
tion of basic changes. Administrative,
faculty, community, student, police or agency
responses that recognize underlying issues
and promise to deal with them productively
must be shared broadly with various parties.
Schools seeking help in responding creatively
to crisis must be provided the information and
expertise to use new procedures.

3. The development of new forms of schooling that
promise to avoid crisis by truly satisfying
the human and educational needs and goals
of students, and of the educators who serve
them. In order to plan change programs it will
be important to have some models or images of
the goals and directions of preferred and
more viable educational structures, training
programs, curricular thrusts and the like.
At this point it appears that new designs for
school governance and instructional processes
are the most vital priorities.

4. The development and utilization of coherent
and reliable strategies for introducing and
implementing changes dealing with basic
discontent in high schools. School systems
will need assistance in making changes.
Information dissemination is clearly insuf-
ficient as an overall strategy; the human
technology of organizational change requires
a much more complex and situationally relevant
set of tactics. Hence, consultant resources
must be made available to aid school systems
implement new ideas and strategies of organ-
ization and instruction. Help in making long
term change, with new structres built into
or replacing existing structures is especially
essential; otherwise minor short-term alter-
ations fade under the ordinary pressures of work
at hand.

5. In order to provide service to schools new
resources need to be developed and made available.
Persons occupying key educator or student and
community roles will need training, and in some
cases retraining, and so will consultants
providing service to schools.

It is clear that this was a tall order, perhaps too much to take on in a newly developed organization. Even if it could be accomplished we did not assume that the work of a single institution was likely to alter the entire face of American education on these dimensions. We conceived of the Facility's function in some of these areas as direct service, especially as they called for our unique skills in intervention, and research or dissemination. In this capacity we conducted programs with local school systems and community groups. In other areas we felt our role was to "prime the pump," and to feed findings, ideas and strategies into other agencies which had the capability to take on direct service roles with schools. Here we worked with Regional Educational Laboratories, Title IV Centers and National and State Agencies and Associations.

While the Team conceptualized institutional racism as a causative factor underlying high school crisis, we had not at the onset grasped its centrality and power as the major cause of overt unrest. The nature of white supremacy in the society, problems of socio-economic racism within local communities, and the character of institutional racism within schools had not been seen in the beginning as major priorities. Rather, organizational issues of power and conflict, staff training and competencies and student influence roles were seen originally as the dominant factors in unrest.

The Team was originally composed of 13 senior professionals (11 whites and 2 blacks), most of whom had Ph.D.'s in the social sciences or education, and all of whom had a tradition of professional autonomy and independence. Seven of the 13 had been members of the Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge (C.R.U.S.K.) at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research (I.S.R.). The major and growing concerns of these professionals, as they had worked on different but related projects, were focused in secondary schools across the country. As they exchanged experiences and findings from their various projects on school change, they discovered a commonality in their diagnoses of problems and their conceptualizations of change strategies. Over a period of 2 years prior to the USOE program these individuals had formed a core group of

social science investigators and change agents committed to sharing some basic conceptual orientations, to continue building more useable knowledge in this field, and to using resultant implications in action programs.

After preliminary discussions with USOE, a proposal for the establishment of a six months planning phase for the National Facility on High School Unrest was submitted to CRUSK and ISR. However, the academic research orientation and accompanying value biases of many of the key staff members of the Institute precluded conducting the planning and establishment of the National Facility under its auspices.* The major issues in this decision-making process appeared to be: 1) the action-developmental-research emphasis of our proposal vs. the traditional research emphasis within ISR; 2) the value-centric conception of social science built into our work vs. the traditional assumptions of value-neutrality in the social sciences held by ISR; 3) the particular conceptions of conflict and consensus that constituted our theoretical base for diagnosis and change vs. the more widely accepted conceptions of these issues within ISR; and 4) the size of our endeavor and the ISR staff's doubts about our ability to manage it effectively within traditional guidelines. The Institute's priorities and our own clearly were different; just how much variance could be tolerated within a major academic research institution seemed to be the main question. After 2 months of negotiation a decision was made by the ISR not to accept the proposal of the Educational Change Team and the potential contract with the USOE. As a result of further discussions within the University, the entire Educational Change Team was invited by the University's School of Education to pursue the activities outlined in the USOE proposal within that setting.

Events in the Initial 6 Month Planning Period**

The development and operation of a National Facility was conceived of in three major phases: a six month action/planning phase in which

*These issues are discussed in more detail in Chapter V and in forth coming publications.

**A more elaborate report of the design, activities and conclusions of this period are presented in: Final Report: Planning Phase, National Facility to Generate and Implement Information Relevant to Secondary School Crisis and Change. Contract # OEC-0-70-3322. Ann Arbor, Michigan, School of Education, 1971

a clear model for such an operation was to be developed; a second
phase of several years in which the Facility's design and program was
to be implemented; and a final phase in which all the functions of the
Facility were to be diffused to other relevant educational structures,
with the Facility dissolved.

The primary purpose of Phase I, the first six months, was to plan
how a Facility designed to fulfill these objectives could be organized
and should operate, and what events, activities and programs it should
conduct. This planning/developmental phase was not an abstract opera-
tion; a series of field events were conducted to provide vital infor-
mation about the viability of specific programs. The evaluation of
these experiences, the discovery and integration of further relevant
knowledge about basic school conditions and change techniques, and
the reflective consideration of experiences, goals and future designs
were the key inputs into this planning/developmental phase.

During the first six months planning phase the Team quickly
grew from the original 13 members to an interdisciplinary group of
25 social scientists, educators and organizers. Staff members included
University faculty in the departments of sociology, psychology and
education, several former high school teachers and a former principal
of an inner city school, and several former Peace Corps volunteers
and VISTA workers. A number of the staff were experienced educational
consultants with backgrounds in organizational development and change,
ongoing professional development programs for school personnel, and
intervention into high school conflict and crisis.

The Team was concerned about racism and sexism; but not yet fully
aware of its own practices. We were, however, beginning to perceive
the racism issues in our own staff and operations. The senior black
staff members on the Team were in constant contact with a number of power-
ful black and brown educators around the country. The Team's white
leadership often was confronted by the input of these black and brown
scholars and activists outside the Team whose support and collaboration
were vital. It was pointed out that the principal links to funding
agencies were white male professionals; that there were 11 white and
2 black senior staff members on the Team; and that white consultants

were being used to train powerful and skilled black educators in the
South. It became obvious that the Team not only needed more black
and brown input into its conceptualization of school crisis and
change, but that it was practicing white racism in its own ignorance
and habitual ways of going about its work.

The management of the Facility was concerned from the beginning
with the integration of the human resources, monetary resources and
professional activities of its own organization. In achieving this
integration it was concerned with budgetary control, the human welfare
and needs of members, and quality control. Of equal concern were the
needs for growth in the organization's capability to understand and
bring about educational change. One of the achievements of the
Facility's six-month planning phase was the development and testing
of the capability to make "hard-nosed" decisions with regard to these
personal, professional and organizational matters.

The governance of the organization was achieved through the
operation of a policy board, management group and decentralized
administration. The policy board established the general operational
guidelines within which the management group and sub-units functioned.
This board was composed originally of all senior professional staff.
After the 6 month planning period the board provided better representa-
tion and more complete integration by including representatives from
junior staff and clerical staff roles. The management group had
responsibility for the coordination and integration of the day to
day operations of the Facility. Various staff members were held
responsible for the conduct of each event, and they administered por-
tions of the program with the management group's supervision.

The major activities of the Facility during the first six months
were designed to test certain ideas about school research, diagnosis
and change, to render some operational service, and to gather inputs
for planning later programs. In addition, we wished to assess our
staff skills and organizational structures, with a view toward
making better personnel and managerial decisions. Consistent with
these goals, and with the broader objectives of the Facility, the

following preliminary events were undertaken.*

1. Dissemination of diagnostic research,
    policy alternatives and skills relevant to
    conditions of school conflict and crisis,
    responses to crisis, and planning for edu-
    cational change. One major mechanism was a
    series of 3 regional dissemination/training
    conferences designed to inform and prepare
    educators, students, community and agency
    personnel for work on these issues. Each
    of these events was co-sponsored or co-organized
    by a major educational agency. (See items
    3, 7 and 11 in Figure 1). A second mechanism
    was a series of policy briefing conferences
    for key educational administrators. (See
    items 5 and 9) A third procedure was to
    attend conferences staged and sponsored by
    other agencies such as NEA, ASCD, Constitutional
    Rights Foundation, U.S. Office of Education,
    etc. The general reactions to these events
    indicated that educators felt our ideas were
    valuable, exciting and relevant. Our partici-
    pation convinced us, however, that large
    conference formats were draining and inflam-
    matory environs for dissemination, and not
    especially useful for the later implementation
    of ideas.

2. Dissemination and aid in the direct implementa-
    tion of educational changes relevant to these
    ideas in a selected school system. In
    attempting to begin long-range change pro-
    grams, we began testing the conditions for
    direct service and research in the Seattle
    Public School System. This start-up activity
    involved about 100 participants, including
    teachers, students, administrators and com-
    munity representatives from three schools.
    (See item 8 in Figure 1) We were assisted
    by funds and personnel from the Washington
    Education Association, the Northwest Regional
    Education Laboratory and the Seattle School
    System. The immediate effects on the three
    schools did seem considerable: they were
    able to highlight and better define their own
    problems; they laid plans for certain important
    changes, and they began to organize themselves

*These events have been summarized in greater detail in Bryant, B.
"Summary of events sponsored during the developmental phase of a National
Facility on High School Unrest." Ann Arbor, Educational Change Team,
1970.

for internal school change. We were also pleased
by the positive potential of multi-agency
collaboration.

3. A critical element in our original ideas for
    the National Facility was the development
    of a plan for a national network of consultants
    who could respond to schools' calls for assis-
    tance. During the six months planning effort
    we were involved in two efforts related to the
    establishment of such a Network: 1) running
    a series of conferences whose major focus was
    on the screening, training and potential selec-
    tion of consultants; and 2) the creation of
    a plan for the development of a Network. Each
    of several consultant preparation conferences
    was held prior to a dissemination conference
    so that we could not only train the consultants
    but also evaluate their work in the conference
    directly following. These efforts enabled us to
    select some network members as well as to test
    designs for the training of consultants. The
    first plan for the network emerged from the
    joint efforts of our staff, the aforementioned
    conferences, and consultations with a number
    of leading scholars and practitioners in
    the area of organizational change.

4. Retrieval Conferences were held where we col-
    lected and shared knowledge about secondary
    school crises and governance systems. The
    first was an in-house conference in which our
    staff discussed intensively the issues involved
    in school change as well as the plans for the
    first six months operation of the Facility. A
    crisis retrieval conference was held where
    scholars and practitioners from a variety of
    backgrounds engaged in dialogue on the themes
    and strategies involved in conflict, crisis
    and crisis utilization for quality educational
    change. A governance retrieval conference then
    brought together consultants and innovative
    educators from a variety of experimental
    schools to focus on new models of decision-
    making and organizational structures in
    secondary schools. (See items 1, 4, and 12
    in Figure 1) The insights and knowledge gained
    from these conferences enabled us to concep-
    tualize better our field operations as well
    as to lay the ground work for the retrieval
    and development activities proposed for the
    first operational year of the National
    Facility.

FIGURE I

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCES CONDUCTED DURING PLANNING PHASE OF NATIONAL FACILITY: APRIL-SEPTEMBER 1970

Subject	Location and Date	Cooperating Agencies	Participants
1. In House Retrieval	Ann Arbor (April)	None	Entire staff of facility
2. Consultant Preparation for DT #1	Ann Arbor (May 13-14)	Wayne County Intermediate School District	High school students and adult consultants (10 people)
3. Dissemination/Training #1 (Midwest)	Detroit (May 15-16)	Great Cities Research Council, Michigan State Department of Education	Local administrators and State Dept. personnel from 8 states and 11 cities in midwest (50 people)
4. Crisis Retrieval	Ann Arbor (June 3-5)	None	National group of experts in race relations, conflict and change in schools (20 people)
5. Citizenship Education Conference of N.Y. State Education Dept.	Glenn Falls, N.Y. (June 11-13)	N.Y. State Education Dept.	Associate Commissioners, Division Directors, Curriculum Specialists, (20 people)
6. Change Agent Workshop (consultant preparation for DT #2) Follow-up in August	Seattle (June 11-13)	Washington Education Assoc. Seattle Public Schools, Northwest Regional Education Lab.	Administrators, teachers, high school students from Seattle (20 people)
7. Dissemination/Training #2 (Northwest)	Seattle (June 14-16)	NWREL	Community organizers, administrators students, community members from 3 N.W. states (20 people)
8. System Training	Seattle (June 18-21)	W.E.A., Seattle Public Schools, NWREL	H.S. students, teachers, administrators, central office staff, community people from 3 high schools (50 people)
9. Policy Briefing	Wash., D.C., etc. (August)	USOE, Department of Justice, NEA Officers	Agency leaders
10. Consultant preparation for DT #3	Atlanta (Sept. 10-12)	Title IV Centers of Georgia and Florida	Educators from Georgia and Florida (15 people)
11. Dissemination/Training #3 (Southeast)	Atlanta (Sept. 12-15)	Title IV Centers of Georgia and Florida	Teams from 7 Georgia and 7 Florida high schools (3 students, 3 teachers and 1 principal per team - 100 people)
12. Governance Retrieval	Ann Arbor (Sept. 18-21)	None	National group of educators and students creating or participating in schools which stress student involvement in governance (20 people)

In addition to these events the work of the first 6 months also
included the following activities:

5. Building effective institutional links
   to the USOE and to other educational organ-
   izations and agencies. Through a variety
   of contacts with local, regional and
   national educational agencies, we were
   integrated into an informal national
   dissemination system.

6. Documenting in detail all activities of the
   planning phase. On the basis of conference
   observations, post conference response
   questionnaires and interviews with par-
   ticipants and staff, we were able to record
   and evaluate the above activities. Evalua-
   tions were reviewed by the management group
   and used to assess and exert control over
   the quality of staff performance. Each
   activity was summarized in a report prepared
   for participants and included as part of our
   phase 1 report to USOE. Further, these
   materials have been integrated into other
   writings prepared by the Team.

7. Building a team of applied social scientists
   and educators who could effectively imple-
   ment a three-year plan for the National
   Facility. This involved orientation and
   training of staff, initial development of
   internal governance and management systems,
   and linkage to relevant units in the univer-
   sity.

The program design for the first operational year then was established.

Operational Design for the National Facility

The Facility's plan consisted of three major components: 1)
an action-field component composed of an intervention network of
consultant teams who could respond to schools' requests for assis-
tance (Network on Educational Unrest), and a dissemination apparatus
to inform many groups of the above issues; 2) a retrieval and develop-
ment component which could gather and interpret research and experience
with needed analyses, models and strategies for change; and 3) a
managerial component to provide direction and monitoring as well as
evaluation. It was also considered vital, although funded separately,

to establish a basic research component that could gather and integrate data regarding conditions in schools. Additional developmental activities funded through other sources sought to prepare special training designs for future action needs. Summaries of the plans and accomplishments for all components are presented in Figure 2.

Action-Field Component

The purpose of an intervention network was to provide a national capability to respond to requests for help from schools facing conflict and crisis. The general function was to create groups of skilled consultants who could intervene in the midst of school crisis with resources that could point a system toward constructive changes in working relations, organizational climates and structures, and learning processes. In some cases, we expected consultants to work in schools that had not yet experienced severe crisis, but we anticipated that most requests from schools would come during or after disruptions. In all cases, consultant efforts were to be focused jointly on momentary conflicts and on the underlying roots and causes of the general state of crisis. We were convinced that although the form of entry might vary, the term of relationship would extend over time. One-shot interventions did not seem to hold much promise, and longer term consultations seemed vital.

The design for a Network first called for identifying and screening members of a new class of educational and community change-agents who could work for several parties' interests in quality education. Our plan was to develop regional teams which would include persons with diverse backgrounds, skills and styles. In this way they could help each other and local schools develop and utilize a wide range of strategies for change. It was our expectation that some network members would be skilled in traditional styles of organizational development in schools. Others might come from a history of community organizing and be self-conscious advocates of the needs of minority groups. Still others we hoped would be innovative and powerful members of the educational system who carried with them new ideas and organizational legitimacy. Racial and age mixes, as well as the integration of diverse consultant styles was a key objective for these teams.

FIGURE 2

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EDUCATIONAL CHANGE TEAM: FALL 1970–SPRING 1972

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
USOE		
Network on Educational Unrest	Staff travel to different regions to identify potential consultants.	Trips made.
	Work with 5-10 core consultants to plan training events.	Core consultants (10-15) identified and invited to conferences to help plan Network and training events.
	Utilize heterogeneous mix of "advocates," "architects" and "innovators."	Teams selected in regional areas, and most have a mix of members by race, sex, status and role.
	Interview 30-50 potential trainees.	Assumptions on which training is based clarified and disseminated to team leaders.
	Train 30 trainees. Another major training event. Link core consultants to trainees.	10 training events held throughout the nation training a total of 120 people in 7 regional teams. Thus linkage of core consultants to trainees is continual since some of the former are team leaders. The regional leaders interview and select trainees for these events.
	Operationalize to test the viability of the Network in several regions: referral systems service to schools follow-up regional training	Network staff used in dissemination events. Referral service has been active and regional teams or clusters of consultants have been of direct service to several schools.
	Document racial issues on an interracial consultant staff.	Done through documentation of training events and discussions in conceptual workgroups.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
USOE		
Network on Educational Unrest (continued)		Newsletter mailed to 800 people.
		Brochure mailed to 4,000 people.
		Integrative summaries of training events in draft form.
Dissemination	Policy briefing sessions for influentials.	Small sessions held for several agencies, school systems and groups.
	Staff appearances at agency conferences.	Programs chaired at meetings of NEA, MEA, ASCD, AASSP, AERA. Many local and national conferences attended.
	Follow-up on DT 1, 2, 3.	Continuing contact maintained and visits made to facilitate locally generated change efforts.
	Distribute materials.	Bibliography compiled. Articles prepared and materials list distributed. Over 11,000 pieces mailed out to scientists, educators, lay persons in every region of the nation.
	Document goals and design of events and do follow-up survey of results.	Follow-up questionnaires sent to materials users. Each event documented.
	Locate, assess, negotiate entry to receptive system, and plan and conduct intervention.	Coordinated entry and program in Denver schools. Under separate unit, design and entry also made to Detroit region for work with group involved in community control and teacher retraining.
Retrieval	Retrieve information from schools having innovations.	Survey, with ASCD, of 900 schools.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
USOE		
Retrieval (continued)	Select 8 schools and study them with questionnaires, interviews, visits.	Selected and made extended visits to 6 schools with multiple instruments and plural staff.
	Analyze and synthesize structures.	Study done and book length manuscript completed and ready for publication.
	Comparative analysis of innovative and non-innovative schools.	Some included in above synthesis; other planned in connection with 3rd year of NIMH grant.
	Feed results into NEU. Identify key innovators.	Results and names of key persons shared at NEU training events and in several dissemination events.
	Multi-media documentation.	Some done, some schools wished not to do it.
Workgroup	Documents outlining state of knowledge in organizational change in education.	Group met, linked several organizational units as planned, fed into designs for and interpretation of NEU and Retrieval activities especially. Several informal papers prepared and several formal articles written by staff members as a result of workgroup work. Both in-house and published examples include Chesler-Lohman, Bryant-Crowfoot, Chesler-Guskin, NEU assumptions. Contribute to bibliography as well.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
USOE		
Workgroup (continued)	Retrieval on race relations: in NEU in innovative schools Prepare racism materials for schools.	Race retrieval work done leading to papers for NEU, and appropriate sections of innovative schools' reports, as well as documenting the issues within the Team itself.
Documentation-evaluation	Systematic overview of activities. Retrieve content and process of events.	General overview done of Team. Reports of NEU conferences, dissemination events, etc. have been done within each unit.
	Feed into management.	Used as basis of final report. Used as part of monitoring activities by management.
Management	Budget control and approval.	Tight overall, although some slippage internally in decentralized accounting. Plans for each unit approved before they went too far, and constant monitoring.
	Quality control re: role fit and feed-backing. Human welfare and needs.	Feedback hard, personnel review process hard, too. Constant effort made to achieve balance among staff personal welfare, organizational tasks' needs and University approved procedures.
	Coordinate and integrate daily operations within general guidelines of the Policy Board. Unit interdependence (NEU, Retrieval, Dissemination, Documentation).	Integration made in crucial areas, but not worked well in general.
	Ombudsman	Not done. Policy Board representation system and caucuses seem to deal with issues.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
USOE		
Management (continued)	Staff participate in growth and training events	On several occasions in several ways, both in-house and through outside agencies and conferences.
EXTENSION for training materials	Retrieve materials and write 2 training manuals and 1 resource manual in area of secondary school conflict and change.	Final drafts of all 3 manuals completed and now being reproduced for dissemination.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
Ford		
Simulation		Bibliography prepared on simulation relevant to school conflict and change.
	Develop, refine and test two new simulation exercises.	Two new games designed, field tested, refined and used in NEU and dissemination events.
		Detailed report prepared for Foundation was abstracted in year end report in September, 1971.
System change	Work with local school system as a model site for long-range organizational change.	Re-entry attempted into Ann Arbor system.
		Diagnostic data collected, change effort designed, then local system decided not to go ahead.
	Disseminate designs and evaluations of efforts.	Report of unsuccessful entry made for Foundation and abstracted in year end report in September, 1971.
	Link these efforts to NEU training	Learning use still made of this unsuccessful effort.
Internship program (in 11/71 extended for another year)	Fellowships to support graduate students in training experiences with the Facility. Staff members work with them.	Several internships provided to staff members in 1970-71 who worked in various parts of the ECT: NIMH Research, Retrieval, Dissemination, NEU. Program extended in 1971-72 to several other students working in various units: NIMH, NEU, Dissemination.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency
and unit

Ford

Proposed Program	Accomplishments
Internship program (in 11/71 extended for another year) (continued)	
Link to other programs of an innovative sort at UM and elsewhere.	Liaison and input made to applied social science training programs in School of Education and School of Social Work at UM, and to several programs elsewhere.

Paper being prepared in new ways of training graduate students in applied social sciences. |

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Program	Accomplishments
NIMH Research on Conflict in High Schools	Review literature and develop theory.	Working papers and hypotheses prepared, 1970-71.
	Select schools and arrange for their participation.	Sixteen schools with varying histories of conflict selected and their participation agreed upon, 1970-71.
	Design research instruments.	Questionnaires and interview schedules prepared for students, teachers and administrators, 1970-71.
	Perform quantitative and qualitative field work in schools.	Research teams visited each school for 4 days to gather data, 1970-71.
		Detailed qualitative case studies in each school prepared using interview and observational data, 1970-71.
		Data analysis plan prepared, questions reviewed with regard to missing data and response pattern and descriptive analysis of the relation of students, teachers and administrator developed, 1971-72.
	Provide feedback on data to 16 participating schools.	Printed newsletter prepared for use with all schools as well as specific newsletter for each school. Hall posters prepared to interest students in the feedback, 1971-72.
	Disseminate descriptive findings.	Printed newsletters disseminated to a mailing list of 800 individuals throughout the country who are involved in high school change as community members or professionals. Findings fed into other units' work, 1971-72.

FIGURE 2
(continued)

Funding agency and unit	Proposed Programs	Accomplishments
NIMH Research on Conflict in High Schools (continued)	Collect further quantitative and qualitative data from schools.	Subsample of 10 of original 16 schools selected after review of their situation, new questionnaires and interview schedules prepared for students, teachers and administrators. Research teams visited each school for 3 days to collect data and present feedback, 1971-72.
	Code new data.	Computer files prepared for students, teachers and administrator's quantitative data, 1971-72.
	Analyze data in detail with comparisons of two collection periods.	Funding not available to the project, 1972-73.*
	Prepare reports and articles on the research.	Brief final report prepared, 1971-72. Funding not available for 1972-73 for more elaborate reports.*

*With the termination of USOE funds to the rest of the ECT, the University decided not to renew this NIMH grant for the third year. See final report of Grant RO1 MH18014-01-02.

Once these consultants were identified, and once key people agreed to lead team efforts in regional areas, our design called for training members of these groups and continuing linkage to them during the year. Consultant members of such teams were to be engaged in the following activities:

As referral agents when local educators, students or communities call for help in crisis.

As intervenors and consultants to the partisan groups involved in a school crisis.

As consultants to schools not in crisis but attempting to deal with underlying conflicts to improve education.

As participants at conferences to share issues and suggestions regarding conflict intervention and school change designs.

As linkers to other educational agencies and institutions concerned with school change.

As collaborators at events to disseminate information and skills to agencies, schools, students and parents.

As senior members who train interns or junior network members.

As consultants to the Facility in helping to monitor its activities.

The Network's activities were conceived as spanning a three year period. During the first year the focus was on identifying and training Network members; organizing the Network in each of five national regions to accept referrals from schools requesting help, and to disseminate Facility products or programs; establishing linkages to other relevant centers of educational change; assembling experts and consultants for periodic work conferences; conducting evaluative research on salient issues; and documenting Network activities. The second year was designed to expand the Network by the establishment of regional training centers. In this period the regional teams were to become fully operational in seeking and responding to calls for intervention. Also planned for this phase

were evaluations of the effectiveness of the training programs and of
the consultant interventions and educational changes made as a result
of conflict and crisis intervention. During the third year, the
Facility planned gradually to withdraw its financial and organiza-
tional resources as the Network became a series of autonomous and col-
laborating organizations.

All the component activities of the Facility were to be generating
knowledge, skills and perspectives to feed into several dissemination
mechanisms. We felt that the educational community at large--
practitioners, students, consultants, public and private agency
personnel and community members--needed to be informed about the issues
and potentials for change. The wide dissemination of new perspectives
on school conflict and crisis represented an important priority; it
was felt that relevant information might help induce school change in
advance of serious crises, and provide a wider repertoire of responses
in the midst of a crisis.

Three primary mechanisms were established for sharing and
disseminating the Facility's resources. Policy briefing sessions
for target groups selected on the basis of their capacity to influence
educational policy at various levels provided one mechanism. Some
examples include meetings with the cabinet of a local school system,
officers of a state department of education, leaders of a student
movement, organizers of the black community, heads of a federal or
professional educational agency, senior staff of a Regional Educational
Laboratory, educational media corps of a city or region.

A second avenue was through presentations, demonstrations and
other appearances at conferences convened by educational agencies or
school systems. Meetings of national and regional professional groups,
in-service training days in a local system, and city-wide school
conferences represent examples of these activities.

A third means of dissemination was through the distribution of
written materials. Although written materials alone were not expected
to lead to change we felt they might help prepare the way for other
efforts and even Network interventions. A variety of documents were
to be developed and readied for dissemination upon request. The contents

of these materials included findings from our own and others' past research and action efforts, the results of current research and developmental operations, and our experiences with the Network.

Developmental Component

Our prior work in schools impressed upon us the need for new structures and new curricula for long range change in educational systems. Adequate study has not been made of the great variety of innovative ideas and experiments with new patterns of school governance and new curricular plans. Research that has been done has not been conceptualized adequately to provide scholars and educators with clear new ways of thinking about schools and school change. In order to plan programs to create better schools, it seemed imperative to develop some models or images of the goals and directions of preferred and more viable educational structures, training programs, curricular thrusts and the like.

For these reasons, we felt it imperative that the Facility make efforts at: 1) retrieving and developing models and examples of organizational and instructional innovation that existed in a number of experimental schools throughout the country; 2) conceptualizing organizational change processes in schools; and 3) conceptualizing the processes of racism, racial conflict and change. These developmental efforts were to be used in the Network's events or disseminated through other Facility mechanisms.

In the first year, we proposed to conduct a retrieval operation to examine selected operational innovations in school governance and curriculum as they related to the increased power of students, faculty and community members. We planned to select a limited number of schools attempting exciting innovations in this area, and visit them with an investigative staff. Documentations of these experiments, and details of the social and educational contexts within which they thrived or died, seemed sure to have relevance for other efforts at long range change in school governance and curricular processes. Of particular interest to us was the nature of the school's innovation; the process of its development; the organizational conditions, resources, and

strategies needed for its implementation and maintenance; and the effect of the innovation on participants' feelings about the quality of their education. Information gathered through such retrieval efforts would be fed into various efforts to conceptualize school change processes, and into the dissemination mechanisms noted earlier. They also would be shared with the growing national network of consultants, to be used as models for their own change strategies and goals.

The second major developmental activity was a continuing seminar or workgroup that would focus on conceptual problems or issues in our work. Most particularly, it was to integrate prior literature and our own experiences with regard to organizational change processes and racial conflict and change. A continuing workgroup appeared to be superior to the ad hoc efforts of individual staff members or the overlapping efforts of each sub-unit in retrieving and integrating such a mass of material. Work of this sort is usually bootlegged or moon-lighted in one's spare time in action-oriented organizations, and we designed this particular unit to avoid that possibility and build conceptual development and advance into the normal work roles of several staff members. Organizational change seemed clear as a major strategy in all our change perspectives, and racism and racial relations was seen as a key factor in school unrest and crisis. It seemed these foci would be directly relevant to all the staff, consultants and clients.

Three other developmental activities were undertaken with the assistance of funds from the Ford Foundation. One of these sub-projects was designed to test certain concepts of school change in a particular school system over a substantial period of time. The development and implementation of new management systems, these operating in accord with new principles of participatory management, were to be utilized in a pilot program.

A second effort was designed to create several new training simu-lations that could be used to help persons learn about the dynamics of school crises and the processes of change. Several staff members planned to review the literature on available simulations and the needs for such devices in our own work. The events of the planning phase had

already demonstrated the need for new skills and for new ways of
learning these skills. With this background they would be able to
create new simulations relevant to our diagnoses of school issues and
our needs for training materials. These new simulations would be used
as training devices with Network teams and in direct work with school
systems.

The third additional developmental activity was a program of
internships for graduate students in the general area of applied social
science. Thus, some students would be provided with financial support
to work with and learn about our programs and approaches to social
science and social change. A long range goal of this endeavor was to
begin to develop alternative training programs for social science
professionals, ones that could deal more clearly with the need for
research skills and action skills in creating social change. In the
short run, we planned to form liaisons with and exerted influence on other
graduate programs in this general area throughout the University.

Research Component

It was planned that these field and developmental activities
would be related closely to the major research component involving a
study of 16 high schools experiencing varying degrees of crisis and
conflict. This NIMH-funded study focussed on an organizational analysis
of conditions in schools over time. Among the obvious foci of the
study were: attitudes of students, teachers and principals toward
each other and the school; collective grievances and goals of different
parties; aspects of organizational structure and process; influences of
racism and the role of students in school; predispositions for change.
Further, it was expected that the team's diagnosis and the work group's
ideas would be fed into the planning of this study and that data later
available from the research analys would be utilized by the develop-
mental units and by the Network.

Management and Documentation of the Facility's Activities

Since the Facility was to be located within the University of
Michigan, it was subject to the usual University and USOE priorities
regarding management style and procedures. In order to stay within
these guidelines, to insure a high quality operation, and to retain

our own priority for an organization that shared control with its constituencies and members, we planned the following managerial procedures.

A management team was created and led by two senior staff members, one black, one white, and was to be provided with a support staff. Their role was to be responsible for administrative coordination and supervision of all activities. In addition, they were to provide overall personnel, financial accounting and clerical services. Our prior experience convinced us of the necessity, however costly, of internal accounting and personnel procedures in addition to those provided by University offices. The management team was responsible for approving all financial expenditures, and for insuring that each unit followed its budget allocations. In addition, the management team was responsible for maintaining liaison with the University and the USOE.

The management team planned to establish a group composed of unit leaders, the senior staff members in charge of each of the separate activities described herein. By meeting and sharing information within this group it was hoped the management functions of the Facility could be widely owned and responsibility for them shared throughout the organization.

The management team, and indeed all the unit directors, were responsible to the overall governing body--the Policy Board. Members of each role group within our staff elected their own representatives to that Board--the senior staff of project directors had four representatives, assistant project directors one, assistants in research one and secretaries one. In addition, provision was made for the collectivity of minority members within the Team--The Black Caucus--and the Women's Caucus each to have one elected member if they wished. In our view this combination of status and political interest groupings had the best chance of checking and balancing the interests and priorities generated by different units and by the management team. The functions of this Board were to provide general policy direction for the Facility and the Educational Change Team, to supervise the administrative decisions of the management team, to oversee the general budget, and to hear individual or collective grievances about existing patterns and policies.

It was our view that the tightly coordinated management of a diverse operation of this sort would be a difficult task. Experience and research evidence suggest that scholars require considerable freedom in order to operate at top efficiency. At the same time, an organization devoted to an external social task or mission must operate in a coordinated manner. The management team sought to provide autonomy for varied units while at the same time requiring coordination across units that all obviously were interdependent with one another. Each unit also was required to submit a year long plan which would expand on the USOE proposal to detail the design for their operations. In this way, the management team would monitor and coordinate activities based on each unit's own statement of their plans. In all cases, however, we knew we would have to be aware of the experimental nature of all our activities, and the need to adapt and adjust to uncertainties as they occurred in schools or inside our own organization.

Management dilemmas also could be predicted with regard to problems of guiding and directing an action-research organization whose membership was quite diverse. The racial balance of the Facility staff was of concern, as were questions about what forms and procedures would be required to encourage collaboration among blacks, browns and whites on politically and racially relevant issues and activities. Similarly, the mix of University based scholars and field practitioners could be expected to present problems in interaction among persons having some very different life styles and commitments. All these issues could be seen as especially crucial in light of our interest in working with top flight consultants and activists in the field. Obviously they, too, could be expected to have priorities different from ours. From our point of view these were all important challenges. Without this diverse a staff we could see no way of being tuned to the myriad of issues in school unrest and change. Without working straightforwardly in our own organization on these issues we could not expect to have the experience nor the credentials to be useful to school people. But, the American society has not solved these problems in coordination and collaboration, and no one on our staff expected it would be easy to be innovative and relevant on these matters.

The management team also took responsibility for insuring effective and full documentation and evaluation of all the Facility's activities. Each unit was to prepare systematic documentation of all their events and the evaluation of their activities and events by both participants and staff. Significant parts of these reports were shared internally and disseminated to consultants and to school practitioners. Evaluations of work conducted directly in schools was to be facilitated by related research activities being conducted under the auspices of grants and contracts from NIMH and the Ford Foundation.

The type of documentation and evaluation efforts we envisioned occurring in the Facility included:

1. Documentation of the development of the Network. An important focus was to be on: providing increased knowledge concerning the processes, structures and problems that are involved in servicing emergent educational needs; assisting our own staff in solving operational problems in the Network; and evaluating the progress of the Network's development.

2. Documentation of Team dissemination activities. This was to include reports, descriptions, and assessments of such activities, and documentation of their goals, activities, problems and successes, as well as staff debriefings after major events.

3. The sophisticated evaluation of longer range change programs. As a result of Network or dissemination activities, we might be involved with specific schools or school systems over time. Quantitative and qualitative research methods developed in conjunction with the NIMH project, and other developmental activities, were to be used in this effort.

4. The developmental components of the Facility had built-in documentation and on-going research as part of their activities. In addition, efforts were to continue in the development of multi-media (films, tapes, etc.) documentaries of confrontations, critical issues, interviews of people on key issues, etc., that emerged from Facility activities.

To provide long-range aid in the tasks of Facility documentation and management we planned to conduct a self-study, a research project on our own developing program and process. This study would document and assess the problems and potentials in creating a muti-racial action-research project run along participatory lines. It was hoped that the findings from such a study would be useful to other scholars and activists engaged in similar programs.

IV. Program Outcomes

The objective of changing fundamental conditions in schools led us
to place major emphasis on the development of teams of consultants use-
ful in local educational settings. The theme running through all our
efforts was the implementation of organizational change strategies:
that is, working with the key parties—students, teachers, community
and administrators—in schools to achieve restructuring and redirection
of school practices. This multiple party approach requires the develop-
ment of expertise and manpower legitimate to all these parties; it
also requires considerable skill and knowledge regarding the most
desirable strategies and tactics to be utilized and the specific
objectives to be achieved in a particular school. Given the plurality
in goals and values of the schools we sought to serve, it was especially
important for us to have clarity about values and goals for change.
The goals of the organizational change strategies we used became
increasingly clear during the year; they focussed on the elimination of
racism and the oppression of youth in schools.

Developmental projects and research efforts undertaken during the
year sought to gather strategic information and highlight key issues
in these areas. These activities were designed and timed to provide
input to training events and dissemination programs. Action efforts
likewise were designed to utilize this input in ways that might lead to
better training programs and real change in schools.

Action-Field Work Component
The Network on Educational Unrest[*]

The Network on Educational Unrest (NEU) was designed as a national
system of multi racial consultant teams prepared to respond to school
conflict and crisis. Its basic purpose was to provide local help in
making long term changes in the organizational climates, structures and

---

[*]The Network has also been described in a brochure, Network on Educational
Unrest. Ann Arbor, Michigan, and in an article, "Conflict utilization:
the Educational Change Team in action," Impact, 1972, 1, 41-49.

learning processes of high schools. During this first year the staff of
NEU primarily was involved in selecting key consultant team leaders and
in coordinating their efforts to create and train regional teams. These
local teams, operating under the direction of team leaders, now constitute
the beginning of a national response capability. The Network's regional
teams are ready and have received requests for assistance from school
systems, teachers, students and parents.

When a request for assistance comes to the National Facility it
is discussed on the telephone with the requesting party and then
referred to the regional team closest or having the most appropriate
resources for that specific situation. The regional team director is
then responsible for conducting further diagnoses, preliminary visits,
and whatever financial and contractual arrangements seem most appropriate.
In all cases he has a responsibility to report back the outcomes of the
referral to the Network Director. In some cases the Facility itself
has used general funds as seed monies to permit a regional Team to begin
work in an impoverished system or with a financially strained component
of a school system.

In some cases a regional team has reached out to other Teams for
personnel to help them respond to a specific situation. Thus, the inter-
changes and training events that brought members of different teams
together have had benefits in encouraging wide patterns of national
collaboration. Network centers also have shared and disseminated
information, ideas and programs with educational policy makers, scholarly
groups, educational associations and school systems who feel the need
for improved conditions.

Brochures announcing the Network's resources and availability
were disseminated to a variety of educators, professional groups (AFT, NEA
NASSP) and non-professional groups across the country. This brochure
included information on the goals and objectives of the Network, the
kind of resources available, descriptions of training workshops, and
names and addresses of regional directors. NEU's growing visibility
and consequent requests for service indicate that its program is seen
actually and potentially as helpful to educators and others concerned
about alternatives in school change. Presently seven regional teams
are ready to operate; team leaders are noted below.

Dr. Uvaldo Palomares, Director
Human Development and Training Institute
4455 Twain Avenue, Suite H
San Diego, California 92102
714/283-7144

Mr. Carroll Waymon, President
Institute for Social Systems Engineering
1956 Fifth Avenue
San Diego, California 92102
714/263-4491

Mr. Roberto Lopez, Director
Horizons Unlimited
3001 22nd Street
San Francisco, California 94110
415/285-2171

Mr. Julian Richardson, Director
540 McCallister
San Francisco, California
415/334-0543

Mr. Jesse Sangster, Director
1700 W. 3rd Street
Flint, Michigan 48503
313/766-9584

Dr. Arthur Thomas, Director
Center for the Study of Student Citizenship,
  Rights and Responsibilities
1145 Germantown
Dayton, Ohio 45408
513/223-8228

Mr. Robert Simms, Executive Director
Community Relations Board
903 Metropolitan Justice Building
1351 N.W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida 33125
305/377-7171

Two teams were developed in both San Francisco and San Diego to respond
to the need for both black-led and brown-led interventions in local and
regional schools. In San Diego the black-led team and brown-led team
are attempting to work as one; in San Francisco they are meeting
separately as two teams although they are in contact with one another.
Initial discussions for placement of teams in New York, Chicago, Houston
and Washington were underway when the project was terminated.

All these teams were built upon an existing base of local community or agency resources. As such, they have a credibility and stability beyond that provided by our own work. Team leaders were selected on the basis of their demonstrated skill and experience in school and community change. They, in turn, selected team members who could work together in interracial change efforts. Selection was also based on assessments of individuals' experience with and skills in school change, and some fit between their values and perspectives and the assumptions on which the Network was based.

The Network staff, in conjunction with members of the Facility's Conceptual Workgroup, developed a series of assumptions that summarize our approach to school conflict and change.

> Conflict is a normal part of relations between people of different races and ethnic groups, with different roles, backgrounds, goals, values, access to rewards, etc.

> Conflict has many positive functions for organizations. It does so partly because its use identifies problems, illustrates directions of needed change and requires people who may otherwise ignore each other to deal with one another.

> Schools are run as if conflict were abnormal, evil or non-existant. The suppression or denial of conflict denies the legitimacy of individual and group differences.

> Students and teachers usually have different goals for their activities in school. Even people who share goals often have conflicts over the means to attain these goals.

> When large numbers of students resent and distrust the control mechanisms employed by educational professionals, the effect is to undermine the collective and legitimate authority of the school.

> Students' desires to control their own lives and to influence the behavior of others in order to make their demands heard and implemented are at the root of many protests and school disruptions.

> Institutional racism is a major determinant of failure and crisis in schools.

> White students are socialized and trained in public schools in ways that perpetuate racism in the society. Black and brown students are trained in ways that perpetuate white racism and white control. Institutional racism alienates white students and minority students from each other and from schools.

The political and economic interests of professionals
support both institutional racism and adult control
of youth in schools.

The educational process is the mechanism by which in-
formation, values and power are passed from one gen-
eration to the other, and is structured and operated
in such a way as to select and prepare (socialize)
those from the younger generation who will inherit
and maintain this power.

Poor people and minority people's expression of their
self-interests often are seen as aberrant by white
middle class professionals and managers of social
systems. What is necessary for the survival of poor
people, minority people or the young is often seen as
a threat to the comfort and power of the privileged.

In order for negotiated change to occur, contending
groups must have equal power; if not legitimate power,
then political crunch. A group cannot compromise
unless it has something to give up.

Schools are a reflection of community priorities,
problems and concerns. For schools to change in
major ways require major changes in parts of the
community or between the school and the community.

These assumptions were constantly discussed and reviewed during the
year. The list was constantly checked with actual experience--our
own and others, with recent writings about schools and school change,
with analyses of institutional racism, with recent research reports,
and with people working directly with schools and communities on
issues of conflict and change. People who seriously disagreed with
large portions of this list often seemed to us to be defensive
about schools as they are, denying the fundamental nature of racism
and oppression in schools, and unclear about goals for change. Not
everyone working in the Network, or in all the regional teams, agreed
with every statement. But these assumptions did provide a general
conceptual framework within which all agreed to work.

In all attempts to recruit and organize regional teams, and in
all training events and orientation conferences with regional teams,
we shared this list and invited comments and discussion. In addition,
regional training events usually included conceptually oriented
sessions which stressed the use of theory and research in planning
change strategies. These events also included skill building sessions,

where participants saw, felt and practiced intervention strategies and tactics. Brief descriptions of training programs NEU conducted with two regional teams are described below.

San Francisco

The first training session for the San Francisco regional
team led by Roberto Lopez was held in San Mateo, Califor-
nia. Our central goals were to introduce and orient
participants to the purpose of the NEU, and to our per-
spectives on and strategies for school conflict and change.
The participants comprised Latin Americans, Chicanos and
poor whites from the Mission area of San Francisco. Eight
were adults and 5 were currently high school students.
These people were all selected for NEU by Roberto Lopez,
director of Horizons Unlimited, a community project working
with students in the Mission area combating drug abuse,
high school dropouts and other community problems. Thus
the participants already had had some experience working
together, and many of the difficult problems of melding
a tightly knit team had been dealt with. Four NEU
staff members led the training, assisted by three con-
sultants from the San Francisco area: Mario Obledo,
Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF);
Marcus Foster, superintendent of Oakland, California
public schools; David Sanchez, San Francisco Board of
Education.

The conference opened with a general introduction of
the staff and participants and with an orientation to
the Network's purpose and activities. This was followed
by a film, "Education and the Mexican-American," which
provided a common framework for the conference. The
film dealt with an actual crisis situation that took place
in the Los Angeles schools, where Chicano students walked
out over conflict with the administration. The next day
the NEU staff led a series of sessions involving simulated
high school crises. Participants played roles of students,
teachers, parents, administrators and the local press
corps. The way the simulation was designed and played
caused many of the dynamics of protest and crisis to be
highlighted. Several participants were asked to play
the role of consultant in this crisis situation. Prob-
lems of client identification and loyalty (to the prin-
cipal, to the faculty, to the students, to which stu-
dents among all students), of strategy (to walk out,
to present grievances, to negotiate, to trust or not
trust faculty), of one's own values and style (is this
what they want or I want--who decides) were all dramatized
and later discussed. In a later situation; the NEU
staff participated in a structured role playing scene
designed to illustrate some of the issues in making entry
into a school system and in establishing an understanding
and a contract for work to be done.

On the last day of the training conference several
conceptual sessions were held. Dr. Bunyan Bryant,
director of NEU, conducted a session on "Crisis, Con-
flict and Power." He spoke about specific concepts of
crisis, conflict and power and the roles they play in
bringing out basic and underlying issues in schools.

key point was that NEU, through understanding and
using tension and power, can effect positive changes in
educational systems. Mark Chesler then discussed aspects
of the political environment of schools. He noted that
business interests, municipal governments and various
professional organizations play a role in deciding school
policies. Any intervention effort must key into these
sources of school policy-making if they are to be
effective in the long run. In another session Mario
Obledo of MALDEF spoke of court cases filed against
several school systems where Chicano students have been
involved. Desegregation and the removal of tracking
systems and biased testing procedures have been their
main goals. Obledo gave NEU possible resources they
might obtain to implement the further training of the
participants in the San Francisco conference. David
Sanchez ended the conference with a talk on the polit-
ical and educational issues involved in desegregation
and busing of students in the San Francisco schools.
He raised issues and suggested strategies especially
pertinent for any change efforts conducted in the
region.

The NEU staff administered a questionnaire at the cul-
mination of the conference to obtain feedback on the
training program. The participants stated they benefited
most from question and answer periods in which fears
and mistrust came out and were dealt with. It was
apparent that they began the conference with many questions
and suspicions about NEU "outsiders." Thus, it was brought
out in the questionnaire that more than half the participants
saw sharing information and describing the Network on
Educational Unrest's (NEU's) concepts as one of the major goals
of the conference. Many were surprised that they could
learn by playing roles and games (simulations). They
also got a clear idea of how NEU functions and the practical
application and relevance of a power-conflict model of
school change. Some stated that in follow-up events there
should be a clearer picture of NEU's long term resources
and plans for resource exchange. Almost everyone felt that
the conference goals had been met and that they looked
forward to another event.

Flint

The Flint regional team members were participants in two
training events, one in Ann Arbor and the second 2 months

later in Flint, Michigan. Since the first conference
had focussed on orienting participants to the Network
and to our diagnosis of schools and school change
efforts, the second aimed more directly at team building,
at providing participants with intervention strategies,
at working on skill development, at providing participants
with an opportunity to apply learned strategies and skills.
The participants of the conferences consisted of a mix
of black-brown-white, male-female, students-adults--
thirteen in all. The regional director for the Flint team
and convenor of the event was Mr. Jesse Sangster, of the
General Motors Institute of Technology. Mr. George Neely
was the principal liaison from NEU.

Mr. Sangster opened the conference by introducing the
staff and leading several exercises that helped team
members get to know each others' values and priorities.
Then he shared the conference design and members added to
and specified their own goals. Norms of openness and
commitment to work together developed throughout the
conference and these contributed to meeting the goals of
team building. One of the most effective techniques used
in the training was a simulation that provided an oppor-
tunity for the development of skills in negotiations.
Different groups had to present the priorities of students
and adults, black and white, in school conflict and then
seek to realize their priorities in a total group setting.
A number of problems in group negotiation (pressing own
goals or accepting larger and embracing goals, developing a
base of power to negotiate from) a variety of needed
skills (in constituency representation, in getting one's
own priorities clear, in knowing how to compromise, in
knowing an opponent's vulnerability) were highlighted in
this manner.

The utilization of various simulation exercises gave par-
ticipants an opportunity to do diagnosis and apply principles
of strategy development. One of the primary learnings was
the need for a type of longitudinal approach to strategy
and diagnosis--what the situation is assessed to be at one
time does not guarantee that the situation will be the same
at another time, thereby necessitating amendments to
strategy. Several conceptual inputs also were made in the
attempt to provide a context and direction for strategies
and tactics. Included in these presentations were ideas
from Lewin's work on force field analyses and from Argyris'
new work on intervention theory.

The conference ended with participants giving and receiving
prescriptive feedback. The purpose of this feedback was
to help identify areas individuals needed to work on in order
to enhance their ability to work in school crisis.

Analysis of participants' responses to post-conference
questionnaires indicated that the skills building practice

>was most helpful. In particular, skills in goal
>setting and organizing negotiations appeared to be
>most highly valued. The participants reported they
>had ample opportunity to share their knowledge with
>others' knowledge. They also reported on the help-
>fulness and importance of becoming a team and learning
>about strategies of multiple party intervention into
>high school crises.

These two examples give some indication of the content and methods of
the training programs for regional teams. Most training events were
intense experiences for the staff and conferees; value searching,
risk taking and testing commitment to change were common experiences
constantly highlighted through simulations and intragroup confronta-
tions. Equally as important was the content of training--the politics
of school change, meanings of conflict and crisis, diagnoses and
strategies for system intervention, court decisions and data about
racism and student rights. We felt, and participants' reports indicate,
that most regional events were helpful in increasing members' skills
and that additional sessions should be forthcoming.

The team training events conducted by NEU involved over 120 people
from varied statuses, occupations and ethnic backgrounds. The NEU
staff conducted one event for some teams, 2 for others; a total of
10 regional training events were held. In addition, a separate event
was held in Michigan for 20 of the white members of these regional
teams. It was the regional directors' judgment, and our own, that
whites often have special problems working in interracial efforts,
and that the issues of racism, white roles in interracial schools,
and white roles on minority controlled teams needed special attention.
In addition to these training events, the regional team directors met
on several occasions to plan activities, learn from each other, and
keep operating as a coherent cooperative Network.

The following charts indicate the numbers of varied people involved
in the 7 regional teams.

Racial Mix of Network

	Dayton	San Diego (2)	San Francisco	San Francisco	Miami	Flint	Total
Black	11	6	30	0	17	7	71
White	5	4	3	5	5	3	25
Brown	0	7	2	8	1	3	21
Oriental			3				3
TOTAL	16	17	38	13	23	13	120

These statistics indicate that regional directors were not in touch with
many whites whom they felt had the commitment and skills to work well
in interracial crisis conditions. Yet the NEU staff and regional direc-
tors knew there were some white consultants who could deal well with the
issues of racism and youth oppression in schools. In addition, there
were white consultants who made their specialized skills available to
the regional teams under certain conditions. Some whites originally
involved on these teams were not utilized immediately, and others in
addition to those noted above gradually connected to regional teams
in ad hoc roles. There was a clear commitment by regional leaders to
locate and utilize more of these persons when their skills seemed
appropriate and necessary.

We also fell short on having sufficient students on the teams,
and were moving to correct this situation before the next series of
regional training events. Obviously it is important to have students
involved in such activities; we found them highly effective in working
with student groups, in providing adult team members with different
perspectives on the issues and in influencing the ways adults related
to students in schools.

Number of Students in Network

	Dayton	San Diego (2)	San Francisco	San Francisco	Miami	Flint	Total
Students	4	0	5	5	0	3	17

Sexual Mix of Network

	Dayton	San Diego (2)	San Francisco	San Francisco	Miami	Flint	Total
Male	11	10	24	6	17	8	76
Female	5	7	14	7	6	5	44
TOTAL	16	17	38	13	23	13	120

On all teams there was usually a role mix as well, with some persons coming from roles inside the educational system and others from outside. Superintendents, principals, teachers, students, paraprofessionals, community workers, parents and local officials were all included in the various teams. This information on the regional teams indicates their heterogeneous quality and their potential accessibility to a wide variety of school parties.

Dissemination

The Dissemination unit was concerned primarily with creating and responding to external requests for information and appearances by staff members. It also provided a general editorial and library service for the staff.

In materials dissemination activities, a standardized procedure was developed for handling requests and, where appropriate, directing requests to other appropriate resources. Over 1,000 requests for our written materials have been handled to date, with a total of approximately 15,000 pieces distributed to serve the needs expressed.* Materials have been sent to persons in every region in the nation, to 38 states, with the vast majority directed to urban areas. Approximately 50% of all requests have been from staff members of universities and education agencies (Regional Laboratories, Desegregation Centers, Research and Development Centers, etc.), 35% from public school personnel (administrators, training officers, curriculum designers, human relations experts and teachers), and 10% from members of student and community groups and agencies. An annotated bibliography was mailed to everyone who requested materials, and follow up efforts attempted to keep people aware of new items. In many cases we also distributed a questionnaire

---

*A partial list of our own writings so disseminated appears on pages 79-80 of this report.

soliciting feedback on the relevance and usefulness of the materials.
The largest reported uses of these items have been for in-service
training programs and staff meetings. Both in terms of the style
and content of our writing, and the available channels of dissemination
utilized, we have not served well community and student portions of
the school population.

In addition to the dissemination of written materials, the staff
also visited and made presentations at meetings with various school
systems and educational or community agencies. In general, such
activities seemed most successful when they were presentations or
training sessions that were used as possible jumping off points for
change activities in a particular system. The main function of such
policy briefings or introductory training sessions was to influence
the policies and attitudes of politically powerful target groups (e.g.,
state superintendents of education and their staffs). In these events
we used the latest findings from retrieval or research studies and
recent experiences of the NEU consultants. Our goals were to catalyze
the school or the system into seriously planning local change programs.
When they appeared ready to take the next step, they were referred to
the appropriate NEU regional team.

In addition to services focussed directly on school systems, we
have made presentations at various meetings of professional educational
associations. Clearly the professions themselves must change if they
are to help schools change, and some effort in this direction must
be made by all concerned. Speeches, discussions and demonstrations
reaching several thousand people were conducted with groups such as:

> American Psychological Association
> American Educational Research Association
> State Education Associations (several)
> Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
> American Association of School Administrators
> National Association of Secondary School Principals

These external appearances indicated that: (1) expert resources
for local change activities are generally quite limited and that NEU
is one of the major such sources available; (2) there exists a great
need to facilitate the delivery of skills to less powerful groups in
a system, such as community and student organizations; (3) in order

for dissemination activities to have sustaining power it is vital that
the target group be focused and that it has an ongoing life and
structure of its own, that sufficient diagnostic work be done prior to
an event so as to best indicate the needs of the target groups, and that
resources be available for follow-up work; (4) in addition to receiving
information and training in system analysis and diagnosis, utilization
of power to combat racism and facilitate change, value clarification,
etc., target groups need knowledge about and understanding of specific
models for innovation that respond to pertinent issues. They require
training in "What to do" as well as "How to do it."*

Developmental Component

One of the key resource problems facing ECT was the lack of good
available materials that bridged scientific thought and school reality,
that connected social research and school change, that denoted the
strategic intelligence useful for local change efforts. Therefore, the
developmental units and activities focused their energies on the
retrieval and creation of such models and materials.

Retrieval

This unit focused on the retrieval and development of innovative
models of high schools relevant to our primary objectives. It was felt that
new configurations of power, ones in which students and/or students and

---

*Attempts to provide materials for such skill training in mass form are
underway in the preparation of several manuals for skill development.
Resources for School Change I: A Manual of Issues and Programs in
Training Educational Change, attempts to provide training in issues and
organizational skills for persons already involved in educational consul-
tation and change efforts. Resources for School Change II: A Guide to
School Administrators focuses on the skills and information needed by
school administrators and other professional personnel concerned about
change in their local system. Finally, Resources for School Change III:
A Manual on Issues and Strategies in Resource Utilization is a guide for
educators and community persons desiring to call upon consultants for
assistance. This volume points out some of the problems involved in
using consultant help in local change efforts, some of the positive
potential thereby, and provides information on various organizations
that can be called upon.

community members shared significantly, could speak to the needs of decreasing the oppression of youth and eliminating racism in schools. In effect, the purpose of this unit was to retrieve operative models of new governance systems which change efforts could attempt to implement. Rather than conjure up idealistic school models or merely accept the journalistic accounts of the success or failure of certain schools, we decided it was critical to study a small sample of highly experimental public and private schools. Particular emphasis was placed on schools not yet popularized.

The schools chosen for investigation were: (1) a large urban multi-racial Seattle public high school, (2) a mini school within a Berkely (California) public high school that is the first of a number of such small schools in that high school, (3) an experimental public school without walls in Chicago, (4) a mini school within a small public high school in Dillington, Massachusetts, (5) a small private urban Milwaukee school, and (6) a small relatively suburban rural private school in Massachusetts. The primary criteria for selecting schools included an operative innovation in governance structure which enabled students to have high degrees of influence or control and/or an operative community-oriented or directed curriculum. These schools were selected from hundreds screened by our staff and associates.

Each school was visited by a four-person staff team that was both interracial and intergenerational in makeup. This staff spent four days in the school and community, interviewing students, staff, parents and administrators. They also visited classrooms and generally observed the school in actual operation. In addition, they administered a research questionnaire to students and faculty that also was being used by the ECT's NIMH-funded research project. The result is an extensive study including aspects of individual schools' experiences and the ways common issues occurred across schools. Brief portions of 3 cases and selected issues from the Retrieval study follow.*

_____

*Extended versions of these descriptions and analyses are planned in articles in varied magazines and in a book to be published in 1973 by Citation Press, New York City.

Metro High School has 350 students, half black, half white,
drawn by lottery from Metropolitan Chicago. There are 21
staff members, of whom approximately 1/3 are black and
Puerto Rican. Most staff are under 30 years old with
highly libertarian or new left perspectives and values
and a deep commitment to the Metro experiment.

Metro is part of the Chicago Public Schools system, but is
financed partially by participating organizations in its
School-Without-Walls structure. The curriculum is heavily
oriented to community need, with a few of the nearly 300
courses taught by Metro staff and many by cooperating agencies
in the city. The flexible curriculum was developed in large
part through students' interests as well as the availability
of resources. The staff places high value on the process
of their relationship with students (warm, relaxed, informal),
and is reluctant to "rock the boat" by imposing rules,
policy and discipline on them. Despite the staff's desire
to reach and motivate all students, the organization of
learning at Metro is quite problemmatic for some students.
Those students who appear to be utilizing Metro's loose
structure to obvious advantage tend to be whites or middle
class blacks who are easily socialized into these innovative
learning patterns.

Metro is committed to shared power but has not yet evolved
a formal structure for achieving it. Neither students nor
staff trust a delegate system, so representative structures
have all failed. Total school meetings for decision-making
also have failed on a continuing basis, except during
various crisis when active and full participation of students
complemented the staff's efforts to deal with the crisis. The
year 1970-71 saw most governance matters in the hands of
the faculty in after-school committee meetings which students
were encouraged to attend, although few did. The principal
attends some of these meetings but leaves a tremendous amount
of the day-to-day governance of the school in the hands of
faculty.

Despite the lack of a formal faculty-student body to govern the
school, Metro students feel they have a great deal of personal
power to get their interests met through courses, activities
and so on. They also feel tremendous trust in the faculty
to make decisions on their behalf because of their warm and
personal relationships. Students see their personal autonomy
as well as the faculty's humanistic values as better guarantees
of shared power than a formal internal governance structure
with a delegate system.

A formal structure is emerging, however, for external governance.
Participating community organizations have formed a not-for-
profit Council to receive and distribute monies directly to
Metro and thereby bypass the city Board of Education. A Policy
Board that is representative of staff, students, parents,

administration and participating organizations has begun to
be the official negotiating agency and liaison with the Board
of Education.   It is accountable directly to the General
Superintendent, rather than to the Central Staff personnel
with whom the principal has to deal with until now.

Milwaukee Independent School is a private school located in a
downtown office building.   It appears to be an informal, relaxed
friendly place, with a tremendous amount of acceptance and
individuality among the 43 students.   White middle class students
started the school and the current staff and student body is all
white.   After applying to attend and after being accepted, students
have to earn $300 ($25 a month); parents are encouraged to
pay $300 additionally.   Seven of the staff share the tuition
receipts (after the rent is paid); three are not paid.

The staff offers courses based on their own interests or on
requests from students.   Other people in Milwaukee, many
from the University of Wisconsin, offer their services for
classes, discussions and apprenticeships which students can
pursue.   There is a list of "minimum expectations" which
suggest that a student do an individual project, take two
group courses, attend the general meetings, have periodic
discussions and progress checks with a staff member.   But
school policy states that people will not be held to this
if they do not choose to.   Evaluation of student progress
is conducted jointly by students and teachers.   The same
mutual feedback process is used in evaluating teachers.
Both academic growth and social relationships are utilized
as criteria for both groups.

MIS was started in February, 1970 by two key students, some
others who planned to quit school and attend MIS and a few
selected adults.   A professional director of the school was
hired, but his adult-oriented values created a student-adult
coalition that forced him from power.   Students plan the
year's activities, hire staff members and select other students
from a waiting list.

Decisions are most often reached through a consensus of the
weekly General Meeting, MIS's key governing mechanism.   This
Meeting is an open forum for student and adult discussions,
disagreements and proposals.   Sometimes, "depending on time
and temperament," a vote is called for and 3/4 of the students
and staff present can pass something.   In 1970 the staff did
not have votes; in 1971 they do.   Small groups meet regularly
to debrief or plan for these weekly meetings, to have personal
discussions and to integrate learning and political activities.

Franklin High School is a multi-racial inner city school in
Seattle. Of 1,550 students, 46% are white; 26% black, 24%
Oriental, 3% Filipino and 1% Native American. There are 90
teachers, including 79% whites, 13% blacks, 5% Orientals,
1 Filipini and 1 Chicano. While it is a comprehensive school,
its curriculum is geared toward academics, since 62% of the
graduates go on to college.

In 1969, participants in various in-service workgroups began
planning to change the school in the direction of a system
of shared power. A year later the Senate was designed, its
constitution was approved and elections were held in the fall
of 1971. The Franklin High School Senate began its work in
February of 1971 and has dealt with the following issues:
1) smoking rules and areas for students and adults; 2)
narcotics agents in the school; 3) extortion; 4) organizing
support for the school levy; 5) planning for a restructured
day; and 6) desegregation by participation in a voluntary
racial transfer program.

Although the Senate does not formally abridge any of the
principal's stated powers, there is an informal working
agreement between him and its members, and he actively
supports the Senate. Yet he can veto any of its decisions.
The Senate has 33 members, including the ex-officio member-
ship of the Principal. Half the remaining members are
students (16) while others include 9 teachers, 5 parents
and 1 representative of the non-certified personnel. The
main sources of information about the Senate's activities
are the school newspaper and the Senate minutes, which are
distributed weekly. Communication is limited, and few members
of the school consider themselves well informed about the
Senate. Many senators are discouraged by their low
visibility to date.

The Senate has encountered little or no resistance after
each decision, and so has not yet tested the extent and
limits of their power. They experienced their start-up
phase as discouraging, but were wrestling with how to
extend participation to a larger and more representative
mix of the school's participants.

All six schools are doing some similar things, yet some very different
plans have been laid and have led to varied outcomes. As noted earlier,
student power or increased student influence was a generating concern
in all cases. Student influence clearly has increased--in some instances
in informal ways and in other instances on a formal level as well.
Community High and Metro are clear examples of increased sense of autonomy
and influence on the part of the students. Sudbury Valley and Dilling-
ton's School in a School provide greater autonomy to students without

related increases in influence. At Franklin the concern was more directly with sharing formal power rather than increasing student autonomy. MIS is the clearest and most advanced example of student control. In general, student power or control seems most advanced in those instances where students played a large part in the initiation of the school. The private schools also appear to have moved further in the direction of formal student control, probably because they have less of the traditional professional control system to wrestle with on a daily basis.

These cases also make it clear that student power cannot be increased markedly in managerial areas without complementary increase of control in academic or professional areas. The context of school is set by academic and professional standards; as long as degrees, grades and behavior are sanctioned by these forces, they control a great part of students' lives. Control over the nature and behavior of the teaching staff is a prime interface between these two arenas of school power and generally highlights just where the power lies. Thus, student power over teachers--to evaluate and hire staff--is a crucial determinant of the ability to equalize power imbalances in schools.

One central aim of student power is to provide students greater control over their own needs and activities in school. As a result of this impetus for autonomy, all schools found themselves struggling to resolve the dilemma of "doing your own thing" versus "sharing with peers" or "working for the good of the collective unit." A genuine individualism of interests was often found, although subgroup or cultural pluralism reflecting collectivities of individual interests was usually lacking. These issues are especially poignant in all new social systems attempting to integrate and serve both individual and collective priorities. Individualism also is important as a key cultural priority among many middle class youth--the main consumers of some of these alternatives. When survival of the collective unit appeared to be at stake, all rallied around and depressed individual priorities; in time of affluence and sustenance for the school, students pressed again their highly individual priorities.

The contrast between individual and collective priorities stresses the further problem of maintaining or creating a pluralistic or anti-racist school. Pluralism always is difficult to create in the midst of

a monolithic culture, but the attempt is worthwhile recording none-
theless. Student and staff populations were all-white at MIS and Sud-
bury Valley, and while the other four schools had racially mixed
students and staffs their curricula and organization did not venture
considerably in a pluralistic or anti-racist direction. White control
predominated: black students had the greatest difficulty working in
the white-oriented Metro school. Some black students at Community High
formed their own tribal unit and left the school to form "Black
House"--a separate black alternative; the program within Community High
simply was not interracial enough to meet the needs of many minority
students--and many white students did not wish to alter their own
priorities. All the interracial schools lacked sufficient black or
other minority staff to create a truly multi-ethnic support system.
Nor did pluralism exist on a social class level within these schools;
middle class values dominated curriculum content, and organization and career
guidance patterns. Because pluralism is difficult within any single
unit, planning across larger units may be required to make plural
alternatives possible--as in the case of Berkeley, where Community
High is one of several system-wide alternatives.

It was difficult for these schools to share formal control be-
cause of some of the dynamics of the innovation process itself.
Despite efforts apparently to the contrary, the persons or groups who
originated the schools generally retained a great deal of power. In
Community High and Dillington's SIAS the founding adults, teachers, still
had primary control; in Sudbury Valley the founder was still the director.
Students joined some teachers in initiating the Senate at Franklin, and
that original group still dominated the scene. The Urban Research
Corporation, parent originator and funding channel of Metro, retained
power beyond the time it planned to, partially because teachers con-
tinued to treat it as the leader. Control rested in students' hands
only at MIS: students started the school and then brought in adults.
Of course all those schools in the public system are ultimately
controlled by that system.

Another dilemma facing many of these schools is their unclarity
about basic goals. For the most part, the hope for a release from op-

pression of youth through new interpersonal and organizational processes
was the spark that led them on. Seldom did other educational or
social goals---a new curriculum, anti-racist education, community reform--
provide the generating impulse. As a result, varied political per-
spectives were present in each school, and at certain times grave
splits arose over matters of central purpose. Splits at that funda-
mental a level sapped schools' strength to be an effective alternative.

Some of these schools quickly were seen as a success by their
constituencies. Moreover, they were useful staging points for admin-
istrators seeking easy ways to deal with deviant students. As a
result, some grew quickly, and grew to rue that rapid growth; the pace
of change generally was not managed well and many participants talk
about the need for slower and better planned growth rates in the
future.

The two private schools clearly had fewest problems interfacing
with the rest of the school system. The four public alternatives
constantly had to hassle their new intergenerational styles, loose
learning systems and credit programs with representatives of the tra-
ditional apparatus. In several cases, students and staff had to endure
resentment and disrespect from the old schools. At the same time,
powerful administrative support from the traditional system was
necessary and forthcoming and helped meet other political resistance
and gain initial legitimacy and protection. As they broke from the
old system, some students and staff expressed and created considerable
alienation and isolation from old patterns and institutions, and some
had subsequent difficulty in maintaining important collaborative links.
In a similar vein, parental involvement was a critical problem; one
whose solution is essential in maintaining the constituency for a
viable alternative to the traditional school operation. Students need
greater home support as they try an innovative educational model, and
each school tried hard to generate that support in collective programs
and individual conferences.

These issues highlight some of the generic problems and opportun-
ities involved in pioneering educational alternatives. Drafts of case
studies or summaries of issues have been utilized at Network training

events and in a variety of dissemination activities. The early thinking
of this group also involved mutual discussions of the variables and
materials used by the research component and the sessions of the
Conceptual Workgroup. Our more complete reports, which deal with
school descriptions of these schools and their issues in greater detail,
will be disseminated more widely.

Conceptual Workgroup

The Conceptual Workgroup concentrated on several key issues that
cut across ECT priorities and activities. Members of the Workgroup
also were members of other units, in most cases unit leaders, and thus
they were in touch with issues from different vantage points. Key
topics were solicited through internal canvassing of both the Workgroup
and other units. The major issues upon which the unit focused most
attention included: (1) institutional racism, (2) professionalism in
education, (3) common assumptions about organizational change, conflict
and change.

The group's typical procedure was to start with discussions of in-
formal working papers in each area--some written internally and some
gathered or reprinted from external scholars. Then, summaries, articles
and bibliographies were developed for further reference and internal
use. As a result, a number of the items disseminated later were developed
in this manner. In addition, the Workgroup helped develop the list of
assumptions guiding NEU training and some of the key variables to be
investigated in the retrieval and research studies.

The existence of the Workgroup helped ease the conceptual crisis
present in most action oriented organizations. Given our heavy involve-
ment in field training events and consultations, the Workgroup played
a vital role in helping to make sense of our experiences and to search
for more fundamental issues and meaning in our work. At the same time,
it helped translate research and developmental efforts into new and
better field designs. Thus, a vital link in the integration of action
and research was forged in the discussions and writings of this group.

Two other important portions of the developmental component were
supported by funds from the Ford Foundation. The Foundation sponsored

units which enhanced and augmented the activities of both the action-field and research components by (1) creating and field testing simulation exercises which were utilized in our field work; and (2) providing scholarships or internships to graduate students being trained in the development of a new curriculum in the applied behavioral sciences.

Simulation Development

The staff of this unit conducted library research on simulation exercises, made contact with other major simulation centers across the nation, and prepared an annotated bibliography of simulation exercises with potential utility for our action work with schools. When a search of the literature indicated no available school simulations with a focus on conflict in areas of major interest, e.g., client-centered consultant relationships and multiparty bargaining as applied to school system role groups, we developed, field-tested and evaluated two new simulations (TAS - Triangles and Squares and BANG - Bargaining and Negotiations Game). Both are now in use in the action work, and several other games have been modified for our special use.

TAS is an exercise highlighting dilemmas of the client-consultant relationship and the needs and dilemmas for the latter in developing an advocacy approach. Field tests conducted with differing populations led to improved versions of the game during the year. Evaluations to date indicate that it is a highly involving exercise which succeeds in sensitizing participants to many of the problems of intervention with complex organizational structures.

The major development phase of BANG has been completed and it, too, is ready for use. Preliminary evaluations indicate that although it is a lengthy exercise (takes 12 to 14 hours to play), it is extremely involving for participants who have learned a great deal about bargaining procedures and techniques, planning and revising strategies, group-on-group power relations and both personal and institutional racism. Further, indications are that the model of serial and bilateral bargaining developed in this simulation has significant potential as a type of multi-party negotiation. The exercise provides an opportunity for bilateral

negotiations to occur between 2 parties and then to occur between another
2 parties and another 2, serially. The evaluations of BANG were carried
out by tests with the staff of our team, in regional NEU training
events at the University of Massachusetts and at San Diego, California,
and in several dissemination events.

Other simulation materials, which include our revised versions
of STAR-POWER, HIGH SCHOOL and SERFDOM have been disseminated through
NEU to Regional Teams for their training operations across the country.*
In addition this unit also filled requests from individuals in
various parts of the country for information about simulation exercises
for training and educational purposes.

Professional/Staff Development Unit

We approached professional development issues out of our commit-
ment to provide more systematic training programs in applied behavioral
science oriented toward graduate students. Clearly there is a need for
skilled professionals who can work with school and community members
in ways that more directly serve the public need. Some of our work in
this area was conducted within NEU; but University graduate programs also
must adopt new procedures and perspectives. The University oriented
training program of the IIT was working toward the following objectives
as they relate to school change;

   (1) creation of plans and guidelines for a graduate and undergrad-
       uate curriculum to develop action and research skills in
       applied behavioral science.

   (2) provision of financial support for several graduate student
       internships within the above framework.

   (3) linkage to and attempts to influence other graduate programs
       in the University of Michigan.

In line with these objectives, stipend funds were utilized directly to
support eight different graduate students over the 2 year period. An
experimental curricula base was established by providing supervised
work programs under senior staff personnel in several Team sub-units.

---

*For further information on these materials, as well as TAS and BANG,
communicate directly with Dr. Anita Lohman or Dr. John Lohman, 1765
Conifer Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Graduate students worked primarily with the network, but also with retrieval and dissemination activities and in several pilot change projects with local communities. These students' experiences also have been used to support innovations in graduate training in several University departments and to begin several new programs. Plans are underway to design new conceptual bases for such curricula, and to generate training programs consistent with this experiential history and these future conceptual developments.

Research Component

The discovery of new knowledge about schools through basic research is clearly an important priority. For an organization such as ours it was a crucial component of effective action-research. We tried to meet this need through a process of retrieval and communication of ideas with other social scientists and through keeping abreast of new developments in the field of educational research. In addition, NIMH funded the Team to conduct a research study directly relevant to the developmental and action components previously discussed.

Longitudinal Study of Crisis and Conflict in High Schools*

This unit studied 17 high schools, in 6 states, which experienced different levels of disturbances: about half of the schools experienced serious crises, the other half experienced tension but not necessarily widespread disorder. The purpose of this study was to investigate systematically a series of variables which emerged from over three years of research and action by Team members. These findings were utilized in various Team activities and have broad relevance for understanding the dynamics of secondary schooling.

The immediate significance of the research project was that it enabled us to determine clearly key aspects of the organizational struc-

*Activities of this unit have been reported in: Facts and Feelings: High School Students, Teachers and Administrators Give Their Opinions. Ann Arbor, High School Research Project, Educational Change Team, 1972. And: Structural and Psychological Factors in High School Conflict. Final Report of National Institutes of Mental Health Project #RO-1-MH-18014-01, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Educational Change Team, 1972.

tures of schools: the relation between conflict and crisis and
school operations, the ways in which students, teachers and administra-
tors perceive and respond to each other and to the organization, the
nature of institutional racism in schools. As we begin to understand
the issues in school social and organizational structures that lead to
the initiation of disturbances, as well as the reactions of students,
teachers and administrators, we should be able to understand better how
to make constructive changes in our high schools.

To provide for the most deliberate and sensitive research on
these issues, the project used a variety of methods of study. Students
and faculty in these schools responded to a colorful and interesting
questionnaire in 1971 and were surveyed again in the spring of 1972.
Each survey was accompanied by personal interviews with a small number
of these persons. Each school also received feedback of the results of
the research to date. This feedback to schools was done in oral and
written form, so that it reached all major groups in the school; student,
teacher, parent and administrator.*

There were 3 major uses by the Team of the conceptualization and
data analysis activities of this unit: (1) interpretations of detailed
descriptions of the nature of conflicts and crises in order to enhance
our theory and diagnosis of schools; (2) repackaging of the data so it
could be used in training materials; and (3) dissemination of preliminary
and final products in forms that could be utilized readily by Network
teams attempting to change schools as well as by individuals and community
groups that shared our orientation toward school change.

Management and Governance Component

The governance of the organization proceeded as had been planned
originally, with a departure from the traditional hierarchical form so
common in corporate and academic systems. As suggested in the design,
representation on the Policy Board, the final inhouse decision-making
agency, was obtained from persons of all roles and statuses within the

---

*Facts and Feelings, op. cit., represents feedback across all schools.
In addition, each school received multiple copies of feedback tailored
to their unique data and situation.

organizat:on, including the minority caucus and the women's caucus. The
senior staff maintained more representation than any other status, al-
though this was reduced during the year. At no time during the year did
the senior staff, per se, hold the balance of voting power on the Policy
Board.

The entire programmatic effort of the Team was directed by this
unique organizational structure. The political thrust of this model was
reflected in the role groups' constituencies and especially in the two
caucuses, each of which had representatives on the Policy Board who
were concerned with protecting the interests of their constituencies.
The administrative portion of this model was reflected in the work of
two co-managers directly responsible for all administrative matters.
They were supported by two staff members in charge of the accounting
system and all financial, personnel and administrative details necessary
to function within the University of Michigan.

The principal investigators remained formally accountable for the
Team's activities to the USOE and the relevant portions of the University.
They delegated operational power to make all decisions, however, to
the internal Policy Board, and agreed to be bound by the decisions of
that Board. At no time did any principal investigator renounce his
full personal responsibility for Team procedures or outcomes, although
the decision-making process was in no way theirs to control. The only
other responsible posture would have been to request changes in the form
of the contract, an alternative explicitly rejected both by the Univer-
sity and the USOE.

This governance model proved to be a dynamic, creative force which,
while not without its problems, served to keep the organization more
honest than most and constantly changing and growing. All meetings of
the Policy Board (with the exception of personnel evaluation and salary
review) were open to all members of the organization. When major issues
were being confronted, role groups and caucuses held special meetings to
hash out their positions and inform their representatives of those
positions.

As the year progressed, an enormous amount of work was produced by
the Team. The nine sub-units were all in high gear. New staff were hired,

research was carried out, developmental work proceeded apace, training
and dissemination conferences were conducted across the nation, policy
briefings were held in state agencies, universities, professional
conventions, etc. At the same time the Team experienced the combined
pain and joy of its own growth and the evolution of its goals. We came
to closer grips with the realities of our own institutional racism and
tried to eradicate it from the organization. Our hiring practices under-
went a drastic change; by August, 1971, 25 of the 60 persons who
constituted the membership of the Team, were from black or brown
minorities. The co-managers were an interracial team and the major action
unit (NEU) operated under minority control. The Policy Board approved
a shift in goals with the highest priority placed on the attempt to
eliminate institutional and other forms of racism from high schools.

On several occasions minority consultants were very helpful in
raising issues with the Team. One of the primary events to influence
us in this direction occurred when the Network brought together 20
outstanding black, brown and white educators, organizational theorists,
and school and community change agents. The purpose of this meeting
was to design and implement an intervention network consisting of regional
teams. It became very clear during the conference that these consul-
tants felt the major cause of school unrest was racism and that the
racist nature of our educational institutions not only oppressed
minority group and poor white students, but also the white middle class
students who were being socialized to maintain the system and continue
the tradition of a white supremist society. It also became clear
that the most oppressed truly understood the system best; that those
who had been victimized by it, who had not shared equally in its rewards,
could best diagnose its ills and with clarity provide the leadership
to heal them. The blacks and browns in that conference had the clearest
insight into the national crisis in education, and they were the most
inspired, creative and committed when it came to designing strategies
for change.

Blacks, browns and whites alike at that conference unanimously recom-
mended minority leadership and control of the Field Action Component
both at the regional and the Ann Arbor level. Black and white ECT staff

who were conveners of the conference and who also participated, concurred.
After the conference, the ECT Policy Board unanimously approved a reso-
lution to that effect. The approval of that policy signalled much
greater efforts, within our staff relations as well as in our work, to
focus on the eradication of racism. But public commitment to these
goals did not necessarily create a new reality inside the organization.
The Policy Board and the management team constantly exerted leadership
in moving to new staffing patterns, new definitions of work, etc.,
but resistance continued to occur among some members of the organiza-
tion. Some progress was made, much more needed to be made.

Self Study

One unit in the organization had the explicit task of documenting
the development of the organization itself. We felt such study was
extremely important for a number of reasons:

(1) we were continuously changing at a very rapid pace and
needed some clear notions about how our recent past
related to present work;

(2) our organization represented a relatively unique attempt to
meld different tasks and models into one organizational
form. By documenting our effort we hoped we could be helpful
to others attempting similar work.

The major foci of this self-study were the evolution of our decision-
making structure, the relationship between the internal decision-making
structure and external colleagues and clientele, the types of formal
and informal conflict resolution that enabled the organization to survive,
and the relationship between our own organizational conflicts and the
organizational change work we were doing in the high schools.

The interracial staff of this unit had access to all meetings and
caucuses, as well as all written materials, memoranda and meeting minutes.
In addition, they conducted an interview study of the staff's attitudes
on the above issues. Through their work we were able to document the
successes and failures that contributed both to our survival and our
demise, and that may make it possible for others to learn from our
experience. The report of this unit has been organized around several
major themes and is integrated into other reflections and perspectives
in section V.

V. Major Issues

The experience of the ECT has provided members with some insight
into issues involved in building new organizations designed to bring
both intellectual resources and action skills to bear on major social
problems. ECT's approach was to involve itself with, not to avoid,
the many conflicting forces that create the context within which social
problems occur. Traditional academic organizations, even those that
concern themselves with research and analysis of social problems and
social change, do so from a distance. They seldom became directly
involved through their internal structures and processes with the issues
faced in the field. By choosing a different path we encountered the
problems of racism and racial coalitions, shared power and participatory
governance, a wholistic approach implemented by autonomous units needing
integration, action efforts and research endeavors, large scale opera-
tions and a value centric basis of membership.

It was our initial desire to create an organization to facilitate
social and educational change which itself could incorporate meaningful
and effective relationships and structures responsive to those forces
which determined the broader issues. Our organization tried to include
innovative structures and practices relevant to those same forces
which threaten to destroy the educational system. The social problems
then became the internal problems of the organization as well as the
external problems it sought to change. Perhaps a brief sharing of
some of the major issues confronted in this process will be helpful to
colleagues and to other organizations already involved in or planning
similar efforts.

Participatory Governance

Most organizational governance structures are hierarchical in
nature. Leadership styles and management practices may vary, but basic
governance structures usually provide for a vertical chain of command
with final decision-making power held by one person in a central or key
position. It seldom matters that the key person or persons responsible

may have limited knowledge of the issues involved in a major decision, or limited concerns about the consequences for a variety of others of the action taken. Participation in and control of major decisions are not necessarily in the hands of the members most qualified or concerned, but in the hands of those at the top of the hierarchy. This organizational pattern is no less true of universities and educational institutions than of any industrial or governmental system.

However, when organizations have highly and overtly value-centric goals incongruent with the societal majority, these traditional forms are unlikely to be effective. When key individuals differ and often conflict in their backgrounds, races, self interests, resources and skills, other means for governance must be found. The integration of such diversity is crucial to a highly coordinated and effective working team and the achievement of organizational goals. Clearly the moral and strategic imperative of our organization--the nature of the work on race and power in schools and the need to integrate and utilize diverse resources to pursue this work--mandated creative experimentation with participation and governance. We are convinced similar mandates will occur for other mission-oriented organizations related to social movements for change and made up of creative and committed scholars and/or activists. The old ways of hierarchical structure and stratified distributions of power are being challenged--not just in high schools, but in universities and communities and other organizations as well.

The ECT had a number of concerns such as the above in mind as it began to experiment with a different governance model. Some of these concerns were: (a) to create a dynamic and evolving organization capable of changing itself to meet the evolving requirements of its work; (b) to be organizationally responsible and effective in meeting legitimate external demands of funding groups and diverse client groups; (c) to provide for continued professional development of its members according to their interests and the organization's needs; (d) to create an organizational climate that was humane and professionally rewarding to its membership and which would result in members' commitment to the organization and its work; (e) to create an organization which could integrate the diverse backgrounds and skills of its members in service of very specific, concrete goals.

It is clear that the ECT did not attain all these objectives. We were constantly confronted with the need to find a balance between various polarities. Some of the major issues around influence and governance that we often found ourselves confronting were:

(a) unit autonomy and freedom versus coordination and quality control across units.

(b) democratic participation in decision-making and creatively utilizing conflict versus time constraints and other work pressures. An open influence structure encouraged the surfacing of issues, sometimes in the form of escalated interest group representation. Thus, participatory governance tended to create overload and we had to find ways to reduce it. In essence, we experienced difficulty confronting internal political issues without threatening to destroy our ability to fulfill overall objectives.

(c) policy making with high participation versus administration with more limited participation and established parameters. A continual issue in ECT was the boundaries of decisional areas and organizational locations for high participation. In some areas of the organization there was low member participation in decision-making and these areas could be seen as the products of either organizational necessity or of controlling elites.

(d) encouraging team members to think and behave in an organizational context versus supporting members to seek individual growth and satisfaction. The opportunity for participation in decisions, with its attendant opportunity for the expression of individual values and goals, provided the potential for the expenditure of time and energy in pursuit of tasks unrelated or peripherally related to the organizational mission. This dilemma was heightened by changing values of the organization and of members, and by diverse initial selection procedures.

(e) action on the basis of close interpersonal bonds versus responding to organizational roles and performance. The senior staff became socially quite close and networks of personal relations had varied impacts on political issues and coalitions. Further, problems arose regarding the difficulty of giving negative performance feedback to colleagues who were also close friends.

(f) task fulfillment versus effective interface with University and agency associates. Throughout our work, its very definition, as well as our internal organization, alienated us from major institutions with which we were required to interact and be dependent upon. In many cases we found our internal dilemmas multiplied by the problems of such institutional interface. Few external colleagues seemed to

care about or support our organizational innovations,
and some deliberately sought to ignore or frustrate
this operational mode.

All organizations probably experience these dilemmas: some try to focus
on them explicitly, others do not.

Anti-Racism and Minority Leadership*

The issues that developed in relation to racism and minority leader-
ship in our organization were many and difficult. As it is in schools,
this was the most difficult and least known set of problems we had to
confront. As we have stated, minority-majority shared leadership
operated only through the last stages of the project. Minority control
of the action network was deemed crucial and implemented earlier. Some
of the major issues that developed and demanded constant problem solving
included: discovering white racist behavior and organizational struc-
tures and changing them; utilizing minority and majority resources in
a coalition; and rewarding minority leadership realistically for their
contributions.

A major issue whites needed to face in our work on issues involving
racism was their own racism simply because they grew up and had been
socialized in a white racist society. Whites were the priviledged:
they got the better education, better paying jobs, higher organizational
positions and the lion's share of other rewards the society and univer-
sity had to offer. Most staff members felt their values were diametrically
opposed to racism, but old, often unrealized patterns of self-interested
racist behavior persisted. And such persistantly racist behaviors were
covertly supported and encouraged by institutions such as the University.

The University's standard criteria for job roles did not include
attention to a person's ability to deal with racism in an interracial
situation; neither did typical University performance evaluations and
promotion procedures; and neither did the usual pattern of relating
to organizational leaders. Both with regard to personnel procedures
and general management operations the inexorable workings of the white

_____

*Some of the implications of these issues are dealt with in greater detail
In: Bryant, B. and Crowfoot, J. Central issues in a multi-racial or-
ganization. In R. Terry, Active New Whiteness. Grand Rapids: Eerdman
Press, 1973.

controlled bureaucracies created barriers to our efforts to develop
anti-racist policies and to reward black and brown excellence. Faced with
these institutional patterns, it was especially important that our
white staff recognize they automatically were involved in racist
behaviors and institutional practices. Only then was it possible to
discover, confront and change these behaviors in ourselves and with
client groups.

Whites in subordinate roles on the Team sometimes were uncomfor-
table and unwilling to follow minority leadership and direction.
Whites in leadership positions sometimes had a hard time knowing how to
make their resources and skills available without conflicting with
blacks over power. Their own needs for leadership and control often
got in the way. Some whites withdrew too far under these circumstances.
Some levied bitter criticism and sought to sabotage and derogate black
leadership internally. Some tended to become so sensitive to the
issues that they overreacted. The lack of consensus or clarity about
organizational goals around racism made it even more difficult to deduce
coherent anti-racist practices. All of us needed to learn more about
how to make   resources and skills available without trying to take
control to escape, or be overly concerned that we would be seen as
doing so. The ECT also needed to deal better with internal objections
to anti-racism as a priority goal and to minority control as a partial leadership
mode. Our own problems, as well as the University's unpreparedness
and resistance to minority leadership, made these anti-racist efforts
fall far short of our goals.

In none of these arenas of work on anti-racism and minority leader-
ship could ECT's efforts be called a success. But beginning attempts
at shared leadership of the team and minority control of the Network
on Educational Unrest clearly were effective. Included here is a list
of relevant issues that were shared in white caucus meetings and used by
NEU for discussion in a conference of white network members.

1. Letting go of white control - It is assumed that most
   whites in minority-led units or organizations will not
   have formerly worked under minority command. They
   will not know how to relinquish old patterns of major-
   ity dominance.

2. <u>Unfamiliar leadership and decision-making styles</u> -
   Cultural differences exist between leaders of social
   movements and leaders of stable bureaucracies. This
   means that many whites trained in white-controlled
   bureaucracies will encounter unfamiliar leadership
   and decision-making styles which are at least partly
   based on racial differences.

3. <u>Rationale for minority control</u> - An issue in the organ-
   ization's or unit's interaction with the environment
   is the question of why, out of many possible patterns
   of interracial collaboration and coalition, is this one
   being used.

4. <u>Your role, and the use of resources on which it is
   based</u> - In a minority controlled organization there is
   a great potential for ambiguity in roles for whites.
   As the same time, it is assumed that you are in the
   minority led or controlled organization because you
   can contribute to its activities. Since whites are
   not controlling the agenda or plans the use of white
   resources comes under minority control.

5. <u>Interracial relationships</u> - Minority controlled organ-
   izations, like other forms of interracial coalition,
   make possible new kinds of relationships. The
   reality of these relationships often raise dilemmas
   for whites.

6. <u>Support for your work and feelings in a minority led
   or controlled activity</u> - This new situation reverses
   deeply held patterns and gives rise to confusion,
   anxiety, passivity and anger in white people. You may
   be all alone, without friends or other situations that
   help you deal with your new experiences. Relations
   with other whites who are in or understand this
   situation are crucial.

7. <u>The goals and activities of your organization or team
   has a place within the movement for racial justice</u> -
   Your activity is only a part of a large and complex
   movement for racial justice; this context poses some
   dilemmas for whites who want immediate payoff and reward.

<u>Action, Research and Development</u>*

In an organization where social scientists, social change agents
and practitioners are brought together there is always a conflict of

*Some of the implications of these issues are discussed in greater
detail in: Guskin, A., and Chesler, M. Partisan diagnosis of social
problems. In G. Zaltman and B. Schwartz, (eds.), <u>Perspectives on
Social Change</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

priorities around research and development versus field action. The
effort to bring about social change needs research and development
support, not only diagnostic studies of the causes of school unrest and
crisis, but also measures of the effectiveness of specific interven-
tions, training designs, etc., in relation to specific school settings,
populations and issues. At the same time, when schools are in crisis,
when violence occurs, and when calls are coming for help, there is
pressure to shift resources from research and development to the action
effort. The situation often changes so rapidly that last year's
research and development outputs may be obsolete and irrelevant to
this year's crisis.

We tried to balance these needs by engaging in a research and
development program as well as the action program--furthermore, the
Network itself was only in the developmental stage this first year.
Such balance is always difficult. Typically, academic institutions
create knowledge and resources that fail to be implemented; action
agencies often are involved in field programs without the data, tools or
designs to do effective work. In our own case, we may have invested
too much in research and development, particularly in view of the fact
that future funding for action programs was not forthcoming. We
expended time, money and energy to select regional teams and to help
prepare them for action via retrieval and planning and training
conferences. We documented all such efforts and in the process developed
a number of highly effective training designs and procedures. We also
developed intervention strategies for changing high schools, but did not
operationalize them sufficiently to be able to assume their effective-
ness. We also undertook long range research on conflict and change in
high schools. At the end of the project we found ourselves with plenty
of hard data, the products of development work on hand, regional teams
prepared for action, and no funds to proceed with the proposed action.

Action programs and research and development programs need to
progress in a tightly coordinated relationship, feeding and building
upon each other. At times the developmental or research components of
our organization served up new priorities for action. The action
component, especially through its own evolving work in the field,

constantly required new resources and an attendant shift in priorities
from the other units. Coordination and control of this mutual influence
process continued to be difficult but workable. Staff members often
resented having their needs unmet or their priorities shifted. Conflict
between units increased and where this was avoided communication faltered
and coordination was not effective. To the extent that the action
component exerted substantial pressure for new priorities and resources,
the minority control pattern for that unit was resented even more by
some whites elsewhere in the organization. Nevertheless, priorities
were shifted and evolving needs were dealt with throughout the year.

Interface with the institutional base

The history of ECT makes it clear that the institutional base of
an organization like this is of major importance. The academic research
setting of the Institute for Social Research simply did not permit our
work to exist there. The School of Education at the University of Mich-
igan provided much of the needed autonomy that permitted us to be
responsive to our mission. But when internal conflicts threatened the
calm of that relationship the School, too, was more willing to sacrifice
the Team's mission than to deal directly with problems of racism, sexism
and organizational conflict. The broader question, however, is not one
of departmental location; it has to do with the very nature of a
university. Can a politically nervous, financially pressed and academically
constrained university be an appropriate base for an operation such as
ours?

One of the key issues is that of a university's political and academic
commitments. These commitments seldom permit a large institution to
risk itself in politically controversial arenas, arenas that deviate
from accepted professional, managerial and majoritarian white values.
The inadequate financial structure of the university means careful
hoarding of scarce extra funds to assure the fulfullment of traditional
functions and support of senior personnel. In our own case we operated
on contract and grant money, with no promise of future financial support
from the University. Since most of our staff were young, most had no
tenure and worked on the institutional edge of survival. A more senior

Team with a more impressive history within the University, probably
would have been accorded a more receptive environment--surely they
would have been a safer financial and managerial risk. Tenured staff
members would not have had to view funds' problems as matters of
economic survival, the University would have protected them to a greater
extent. The considerable overhead or indirect cost monies made available
to the University by virtue of these contracts went into general funds
accounts and were not usable, according to the University, for temporary
support for our Team. The issue is clear--the University simply was
not prepared to risk itsel·-financially and politically--and young
deviant staff members who have not paid their dues, who have not
demonstrated their trustability in established terms, cannot expect
to find support within the University when times are hard. None of
this should be a surprise. The academy's record and commitments on
these matters are quite clear, despite occasional rhetoric around
innovative and socially reformist programs.

In a number of instances our response to evolving field needs and
our attempt to develop internal innovations were delayed, stymied and
at times defeated by traditional bureaucratic assumptions and normal
institutional racism. For instance, we found it difficult to adequately
reward minority group staff with merited promotions and raises commen-
surate with our view of their contributions. These problems were partly
due to the unique nature of our work and the unique roles of minority
staff in that work, and partly due to the deviant "credentials" of
our minority staff. Minority staff members were checked with an unusual
degree of both anxiety and scrutiny. When majority and minority staff
members disagreed on key matters to University officials it was usually
the minority staff member whose veracity was questioned. When majority
and minority staff members both presented themselves in key situations,
it was the majority staff member who was listened to and responded to.
Clearly, this state of affairs made it even more difficult to share
internal control across interracial lines.

It was also difficult to find innovative and professionally sup-
portive accounting and management systems when things got tight. Once
again, our unique work and needs made for some "bad fits." Other exper-
iences of this sort created mistrust and irritation, embarrassment, low

morale and lost human resources. Clearly some University actions
indicated an unwillingness to accept the recommendations of the
project administrators at face value. In some ways this was an exten-
sion of the non-trust invested in a young management group; in other
ways it was a reflection of the University's discomfiture with a minority
oriented program of social action; it was the antithesis of the request
for a clear administrative leader who would exercise and accept respon-
sibility. At the same time, our own style and priorities undoubtedly
created problems for colleagues and/or service staff at the University.

We do not suspect the University of Michigan to be very unique in
these regards. Colleagues attempting similar efforts elsewhere have
reported similar strains with universities. If universities in general
are not the appropriate bases for such operations, where else should
they be quartered?

Funding Implications

How does an organization such as ECT assure itself of adequate
funding without total dependency on the funding system? Funding sources
are prone to set conditions for funding in order to protect themselves
from ineffective work, unfavorable publicity and political attacks. In
our own case it seemed clear that as our work became increasingly
difficult technically and controversial politically, we eroded the base
of support for our program within DHEW. As new officials moved in and
out of Washington apparent priorities changed within the federal bureau-
cracy. The direct focus upon racism and youth oppression, and necessary
concerns for minority control and participatory management, nowhere
reflected even the rhetoric, let alone the intent, of official USOE
policy. In addition, a variety of disagreements on the technical
criteria to be used to evaluate a program of this sort, coupled with
concerns about our internal operating structures, made the problems of
funds continuation very delicate.

Funding agencies have the power to initiate funds for a proposed
multi-year program and then delay or cut off further funds. The con-
stant uncertainty was debilitating and destructive for a large project
otherwise unsupported, and our field commitments required guarantees

-68-

simply not forthcoming. Moreover, any long term operation like ours
had and will have a difficult time getting or showing positive results
in the middle of its planned life. On the other hand, when money was
coming in, other funding sources often wanted to jump on the band wagon.
Some we accepted and others we rejected, delayed or tried to broker
with other institutions. An organization that accepts large monies
is threatened with too rapid a growth, subsequent overload on its key
resources and a decrease in the quality of its work. The ECT experienced
a full range of these problems.

When an organization involved in fundamental social change operates
effectively on "soft" money its members take high risks. The ever
present threat of next year's funding not being there lowers commitment
and creates anxiety and pressure; the actual cut off creates unemploy-
ment as well as the loss of hopes and morale regarding further work on
change in the future. Perhaps an organization should not attempt to
carry out a meaningful long range program without the positive commit-
ment from its funding source to follow through to completion. Such
commitments seldom are forthcoming, however, and when forthcoming can
never be guaranteed. That certainly doesn't mean don't try. But trying
is highly risky.

How much to try, how much to do

One of the clearest reflections on our own experience is that we
tried to do too much. It is not just that we tried to be relevant to
too many aspects of schools--we felt that was a necessity to stay res-
ponsive to the actual complexity of life in schools. But in addition to
the difficult content of our field component, in addition to the innova-
tive developmental work, and in addition to a major research operation
we experimented with major new internal processes and difficult inter-
faces with parent institutions. As a result, life in ECT was never dull; it was
almost always provocative and exciting. It also was often painful and
tedious, energy draining and frustrating.

Undoubtedly the thrust on anti-racism and minority leadership was
vital to survival in the sense of responding to basic issues in the field
and in interracial work; clearly the innovations in participatory

governance were important; probably the inclusion of a full range of
action, developmental and research activities was efficient; and
obviously doing it at a major traditional university was expedient.
Doing all this at once made each more difficult, seriously affected
our ability to perform our basic mission and contributed along with
the other difficulties described above to the eventual demise of the
organization.

    We tried to do too much. Others, and ourselves, should try
smaller pieces. But it is all necessary. Absolutely necessary.

VI.   Continuing Resources to Aid Change in Schools

We have described a set of assumptions, diagnostic studies, developmental activities and action programs designed by the ECT to be responsive to the current situation in American secondary schooling. We have not tried to respond to the entire range of issues in secondary schools. However, we selected to focus on what we thought were outstanding issues: racism and youth oppression, and the ways these patterns are created and exacerbated by professionalism and patterns of organizational conflict. These issues needed and still need to be dealt with before any lasting change in high schools can be expected.

We have described the history of the ECT and have tried to be forthright about the Team's resources and limitations, and the kind of responses it could make to some of the crises in American secondary education. We also indicated that the ECT will no longer be funded through federal contracts and grants. Thus, as originally constituted, it no longer exists as an effective potential response to the crisis in our schools.

At the same time, it is clear that crises in American secondary education continue. Underlying issues of racism and youth oppression have not been dealt with adequately in the vast majority of school systems. Dropout rates and attendance may vary, drug and gang behaviors may change, incidents of disruption and explosion may disappear temporarily, but the underlying injustices to minority students' skills and goals, and the underlying constraints upon young people's rights and influence continue.

It is crucial that numerous organizations and agencies begin to develop and provide the kinds of resources described in this report. A great deal of aid is needed to help students and to help schools respond more effectively to the problems that diminish the opportunities for students, and in particular minority students, to learn and grow into a more democratic society.

Some Pre-Conditions for Order and Quality in Schools

The resolution of crisis, the creation of orderly behavior and
quality learning in public schools cannot be attained through firm
management, vigorous repression of deviancy or creativity, highly
constraining norms, police or media supervision or the promotion of
rigid rules and regulations. Tight regulations and punishment by
educators or intervention by police officials does not help any student
to learn. Without learning, and without feeling good about learning,
no student reasonably can be expected to be committed to the goals and
processes of school. Without the ability to hold the school accountable
to himself and his peers, no student group can be expected to have faith
in arbitrary school processes. Public order in schools can only be the
outgrowth of youth committed to the goals and processes of school life.
These goals and processes must mirror students' desires, reward their
concern for human dignity, provide them with technical skills and an
understanding of their self and society, and conduct these pursuits in
the midst of an enjoyment of life and leisure. It is essential that we
begin to create in schools these preconditions for order and for quality
education. Without these conditions no order will be obtained in the
schools or the society, no matter how much good will or repressive
force is called into use.

The fundamental alterations required in schools focus, from our
point of view, on the twin issues of racism and youth oppression. It
seems to us that the foci of all attempts to alter schools must include
the advocacy of anti-racist educational structures, procedures, curricula
and training programs. The public and universal character of racism in
American education should no longer need to be documented or argued; it
needs to be changed. Teacher and administrator retraining programs,
the development of new curricula, special attention to the cultural
pluralism of a local community, new financial systems that provide for
equal educational resources, new school structures in which minority
students and parents share in the control of the school, and affirmative
action plans that racially balance staffs are all options crucial to the
development of a coherent program to eradicate racism from American
education.

It is further necessary that schools serve youth more directly on their own terms. In the constant battle between the priorities of young people and the priorities of the society, schools predominantly have taken a position in favor of societal socialization to the detriment of the independent and autonmous needs of young people. The terms of this bargain must be redressed, and the needs of young people as they state them and as they feel they exist must be met more directly. A natural consequence of this redress is for the civil liberties and rights due citizens in any public democracy to be extended to students in schools. As clients of the educational apparatus, students should be exerting greater influence and control over decisions about the conduct of schooling. Certainly this is also true of representatives of the local community served by the school. Inside and out, on curriculum matters and on staff hiring and firing, on budget allocations and on program designs, it is essential to broaden the base of power within the school and to innovate in ways that provide young people with a greater measure of control over and accountability from the social institution designed to serve their needs. As we have indicated, there is no better guarantee that the school will serve students' needs than for students to be involved in deciding how their needs are to be served.

These are not the only priorities in changing schools, but they are to us the master variables. Without their change, we think little of value will happen. Moreover, innovation in the area of anti-racism and youth rights and power will necessarily require alterations in other areas such as teaching and learning. Passive students and dominating teachers, rote learning and constraining classrooms are inconsistent with the liberation of minorities and the exercise of student initiative and control. As these priorities begin to be dominant in the school, the teaching-learning processes will necessarily become more relevant and more reciprocal.

Kinds of Resources Needed for Change*

The clear implications of this report and our experience are at
least three-fold: (1) various public and private agencies must develop
a capacity to respond effectively to the multiple constituencies which
make up the school; (2) existing resources need to be publicized widely
and made available to student and community groups and local educators
before, as well as during, crises; and (3) all persons or groups
involved in providing help and receiving help must plan for the polit-
ical problems of creating change in schools.

Schools operate in general allegiance to the priorities of the
society, and they only can be changed by local and regional alterations
of these financial, ideological and political priorities. School support
is also political--it is laden with values and cannot be neutral. It
is our view that certain kinds of support aimed at realizing the twin
goals of anti-racism and student advocacy are of the highest priority
and should be provided.

The failure of our schools to educate students effectively is
consummate and undeniable. The mythology of the profession states
that this failure simply does not exist, or if it does exist, is either
a temporary abberation or an ongoing reflection of the problems of the
young and the community. Surely this is partly so, and we would not
want to lay all the blame for failure on the harassed shoulders of
overburdened educators. Yet, those educators do operate social struc-
tures that continue to manifest and increase the oppression of minority
people and the oppression of young people.

For most school people the ultimate panaceas for school change are
magic money and a suddenly reformed society. But money alone seems to
change little of the things we are concerned with, and no one can wait
for the new society. What other social conditions and resources may
aid the process of school change?

As the issues and relations among members of the school and between
the school and community become better defined and elaborated, political
and ideological differences can become clarified. Then organizational

---

*One effort to provide written resources of this sort are reflected in
a series of our recent publications: Resources for School Change, Volume
I-III.

structures can be developed wherein issues may be surfaced squarely and accurate assessments made of political strengths. The development and articulation of such political organization represents a resource for school change. Where the organization of school or community or student interests is weak or diffuse, the diversity of individual goals and strategies is likely to make mobilization for action or reaction extremely difficult.

A second resource in the development of new school forms and the advocacy of new policies is trust. Systemic trust requires the assumption that each party's unique interests and desires are legitimate, and that arguments about differences also are legitimate. Such reciprocal trust and respect is not merely a matter of good advertising and cannot be developed very quickly; it is the outgrowth of both good organization and a set of positive working relations over time among people who have agreed to treat each other as peers and have agreed to be interdependent with one another. These relations need to have produced agreed upon outcomes that satisfy all parties.

An effective resource for most poor and/or minority communities and many relatively impotent school groups has been the creation of tension. Although decision-makers may regard tension as an inappropriate and ineffective strategy, it may be most effective for people who feel alienated or otherwise shut out from the centers of decision-making. The resources available to other parties like money, status, interest group organization, or effective political influence may be minimal in student groups or poor communities. When tension itself is disregarded or denied expression it may appear later in the more vigorous form of disruptive power or crisis.

For the advocate of change, effectiveness depends largely on the mobilization of resources that can be translated into new forms of power. Managers utilize power to rule and direct organizations-- industries, schools, classrooms--and people who would change an organization also require power. Organization and tension are not merely valuable to change-agents, they are necessary. With them one can develop the strength of weak factions and bring hidden issues to life so that realistic dialogue can occur. With them one can challenge or threaten

-75-

the strength of strong factions and bring hidden deficits to light.
With them the imbalance of power may be redressed.

If these are needed resources, how do they become available; how
do educators and students find or utilize such resources to aid them in
bringing about change? How do they overcome resistance to change,
and resistance to the development of new resources? Especially in
times of high conflict and tension many educators simply do not have
the skills and abilities to respond in creative ways. Even if they
would prefer to innovate they may find themselves locked in by their
own roles and fears. In order to respond more effectively and utilize
new resources, school administrators will require special preparation
and training, as well as access to key outside assistance. They will
also need more time, energy and courage for planning, organizing and
exerting staff leadership then is usually the norm. Perhaps these
issues can be illustrated more specifically by listing some of the
re-training objectives administrators themselves have suggested:

> I need a guide of court decisions relating to
> school dis ipline and conduct.

> I have weak management skills in the organization
> and use of personnel. I never studied this in
> prer ration for school administration.

> What are the best ways to be honest and realistic
> with all segments of the community, when the
> community is split right down the middle?

> I need help on the best ways to keep a faculty
> informed during an emergency.

> How can I increase student involvement and power
> but at the same time avoid the negative reactions
> that arise from the normal process of frustration?

These are key management skills, and ought to be within the perspective
and talents of any school administrator. But clearly they are not.
And, where is such training available? Certainly not in most schools
of education, themselves the prime training grounds for current managers
of traditional, often oppressive schools. These institutions are
themselves in great need of change and cannot be counted on as sources
of reform for our public schools.

It is clear also that training programs simply are inadequate in
themselves to change the face of secondary education. Well trained

administrators also require the commitment and the freedom to create innovative structures, to liberate their own resources and those of teachers, and to engage the expertise and energy of students and community members. Educators must begin to define their roles in ways that involve a conscious move towards change agentry in schools. It is passive and archaic to define the role of the administrator or teacher as the ongoing manager of the school or classroom. Far more creative is the concept of manager as creator and director of organizational change. This role definition requires special preparation in at least 3 areas: 1) the development of skills in system change agentry; 2) the development of internal systems for educational and political support of needed changes and 3) the development and exercise of considerable risk and courage on the part of the local educator.

The educator who elects to be a strong advocate of school improvement can expect to encounter resistance from forces desiring to maintain the status quo or the priority of their own competing interests. School faculties, portions of the student body, the community, senior administrators and boards of education may all feel adversely affected by needed change. The risks to one's security and tenure are considerable, and an educator who intends to alter or innovate in the face of established traditions cannot afford to be naive about the stakes.

Students and community members also need to define new roles for themselves, roles that press them to influence and advocate change in the school. The passive recipient of service is doomed t receive whatever the professional provides; the active influencer may help determine the nature and quality of services available. Skills and commitments are needed in defining goals and diagnosing educational problems, organizing and mobilizing like-minded individuals in pursuit of these goals, entering into and carrying to completion reprogramming and restructuring of educational organizations, taking high risks and mutually supporting others also taking such risks. Of course, the activity of lay people, of clients, are always suspect and often inadequate from professionals' viewpoints, and it will be more difficult for students and community members to assert a base of legitimate power and challenge and to get the resources necessary to achieve this difficult task.

In addition to the retraining of educators and their clients, it seems to us important to provide skilled consultant help to all parties in schools. One of education's rapidly growing roles is that of consultant to schools, wherein persons trained in human and organizational change make themselves available to aid school change. In many cases educators are quite resistant to these resources and don't wish to employ personnel external to the school system, particularly in times of high conflict within the school. At the same time, many educators feel they generally cannot handle a crisis without some kind of help.

There are many issues to be dealt with in the use of consultants external to the school system. There is no guarantee that a consultant can be depended upon to provide the kinds of resources that the local system needs. Many consultants see themselves as educational professionals. Thus they usually owe allegiance to the person, pocketbook, and perspective of other professionals, seldom to students and community people, and even less often to minority people. Some consultants, however, can make a diagnosis of the system and analyze needed changes in ways that lead them to work directly as a facilitator or advocate of community or student interests. In all cases consultants should be utilized who know the issues in racism and youth oppression, and who are prepared to advocate their eradication. No mere technical overlay of managerial consultation or teacher retraining should distract schools, students, or community members from these twin arenas of needed change.

The decision to utilize a consultant, and the agreement upon the conditions of his entry into the system is a crucial determinant of future flexibility and success in helping to create change in troubled school situations. In most cases the educator or student group seeking help should define their goals and relationships prior to a consultant's entry. Then they will know how to select the right consultant for themselves, and a consultant can decide with whom he wants to work. Moreover, it makes strategic decisions clearer; if the consultant feels that being called into a situation by a school board will alienate him from other parties he needs to work with in a crisis, he can try to gain entry through a different part of the system. No matter how the

entry begins, our own experience stresses the need for a variety of
links into the system—with the news media, faculty, parents of students
and students themselves—if consultants are to be at all effective.
In our own work we have tried to use teams composed of people who can
work with various groups in a school system.

Another issue lies in the potential danger that local systems will
become dependent upon the resources of external consultants and fail
to create new resources in their internal operations. Any attempt by
consultants ought to be very sensitive to the need to build ongoing
resources internally. This brings us back to the issue of professional
educators and student clients seeing roles for themselves as change
agents. Ultimately, that is where the ongoing resources for change
must be found or created.

Local schools, state departments of education, regional and national
offices of USOE-DHEW, Regional Educational Laboratories, Research
and Development Centers and Desegregation Centers are all potential
sources of consultant help and expert resources for change. Very often
these systems fail to share the educational analyses and political
priorities specified in this report. It is our feeling these
institutions would serve schools even better if they could incorporate
such skills and perspectives into their own programs.

The job of creating school change in the interest of minority
people and students is vast. It will require the energies of people
in many roles, and the resources of many agencies, foundations, or organ-
izations which have the vision and commitment to depart from merely
repairing the status quo. For while the best kinds of changes may be
unknown, and the best models for the future unsure, it is clear the
status quo is already obsolete.

Relevant Publications Available by or From ECT

Assumptions for regional workshops. Ann Arbor: Network on Educational
Unrest, Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1971.

Central issues in a multi-racial organization. In a book by Robert
Terry (ed.), Active New Whiteness. Grand Rapids, Michigan:
Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1973.

Changing schools through student advocacy. In Schmuck and Miles (eds.),
Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press
Books, 1971, 185-212.

Contemporary school crisis: a diagnosis. Ann Arbor: Educational Change
Team, University of Michigan, 1971.

Facts and Feelings: High School Students, Teachers and Administrators
Give Their Opinions. High School Research Project, Educational
Change Team, University of Michigan, 1972.

Integrating the races in your school: five roles you must play. High
School Principal's Service - Operational Briefing. Croft Educational
Services, Inc., 1970, September.

Interracial and intergenerational conflict in secondary schools. Ann
Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1970.

Intervention in high school crises: consultant roles. Ann Arbor:
Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan September, 1970.

Network on Educational Unrest. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team,
the University of Michigan, 1971.

NEU Newsletter. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of
Michigan, Editions 1 and 2, 1971.

Partisan diagnosis of social problems. In G. Zaltman and R. Schwartz,
(eds.), Perspectives on Social Change. New York: John Wiley and
Sons, 1972.

Problems and potentials of innovative governance structures in secondary
schools. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of
Michigan, 1971.

Resources for School Change I: A Manual of Issues and Programs in
Training Educational Change-Agents. Ann Arbor: Educational
Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1972.

Resources for School Change II: A Guide to School Administrators. Ann
Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1972.

Bibliography of School Conflict and Change

This bibliography is not exhaustive, but it indicates
what are in our view the best available materials
relevant to our work. The general areas covered
include: school organization, institutional racism,
youth oppression, organizational conflict, crisis
and disruption, social and educational change, and
alternatives to current systems of education.

Organization of School

Becker, H. The teacher in the authority system of the public school. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1953, 27, 128-141.

Benne, K. Authority in education. Harvard Ed.__:ional Review, 1970, 90, 385-410.

Bennis, W. A funny thing happened on the way to the future. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 595-608.

Bidwell, C. The school as a formal organization. In J. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Bryant, B. Intergroup conflict and the instructional process in seven secondary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.

Calhoun, L. New York: schools and power--whose? Integrated Education, 1968, November.

Campbell, A. Who governs the schools? Saturday Review, 1968, December 21, 50-52+.

Chesler, M. and BenDor, J. Interracial and intergenerational conflict in secondary schools. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1970.

Clark, B. Educating the Expert Society. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Coleman, J. et. al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, J. The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press, 1949.

Crowfoot, J. Conflict in high schools: theory and illustrative data. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, 1972.

Douvan, E. and Adelson, J. The Adolescent Experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Edgar, D. and Warren, R. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology and Education, 1969, 42, 386-399.

Fantini, M. and Weinstein, G. The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Gamson, W. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

George, J. Gault and the Juvenile Court Revolution. Ann Arbor: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1968.

Goldstein, S. The scope and sources of school board authority to regulate student conduct and status: a non-constitutional analysis. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 1969, 117, 373-410.

Gordon, C. The Social System of the High School. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Goslin, D. The School in Contemporary Society. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1965.

Gross, N. and Herriot, R. Staff Leadership in Public Schools. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Havinghurst, R. and Taba, H. Adolescent Character and Personality. New York: Wiley, 1963.

Guskin, A. and Guskin, S. A Social Psychology of Education. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1970.

Hamilton, C. Race and education: a search for legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 669-684.

Haskell, P. Judicial review of school discipline. Case Western Reserve Law Review, 1970, 21, 211-245.

Hess, R. Political socialization in the schools. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 528-536.

Jorgensen, C. The socialization and meaning of sense of internal vs. external control among black high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organization. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kvaraceus, W. Negro youth and school adaptation. In W. Kvaraceus, et. al., Negro Self Concept. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Mann, J. Dimensions of teacher ideology and their relationship to aspects of perceived work environment and job satisfaction in crisis secondary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.

Mays, J. The Young Pretenders. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Meyer, J. Suburbia: a wasteland of disadvantaged youth and negligent schools? Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50, 575-578.

Moeller, G. and Charters, W. Relation of bureaucratization to sense of power among teachers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 10, 444-465.

Newmann, R. and Oliver, D. Education and community. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 61-106.

Nordstrom, C., Friedenberc, E., and Gold, H. Society's Children. New York: Random House, 1967.

Offer, D. The Psychological World of the Teenager. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Rhea, B. Institutional paternalism in high schools. The Urban Review, 1968, 3-4, 13-15.

Rogers, D. 110 Livingston Street. New York: Random House, 1968.

Silberman, C. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Spindler, G. (ed.). Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Stinchcombe, A. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1964.

The School and the Democratic Environment. New York: University Press, 1970.

The Unfinished Education. Report II: Mexican American Education Series. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1971.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

Trump, J. and Hunt, J. Report of a National Survey of Secondary School Principals on the Nature and Extent of Student Activism. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.

Waller, W. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1932.

Willower, D., Eidell, L. and Hoy, W.K. The School and Pupil Control Ideology. State College, Pennsylvania: Penn State University Studies, 1967, 24.

Wittes, S. Contemporary school crisis: a diagnosis. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, University of Michigan, 1971.

Institutional Racism

Bidol, P. Developing New Perspectives on Race. Detroit, Mich.: New Detroit Inc., 1970.

Billingsley, A. Black families and white social science. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26, 127-142.

Boesel, D., Berk, R., Groves, E., Edison, B. and Rossi, P. White institutions and black rage. Trans-Action, 1969, 6, 24-31.

Bryant, B., and Crowfoot, J. Central issues in a multi-racial oraaniza-tion. In R. Terry (ed.), Active New Whiteness. Grand Rapids: Eerdman Publishing Company, 1972.

Campbell, A. White Attitudes Toward Black People. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1971.

Carter, T. Mexican-Americans in School: History of Education Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Citron, A. The rightness of whiteness. Detroit: MOREL, 1969.

Coles, R. Children of Crisis. Boston: Atlantic-Little Brown, 1964.

Crowell, E., Jr. Anti-racism (the new movement). Civil Rights Digest, 1969, 29.

Farber, J. The Student as Nigger. New York: Pocket Press, 1970.

Green, R. (ed.). Racial Crisis in American Education. Chicago: Follette, 1969.

Grier, W. and Cobbs, P. Black Rage. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

Hamilton, C. Race and education: a search for legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 669-684.

Heyer, R. and Monte, F. Am I A Racist? New York: Paullist Press and Association Press, 1969.

Jordan, W. White Over Black. Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1968.

Knowles, L. and Prewitt, K. Institutional Racism in America. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1969.

Kozol, J. Death at an Early Age. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967.

Meil, A. The Short-Changed Children of Suburbia. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1967.

Nava, J. Mexican-Americans: Past, Present and Future. Northridge, Ill.: Litton Inc.

Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1967.

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: Bantam, 1968.

Rossi, P., Berk, R., Boesel, D., Eidson, B., and Groves, W. Between white and black: the faces of American institutions in the ghetto. In Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1968.

Schwartz, B. and Disch, R. White Racism. New York: Dell, 1970.

Scott, H. The black school administrator and the black community. Integrated Education, 1969, 7, 52-56.

Shafer, W., Olexa, C. and Polk, K. Programmed for social class: tracking school. Trans-Action, 1970, 7, 39-46.

Steinberg, D. Racism in America--definition and analysis. Adapted from People against racism materials.

Terry, R. For Whites Only. Grand Rapids: Eerdman Press, 1970.

The elusive black educator: how to find, hire and keep him. School Management, 1969, March, 54-84.

Wilcox, P. So you want to be black. 1968, October 7. (mimeo)

Wilhelm, S. Who Needs the Negro? New York: Anchor, 1971.

Winecoff, L and Kelly, E. Teachers, free of prejudice? Take this test and see. Integrated Education, 1969, 37, 30-36.

Youth oppression

Abbott, C. Demonstrations, dismissals, due process and the high school: an overview. School Review, 1961, 77, 128-143.

Bull, J. High school women--oppression and liberation. Women: A Journal of Liberation, 1970, 1, 42-46.

Divoky, D. (ed.). How Old Will You Be in 1984? Avon Books, 1969.

Farber, J. The Student as Nigger. New York: Pocket Press, 1970.

Flacks, R. Protest or conform: some social psychological perspectives on legitimacy. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1969, 5, 127-150.

Friedenberg, E. Contemptuous hairdressers: ceremonies of humiliation in school. This Magazine is About Schools. 1966, 9-18.

Friedenberg, E. The Vanishing Adolescent. New York: Dell, 1962.

Glasser, I. Schools for scandal--the Bill of Rights and public education Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 51, 190-194.

Goodman, P. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage, 1962.

Hickerson, N. Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Herndon, J. The Way it Spozed To Be. New York: Bantam Books, 1965.

Kaufman, B. Up the Down Staircase. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Kozol, J. Death at an Early Age. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967.

Levine, S. From my point of view. Social Education, 1969, 991.

Liberle, M. and Seligson, T. The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Random House, 1970.

The National Juvenile Law Center and The Center for the Study of Student Citizenship, Rights and Responsibilities. Student Rights Handbook. Dayton, 1971.

Noyes, K. and McAndrew, G. Is this what schools are for? Saturday Review, 1968, December, 58-59.

Reeves, D. A study voice in policy. A short history of the student bill of rights. New York City, General Organization Council, 1970, March 29. (mimeo)

Wasserman, M. School mythology and the education of oppression. Schools, 1971, 5, 25-36.

What happens when students criticize. Nation's Schools, 1969, 84, 59-60.

Conflict

Aubert, V. Competition and dissensus: two types of conflict and of conflict resolution. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1963, 7, 26-42.

Baldridge, V. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Bernard, J., Aron, R., Angel, R. The conceptualization of intergroup relations with special reference to conflict. Social Forces, 1951, 29, 243-251.

Corwin, R. Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Coser, L. Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Coser, L. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Dahl, R. Pluralist Democracy in The U.S. Conflict and Consent. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. Toward a theory of social conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1958, 2, 170-183.

Dodson, D. The creative role of conflict re-examined. Journal of Inter-group Relations, 1960, 1, 5-12. [With comments by A. Miller, 13-19; and G. Schermer, 20-23.]

Fink, C. Some conceptual difficulties in the theory of social conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1968, 12, 412-460.

Galtung, J. Institutionalized conflict resolution: A theoretical paradigm. Journal of Peace Research, 1965, 2, 348-396.

Gamson, W. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Getzels, J. Conflict and role behavior in the educational setting. In W. Charters and N. Gage (eds.), Readings in the Social Psychology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.

Himes, J. The function of racial conflict. Social Forces, 1966, 45, 1-10.

Horowitz, I. Consensus, conflict and cooperation: a sociological inven-tory. Social Forces, 1962, 41, 177-188.

Kahn, R. and Boulding, E. (eds.). Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Loomis, C. In praise of conflict and its resolution. American Sociological Review, 1967, 1, 212-248.

Mack, R. and Snyder, R. The analysis of social conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1957, 1, 212-248.

Scott, W. The Management of Conflict: Appeal Systems in Organizations. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1965.

Thompson, J. Organizational management of conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1960, 4, 390-409.

Walberg, H. Professional role discontinuities in educational careers. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 409-420.

Crisis and disruption

Ashbaugh, C. High school activism, tested approaches for coping with conflict situations. Nationals Schools, 1969, 83, 94-96.

Bailey, S., et. al. Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Final Report OEC-0-70-3444 (508), Syracuse University Research Corporation, Syracuse, New York, 1970. Also: Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Birmingham, J. Our Time is Now. New York: Bantam, 1970.

Chesler, M. Student and administration crises. Educational Leadership,
    1969, 27, 34-42.

Fish, K. Conflict and Dissent in the High School. Bruce, 1970.

Flacks, R. Social and cultural meanings of student revolt: some informal
    comparative observations. Social Problems, 1970, 17, 340-357.

Friedenberg, E. Current patterns of a generational conflict. Journal
    of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 21.

Graham, H. and Gurr, T. Violence in America: Historical and Comparative
    Perspectives. A Report to the National Commission on the Causes
    and Prevention of Violence, 1969.

Halleck, S. Hypotheses of student unrest. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50,
    8-10.

Haug, M. and Sussman, M. Professional autonomy and the revolt of the
    client. Social Problems, 1969, 17, 153-161.

Hermann, C. Some consequences of crisis which limit the viability of
    organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1963, 7, 61-82.

Laue, J. Power, conflict and social change. In Massotti, L.
    Bowen, D.   (eds.), Riots and Rebellion: Civil Violence in the
    Urban Community. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.

Lowi, T. The Politics of Disorder. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Oppenheimer, K. The Urban Guerillas. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.

Paige, J. Collective violence and the culture of subordination: a
    study of the participants in the July 1967 riots in Newark, New
    Jersey and Detroit, Michigan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,
    University of Michigan, 1968.

Special report on student unrest in the public schools. School Manage-
    ment, 1968, 12, 50-98.

Strategies for coping with student disruptions, School Management, 1969,
    13, 46-63.

Student involvement: channeling activism into accomplishment. Nation's
    Schools, 1969, 84, 39-41 and 46-47.

Students take over at Ramapo Senior High. Inside Education, 1970, February.

Tilly, C. Collective violence in European perspective. In Graham and
    Gurr, (eds.), Violence in America: Historial and Comparative
    Perspectives. Bantam, 1969.

Wasserman, M and Reimann, J. Student rebels and school defenders. The
    Urban Review, 1969, 4, 9-17.

Societal and Educational Change

Alinsky, S. Reveille for Radicals. New York: Random House, 1969.

Assumptions for regional workshops. Network on Educational Unrest.
    Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1971.

Aya, R. and Miller, N. (eds.). The New American Revolution. New York:
    Free Press, 1971.

Beale, G. Educational Advocacy Groups in the Black Community. Unpub-
    lished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, 1972.

Bennis, W., Benne, K., and Chin, R. (eds.). The Planning of Change
    (2nd edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Bryant, B. Summary of events sponsored during the developmental phase
    of a national facility on high school unrest. Ann Arbor: Educational
    Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1970.

Buchanan, P. Laboratory training and organizational development.
    Administrative Science Quarterly, 1969, 14, 466-480.

Buchanan, P. The concept of organizational development or self-renewal
    as a form of planned change. In G. Watson (ed.) Concepts for
    Social Change. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories-
    National Education Association, 1967.

Carmichael, S. and Hamilton, C. Black Power: The Politics of Liberation
    in America. New York: Random House, 1967.

Chalmers, E., and Cormick, G. Collective bargaining in racial disputes?
    Racial Negotiations Project, Institute of Labor and Industrial
    Relations, University of Michigan at Wayne State, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
    January, 1970.

Chesler, M. Teacher training designs for improving instruction in
    interracial classrooms. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971,
    7, 612-641.

Chesler, M. and Arnstein, F. The school consultant: change agent or
    defender of the status quo? Integrated Education, 1970, 19-25.

Chesler, M. and Lohman, J. Changing schools through student advocacy.
    In R. Schmuck and M. Miles (eds.), Organization Development in
    Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1971.

Chesler, M., Jorgensen, C., and Erenberg, P. Planning Educational Change,
    III: Integrating the Desegregated School. Washington, D.C.:
    USGPO, 1970.

Crain, R. (ed.). The Politics of Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Covello, L., Beagle, S., and Bock. L. The community in a great metropolis. Education for Better Living: The Role of the School in Community Improvement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1957.

Cunningham, L. Community involvement in change. Educational Leadership. 1970, 28, 363-366.

Davidoff, P. Advocacy and social concern in planning. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1965, 21, 331-337.

Dean, J. and Rosen, A. A Manual of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Flacks, R. Youth and Social Change. Chicago: Markham, 1971.

Fuchs, E. Pickets at the Gate. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Gamsen, W. Stable unrepresentation in American society. The American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, 12, 15-21.

Glatthorn, A. Students, Schools and the Tides of Change. New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services, 1970.

Goldstein, S. Reflections on developing trends in the law of student rights. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 1970, 118, 612-620.

Grosser, C. Helping Youth: A Study of Six Community Organization Programs. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1968.

Guskin, A., and Chesler, M. Intervention in high school crises: consultant roles. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1970.

Hayden, T. Trial. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

High School Student Information Service

If the Police Come... Know Your Rights/Si el Policia Viene... Conoce Tus Derechos. Austin, Texas: Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, Inc., 1966.

Janowitz, G. Helping Hands: Volunteer Work in Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Janowitz, M. Institution Building in Urban Education. Hartford, Conn.: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Karenga, M.R. The black community and the university: a community organizer's perspective. In A.L. Robinson, et. al. (eds.), Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1969, 39-55.

Katz, I. Desegregation or integration in public schools? The policy implications of research. Integrated Education, 1967, 30.

Katz, I. Review of evidence relating to effects of desegregation on the intellectual performance of Negroes. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 381-399.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organization. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kornhauser, W. The Politics of Mass Society. New York: Free Press, 1959.

Kramer, R. and Specht, H. Readings in Community Organization Practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Leavitt, H. Applied organizational change in industry: structural technological and humanistic approaches. In J.G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965.

Lenin, V. What is to be Done? New York: International Publishers, 1943.

Lurie, E. How to Change the Schools. New York: Random House, 1970.

Mack, R. Our Children's Burden. New York: Vintage, 1968.

Mayer, M. The children's crusade. The Center Magazine, 1969, 2, 2-7.

Mead, M. Youth revolt: the future is now. Saturday Review, 1970, 10, 23-25.

Morgan, R. Sisterhood is Powerful. New York: Random House, 1970.

Negotiation: A Tool for Change. New York: SEDFRE, 1968.

Network on Educational Unrest. Ann Arbor: Educational Change Team, the University of Michigan, 1971.

Nottingham, M. Conflict intervention in Palm Springs. Journal of Secondary Education, 1969, 44, 147-149.

Oppenheimer, M. and Lakey, G. A Manual for Direct Action. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1964.

Pearl, A. What's wrong with the new informalism in education? Social Policy, 1971, 1, 15-23.

Resnik, H. No game for radicals. Saturday Review, 1970, July, 49-51+.

Schein, E. Process Consultation: Its Role in Organizational Development. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Schmuck, R., and Miles, M. Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1971.

Walton, R. Two strategies of social change and their dilemmas. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1965, 1, 167-179.

What is community control of schools? A citizen fact sheet adapted from P. Wilcox, Readings for local use.

Whiteside, H. Student involvement: one school's experience. Student Life Highlights, 1969, April, 4-7.

Wilcox, P. The meaning of community control. Foresight, 1969, 1.

Wilcox, P. The community-centered school. In The Schoolhouse in the City, Praeger, 1968.

Wittes, G. The school-community relationship: community participation for school accountability. From Parent Education Groups: A Vehicle for Community Participation in Schools. Ypsilanti, Michigan: Ypsilanti Public Schools - Early Education Project, 1970.

Zinn, H. SNCC: The New Abolitionists. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Alternatives

Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, September, 1968.

Community School Council. Wilberforce, Ohio: Institute for Research and Development in Urban Areas, 1971.

Fantini, M. and Weinstein, G. A model for developing a relevant curriculum. In Making Urban Schools Work. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Featherstone, J. The primary school revolution in Britain: A report: The New Republic. 1967, August 10, Schools for children. 1967, September 2, How children learn. 1967, September 9, Teaching children to think.

Goldberg, G. Intermediate school 201: an educational landmark. The Bulletin, Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, 1966-67, 2 and 3, 1-8.

Goodlad, J. The schools vs. education. Saturday Review, 1969, April.

Goodman, P., and Goodman, P. Communitas. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Gross, F. Enfield's excited about living history. Scholastic Teacher, 1969, May 9, 13-14.

Gross, R., and Gross, B. Radical School Reform. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

Illyich, I. Schooling: the ritual of progress. New York Review, 1970, December 3. [And] Education without schools: how it can be done. New York Review, 1971, January 7.

Kanter, R. Communes: why and how they are formed; which are likely to make it and why. Psychology Today, 1970, July.

Katz, M. The Irony of Early School Reform. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Kozol, J. Free Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1972.

Leonard, G. Education and Ecstacy. New York: Dela Corte, 1968.

Lauter, P. The short, happy life of the Adams-Morgan Community School project. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 235-262.

Maris, P. and Rein, M. Dilemmas of School Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the U.S. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.

Michael, D. The Next Generation. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Mills, G. Educational Information Series, Number One. New York: Community Education Project - Mobilization for Youth, n.d., and Spanish translation.

Newmann, F. and Oliver, D. Education and community. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 61-106.

New Schools Exchange.

Robinson, A., et. al. (eds.). Black Studies in the University: A Symposium. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1969.

Roszak, T. The Making of a Counter-Culture. New York: Anchor Books, 1968.

Rowat, D. (ed.). The Ombudsman: Citizens Defender. London, England: Allan and Unwin, 1965.

Schaller, J. How to Start a High School Underground. 530 Brainard Street, Naperville, Illinois. (undated)

Seligson, T. Free schools vs. public schools. Evergreen, 1971, 29-35.

Slater, P. The Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture to the Breaking Point. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Stretch, B. The rise of the free schools. Saturday Review, 1970, June, 76-79+.

Walton, S. The Black Curriculum: Developing a Program in Afro-American
     Studies. East Palo Alto: Black Liberation Publishers, 1969.

Walton, S. Education for Humanization and Social Responsibility. East
     Palo Alto, Calif.: Black Liberation Publishers, 1969.

Whole Earth Catalogue. New York: Random House, Portola Institute.

The Staff of the Educational Change Team

Field Action Component

Network on Educational Unrest

Bunyan Bryant
Rudolfo Arevalo
Edith McCullough
Dennis Fair
George Neely
Arturo Rangel
Lucille Schaible
Salathiel Smith
Deb Stowe
Gretchen Wilson

Dissemination

Simon Wittes
Carol Fonvielle
Jan Huber
John Wilson

Developmental Component

Retrievel

Glorianne Wittes
Joan Chesler
Dale Crowfoot
Beth Duncombe
Sue Golden
Patricia Graham
Betty Neal
Penny Owen

Workgroup

Roslyn McClendon
Bunyan Bryant
Mark Chesler
James Crowfoot
Alan Guskin
Glorianne Wittes
Evie Feinberg

Simulation (Ford Foundation)

Anita Lohman
John Lohman
Marilyn Housewright
Deb Stowe

Long-Range Change (Ford Foundatic

Lou Piotrowski
Raymond Campbell
Martha Templeton

Community-School Change Pilot

Gary Beale
Jesse Ingram
Lois Franklin
Karen Moss

Applied Social Science Internshi
(Ford Foundation)
Personnel placed on varied
units of the Team

Gary Beale
Jesse Ingram
Beth Duncombe
Penry Owen
George Neely
Arthro Rangel
Rudolfo Arevalo
Carol Fonvielle

Research Component

Longitudinal Study of High Schools in Crisis (NIMH)

James Crowfoot
Alan Guskin
Pat Alting
Jan BenDor
Tom Beukema
Ted Calvin
Susan Grad
Cornelius Harris

John Revitte
Cheryl Roberts
Jesse Rutherford
Ira Stallworth
Frank Starkweather
Martha Templeton
Baxter Wright

Management and Evaluation Component

Management

Mark Chesler
Bunyan Bryant
Lois Franklin
Karl Klee
Mary Lou Neely
Sally Wilson

Evaluation

Judith Guskin
Perry Cunningham
Marguerite Sutler