DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 350   95   SP 008 020

AUTHOR   Thomas, George B.; Jones, James M.
TITLE   Innovation Teams: Operating Principles.
INSTITUTION   Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, Mass.
                Pilot Communities Program.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Lab.
                Branch.
BUREAU NO   BR-6-2805
PUB DATE   Aug 71
CONTRACT   OEC-1-7-062805-3963
NOTE   128p.; For related documents, see SP 008 021-023 and
                030

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS   *Change Agents; Educational Change; Educational
                History; Educational Improvement; *Educational
                Innovation; Team Training; *Teamwork

ABSTRACT
                This examination of the operation of teams in the
Pilot Communities Program is chiefly historical in character. Based
on intensive examination of proposals, evaluation studie=, reports,
memoranda, and interviews with personnel involved in the program, it
was written by two university professors who had not been involved in
the actual program. The introduction discusses teams as a vehicle for
change and presents operating principles drawn from the experience of
the Pilot Communities Program's teams in Maine; Boston; Washington,
D.C.; and Bridgeport, Connecticut. The first four chapters examine
the history of the individual teams and draw principles of operation
from them. The fifth chapter examines the commonalities which exist
among the four projects, and the final chapter discusses the
possibilities and limitations of innovation teams. (HMD)

ED 091350

5P

innovation teams operating as principles

The Pilot Communities Program
of Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts

70008 020

innovation
teams

operating
principles

by George B. Thomas
and James M. Jones
(TDR Associates, Inc.)

August, 1971

The operation of teams in the Pilot Communities Program has been exam-
ined, summarized, and written about in two distinctly different ways.
There is both a history and a "how to do it" volume on innovation teams.

This volume is chiefly historical in character. Based upon intensive
examination of proposals, evaluation studies, reports, memoranda, and
interviews with personnel involved in the program, it was written by
two university professors who had not been involved in the actual pro-
gram. They were asked to examine the written record and to bring to
it their own biases and points of view, even if based on theories of
change different from those demonstrated or seen in the program.

In my view the two authors have written an interesting and authentic
historical account of a very complicated program. In addition, they have
pulled from the history a series of abstractions about team operations
in relationship to outside systems. These abstractions are their own,
and from the point of view of those of us who struggled with the pro-
gram, participated in it and made mistakes, they offer useful guidelines.

Our experience and knowledge also supports a more prescriptive and
directive discussion of the "how to" and theoretical basis for building
teams. We have developed another book therefore, written by the prac-
titioners, myself, and a team leader reflecting directly what experience
has taught us. Anyone interested in building a team should probably
read both documents. They support and extend and challenge one another.
They slice through data in different ways. They represent the tension of
the observer and doer. This should be useful and reflects, in our view,
reality.

<div style="text-align: right">

Mary Lela Sherburne
Director
Pilot Communities Program

</div>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We have been especially aided by the Pilot Communities Newton

staff in the development of this document. They gave us access

to their voluminous files, read and re-read our drafts, and

tried their best to keep us honest. The teams that we visited

in the field were also most helpful.

We owe special thanks to Julianne Zuck and Gail Saliterman

and, above all, Mary Lela Sherburne for their general criticisms

and help.

<div style="text-align: right">

George B. Thomas
James M. Jones

</div>

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: Teams as a Vehicle for Change

In the fall of 1967, four teams of master teachers, trained in the use
of new classroom materials and eager to do something about what they
believed were outmoded instructional practices, walked into selected
schools and established contact with classroom teachers. That was the
beginning of a four-year project in educational change known as the
Pilot Communities Program. Headquarters for the operation was the Edu-
cation Development Center, a curriculum development organization in
Newton, Massachusetts, and most of its funds came from a Title IV grant of
the U.S. Office of Education. Both EDC and OE hoped that the four teams of
master teachers in four "Pilot Communities" in the Northeast could effectively
channel new curricular and teaching methods into the public schools.

This book presents what the authors believe are the major lessons learned
from the Pilot Communities experience about using teams as a vehicle for
change. It is a description of what happened in four places on the East
Coast, not a prescription guaranteed to make the same things happen else-
where. Kansas City in 1977 is not Boston in 1967. Nevertheless, we hope
that people who want to improve schools--in Kansas City, in Duluth, in
Houston--will find this description of the use of teams helpful in plan-
ning their own programs.

It's important to say a word about the historical context within which
the Pilot Communities Program was conceptualized.

In the spring of 1967, when Pilot Communities was being planned, major
federal aid to public education, embodied in the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act, was less than two years old. Urban education problems

were just beginning to attract the interest of innovating institutions, which, like EDC, had concentrated on the college preparatory track of suburban schools. EDC's laboratory had been Newton, the suburb next door, and not Boston, the urban center a couple of miles down the Charles River.

In 1967, those citizens of the urban communities who were active in educational reform were primarily concerned with public school integration. They were setting up busing programs within the cities and with suburbs like Newton. Tutoring and "enrichment" programs to supplement regular public school programs after school hours were also popular.

In 1967, the cry for "community control" was barely heard in the background. Like the curriculum reformers at EDC and elsewhere, urban reformers, black and white, had not yet developed full-fledged criticisms of the curriculum and control of the public schools. I.S. 201 in New York City, the bellwether of local control, did not erupt until the winter of 1967. It was still possible to plan a program for school improvement like the Pilot Communities Program without a heavy component of "community involvement" and without incessant demands for "community control."

The Pilot Communities Program, then, was born in a relatively quiet time. It was a far-sighted program for 1967, and many of its principles are still revolutionary for most public schools. But it was not intended to provide radical alternatives; its aims were much more modest. EDC and the Office of Education intended the Program to improve classroom instruction in some schools in a few "pilot" communities, not to remake

their school systems completely. In this document, we will try to describe
the Innovation Teams started by the Program as concisely and fairly as
possible, without losing a sense of the complexity and variety of the
Program's activities, and without demanding that it be more than it was
intended to be. If we are judgmental, we will try to judge the Program
in terms of its intended scope.

Specifically, the scope of the Pilot Communities was only as broad as
the movements of its four teams. One team worked in a model school divi-
sion of Washington, D.C.; a second worked with two middle schools in
Bridgeport, Connecticut; a third operated out of a resource center in the
Roxbury District of Boston, Massachusetts; and a fourth divided its efforts
between three towns in a triangular section of the Maine coast.

The primary clients of the Innovation Teams were experienced elementary
school teachers, and their primary function was to help teachers adopt
new curriculum materials and methods of instruction.

Each Team carried out projects that were exceptions to this general rule.
The Boston Team, for example, devoted much time in the first two years
to private "community" schools; the Maine Team spent the past two years
in pre-service education; and a training program for teacher aides was
a principal outcome of the Pilot Communities work in Bridgeport. These
exceptions tend to obstruct the view of the whole Program, partly because
some of the individual projects were so successful. Nevertheless, the
initial intention of the Pilot Communities Program was not to initiate
projects in aide-training or bilingual education, but to bring new cur-

riculum resources to experienced classroom teachers in public schools.
And, to this end, over the four years on all four sites, Team members
spent most of their time organizing and running workshops for teachers
and working individual classrooms, sometimes teaching demonstration
lessons and sometimes working cooperatively with the teachers.

In addition, the Innovation Team concept called for master teachers to
work together, in Teams, not as separated, autonomous agents. Each team
provided a pool of human resources, available on call to individual Team
members in need of specific help. Each Team was trained as a Team,
usually with aid from EDC-Newton, in content areas and in group dynamics.
Each Team planned and replanned its strategies, often with considerable
complication and sophistication. And each Team from time to time car-
ried out special projects, like the Boston Team's help with the establish-
ment of a bilingual transitional school. But the Team's main function
was to provide support to the work of Team members with classroom tea-
chers.

The simplest way of describing this teacher-to-teacher activity is to say
that experienced classroom teachers were recruited to help less-exper-
ienced teachers who wanted their help. This helping was always on an
invitational basis. Team members went into classrooms only when they
were asked in, and teachers attended Team workshops on a voluntary basis.

The struggles each team experienced in seeking to influence the client
schools provide sufficient data to generalize about what an innovation
team needs to do if it is to hope for some measure of success.

The following is a distillation of the operating principles we have isolated as crucial and generally applicable:

1. Preconditions for Change: There must be widespread dissatisfaction with a given school system, if an innovation team is to intervene there successfully. (See p. 8)

2. Administrative Support: Solid and visible support at each level of the school system's administration must be present from the beginning. (See p. 10)

3. Contracting: The process of contracting, or making and re-making agreements between the Team and its "client" never stops (See p. 49)

4. Team Leader: A Team needs a leader as a rallying point for its energies. After the crucial stages, the leader should continue in his role only by consensus among the team. (See p. 30)

5. Team Members: Certain characteristics of prospective Team members are imperative--"fit" with teachers they're intended to work with; high intelligence, poise, and self-assurance; specific expertise; tenacity, and likemindedness. (See p. 31)

6. Team-Building and Planning: A Team must make a conscious effort to become a Team, and it must continue to grow. Its members must confront each other when necessary, lock horns on problems, make decisions, and keep moving. (See p. 53)

7. Interaction with the Client System: Team members must walk a difficult path in their dealings with teachers. They must never take part in the system's evaluation of its teachers; on the other hand, they must not shrink from critical interaction with teachers. (See p. 97)

8. Relationship-Building with Individual Teachers: Team members should go only where they are wanted. They should respond to specific needs, and build relationships with individual teachers in an atmosphere of mutual respect and learning. (See p. 98)

9. Quick Response to New Opportunities: Team members' time should be loosely enough allocated to allow quick response to needs that arise on the project site. (See p. 78)

10. The Necessity of Trust: Without mutual trust, any helping relationship will founder. (See p. 79)

The four chapters that follow--one for each of the four teams--illustrate the above principles in two ways. They are illustrated informally by the evidence presented in our narrative description of a specific team's operations, its problems, and successes. They are illustrated more directly on the blue pages dispersed throughout the text. Here the operating principles are restated and supporting evidence is drawn from the experience of all four teams.

We believe that the principal mission of the Pilot Communities Teams was their work with classroom teachers, in groups and as individuals. Thus, we have emphasized narrative materials and operating principles that focus primarily on that teacher-helping activity; other issues, such as the functioning of the central administration in Newton and the additional projects which some of the Teams initiated which seemed tangential to their main purpose, are given peripheral consideration.

In the four narratives, our reconstruction of events has depended principally on the Program's written records, which are incomplete and inconsistent across sites. For example, the only complete logs of Team members' interactions with teachers available to us come from the first two years in Maine. Logs on other sites were never kept, or lost. Similarly, the only records of Team meetings come from one year in Boston. We had no contemporary records at all from the Washington Team. Given this limited data, we chose not to try to provide full "case studies" of each site. We have tried to emphasize the highlights of the activity on each of the four sites, presenting in some detail those problems and successes which shed light on the functioning of an Innovation Team. The narratives

are not symmetrical in terms of the topics covered, nor the extensiveness
of the treatment; however, the discussions have been organized according
to the major categories of operating principles for easy reference.

We offer this description as the record of ideas that were often only
understood after they were put into practice. We urge our colleagues
in other school systems to be suspicious of their validity at other times
and in other places, but not to dismiss them out of hand. We believe that
the Pilot Communities Program generated some new ideas about change in
public school systems and confirmed some old ones. Old or new, the ideas are
valuable for anyone who wants to improve schooling.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (I)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities experience
identify the conditions in the school system and the community
that must exist for successful employment of an innovation
team.

Operating
Principle

PRECONDITIONS FOR CHANGE. In the entry stage of a team's inter-
vention, there must be dissatisfaction with the current state
of affairs. This dissatisfaction must be widespread and shared
among all the constituencies related to the school system:
parents, teachers, supervisors, and children. There must also
be general agreement that the needs can be met with the kinds
of activities an Innovation Team can carry out.

Evidence
from the
Four
Sites

The four Teams of the Pilot Communities Program operated effec-
tively only where there was general agreement that they were
needed. Without initial general support, their low-key help-
ing activities were undercut. Whenever there was hostility or
apathy from parents, teachers, or administrators, the Teams'
benign efforts at change were rendered difficult or impossible.

When the Pilot Communities Program was starting, in 1967, dis-
satisfaction with the schools in Boston's black community
was widespread. Roxbury leaders were starting private community
schools and tutorial programs, and they kept educational prob-
lems squarely in the headlines.

It is not so clear that black parents in general were dis-
satisfied with the schools, but many people--children, teachers,
and administrators--knew that changes in Roxbury schools were
essential. The time was ripe for a Team effort. (In fact, the
needs in Roxbury for school improvement may have been so
great, the Team's efforts could never be sufficient.)

This dissatisfaction in Roxbury was not generally shared by
whites in South Boston's Andrew School district. Neither
parents nor teachers were ready for much change, especially if
that change was to be activated by "outsiders." People in
South Boston preferred to be left alone. Sensing this, the
Boston Team invested less and less effort in work at the
Andrew School.

In 1967, there was also little apparent local dissatisfaction
in and around the schools serviced by the Maine Team. Tea-
chers, parents, administrators, and students seem to have
been relatively complacent and not highly enthusiastic about
the necessity of educational improvement, although they were
willing to let the Team try its hand. This low initial dis-
satisfaction and, indeed, organized parental opposition to some
of the changes proposed for the Tennants Harbor School dimin-
ished the effectiveness of the Maine Team, helping encourage
it to shift its energies to pre-service teacher training acti-
vities after the second year.

In addition to the need for a community-wide consensus that improvement in the schools is necessary, there must be some knowledge of the capacities and the limitations of Innovation Teams. The kinds of Innovation Teams disclosed in this report primarily sponsor direct teacher-support activities. They are not primarily curriculum developers, community organizers, or remedial specialists. They cannot bail out helpless teachers; they cannot resolve severely polarized school-community disputes; they are not primarily project-doers.

Operating Principle

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT. Solid and visible support at each level of the school system's administration must be present from the beginning and continue throughout an Innovation Team project.

Evidence from the Four Sites

The Bridgeport Team's experience offers the most tangible evidence of this need. The Team's operations were encouraged by the Superintendent, but several key top administrators were either hostile or wary. Their suspicion, which was not clearly identified until the work in Bridgeport was well underway, proved to be impossible to overcome. Since the Team existed at the sufferance of the school system, such opposition could not be overcome by confrontation, and no other resolution was apparently attempted.

In Washington, by contrast, the Team operated under the personal protection of the administrator of the Model School Division. Even when there was opposition to the Team's activities among some of the administrators in the central office, the relative autonomy of the MSD and the personal interest of its administrator helped shelter the Washington Team. Even more important, the MSD staff encouraged the teachers even when the work resulted in unusual changes in classroom practice. Unlike the Bridgeport teachers, teachers in Washington could be sure that the changes they made in classrooms would not affect their records adversely.

The Boston Team enjoyed moderate support from the administrators they worked with. In general, they were given considerable autonomy. The assistant superintendents responsible for the districts the Team operated in were especially supportive. In Maine, relations with superintendents were good from the beginning, the result of much pre-planning and a continuous flow of information.

Support from the schools system's administration should reward teachers for cooperation with the Team. The Superintendent should assign the Team to a top administrator who agrees with the Team's goals and strategies. Extra money for Team operations, pay for substitute teachers, released time, materials, workshops, and consultants will provide tangible evidence of the administration's support.

Formally allowing the Team unusual degrees of freedom will

also enhance its operations. In Washington this was accom-

plished by assigning the Team to the Model School Division,

an already-existing semi-autonomous sub-system. Whether or

not a sub-system or a decentralized district is used as the

formal framework, a Team will need to be vested with the

right to judge the appropriate qualifications of its members

and to experiment with new classroom material and curricula.

Top administrative support symbolized by a semi-autonomous

jurisdiction, as well as having an advocate in the top admin-

istrative councils will help meet the need for support and

freedom.

CHAPTER 1

MID-COAST MAINE

> If you guys have done nothing else, you've at least
> gotten the teachers to the point where they can talk
> with each other about their problems and their feel-
> ings without hostility. They're open enough so that
> they can air their ideas without fear of being walked
> on. If you don't accomplish anthing else but that,
> it's been worthwhile.
>
> > --Superintendent of a
> > school district in
> > Maine about the first
> > year efforts of the
> > Maine Innovation Team

The activities of the Pilot Communities Program in Maine during the

first two years were tightly focused with modest objectives. In the

first year (1967-8), three Team members were assigned to three schools:

an elementary school in the small coastal city of Bath, a 100-pupil high

school seventy miles inland in Richmond, and another elementary school fifty

miles up the coast in Tenants Harbor. During the second year two Team

members covered the three schools.

Each Maine Team member spent about one day a week in the school to which

he was assigned. He often arrived early in the morning for the weekly

faculty meeting. He also visited the other schools, took part in Team

meetings, attended conferences, and went to meetings with state and local

school officials. But his principal energies were directed towards that

day each week in "his" school. He responded to requests for help from

teachers and principals, contacted specialists for advice, and sometimes

brought them to the schools. Each Team member was, therefore, both a

helper himself and a contact man for a larger network of help--from EDC

at first, and increasingly from resources in Maine.

The initial members of the Maine Team shared personal characteristics important to the successful functioning of the Team. All three were similar to the teachers they were to work with in terms of age, race, and experience; each had extensive and successful classroom experience in schools similar to the one he would work with, and each agreed with the others' educational philosophy and strategies for change.

ENTRY AND INITIAL CONTRACTING. The Maine team made its entry into the three schools through a long and careful process. In the fall of 1966, an initial commitment was made to working in a rural New England community as one of the experimental sites. Through the winter, Pilot Communities planning staff looked in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont for possible sites and finally settled on a section of mid-coast Maine, a triangle 50 miles on each side, served by eleven school administrative districts and eleven superintendents. The nature and extent of collaboration with the schools was the next question. The idea of leading off the program with activities which would blanket the whole area was rejected, because this would entail a lot of talk and far more funds than were available. For the sake of economy, earlier visibility, and better opportunity for team learning, it was decided to work initially with the teachers in a small number of schools. Early in the summer, the following possibilities were listed:

- Cooperating with a proposed research project in the Coffin School in Brunswick.

- Cooperating with a joint committee of teachers from Brunswick and Bath in selection of new materials for the elementary science curriculum.

- Helping the Newell School in Bath develope flex-
  ible pupil groupings.

- Developing an individual learning center at
  Richmond High School and cultivating relations
  with a year-long Headstart Program in Richmond.

- Assisting the staff of Georges Valley High School
  in Thomaston in improving the curriculum, parti-
  cularly in English.

- Working with the staff of the St. George School
  in Tenants Harbor to follow up an earlier start
  toward nongrading.

- Following up summer Headstart teachers who had
  already worked with EDC staff in their summer
  training program.

- Undertaking some kind of project in vocational
  education.

The three schools that were finally selected--the Newell School in Bath,

Richmond High School in Richmond, and the St. George School in Tenants

Harbor--represented a type of educational and socio-economic situation

that was fairly characteristic of the area. It is important to note

the extreme care with which EDC palnners defined their goals and func-

tions. They anticipated working with client schools on the following

projects:

- An indoor-outdoor comprehensive science program
  that would make use of the rich outdoor environment
  of the Newell school. An architectural plan intended
  to allow flexible grouping of children and teacher
  utilization patterns.

- The introduction of materials and teaching-learning
  methods that would encourage greater activity for
  children and increase motivation for reading and writ-
  ing in the primary grades.

- A laboratory for the rural high school in Richmond in
  which the students would have access to a broad spectrum
  of learning materials, not merely in the hard sciences,
  but also in the social sciences, language study, and
  anthropology.

● An ungraded primary plan for St. George School and a substantive program of individualized instruction.

The planning and contracting process went on, even after this extensive list of projects and activities was drafted. At a three-day conference in August, 1967, involving all the teachers and principals of the target schools and the superintendent from the eleven school districts, the Pilot Communities Staff demonstrated some of the new modes of teaching, and the teachers and principal of each school told the Pilot Communities Staff where they could use some help. For example, the staff of the Newell School expressed needs . . .

● To give children opportunity to experience success - reading is critical - but other areas of the curriculum are involved.

● To rearrange class groups.

● To familiarize themselves with a wider range of curriculum materials.

- To visit other schools to see other teachers in
  action.

- To inform parents of changes.

This slow and careful entry process helped to develop initial "contracts"

between all the participants. It also legitimated the project by show-

ing it as part of a large and carefully-thought-out program. During

the long planning process, Pilot Communities dealt with the several

levels of the educational hierarchy. The only group left out of the

negotiations were the taxpaying citizens, and this neglect took its toll

in Tenants Harbor a year-and-half later.

TEAM INTERACTION WITH TARGET SCHOOLS. In September, on invitation of

of individual teachers with whom they had been working during the sum-

mer workshop, Team members started visiting classrooms. They asked

questions about pupils and made suggestions about techniques and mater-

ials. Weekly meetings with the school staff began in the two elemen-

tary schools. Team members taught cooperatively with several teachers

in each school. Sharing responsibility for their pupils, in this way,

represented an important level of acceptance by the teachers. They

"risked some of themselves," one Team member commented, with a person

from "outside." As specific problems were identified, consultants in

the fields of child development, reading instruction, social studies,

English, and science were invited to work with individual teachers and

groups. For three months in the spring of 1968, an educator-craftsman

took up residence in Richmond and worked with teachers and pupils in

various types of handiwork. During the year, a few visits were arranged

for groups of teachers. Teachers were supplied with special curriculum

materials--Cuisenaire rods, programmed reading materials, geo-boards,

and so forth--and watched pupils perform in new learning situations.

Team members assisted in preparing several of the Richmond teachers for

teaching English to Russian-speaking residents.

The purpose of all this varied activity was implicit rather than explicit.

The Team members sought to earn the confidence of the teachers, to see

their problems through the teachers' eyes and to help solve them, to

help the teachers understand their pupils as individuals, and to devise

and use modes and materials of instruction appropriate to this orienta-

tion.

Steps were also taken during the first year to interpret the project to

a wider community and to prepare for broader involvement.

- At a meeting in late November with superintendents
  and officials from the State Department of Educa-
  tion, the principals of the three schools reported
  informally on their Pilot Communities-related acti-
  vities.

- The Team assisted one of the school districts to
  prepare a successful Title II (ESEA) proposal for
  a Model Staff Workshop and Summer School.

- It prepared another proposal for funding an Insti-
  tute on Educational Change. (This Institute, although
  it wasn't funded immediately, developed into the
  Team's major effort in its last two years.)

- And, on four occasions, the Maine Team met with a
  community development specialist about the ques-
  tion of involving the larger community in educa-
  tional development.

Although the personnel of the Team changed in the second year, the acti-

vities of the Team changed very little. There were more activities of

the planning and coordinating variety described above. The principal

focus was still on classroom teachers in the target schools.

DIARY OF A TEAM MEMBER. The core of the Team members' work with an indi-

vidual teacher is exemplified by the record of collaboration between

one Team member, "Charles," and a high school teacher, "Jim," who had

attended Pilot Communities summer workshops. This section consists of

excerpts from a log kept by Charles which give his reactions to some

of his interactions over a period of four months. All names have been

changed, and the excerpts have been edited to focus on the interactions

between Charles and Jim, although Charles was also working with other

teachers in the same school.

> Visit to Hamilton High   October 8
>
> Jim told me about his efforts with an economics course
> for general students. They have done surveys and col-
> lected artifacts and given presentations to the rest of
> the class. They didn't write anything--writing is dif-
> ficult for them. Jim says the class likes what it is
> doing. We came up with the following list of ideas
> that we could pursue.
>
> > 1. Write to other schools to ask them to
> >   send food prices from their locality.
> >   (I am working on getting a list.)
> >
> > 2. Look at SRA economics games. Where can
> >   these be seen? At the Curriculum Cen-
> >   ter? Is it operating yet? Call SRA
> >   salesman. Where do you locate him?
>
> I am not sure how much of this I should do for Jim,
> because he is capable if he has time.

In the following entry, Charles defines his sense of his role. He has

to be a listener, a mirror, and a facilitator. He would try not to

overwhelm Jim, but, at the same time, he would try to stretch him,

urging a larger, more systematic look at a framework that could inform

the day-to-day classroom activities. A constant thread in the log

entries is Jim's lack of time to pay careful, systematic attention to

his economics course, or to Charles' suggestions.

> My impressions of Jim are that he is an enthusiastic,
> more scholarly than average, but impulsive teacher.
> I feel that he is very capable of proceeding on his
> own and that my function will be to listen to his
> requests, to try to interpret his needs, and weigh
> means of giving him help that doesn't overwhelm him.
> I do hope that in the future I can get other people,
> such as sociologists, economists, other teachers
> that Jim can talk to.

More than anything else, the following letter represents the immense

frustration experienced by Jim and Charles simply in finding enough

time to talk. Some of this difficulty may have been due to faulty

scheduling; the Team members generally spent only a day a week in the

school they were assigned to. But most was a direct function of Jim's

incredibly full schedule. Their meetings seem to have been catch-as-

catch-can, always sandwiched between Jim's manifold obligations.

In the letter (which must have seemed rather overwhelming to Jim),

Charles tries to walk a careful line between practical suggestions, like

the weekly letters and field trips, and suggestions about economic theory

and processes that will help students "discover" economic principles.

<div align="right">November 28</div>

> Dear Jim,
>
> A letter seems sort of foolish since I see you so often.
> However, when I return to the office, I find that there
> are so many items that I've never talked to you about.
> Perhaps this letter will serve as a reminder for some
> topics of conversation for the future.
>
> First of all, I have observed that you are a very busy,
> conscientious guy. You teach five courses and have
> extra-curricular duties such as the student council

and coaching. If I were in your shoes, priorities
would be set upon my time, probably on the basis of
the amount of enthusiasm that students offered me.
If this were the case, the economics course would
probably appear far down on the list. This is not
an accusation, because I don't know how you set your
priorities.

What I am trying to say is that I think you ought
consciously to set your own priorities since you are
so busy and that economics ought to be very high on
the list . . .

I am still interested in trying to develop a unit
which deals with economics and might be interesting
to the students. We listed some ideas early in the
year and it would be fun to talk about these again
and see if we have any further ideas.

Earlier I suggested some case studies involving prob-
lems of finding a job or buying some large item
which would at least ask students to analyze and
sort out data, involve some kind of emotion and
involve some of the inductive process that we were
talking about earlier. But even this is probably
too dull. My next thought was that perhaps we could
make believe that we're looking for a job or going
to buy some large item and actually go on trips to
places--a trip that would involve a whole afternoon
or a whole morning, stop for coffee and all the con-
versation that goes along with a free and easy kind
of trip. So the last step in this chain of thought
involves one or two possible activities.

The first one is that I would write your class a
letter every week with some fictitious name asking
for some kind of advice about buying a car or
refrigerator, finding a job in the area and the
students would do some research involving going some
places, reading some things, talking to some people,
and send me an answer back. The other possibility
is to set up a real advisory center for the people
in your neighborhood. I will enclose a rough copy
of a letter that you might send to townspeople con-
cerning this idea. The idea appeals to me because
we would be expanding our economic laboratory to
the places where you apply for jobs and the places
where you buy things. Also, this kind of experience
includes almost everything that is involved in econ-
omics, not just how much you pay and where the money
goes, but also, in buying a car, whether you like

the looks of a salesman, whether you trust him, how
worn the tires are, the cigarette burn in the front
seat, how much the rubber matting has worn, is the
mileage accurate, does it fit with the amount of
wear on the rubber mat on the floor. It probably
would involve all kinds of conversations, some non-
sense, some very intelligent thought. Even adults
don't think rationally all of the time. This kind
of experience would also force us to find more items
for the economics laboratory back at the school.
We simply would need to call somebody or need to
find a book or need to find an article, and indeed
this experience would be good. Perhaps we would be
incapable, but I don't think so. Also, we would be
able to ask questions of experts who know more than
we do and thereby have their knowledge of economics
brought to bear on a specific item and thereby we
can learn too. That is, we have a reason to ask
questions of experts and apparently there are many
around . . . .

> Sincerely yours,
> Charles

Charles' log continues with an entry about establishing a level of trust
in his relationship with Jim.

December 4

When I arrived at the school, Jim and another teacher
were cleaning out the teachers' room in preparation
for the open house tonight and they were both in a
complaining, irritable mood. Jim told me that just
everything in general is wrong here today. I can't
remember all of the things Jim said--none of them
positive--but I listened. Slowly the chain of his
thought turned to what he has been doing in his
classes, and he told me all sorts of good things that

are happening. He has joined the Community Betterment
Council as a result of a newspaper clipping I sent him
and has been appointed the liaison between that coun-
cil and the State Department of Economic Development.
He says he really enjoys the work and enjoys meeting
the people and talking about the issues.

He told me that he had read a pamphlet that I sent him
last week on economics and in the pamphlet they list
a number of areas that ought to be studied in a course
of practical economics, and that was exactly what he
had done last year. I gave him the four SRA units
related to economics. He said that he wished we had
more time to sit down and talk about these things, and
wondered if it would be possible if he could set aside
a time every week. I suggested various times and each
of these was no good because of his busy schedule and
then he asked if we could meet on Saturday mornings,
which I think would be very, very good, if he's wil-
ling to give that time.

The bell rang and it was time for him to teach his
next class, but on the way up he found out that school
was going to close in ten minutes, so we made arrange-
ments to go to a restaurant so I could eat my lunch
and he could have a cup of tea and we could talk fur-
ther.

At the restaurant we didn't talk about economics
because Jim didn't give me the chance to introduce the
subject. He was full of complaints about how the princi-
pal doesn't do his work. Jim also complained about the
conversation in the teachers' room--how it's always
about how bad this kid is or that kid is. He also com-
plained about how many extra duties he has and how most
of the staff doesn't do anything like that. He feels
that people are stepping on him because if he doesn't
make the coffee nobody else will, if he doesn't take the
student council, nobody else will, if he doesn't help in
athletics, nobody else will. I feel honored that Jim
should tell me all this, and at least have somebody to
talk to, although I have no idea how one responds to
these kinds of complaints, except to sit and listen.

The next entry begins with a long description of a Monopoly-like game about

banking that Jim played with his six-student economics class. Charles

was invited to join the class and soon began working out a problem in

which he became interested.

December 12

I had never been clear as to which kind of checking
account was best and it suddenly occurred to me sitting
in this atmosphere of learning that the only variable
is the number of checks you use, so while the boys and
girls were talking I started working out a chart which
would permit me to calculate how much it would cost for
using 5 checks, 20 checks or 50 checks per month. When
I looked up the whole class was watching me and Jim
asked me to explain what I was doing. I explained very
enthusiastically because here I had learned something
I had never known before. The students couldn't fol-
low my thinking and Jim became even more discouraged
because his class had been taken totally away from the
game.

After the class I apologized to Jim for working out the
chart in class and he accepted my apology. However,
jokingly I told him that he had taught me something that
I had never known before and he denied teaching me some-
thing, and that led us into a discussion of how one might
learn and how one might teach, and what the role
of a teacher is. I won't relate the discussion because
I can't remember all that was said, but the point here
is that it illustrates how different Jim and I are in
our definition of the role of a teacher. He set the stage
and I learned. That is teaching.

January 16

Some comments taken from a tape recording of a meeting
of the Maine Team. Present at the meeting: The three
Team members, a group process consultant, and two EDC-
Newton staffers. After lunch, Peter Bins, a principal
in one of the schools we're working in, and Jim joined
us. (Jim was asked what he thought of the Pilot Commun-
ities effort so far.)

JIM: I don't want people around me that are all subtle.
I want you to come out and tell me what you want. If
somebody has got some ideas we will go down and talk
about it. Pilot Communities is snooping around trying
to get something into the schools. What the hell is the
guy talking about? If--if we want to work on something
we got to--to say what we want to happen. You take the
approach that you got some nut to crack--that you got
to manipulate and I'm getting tired of it!

(Applause)

> PROCESS CONSULTANT: How long has it taken you to
> state it?
>
> JIM: I don't know what the hell the goals of Pilot
> Communities are yet.   I haven't the slightest idea.
> Somebody should say who the hell is Pilot Communities.
> Just who are you?   What do you want to do?   'Well, we
> want to enrich the curriculum.'   I've been waiting
> for them to enrich the curriculum--I don't just expect
> just a bag of tricks.

Jim's outburst points up the slow, and sometimes painful, process of

trust-building.   After eighteen months of contact with Pilot Communities,

and four months of fairly intensive work with Charles, Jim is still not

sure what kind of help he can expect from Charles, and Charles is still

insisting on his own responsibility not to play expert providing instant

solutions.   He refuses to be a passive "resource Center" and claims the

right to his own judgements.

Six months later Charles reflected on his work with Jim.   His comments

are germane to anyone who would undertake similar work.

> I learned from the experience about the necessity to iden-
> tify, first in your own mind, what you are doing, and,
> second, demand that your client take time to try to under-
> stand what he can expect and what he cannot expect.   Jim
> did not really know what to expect and, consequently, dic-
> tated the nature of the relationship according to a need
> he had on a particular day, as well as upon perceptions
> he had formed about Pilot Communities during the first
> year.   I responded with little understanding of the nature
> of my role and with too much anxiety about producing results.
> I should have asked more questions.   I should have given
> less advice.

Advice given to me, however, such as, "You have to know
where he is," or "Be a process technician" from bosses.
and consultants who I did not know very well was as
useless as the advice I offered Jim about teaching
economics. Are there consultants capable of providing
models of behavior consistent with their advice? Per-
haps it is a big "con;" we ask too much of other
people and too little of ourselves.

We are not teachers, or principals, or superintendents,
or consultants from a local college, but we do work in
schools. Our job is new and different, and we work with
cautious people. Our role is poorly understood. This
is our problem. We compound that problem when we are less
than honest with ourselves and our clients about our roles.

Accepting the responsibility to clarify roles and rela-
tionships for both my client and myself has been the major
lesson learned this year. Even this act is unfamiliar to
school people, but the lack of any implicit relationship
demands that time be spent doing this so that both parties
can begin to overcome the hostility that appears to exist.
I see no other way to provide a service without being a
servant to an unwanted master.

RESISTANCE TO CHANGE. During the first two years of the Pilot Communities'

effort in Maine, the Team members found they could bring valuable resources

to teachers in the three isolated target schools; nevertheless, they

encountered considerable resistance to change. One reason for the resist-

ance was simply that the Team's energies seemed to be spread too thin.

With only one day a week spent in each school, the Team members did not

have time to work with all the teachers in each school. The target

schools were spread too widely apart to facilitate efficient use of the

Team's resources. Each Team member also felt isolated from his Team,

and from EDC-Newton. When called in to assist the Team, evaluation per-

sonnel talked abstractly about goals, and EDC-Newton administrators

interpreted requests for help as criticism of central administration.

Team members were confused by frequent changes in EDC-Newton personnel,

and by the continuing inability of EDC to provide access to its own cur-
riculum. In short, Team meetings seemed to confuse Team operations
instead of helping the Maine Team function as a cohesive group.

At the end of the second year, several of the teachers expressed disap-
pointment at the failure of Team members to carry through on certain pro-
jects. The Maine Team recognized at the end of the second year, they
should have continued the contracting process begun so carefully at the
outset. Both the Team and the teachers they were working with tended to
become absorbed in immediate problems, thereby avoiding larger (and,
often, more personal) issues. The Team felt that their role as helpers
had not been adequately understood, that "the role of the change agent
should be conceived by the staff and perceived by clients not so much to
do things for individuals as to help them to do things better for themselves."
They felt the need for a continuing, overt discussion of role definitions
and expectations, as perceived by them, by their "clients," and by out-
side observers.

In addition, the Team realized the need to deal more quickly and openly
with parental resistance to new programs. At the Tenants Harbor School,
new classroom organization for individual learning and non-grading aroused
the community, and several well-attended community meetings focused on
the parents' fear of too rapid change. Several teachers agreed that they
had tried "too much too soon," and that there should be more careful plan-
ning and a thorough assessment of progress before new programs were begun.
The principal of the school resigned, partly because he felt that the com-
munity had not supported him. Through this incident, the Program learned

in Maine, as it was to learn on the other sites, that over-reliance on
curriculum change and insufficient attention to educating parents about
new methods might result in resistance that could stymie the Team's
efforts. The work in the other two schools in Maine met less overt
resistance, but was not notably more successful. Teachers were still
wary of Team members, partly because two of the three Team members were
new.

But the principal reason for this resistance to the Team's efforts in the
first two years was failure to meet a necessary pre-condition to change--
the dissatisfaction with the status quo. That dissatisfaction must
be pervasive; it should be shared by all the constituencies in a system--
teachers, parents, administrators, and students. In retrospect it seems
clear that such generalized dissatisfaction was not present around the
Maine target schools at the beginning of the Team's work in 1967. The
Maine Team members were, therefore, operating under a handicap; no mat-
ter how well they performed, their presence was not perceived as neces-
sary.

For these and other reasons, the Maine Team discontinued most of its work
with individual classroom teachers. The Team personnel changed again,
and beginning in the fall of 1969, the program in Maine concentrated on
the affective pre-service education of teachers.

The new training program bears little resemblance to the original Maine
Team model which used master teachers to work with experienced teachers.
The in-the-classroom work has been greatly reduced, to a once-a-month

visit. More significantly, the emphasis in the summer workshop is on

encounter-group training. Curriculum materials, considered in 1967 as

having a significant change-producing effect in and of themselves, have

been subordinated to affective learning.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (II)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities experience

identify personal characteristics of an effective team leader

and a tightly knit team membership.

Operating   TEAM LEADER. A Team needs a leader as a rallying-point for
Principle
               its energies. The initial leader is usually chosen before the

               other Team members and, therefore, has the choice of a Team

               as his first task. He also has a heavy responsibility in de-

               fining initial objectives that are realizable by the Team. After

               the initial stages, the leader should continue in his role only

               by consensus among the Team. He is the principal negotiator for

               the Team, and he is formally responsible for its day-to-day

               operations.

               _____

Evidence   Each of the initial Team leaders in the Pilot Communities Program
from the
Four   came from outside the four client school systems. EDC chose the
Sites
               initial leaders because of their general familiarity with EDC

               materials, and because each had a substantive skill (math, evalua-

               tion, science) that he could bring to his Team's resource pool.

               Two initial Team leaders had had experience in group process

               training; two had taught in classrooms like the ones their Teams

               would be working in.

               On all the sites but Washington, leaders who succeeded the initial

               leaders were selected by the EDC-Newton staff. The leader for

1969-1971 in Maine came from outside the Team and brought in a

special interest in teacher education when the Team shifted

its interests in that direction. The Boston leader for the

last year was appointed from within the Team, as was the second

leader in Bridgeport.

The Washington Team provides a contrast in its selection of

leaders. At the end of the first year, the Team elected its

own leader from within its ranks. This process of selecting

a leader, in and of itself, contributed to the Team's own

cohesiveness and sense of efficacy.

Operating
Principle

TEAM MEMBERS. Certain characteristics of prospective Team

members are imperative:

(1) "Fit" with teachers they are intended to work with.

"Fit" means at least similar age, race, and class-

room experience.

(2) High intelligence, poise, and self-assurance.

(3) Expertness. Each Team member should have both

general classroom competence and skill in a specific

area: reading, science, math. Teams "pool" these

skills, to train each other, and to help teachers.

(4) Loyalty or Tenacity. If a Team member comes from

the school system, and intends to stay within it,

he will be a more effective member of a Team working

with classroom teachers in that system. His

principal reference group is then his peers in the
system.

(5) Likemindedness. There should be general agreement
among Team Members as to their philosophies of educa-
tion and their general approach to educational change.

**Evidence
from the
Four
Sites**

Without appropriate Team members, a Team will fail. This seems
to be self-evident but, time after time, Teams in the Pilot
Communities Program were composed of inappropriate members who
made already difficult tasks impossible. Selection of appro-
priate Team members is the leader's most important task.

During the four years of the Program's existence, the Teams
and the EDC-Newton staff attempted to adjust the Team membership
to accomplish a better fit between the Teams and the teachers
they were to work with. During the last year in Maine, for
example, the Team was composed of three members. All three
had had classroom and administrative experience in Maine schools.
One came to the Team from the Maine Department of Education,
providing an essential link to the teacher certifying agency.
Another had been a principal in one of the schools and served during
the Team's initial two years of work with experienced classroom
teachers. He knew directly the problems of teachers, new and
experienced, and he knew how teachers and principals interact
in small, isolated schools. The third, the Team's leader, had
had special training in affective training, the principal

activity of the Maine Team in 1969-1971. All three could
"speak the language" of teachers in isolated rural schools,
and all three agreed on the mission of the Team: the
preparation of teachers through encounter group training.

The Washington Team enjoyed the same sort of fit with teachers
in the D. C. schools from the very outset. Almost all of its
members were black, and all had classroom experience in city
schools. Their principal loyalties were to the school system,
and most will continue to work in the D.C. schools even if the
Team is disbanded at the end of this year. Their loyalty to
the system and their common bonds of race and of ideology,
arrived at in the crucible of experience, gave the Washington
Team a high level of cohesiveness and meant that individual
Team members could rely on each other in times of crises.

In contrast, the Bridgeport Team fell apart in crisis. Most
members of the Bridgeport Team came from outside the system.
Few had had much experience in urban classrooms, and few saw
the Bridgeport schools as a long-term "career" employer. The
necessary likemindedness and crucial cohesion never arrived.

The Boston Team presents a much more complicated picture.
Despite the early commitment to concentrate much of the Team's
resources in black schools, only two of the initial Team members
were black. Only one initial Team member had any teaching
experience in urban schools. Gradually, the Boston Team's
membership was changed by recruiting black members, although

none came from the Boston schools, and few had teaching

experience in urban schools. The new, black members were

intensely committed to educational reform. But none of

them had roots in the system. Their "outsideness" aided

them in working with black agencies and community schools,

and with black parents. But it undercut their effectiveness

with classroom teachers, who became less and less their

primary clients. Working in a school full of black children

with an almost completely white staff, the Boston Team's fit

was with the children, not with the teachers. It may well

be that the very incongruity of such a school would make it

very difficult for any Team to operate successfully in it.

In general, the Pilot Communities experience points up the

need for a large proportion of "indigenous" members on Innova-

tion Teams. Teachers who are recruited from a system are

almost automatically attuned to the people in that system.

They have a better chance of hearing teachers' needs accurately

and helping them to new levels of performance.

Change agents should be able to blend into the background. They

need to be tuned into the rhythms of the teacher's professional

life, able to take part in the small talk of the teachers' room.

This is not the only characteristic of a successful change agent,

but it is an essential one. There must be time for humaneness

around the edges of the task at hand, and that kind of goalless

interaction is easier for people roughly similar to each other.

CHAPTER 2

BRIDGEPORT

> Had the principals not been so threatened by their supervisors
> and so hostile to us, and had we not been so intrusive in our
> manners and hostile to them, we might have been able to deter-
> mine a joint course of action. However there was so much
> antagonism at all levels that reconciliation and orderly
> sensitive planning of this kind was extremely difficult.
>
> Leader of the
> Bridgeport Innovation Team

The activities of the Pilot Communities Resource Team in Bridgeport followed
much the same general pattern as in Maine. The Bridgeport Team started
with an exclusive focus on curriculum development. The September, 1967
agreement with the Bridgeport Superintendent of Schools stated: "The
Bridgeport schools will jointly share with EDC and the University of
Bridgeport, a program involving the redevelopment of various curricula."
In fact, the initial emphasis was so narrowly curricular that the Bridgeport
School Administration asked a consultant from another organization to help
with "the various aspects of school organization, scheduling, teacher
assignments, pupil groupings, etc." for the new middle schools. The Pilot
Communities Team was told by the Superintendent to avoid extending its
activities beyond curriculum study and revision.

This initial reliance on the reform of classroom teaching through the use
of curriculum materials was inherited from the Elementary Science Study
(E.S.S.), an EDC curriculum development group that had generated many
units of science materials for use in elementary school classrooms.
Several of the initial Team members at each site, including the first
Team leaders in Boston and Washington, had come from E.S.S.

The E.S.S. units depended on the manipulation of simple materials, (Meal-worms, Batteries and Bulbs, Pendulums), and their use was greatly facilitated by an open classroom environment--children uncovering principles for themselves instead of passively receiving observations and rules handed down by teachers.

Until 1967, the development and acceptance of the E.S.S. units had been for the most part limited to suburban schools. Like other curriculum "shops" at E.D.C., and like curriculum developers in general, E.S.S. had not penetrated rural or urban public schools by 1967.

Pilot Communities staff would soon find in Bridgeport, as they were finding in Maine, that the dissemination or development of new materials would not be enough.

ENTRY AND CONTRACTING. The first two years of the Program's activity in Bridgeport involved the initiation and development of a Resource Team, similar in its focus on curriculum, but quite different in its operation from the Maine Team. In Maine, the three-man team worked with teachers in three widely-separated small schools. In Bridgeport, the Team consisted of fourteen part-time members who worked with teachers in four elementary schools.

The Bridgeport Team was larger and its organization more complex than the Maine Team and the initial objectives in Bridgeport were far more ambitious. The Bridgeport Team contracted to help the teachers from inner-city schools to prepare new curricula for a new facility--the Read Middle School--which was scheduled to open in March. The Team began work in September and hoped

to complete a major part of its work before the school opened. Given the short time, success in such a venture would have been extraordinary, especially since curricula for the upper elementary grades had been neglected by national curriculum-development efforts (like EDC's) which had concentrated on primary and secondary school curricula. A part-time staff, meeting evenings and Saturdays with teachers otherwise carrying a full-time load, could hardly have been expected to develop successful new curricula in six months. Thus, it should come as no surprise that the Team had great difficulties. But the source of the Team's problems went beyond its overly ambitious goals.

As the leader of the Bridgeport Team noted later, two factors had cumulatively negative effect on the Bridgeport Team's activities. First, the initial decisions to contract with the Pilot Communities Program were made quickly without the approval and involvement of either the middle echelon of leadership--the principals and supervisors--or the teachers. Neither group was consulted until late in the summer, and then in the context of large, formal planning sessions. By then, the contract was a _fait accompli_; teachers could not formally object even if they opposed the idea. In essence, they were told to use consultants whether they wanted them or not.

Contrast the slow and careful entry process in Maine. There, target schools were selected only after teachers and principals generated their own requests for assistance during a summer workshop. And, even after schools in Maine were chosen, individual teachers had the right to choose not to invite Team members into their classrooms.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT. Second, the top Bridgeport administrators were never united in support of the EDC project. The Superintendent and his assistant

were far more enthusiastic about the proposed project than were the

Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education and the Supervisor

of Elementary Curriculum. (The leader of the Bridgeport Team did not

know this until months later.)

The Bridgeport Team needed a stable relationship with the upper echelons

of the School Department. This did not really materialize until the

initial Team had been disbanded and several new projects started. The

Team's leader cited an example of the kind of confrontation and conflict

that materialized early in the project:

> At our monthly Team meetings we had begun to plan for an on-
> site involvement with teachers at Read School to replace the
> workshops. Our unanimous opinion was that a resource center
> in this school, preferably an extension of the library, would
> serve admirably as a base for Team activities at Read. Much
> to our surprise, the request was turned down because of lack
> of space and we were offered some closet where we could keep
> our materials. The first day of school, the school librarian,
> without checking with her superiors (the Chief Librarian
> and the Principals) suggested that we try to use the library
> as a resource center. Commenting that she would not be able
> to help us because of an impending hospitalization, she asked
> that we hold off any planning until her return.

> At this point an EDC-Newton staffer and I disagreed. His
> immediate response to the Librarian's request was to begin
> immediately. My own recommendation was to wait until she
> returned, then to enlist the aid of the Principals and the
> Superintendents in granting the use of the Library as a
> resource center. He decided to move on his own and he stocked
> a corner of the unused Library and rear consultation room
> with our books and materials. In twenty-four hours the re-
> percussions were felt. The Superintendent of Elementary
> Education, the Chief Librarian and the Principals complained
> to the Superintendent that we had ignored their specific re-
> quests about the storage of our materials. Thereupon, we
> returned the material to the closets.

This incident illustrates several characteristic problems of the Bridgeport

Team. The Team's leader and EDC-Newton staff disagreed about the desirability
of confrontation. In general, the Bridgeport Team leader wanted to follow
a softer, less challenging line, and several of the EDC-Newton staff often
tried to press him to assert the Team's needs more forcefully. In taking
the more aggressive position in this case, however, the EDC Newton staffer
pre-empted the authority of the Team leader, leaving him to handle a problem
that was not of the Team's making. In addition, such a direct and unilateral
challenge to the librarian's superiors fostered unnecessary stress between
the Team and the top administration of the School Department.

As time went on in the Read School project, disagreements like this one greatly
affected the process of joint planning. The Team leader, seeing ever-widening
gulfs between the Resource Team and the administration, suggested to the
Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education that they try to bring the
entire staff of the new school together early in the fall. She told him,
in a briskly-worded note, that plans were "nicely under way." He inquired
then how the Team was to be involved in those meetings and, when he was
informed that the Pilot Communities effort was not on the agenda of the first
meeting, he asked to be invited to make some comments on future plans.
According to the Team leader:

> The meeting itself was extraordinary because the principals
> obviously had no responsibility other than to serve refresh-
> ments. After an introductory remark by the superintendents,
> the Superintendent of Elementary Education took over the
> meeting, reading off the items she had listed for the teachers,
> most of them relating to the logistics of the school move.
> Just before the meeting ended I was called on to make a few
> remarks. The following day I spoke to the Superintendent and
> the Superintendent for Elementary Education to request that at
> least half of the next planning session be devoted to a dis-
> cussion of EDC's role in the school.

A meeting some days later focused on the Team's role in the Read operation. Several Pilot Communities observers were convinced that the Bridgeport Team was doomed to impotence. They told the Team's leader that the Resource Team had made no inroads, and that the Team would do better to clear out of Bridgeport and put its efforts elsewhere.

Tensions between the Team and administrators on several levels in the system continued after the Read School opened in March. This conflict on the upper levels led to haphazard planning and poor morale among the teachers, who were disturbed by over-crowded classes, inadequate books and materials, undisciplined children, and a general lack of appropriate rules and regulations. The teachers could not turn to the principals for help because the principals were caught between the struggles on the upper levels. The lack of communication between the teachers and principals was further aggravated by the lack of communication and substantive disagreements between the Resource Team and the upper echelon of the school system's administration.

As the teachers turned to the Resource Team for assistance, these disagreements with the administration became more intense. From the point of view of the top administration, any alliance between the members and teachers could be viewed as a form of sabotage. Before long, the Team and its leader received a series of instructions from the central office designed to remind the Team members that they were the "guests" of the principals, "to observe and to assist," but not to teach. Such an admonition defeated the initial notion of "master teachers." The leader met with the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, pointing out that they needed as much flexibility in exchanges with the teachers as possible, including the freedom to use demonstration teaching. But the relationship between the

Resource Team and the principals became even more estranged. The Team

leader said later that:

> had the principals not been so threatened by their super-
> visors and so hostile to us, and had we not been so intrusive
> in our manners and hostile to them, we might have been able
> to determine a joint course of action. However, there was
> so much antagonism at all levels that reconciliation and
> orderly sensitive planning of this kind was extremely dif-
> ficult.

In another incident during the Summer Institute of 1968, one of the young

teachers, considered inexperienced by the older staff members, asked a

question of a consultant. The question was immediately challenged by the

Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education. Confused by the challenge,

the young teacher turned to the consultant. He, however, sided with the

Assistant Superintendent. As a result of that incident, the Team's influence

with the teachers continued to decline.

In retrospect, the Team's initial failure to gain solid support from all

the administrators, not just the Superintendent, probably doomed the project

from the start. Because staffing new middle schools was at the center

of Bridgeport's efforts at innovation, an unusual degree of day-to-day

involvement of the top administration was necessary. However, the top ad-

ministrators had not participated in the initial negotiations with Pilot

Communities, and it seems that they never fully approved of the Team.

They thus felt that the Team was intruding in areas that were their respon-

sibility. Since the Team was, by definition, a temporary phenomenon in the

system, the principals and teachers whether or not they agreed with the Team

were far more likely to side with the permanent staff.

TEAM MEMBERS AND TEAM OPERATIONS. The inclination to disagree with the
Team in times of stress and side with the "permanent" system was reinforced
by the make-up of the Team. Only three of the fourteen part-time members
came to the Team from the school system--and they were not typical urban
teachers, but curriculum specialists from the Bridgeport Title I staff.
The rest of the Team were "outsiders:" four were curriculum specialists
on the faculty of the University of Bridgeport, and the others were re-
cruited from school systems in suburban Connecticut, EDC staff in Newton,
and Bridgeport's anti-poverty program. None had had extensive experience
teaching in urban schools.

The newly-recruited Team arranged to meet the Bridgeport teachers through
two large curriculum conferences. Forty Bridgeport teachers and supervisors
attended the first meeting, which introduced them to some of the ideas,
materials and facilities at EDC. Almost one hundred came to the second
meeting in September. By then the Team members had decided to divide into
four sub-teams, each concerned with a major traditional curriculum area:
Social Studies, Science, Math,and Reading. As an outgrowth of the second
meeting, regularly scheduled workshops to explore new ways and new materials.
were arranged by each curriculum sub-team. In order to encourage participa-
tion, the meetings were held after school hours (evenings and Saturday
mornings) and stipends were paid to those who attended; nevertheless, problems
arose. As the Team's leader wrote:

> This probably created fantasies about the extent of EDC's
> power and influence in the system. What else could the
> teachers have thought? The New Haven venture was exceedingly
> extravagant, set off by a luncheon, and the visit to EDC
> included hotel accommodations for all. Curriculum workshops
> under EDC's sponsorship, unlike any others in Bridgeport's

school system history, were not only voluntary but
included a stipend. It wasn't until the middle of
October that the Resource Team realized that the new
budget, to take effect December 1, 1967, would permit
no such generosities as had been encouraged up to then.
The teachers were informed that the new budget would
only permit stipends to be paid through December. It
is hard to say, of course, just how the total Team
effort was affected by the change, but there is no
question that workshop attendance suffered.

In the fall and winter prior to the opening of the Read School, the

workshop-seminars continued. The Science group, composed largely of

the Science teachers from the feeder elementary schools, examined

various ESS units that had proven highly successful with upper elemen-

tary grades. Only a few of the teachers tried out these units in their

classrooms, but for the most part, the feedback indicated that when they

felt comfortable with a unit, the children were interested and responsive.

The participants in the Math workshop became immersed in two-hour sessions

on the application of the geo-board, Cuisennaire Rods, and other devices

for presenting basic arithmetic problems. Most of the Social Studies

seminars were lectures, with guest speakers presenting their various wares.

This exploration of different Social Studies schemes was what the teachers

said they wanted, and attendance at these monthly Saturday mornings was

usually very good.

The English-Reading workshops held at Bridgeport University on Saturdays

were equally well-attended. An EDC-Newton staffer acted as chairman of

these sessions leaving the team with a head in Boston and a body in Bridge-

port. Although the other members of the sub-team were able to meet with

one another frequently, they were only able to plan briefly with the

chairman. The English-Reading workshops were inconsistent in quality and

lacked a clear point of view.

The transition from the workshop-seminars to the on-site work in the new
Read School classroom differed greatly from one curriculum area to another.
The Math specialist, who came to the team with considerable experience as
a trainer and curriculum developer, managed the transition from the
workshop to the classroom well; her workshop members arrived at school with
a clear notion of what they had to do and how they might help develop an
overall curriculum. Moreover, because of their well-defined tasks, this
group had less time to become preoccupied with conflicts within the sys-
tem, and the Math specialist was able to maintain status with the adminis-
tration as well as with the staff. Similarly, although the English-Reading
workshops had not been notably successful, the Reading Specialist, once
she was in the school, quickly responded to the reading problems in the
new school and was soon being sought out for help.

As for Science, the Supervisor of Elementary Curriculum could establish no
clear agreements on how the ESS and other units would be part of the new
curriculum. The Science teachers had some difficulty integrating content
with the techniques of open inquiry, although they were probably among the
best teachers in the school.

The progress of the Social Studies curriculum group was, perhaps the most
difficult to assess. The curriculum consultant in this area outlined an
ambitious curriculum, but could not clearly identify its components in
operational terms. The teachers were unable to make use of the projected
outline. This group also failed to develop black history curricula, even
though that area had high priority in the Read Middle School.

TEAM OPERATIONS--INTERNAL. One important principle can be drawn from the experiences of the Bridgeport Resource Team: team-building should be started very early. The central sense of identity of a Team should transcend the particular concerns of individual curriculum groups. The Bridgeport Team never arrived at an articulated point of view about educational change on an agreement on strategies to effect that change. The welding of the various resource persons and sub-teams into a real Team did not effectively occur.

By the end of the first year, the disagreements about values and objectives crystallized in the planning of the Summer Institute; there it became quite obvious that serious differences existed between the members of the Team from the University of Bridgeport and the members who were either directly hired by EDC or from the Title I staff of the Bridgeport Public School System. From that point on, the concept of a true Team existed in name only.

The leader and the Resource Team hoped that the Summer Institute of 1968 could pull the Read staff together by making them assume joint responsibility for the creation of a curriculum. But this program was planned without involving the principals and teachers and, once again, this omission undermined the crucial point of mutual cooperation. In addition, the appointment of two Team members as co-directors of the Institute limited the possibilities of open exchange between the Resource Team and those with whom they were trying to re-establish a cooperative relationship.

TEAM LEADER. There was much discontent about the quality of the leadership of the Project. Because of the "in-house" power struggles which occurred,

it is difficult to ascertain the true basis for the discontent. The question
is whether the source of discontent was the actual leadership or whether it
was a desire, present from the beginning, to take over the leadership. Dis-
content over the leadership of the Project was voiced not only in Bridgeport,
but also by the EDC administration in Newton, Massachusetts.

In addition, some of the Team members wanted much stronger leadership. When
the leader did not respond, the Team was easily split into factions, each
with its own leader. When the splits in the group began to develop, the
Team would have been helped if the leader had taken a stronger role to
weld them back together. Change agent teams must confront and resolve
differences if they are to work towards agreed-upon objectives.

After the 1968 Summer Institute, the Team gradually reduced its activities
at the Read School. The Team leader resigned in March, 1969. The Math
specialist assumed the leadership of the Team for the remainder of the year
and stayed on during the following school year, 1969-70, as the only re-
maining Bridgeport Team member. Her work was considered highly successful.

EAST SIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL. During the second year, the Read Middle School pro-
ject was gradually de-emphasized, but more and more support was requested by
the principal of another new school--the East Side Middle School. He was
uncomfortable with the relations that had existed at Read School between Resource
Team members and the teachers. Thus, when a new two-man Team arrived at East
Side Middle School in the fall of 1968, the principal and the new Team or-
ganized a planning committee including parents, members of community organizations,
teachers, members of the Model Cities Educational Task Force, members of the

EDC Bridgeport Pilot Communities project, and representatives from the University of Bridgeport and Housatonic College. There were two representatives from EDC, both from the EDC-Newton office, both new to the Bridgeport scene. They saw their relationship to the principal as resource people who would help facilitate the planning of the school. The principal was pleased that these representatives did not plan to follow the team model established in the work with Read Middle School faculty.

After planning by the principal and the large committee, groups drawn from the community and the EDC Resource Team held a six-week summer work-shop in July and August, 1969. This workshop was seen as a starting point rather than a workshop to draw conclusive decisions. The work started during the summer was continued in the following school year, in an on-going, in-service training program for both teacher aides and teachers.

In addition, during that school year, EDC-Newton staff assisted the Super-intendent in an abortive attempt to develop a decentralized district. A large portion of EDC's Bridgeport activity in 1969-70 was directed toward "consultation and training of the Bridgeport school administration" and "assistance with developing and training the community for accepting the ideas of a Model School Division."

SUMMARY. We have already noted the growing awareness that the provision of new curriculum materials alone would do relatively little to change teachers' attitudes. After the first two years of the Program, the shifts in Maine to pre-service education, and in Bridgeport to planning activities with administrators and community representatives, were partially justified

in reports written by Program staff that described the apparent difficulty

of encouraging change through curriculum.

But a reader of those reports is nagged by the "what-if?". What if from

the beginning, the Bridgeport Schools had provided release time and sub-

stitutes and/or extra payments for teachers engaged in developing new

curricula? What if the Bridgeport Team had really confronted its internal

difficulties, examined its own fragmentation, and forged some common objec-

tives?

From the beginning there had been a healthy and pervasive dissatisfaction

with the schools in Bridgeport, a necessary pre-condition to improvement.

The new middle schools were planned to "integrate" the city, and elemen-

tary teachers knew they needed to be pi pared to teach in them. Furthermore,

"the community" was willing both to criticize and to pitch in its lot with

reform. This is not to say that the needs were universally understood or

admitted, nor that the "solutions" were all agreed upon. Indeed, two top

administrators strongly disagreed with many of the ideas generated by the

Team, and perhaps with its very existence. But the failure of the Bridgeport

Team as a whole cannot be attributed to general unreadiness for change.

The resources in Bridgeport also seem to have been spread far too thin.

The Bridgeport Team was essentially on its own financially; there was

little local support. Substitutes and release time were not provided in

the first and second years. One suspects that EDC should have driven a

much harder bargain--the Read Middle School cost millions of dollars, but

the Bridgeport Public Schools were apparently reluctant to spend a cent

to prepare teachers to teach in it.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (III)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities experience
describe the need for continuous rethinking and renegotia-
tion both internally among team members and externally
between the team and the client system.

Operating
Principle

CONTRACTING. The process of contracting, or making and re-
making agreements between the Team and its "clients " never
·stops. The agreements are equivalent to solutions to the
dissatisfactions people have expressed with the school system.
These agreements must be clear and specific at every stage, and,
from the beginning, there must be formally built-in procedures
for periodic renegotiation.

Evidence
from the
Four
Sites

In the case of the Pilot Communities Program in Maine, a
year-long process of contracting and goal-setting resulted
in a lengthy and elaborate needs-census that established the
initial objectives of the Maine Team. Equally important,
the initial contracting process in Maine engaged all the
teachers and administrators in the target schools before
the Team was finally formed. Considerable lack of clarity
over later agreements between individual teachers and
members of the Maine Team continued throughout the first
two years of the project. During the second year, the
Team found it necessary to distribute a paper which stated

its basic assumptions and "some of the beliefs held by
EDC personnel." But, in comparison to much of the work
on the other sites, the Maine Team's tasks and priorities
were clearly, fully, and repeatedly stated.

In Bridgeport, in contrast, the initial contracting process
in the Read Middle School project was severely truncated.
Teachers and principals were involved at the last moment,
which was too late. As one evaluator said, "Teachers were
expected to become involved in the program with no clear and
specific details as to what part they might play in its
development." A more careful planning process in Bridgeport
might also have protected the Team from agreeing to objectives
that were obviously impossible to meet. The initial con-
tracting process in Boston was also too quick, and it involved
too few people on both sides.

In a change project like the Pilot Communities Program, the
process of making agreements never stops. In some change
projects, the change agents can be held accountable for
their agreements, as they are in most performance contracting
schemes. At the other extreme, some change projects operate
with exceedingly open agreements: a group of change agents
is simply engaged to hang around and be useful. Government
sponsored programs like the Peace Corps and Vista come closer
to this extreme.

The Pilot Communities Teams operated somewhere between
these extremes. The Teams did not "guarantee" to im-
prove teacher or student performance. On the other
hand, they never acted as free agents, coming and going as
they pleased with no accountability to their clients. From
the beginning, the more successful Teams were in constant
negotiation making and re-making agreements, with the
individuals and groups

This continuing contracting process was based on the assump-
tion that Team members should declare their own needs and
interests to the people they sought to work with. They were
not merely facilitators, or deliverymen for new curriculum
materials, but they tried to establish a genuinely collegial
relationship in which both parties could respect the rights
and biases of the other. Even after the elaborate early
negotiations in Maine, Team members there were accused of
hiding their real intentions, of manipulating the people
they were working with. Since EDC did have a point of view
about student-centered discovery learning, it was important
for individual Team members to articulate that point of view,
when it was appropriate. Insisting that teachers "discover"--
the discovery method makes the teachers' task almost impossible.

Such an overt, rationalized contracting process might imply
that Team members must know themselves, and each other,
perfectly before they engage to work with clients. But

such perfection is obviously impossible, and probably

undesirable. Team members were not always able to see

themselves clearly, and their motives and beliefs under-

went constant growth. Furthermore, their motivations

were not always neatly congruent with those of their client-

teachers. In Washington, for example, they wanted to

"humanize" the system, but some teachers persisted in

seeing them primarily as deliverymen for new materials.

What seemed best, as a general principle on all four

sites, was a recurring process of setting objectives,

with review dates set well in advance.

Contracting and reviewing objectives are not processes

accomplished solely between individual Team members and

individual teachers. They can involve the whole Team

or sub-teams on the one hand, and school boards, parents,

funding sources, or evaluators on the other. In Maine,

the Team leader declared and defended his Team's objectives

in a hot exchange of articles with a critic in a local

newspaper. Teams in the Pilot Communities Program were

continuously subjected to internal and external evaluations

and reported frequently to EDC-Newton and the U.S. Office

of Education. Each explanation and defense of objectives

can lead to changes in a Team's strategies, and new con-

tracts with the school system, building principles, or

teachers.

Operating
Principle

TEAM-BUILDING AND PLANNING. Team members must make a
conscious effort in building a Team, and it must continue
to grow. Its members must confront each other when neces-
sary, lock horns on problems, make decisions, and keep moving.

Evidence
from the
Four
Sites

The brief excerpts in the Maine log, from a meeting of a Team
with teachers and principals from the target schools
exemplify one sort of team-building practiced by all the
Teams in the Pilot Communities Program. Each Team met for
as much as a day a week to examine its activities, join in
group training exercises which were often presented by
EDC-Newton staff, and "take the temperature" of its efforts
in the schools. Most of the Teams used external group process
consultlants during these introspective meetings to aid their
self-analysis.

As the Bridgeport narrative demonstrates, a Team runs the
risk of failure if it fails to join problematic issues
squarely. A principal function of a Team leader is to
force internal or external confrontation when it is necessary,
and to lead the Team in working through disagreements towards
resolution. The Bridgeport Team avoided disagreements
temporarily by permanently sub-dividing its activities. But
this compartmentalization destroyed the possibility of de-
veloping Team consensus on educational philosophy and strategy,
not to mention facing crises as a Team with a united front.

Sub-dividing for specific short-term tasks was an important
component of each Team's internal process, however. For
example, during the third year, the Boston Team divided into
several groups, each with a detailed mission. The Washington
Team began its work with teachers in pairs and trios, so that
each Team member could learn the others' strengths and weak-
nesses, skills, and difficulties. Like training in process
analysis, pairing became less important over time. But
grouping and re-grouping of small task forces around specific,
short-term problems continued.

Each Team was continuously engaged in its own in-service
training. Team members attended institutes and conferences,
visited experimental schools, took courses at universities,
and watched each other lead workshops. They also lectured,
ran seminars and consulted. EDC-Newton was an especially
valuable resource for this refueling process.

CHAPTER 3

BOSTON

> I wanted to make classrooms a little less structured,
> make school experiences for young people a lot more
> pleasant. . . so they wanted to be in school and
> wanted to learn. I wanted to do something about
> getting more black teachers and black people into
> the schools so that they really understood what was
> going on with their kids. . .

>> Leader of the
>> Boston Innovation Team

Over four years, more Pilot Communities' funds were spent in Boston than

in the other three cities combined -- almost $900,000. The Boston

Team's effort represents a wider range of approaches to educational

change than that of any other Team. The project began with dissemination

of curriculum materials and later expanded its efforts to include assis-

tance in the development of a private "community school", working with

teacher-training institutions and enlisting parents to assist in the

education of their children at a public school. The Resource Team in

Boston was similar to the Washington Innovation Team effort in scale and

duration; nonetheless, differences were numerous and profound.

A fundamental difference between the Washington and Boston Team operations

was staff development and Team growth. During the four years of Pilot

Communities activities, the personnel of the Washington Team remained

essentially intact, but the Boston Team changed almost completely.

Thus, an account of the Washington Team must tell about a group of
people committed to educational change who became a choesive, strong,
confident and competent Team. An account of the Boston Team, on the
other hand, must tell about several "generations" of Team members.
Attempts to select Team members who could be effective in helping teachers
in the target schools and who could work together as a Team consumed much
more energy in Boston than in Washington. We will, therefore, chart the
development of the Boston Team year by year, including both Team
activities and changes in Team structure and personnel.

TEAM MEMBERS. The initial Team members were expected to improve teaching
through the use of curricular materials that were innovative and stim-
ulating to teachers and students. The Team's focus, then, was on the
public school system in general, the classroom in particular. The
original Team, like the initial Teams in Maine and Bridgeport, consisted
of nine master teachers whose skills were in creative teaching and
innovative curriculum management.

Only one member of the original Boston Team had taught in urban schools.
Ironically, she was assigned to organize a Resource Center, and not to
work directly with teachers. Another member, who was one of two blacks on
the Team, had had extensive inner-city experience in community educational
ventures outside the public schools. The rest of the Team was white --
either quite young, with little or no classroom teaching experience,
or older, with suburban teaching experience. The half-dozen older

members of the Team had worked on EDC curriculum projects. This initial Boston Team was an "outside" Team, composed of people from outside the Boston Public Schools. There was also relatively little ethnic "fit" between them and the predominantly Irish teachers they were to work with in South Boston or the black children in the black target schools.

PRECONDITIONS FOR CHANGE AND ENTRY. In the three years that preceded the Boston Teams' formation, several local universities had mounted change programs intended to reform education in the Boston Public Schools. The programs seemed to have little effect, and the universities quickly retreated. With this discouraging knowledge, the Boston Team began to plan its entry around a conscious commitment to "stick it out". The tone of this commitment is captured in the report of the first year's activities:

> It was part of our internal thinking about the program
> that we would not, must not, pull out. . . If we had
> problems difficult to solve, if we had to revise the
> direction of our effort, we would be tenacious about
> maintaning our presence working through our problems.

After visiting several schools, the Pilot Communities' planning staff decided to focus on:

1. the Andrew School District in South Boston, whose lower-
   class white students were mostly Irish

2. the Dearborn School District in Roxbury, whose students were
   mostly lower-class blacks

3. the Boardman School in Roxbury, with mostly black students

4. the development of a Resource Center to service public

school teachers and parents of the two private "community
schools" just starting in Roxbury

An important precondition for change in any system is dissatisfaction
with the current state of affairs. This precondition was met dramati-
cally in the Roxbury community where dissaffection with the public
school system had already produced these community schools. Roxbury
citizens were especially incensed at the almost complete absence of black
teachers in the public schools. In South Boston, on the other hand, teachers,
principals, parents, and children were racially and ethnically homogeneous.
Dissatisfaction there, if it existed at all, was never proclaimed to
people from outside the immediate community.

Teachers in the target schools played no part in the entry process in
Boston, and there was no summer workshop preceding the Boston Team's
arrival on the scene in the fall of 1967. As in Bridgeport, this initial
lack of attention to the teachers' needs undercut the effectiveness of
the Boston Team's early efforts.

INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS -- ANDREW AND DEARBORN SCHOOL DISTRICTS. The
Team's leader visited the Andrew School regularly, demonstrating the use of
E.S.S. materials to three science classes and teaching the classes twice
a week. As the year progressed, she began teaching once a week, leaving
the other class to the regular classroom teacher. By the end of the year,

the regular teachers were doing all of the teaching and she visited classes

only as a consultant. Another Team member worked in arithmetic with a sixth

grade class of below-average skills. She demonstrated use of Cuisenaire

Rods, geo-boards, and other kinds of manipulative materials.

The principal of the Andrew District, described by one Team member as

an "intelligent woman who exercises strong control over her three

schools," determined the extent and location of the Team's activities in

her schools. The principal was openlywarm and receptive, but there remained

a core resistance to fundamental changes, not only in teaching and curriculum

but basic attitudes toward education. The Team's potential effect on education

in the Andrew District was clearly circumscribed from the very beginning.

Although they started with basic science and math materials, Team members

planned eventually to include social studies and a special reading program

already being used in Roxbury.

Pilot Communities programs in the three buildings that made up the

Dearborn District -- Albert Palmer, Dearborn Elementary, and Dearborn

Annex -- represented the greatest involvement in staff and materials that

EDC made in any Boston school from 1967 to the present.

One of the most extensive and important Pilot Community activities in the

Dearborn District was Dr. Nancy Curtis' reading program. As a continuation

of her work in the Roxbury Basic Reading Program, Dr. Curtis trained aides

to teach individual children or small groups of children to read. The

importance of this work was not simply in teaching children to read,

but in getting adults who were not teachers involved in the education of

children. This focus became an increasingly important part of the Boston

Team's activities.

By mid-November, 1967, 12 aides were teaching reading in the Palmer School

to 55 kindergarten and first-grade children. In 25 hours of training

sessions the aides (suburban volunteers and paid community people) were

taught Unified Phonics and given instruction in how to teach this method

of reading to young children. The program was highly structured and

emphasized direct teaching of children as opposed to the more open-ended

discovery methods.

Each aide worked with three to five children two days a week for one hour

each day. The usual discipline problems and the problem of matching the

teaching program to the needs of individual children were encountered at

first. As the aides became more confident in their teaching abilities,

they were more flexible in their techniques and were thus able to alter

the material to fit children's needs.

In the spring of 1968, eleven aides began teaching reading to two sixth-grade

classes in the Dearborn School. This program had the basic aims of "helping

the children improve in the basic reading skills of critical and evaluative

reading, reference skills and vocabulary, and, in addition, working with

the children on special projects designed to encourage utilization of

the reading skills and to develop an interest in wide-range reading".

With the exception of the reading programs, Team activities in the Dearborn

schools were primarily supportive of ongoing classes. Team members were

"extra persons" in the classrooms who attempted to expand the classroom

experience. One Team member worked in a second-grade classroom with

Cuisenaire Rods. Another, from EDC's Photography Laboratory, provided

fourth-grade children with small cheap cameras; children took pictures

and developed and printed them. The products were used to stimulate student

writing. From the beginning, involvement with the teachers was sporadic.

Some teachers even resisted watching the Team members' "demonstrations".

Others treated the Team members as useful extra hands to have in the classroom

--but not essential. Excerpts from one log exemplify the feelings of Team

members about their roles as extras in the classroom:

> I felt the tenor of my relations with most of the faculty
> was quite good, relaxed, friendly, noncombative, except
> when people's anxieties were aroused about the intent
> of EDC in general. However, these friendly relations did
> not lead to very much change in the classrooms of the
> teachers in question. One teacher invited me to work with
> her every day. Over the two months or so there was maybe a
> marginal overall improvement in the way the class went.
> Occasionally we had a very successful day when the kids and
> we were relaxed but not chaotic, and when most of them
> took one of the options (SRA, library, etc.) and did some-
> thing during the period, but not too often. . . She did
> not feel comfortable letting things get beyond a certain
> point. She was in the position of not being able to put her
> ideas into practice, and my coming helped her to do a few things

but not really to change the scene. . . Another class was
taught by the music teacher. Once I got the library started
there, I hoped to work with them last period Fridays, doing
poetry -- something that he had suggested. I became.dis-
couraged by his continually leaving the room when I came to
take the class. I should say angry rather than discouraged --
this being one of the cases where I couldn't express my
actual feeling!! I think Pilot Communities runs the risk
of acting irresponsibly in a place like the Dearborn, because
it is not we but the regular staff who have to live with what
we have created. To say nothing of the kids who find totally
different norms of behavior from one class to the next.

These excerpts capture a great deal of the early strategies and relation-

ships in the Boston Team operations. Team members were interested in

improving classroom teaching but were cautious about trying to change teachers.

They, therefore, chose a middle course -- demonstration teaching -- and hoped

the teachers would learn from watching. But, when the regular teacher

left the room, even the possibility of demonstration was undercut.

We can imagine the feelings on both sides of the dialogue that seldom

occurred:

Team Member: I know how a good class should be run. I will demon-
               strate for you. If you watch and copy what I do, you
               too can run a good classroom.

Teacher: I realize my classes could be run better, but I'm
               no fool. Who does she think she is, the perfect
               teacher? If she wants to be a big deal, let her.
               I'll use the time to relax.

But the Team members' attitudes went even further. They seemed to believe

that they could make the changes, and that smart teachers would then adopt

them.

The teachers' resistances to this "demonstration mode" of change probably originated in faulty handling of the whole entry process. They had not been consulted in the selection of their schools as target schools. So, from the beginning, many were suspicious of the Team. Their "wait-and-see" attitude reinforced the ineffectiveness of demonstration teaching unaccompanied by overt discussion of differences in teaching style and educational philosophy. The Team had backed itself into an unproductive set of contracts with teachers, contracts that allowed Team members and teachers none of the essential dialogue about change.

THE RESOURCE CENTER. Also located in Roxbury, the Resource Center "was originally conceived as a teacher advisory center with responsibilities for working with the community especially in connection with school programs". The Center opened in December, 1967 with an exhibit on reading and language. During the spring of 1968, the Center sponsored a number of activities: four all-day reading workshops directed by educators from local colleges; a series of weekly workshops in mathematics, science, tri-wall carpentry, and education films; a library of teaching materials; a gathering place for many young people in the community; and a center for a variety of people including interns from pre-service teacher-training programs, Peace Corps trainees, and community adults.

The Resource Center became increasingly responsive to the children in the community. The summer of 1968 saw some Head-Start classes, a summer school, a community consumer group workshop, a T-group workshop with new teachers from the Highland Park Free School, and a Drop-In Center instituted with

the help of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

Although the Pilot Communities Team did not sponsor all of these activities,
the Team felt that "the whole tone of the activities and the ways people
met and talked with each other had a cohesiveness and unity that can only
be ascribed to the continuity and responsiveness of the staff of both
Hawthorne House (a community center) and Pilot Communities who were on
hand".

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS. In 1967-68, much of the Team's work outside of the public
schools was concentrated in a private community school, the New School for
Children in Roxbury. The school had been started without careful curriculum
study, and the Resource Team had difficulty communicating with the New School's
staff about matters of curriculum. Team members visited classes, held
discussions with the teaching staff, and conducted several small workshops.
At the end of the 1967-68 year, one Team member left the team to become
Headmistress of the New School. The Team planned to continue assisting the
New School with workshops, materials, and seminars. Similar support was
also planned for the Roxbury Community School.

Of considerably more interest and commitment was the Team's help in establishing
a third community school, the Highland Park Free School. Plans were made to
hire a principal, train teachers, and conduct seminars on education with
parents and other people from the community.*

_____

*A detailed account of the Boston Team's relations with the Highland Park
Free School, is available in another publication of the Pilot Communities
Program. Richard B. Griffin, The Highland Park Free School and Education
Development Center: Uneasy Partnership in Community Education, Education
Development Center, Newton, Massachusetts, 1971.

The Boston Resource Center reading program and the involvement with community schools represented a community-center orientation toward education that was different from EDC's usual school-centered orientation.

By the end of the first year, the Boston Team recognized the need to change its staff and modes of operation. It needed to develop new modes of relationship with teachers, modes that would help both Team members and teachers to confront their differences and respect each other. The Team's increasing priority on work in the black community and outside the schools called for new black community-oriented Team members. Finally, the Team needed a more thorough knowledge of the Boston school bureaucracy if it was to begin working effectively with teachers. These needs were summarized in the Team's end-of-year report:

> There is an underlying effort necessary in building a
> foundation both for the development of new programs and
> for ongoing work in seminars and workshops. . . We must,
> for example, build an intricate knowledge of Boston's
> bureaucracy and its divisions of responsibility. We
> must identify problems as we go along, both our own and
> those which teachers and administrators in the Boston
> schools conceive to be their concern. . . We must
> be constantly building staff, both recruiting new members
> or replacements and continuing a program of development
> of skills.

TEAM OPERATIONS (1968-69). During the second year, the Boston Resource Team experienced many political and personality conflicts within the Team, and between Team members and the EDC-Newton leadership. Although the various curriculum and teacher workshop projects continued, the more important Team activities concerned trying to reconcile the different personalities, goals, and styles of team members.

During the year, the white female Team leader was replaced by a black

male, and the director of the overall Pilot Communities Program was

replaced by a second director, who in turn was replaced by a triumvirate.

In the spring, the triumvirate was replaced by still another director.

This kind of political instability at EDC-Newton did not facilitate the

Boston Team's efforts in the Dearborn and Andrew schools.

A major effort of the Boston Team in its second year was the direction it

gave to a summer session of the newly formed Highland Park Free School, an

experiment in community education. The difficulties of this summer workshop

were not unlike the kinds of problems often voiced by teachers who worked

with Teams at all four sites. Toward the end of the summer workshop,

teachers criticized the "lack of articulated philosophy and goals, lack of

cohesiveness and warmth, lack of background in content, and the black-white

problem". The black-white problem was confronted directly when two

consultants came to talk with the teachers. The black teachers and white

teachers met separately with the consultants and "the meeting of the white

teachers proved to be quite traumatic, since their intentions and effective-

ness in teaching in a predominantly black school were questioned. The

meeting of the black teachers, on the other hand, seemed to strengthen their

feeling of worth and potential".

In spite of these many sources of conflict and tension, one evaluator wrote:

> When compared to the public schools to which the children
> and parents were accustomed, the summer school would
> receive a higher rating than when compared to the expec-
> tations of those who wrote the proposal. The many visitors
> found children and teachers happily working together and
> made many positive comments concerning the climate of
> the school. Many children arrived in the morning before
> the teachers, and to my knowledge no child came against his
> will.

The Highland Park Free School officially got under way in the fall follow-

ing the summer workshop. The school is still in operation and has grown.

Although it continues to face severe money problems, it has served the

community well. There is a new principal, and all the teachers are now

black. Although the Boston Team may have attempted to purvey curriculum

and methods that may not have been appropriate, it may have been just

the right group at the right time to give the impetus needed to launch

the school. The school could stand as one of the Boston Team's most

notable achievements in educational change.

An important event of the second year was the appointment of a black

male to take over the leadership of the Team. A shift in focus, implicit

in the choice, was expressed by the new leader this way:

> (I want) to make classrooms a little less structured
> make school experiences for young people a lot more
> pleasant ones so they wanted to be in school and wanted
> to learn. (I) wanted to do something about getting
> more black teachers and black people into the schools so
> that they really understood what was going on with their
> kids and make it a more human place for the kids.

The new leader reflected a trend away from the earlier concentration on

curriculum. There was not an abrupt shift, but his interest in black

teachers and community people coincided with the Team's earlier commit-

ment to parent involvement. During the 1969-70 year this shift was

discussed openly and was a source of contention within the Team.

TEAM OPERATIONS (1969-70): The perfunctory entry process and minimal

contractual arrangements that had accompanied the initiation of the

Resource Team in Boston contributed to the confused course it followed.

The original task was not clearly set; the initial goals were vague.

Boston was chosen primarily because of its proximity to EDC in Newton.

The selection of the two school districts were apparently based on a

desire to work with what appeared to be a powerful, white, South Boston

constituency and a problematic, black Roxbury constituency. The major

criteria were, therefore, political and sociological, not educational.

These criteria were involved in the other site selections also, but

nowhere as forcefully as in Boston. Thus, many of the Team's activities

over the four years were in response to social and political pressures

from various sectors of the constituency. In addition, these same fac-

tors exerted strong influence on the Team's internal operations.

On the other sites, fairly clear objectives were charted and activities

were geared toward achieving them. The goals were pursued until comple-

tion (Washington) or until blocked, at which point new directions emerged

(Maine), or the project was terminated (Bridgeport). But the activities

of the Boston Team were significantly determined by political pressures

until the final year (1970-71) when a reassessment and regrouping resulted

in an equilibrium of sorts, and the Team was able to identify and pursue

a goal of its own choosing.

Planning for the 1969 school year began with a Summer Institute for forty

teachers and parents from the Dearborn and Andrew School districts.

One of the objectives of the Institute was "to encourage the development

of positive attitudes toward schools in parents and community people by

introducing them to what's going on in today's classroom." Parents con-

sidered the Institute very successful in this objective. Parents also liked

meeting teachers on an equal footing. Some of their comments are illus-

trative:

> I liked most that parents and teachers got to know each
> other, and the parents found out that they could relate
> to the teachers. They learned a lot more....after they
> learned about the teachers, they could communicate with
> them.

> I liked it because the parents had a chance to get
> together with a lot of the teachers.... mostly on an even
> keel, where they weren't really standing on ceremony but
> were working one with the other.

> I liked the idea of being with the teachers and it gave
> you opportunities to know what was really going on in
> the classroom, to know what the teachers are doing and
> what they like doing.

Parents also liked learning new skills. One commented:

> The one thing the Dearborn Summer Institute introduced
> to the people in the neighborhood was that they had skill
> they didn't know they had.

For future workshops, parents suggested that more parents, as well as

more children, be involved, and also that they have a chance to partici-

pate in the planning stages.

With teachers it was quite another story. Participants were allowed to

attend workshops in photography, language arts, reading, dramatics, math

and science, building with tri-wall, or black social studies. They

could also choose to work individually on writing and generating curri-

culum appropriate to their own needs in the classroom. The large amount

of freedom was not always appreciated. Many felt it was "disorganized."

Teachers commented:

> The beginning contained more structure; then it became
> a free-for-all.

> A lot of people I talked to sort of felt it was a game.
> They were getting paid, and they were happy with the money.
> Other than that they really didn't see the purpose of it....
> A lot of teachers felt a terrible lack of direction and a
> lack of relevance. It was just sort of messing around,

you know? And it was an enjoyable way to get some money
without putting out too much effort. I think it was too
bad that a lot of them were sort of sneering at the whole
thing.

I had a new dog, and it was too hot. They let us choose
what we wanted to do and I chose the beach.

The freedom of the Institute seems to have produced reactions in the

teachers not unlike those often attributed to black parents and children

who confront open education. The parents want their children to learn

specific skills in school. The children say "Wow, going to school and

getting to play and take trips! That's school work?" As one teacher

commented:

If you're going to unstructure a class or learning exper-
ience, a person who is leading that experience has to be
tremendously structured himself, and that's the chief
thing that was wrong with the Institute.

A major educational controversy is reflected here--the open classroom ver-

sus the tight training classroom. Many black educators and parents have

advocated the tight classroom for black children. The reading workshop

at the Dearborn School was a significant exception to the Institute's

atmosphere. Attendance was compulsory and a carefully delineated set of

skills and materials was taught. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark's program for teach-

ing reading in Washington emphasizes performance contracting. Strict

adherence to this plan (known in Washington as the Clark Plan) makes it

very difficult to follow the open classroom philosophy promulgated by the

Pilot Communities Program. It is not clear whether the two approaches are,

in fact, incompatible, but at the moment, the two camps are clearly divided.

One serious question implied in this controversy is whether the goals of

educational change are different for black and white children, parents,

and communities. But, as the teacher commented, whatever way an individual chooses to organize the learning experience, the instructor must have his own principles tightly organized. The effectiveness of his techniques must be judged against the needs of the participants and the carefully worked-out goals of the instructor. Much of the Pilot Communities work can be seen as the development of strategies for education, rather than the implementation of such strategies.

NEW TEAM STRUCTURE. Because of its extensive commitments to thirty separate educational agencies and institutions, both public and private, the Boston Resource Team had to reorganize in 1969. The four principal components of the Team's activities (Research and Development, Evaluation, Community, and Operations) were coordinated with three Task Forces (Whole School, Pre-and In-Service Training, and School Department).

The Whole School Task Force worked directly with teachers and administrators, both individually and through workshops in the Dearborn and Andrew Schools. This teacher-directed effort was considerably diluted by the Team's expansion into new areas. Some of the original Team members, whose major commitment was to working with teachers in the target schools, became disaffected and resigned during the year.

The Pre- and In-Service Training Task Force maintained relationships with Highland Park Free School, New School for Children, the Roxbury Community School--a community school started by the Committee for Community Educational Development--a group of four Catholic parochial schools in Roxbury which were redesigning their curricula--and teacher-training institutions.

The Resource Center, located in the Hawthorne House in Roxbury, continued

its workshops for teachers, a Black History Library, and served as a

drop-in center for children and adults. The School Department Task

Force dealt with the administration of the Boston public schools. Its

principal activity was the development of a bilingual school for Spanish-

speaking children.

One of the principal negative effects of the new and elaborate organiza-

tion was to split the Boston Team into unworkably small sub-units; in

addition, most members were part of more than one sub-group, demanding

more and more meetings with less and less results. Perhaps most impor-

tant, there was also a disunion among Team members. Individuals who had

commitments to their own activities now found themselves in competition

with their fellow Team members for EDC monies and resources. Thus, the

question of focus became crucial. In a January letter, the Team leader

suggested

> that our direction and focus should be primarily one
> of bringing awareness and education to the consti-
> tuency--and we mean by that parents and community
> people that are involved with students who attend
> public schools. (For education) to be relevant to
> black people, non-whites and poor people, there must
> be a mutual appreciation for the differences in people
> and one need not feel that their existence and their
> set of values is necessarily better (or worse) than
> another's.

Congruent with this emphasis, the Task Force leaders decided that mean-

ingful education must involve improving the self-image of the child, a

search for changing values, and working with parents in a productive

way. They also thought strategy for constant in-house reassessment

needed to be articulated, and individual Team members' skills and

abilities needed to be clarified. However, these attempts at self-direction were doomed by the diversity of personal goals and directions. It was clear that the Team leadership was moving more heavily toward a community involvement, but some of the original Team members were not prepared to accept this focus. Racial conflicts played a part in this inability to achieve unity of purpose.

SELF-EVALUATION. An important part of team-building activity is self-evaluation. Without built-in checks, it is quite possible to go astray or to find that one's efforts are achieving undesirable effects. The Boston Team was very conscientious about taking stock of itself. During this period of shifting emphasis in the spring of 1970, it asked itself questions like the following:

> How can we explain to black kids that this country passed
> laws never believing blacks were people?
>
> Where in the system can there be change?
>
> What kind of approach will provide individuals with
> another criterion to measure education progress?
>
> Are we thinking about team-building or cleaning house?
>
> How do we strengthen Team members? How do we strengthen
> people?
>
> How to help kids deal with competition in schools yet
> prepare them for a competitive society
>
> How can the group improve the self-image of kids when
> they aren't involved in self-examination?
>
> What is the best approach or what are the best approaches
> for involving parents?

Answers did not come easily. And when they did come, it was not always

possible to implement the suggested actions. As one Team member said

in retrospect:

> If you are going to embark on a program like this,
> you've got to get a large Team and this large Team has
> to be very similar in the way they operate and the
> philosophy they have about education. If not, you
> spend all your time fighting and discussing the things
> you are going to do--then you never get to the task.

Diversity of race, philosophy, tactical strategy, and Team activities

characterized the Boston Pilot Communities' effort during the first three

years. The year 1969-70 saw the maximum variability on each point. At

the close of the year, the Team decided to concentrate all of its efforts

on the Dearborn School district.

The Team had begun the year with eighteen members. By the end of the

year, four including the leader had quit and five had been let go. The

only remaining original Team member became the leader of a seven-member

all-black Team. There were also two white part-time members, but the

focus on the Dearborn School and the Resource Center in Roxbury repre-

sented the focus that had never previously been achieved. The Team mem-

bers who began planning the 1970-71 year were in _their_ first year of

existence as a Team.

TEAM OPERATIONS (1970-71). By the end of June, 1970, the Boston Team

had undergone an almost complete transformation. The original Team con-

sisted of white, mostly female school teachers who had little urban

school experience. The Team that began the summer was black, largely

male, with few teachers and several community organizers. All Team

activities were to be concentrated in the Resource Center and the Dear-

born School district.

In the summer of 1970, EDC held a workshop in Newton for teachers from

all over the country. Among those attending were five members of the

Boston Team. Of those attending the workshop, only one had had any teach-

ing experience in Roxbury (he taught physical education at the Dearborn

School), and only one other had taught in regular classrooms. Three were

formally introduced to teaching and curriculum at this workshop.

The Team that began the year had a unified focus and similar philosophies

of education. Since many of the Team members were new in education,

learning about teaching techniques and school systems were difficult and

demanding tasks.

The Team set the following goals:

- Changing the physical appearance of the Dearborn School
  including lighting, broken glass and garbage removal, as
  well as painting, fixing window panes, doorknobs and
  shades.

- Improving the morale of the school staff and students.

- Making the curriculum relevant to the needs of the stu-
  dents.

- Getting more parents involved in the school.

The Team's activities for the year were coordinated around two loca-

tions, the Resource Room in the Dearborn School and the Resource Center,

located in a former bank building in the Roxbury community. The Resource

Room served the children of the Dearborn School and was planned to serve

the teachers as well. The Resource Center primarily served the com-

munity, but also was used for teacher workshops and student projects.

Under the slogan "Dearborn is Beautiful," the Resource Room brightened

up an otherwise drab and depressing school building. An average-sized

classroom in the Dearborn Annex, it housed a variety of activities.

Paperback library, darkroom, science corner, art supplies, and sewing

machines interested and excited students--a rarity in the Deerborn

School.

It is almost impossible to convey in writing the ethos of the Resource

Room. The curriculum materials were designed and presented in ways to

which children could respond and enrich their own experience of the world;

it was an attempt to reach rather than to teach the children. A session

on the Eskimos exposed the children to the contrasting cultures of minority

groups. A photography unit on their community helped the children to

experience more clearly their own particular way of life. A Parents'

Awareness Workshop encouraged parents to become involved with their

children in the process of learning and growing.

Teachers did not use the Resource Room; they "felt it belonged to EDC."

Most of them felt it was important to the school, but did not feel they

had any stake in its functioning. The Resource Room remained an oasis

in the school until the end of the year.

Pilot Communities ended in June of 1971. The Boston Team spent several

months agonizing over what would become of the Resource Room, what would

become of the children. They feared leaving the children with a sense

of abandonment. They had little confidence that the teachers would or

could carry out the work of the Resource Room.

An entry from an evaluator's log, after the Team had left, provides a postscript to the Team's activities in the Dearborn.

June 1971

On my way into the main building, one of the three school volunteers walking behind me had her handbag stolen and was knocked down in the process of trying to hang on to it. She was an older woman with white hair--looked like a typical suburbanite. Caught a glimpse of the boy running with her bag as she sat in the middle of the road, red-faced and a bit stunned.

I picked up questionnaires that teachers had left in the office, then proceeded to the annex. The Resource Room had been vandalized over the weekend, and all the audio-visual equipment had been stolen. Books and other things were strewn about the room; the windows had been boarded up, and the room had been torn up.

The constant confusion, kids running up and down the hallways, in and out of classes. Girls smoking forbidden cigarettes in the bathroom, trying to find ways to duck classes. Kids going into classrooms selling stolen goods, cookies, little cakes, and ice cream. "EVERYTHING IS GOING ON HERE EXCEPT EDUCATION."

The Resource Room was gone, vandalized. Although the teachers felt it belonged to EDC, and Team members felt teachers did not care, the nearly unanimous consensus was that it was a good thing, and the Dearborn School was better for it.

These comments by teachers and administrators at the Dearborn School capture some of the perceived good and bad points of the Boston Team's effort at the Dearborn. On balance, the reaction was highly positive. Looking to the future, however, the vandalized Resource Room sets the tone. There remain white teachers teaching black children who, with their parents, lack confidence and interest in the school.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (IV)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities' experi-
ence describe the ideal working relationship between teams
and teachers.

Operating   QUICK RESPONSE TO NEW OPPORTUNITIES. Team members' time
Principle
should be loosely enough allocated to allow quick response to
needs that arise on the project site.

Evidence   In comparison to the teachers they were serving, the Teams
from the
Four   in the Pilot Communities Program had vast blocks of uncommitted
Sites
time. They could respond to opportunities that arose and
shift their resources to cover obligations incurred in the
past. The response of the Washington Team to the incidents
that followed the assassination of Martin Luther King (see p.
91) beautifully illustrates the potential of creative Team
work.

The Boston Team was especially responsive to newly-discovered
needs. Team members helped plan a new private community
school. They organized a large bilingual program for Spanish-
speaking children. They worked with education task forces
in Boston's Model Cities Program. And they helped parent
groups to organize. To some extent, this fervent work outside
of the schools arose from the Boston Team's difficulties relat-

ing to teachers in schools. But it was a¹so a series of genu-

ine responses to never-ending demands for help from under-

staffed groups.

**Operating
Principle**

THE NECESSITY OF TRUST. Without mutual trust, any helping

relationship will founder. As one Team member put it, "change,

being personal, is based on trust, and one has to be trusted

as a person before much happens in the way of attitude change.

That business of building trust needs time."

**Evidence
from the
Four
Sites**

A Team member in Boston struck a similar chord:

> "The first thing is establishing a trust level so they
>
> can feel you have something in common with them, and,
>
> secondly, that you can work with them. It's very impor-
>
> tant not to work on them, which seems to be the prac-
>
> tice for a lot of people coming in who call themselves
>
> change agents. They sort of come in working their
>
> own thing rather than finding out what kinds of things
>
> parents are concerned about. Work around those things;
>
> then, possibly, as a result . . . find some success
>
> so that you can move onto other things that you may see
>
> as important. But they have to be able to work out their
>
> own things in the beginning in order for them to have any
>
> confidence in themselves and you. Work with, rather than
>
> on."

He also talked about listening and helping in a way that is
applicable to all of the Teams' operations.

"The first rule is to learn how to listen, and be able
to process the things that you listen to in order to be
able to come up with a working plan that both community
people and you agree on. There are too many times that
people go in working in their own thing. There's nothing
wrong with that, but there's a time and a point at which
you can do that and that's after you have established
this credibility and after you have overcome this trust
barrier. The only way that you can overcome this thing
is by listening to people and trying to help them to faci-
litate their ideas first. Now if they agree on some
other things that you want to do then you can go on, but
so many times people come in and they've got their whole
plan mapped out and they start working it and they meet
a lot of resistance and they wonder why. The point is
that people don't feel as if they have any part in that
plan, making up that plan, so as a result they are going
to resist it because they do not know what ends you are
working for."

And there cannot be a "facade;" there cannot be a "screen;"
the Team member cannot go through the futility of playing
"expert." Instead, humility is necessary. A person who is
honest must say "I don't know everything," and "let's work
some of these things through;" he cannot be the person who
says "I know."

CHAPTER 4

WASHINGTON

> The Team is a group of classroom teachers charged with
> providing an in-service program for teachers. What's
> unique about this? Simply the fact that teachers are
> responsible for the program. . . . Given no authority
> and no formal evaluative powers, this group has designed
> and implemented the Model School Division (MSD) in-
> service program for four years.
>
>   Ike Gordy
>   Leader of the
>   Washington Innovation Team

The members of the Pilot Communities Team in Washington all attribute their

high degree of success as a team to the fact that they had previously been

classroom teachers in the schools in which they worked. They did not come

as experts from outside the system. In this respect, the Washington Team

was unique in the Program. Of equal, if not greater importance, is the

fact that before the Innovation Team began, the Pilot Communities staff

and the school administrators associated with the Model School Division (MSD)

in Washington had come to trust and respect one another. In fact, the very

idea of the Innovation Team came out of their joint efforts to provide sup-

port to fifty elementary teachers.

PRECONDITIONS FOR CHANGE. In the years before the founding of the Innova-

tion Team, the poverty of the school system in the Model School Division

area ran deep--deeper by far than simple material shortages. As one educa-

tional reformer stated in a letter to Congressmen Adam Clayton Powell and

Roman C. Pucinski:

The outmoded nature of the system can be seen in the
structure of the school system itself where standard
operating procedures undercut the status of the teacher,
inhibit the verbal development of the deprived child,
and restrict the participation of the non-middle-class
adult. The poverty of the system is visible in the
precedence that administrative goals have over what should
be the ultimate goal--teaching.

Principals must complete outlandish numbers of forms
before staff, supplies, and students can come together
in a learning situation. The teacher who requests some-
thing unusual wins no favor for her ingenuity; it is
far simpler to require that everyone use the same supplies
and order them at the same time, and ignore the fact that
they may be needed later or that the enthusiasms of a
class may suddenly demand unanticipated teaching materials.

/The/ lack of flexibility /characterizing the District's
schools/ does more than simply inhibit learning. It rein-
forces undesirable attitudes and behavior among administra-
tors, teachers and students. Control, not learning, becomes
the keystone; and authority, not participation, becomes the
standard method of operation. The result is that rather
than working together, administrators, teachers and students
seem locked in battle.

The purpose of the MSD and, eventually, the Innovation Team, was to see

that this organizational poverty in the Washington school system was

somehow changed or eradicated.

The movement for a Model School Division began with a report of March, 1964,

by the President's Panel on Educational Research and Development. The report

urged superintendents of urban school systems to carve out a sub-system of

schools and free them to experiment without the usual institutional restraints.

The Superinten ent of the D. C. schools, taking the report as a mandate,

proposed that the Board of Education adopt the model school system concept

and implement it by appointing an Advisory Committee. With the creation of

this committee, the MSD was officially launched.

There is no need to review the early development of the MSD and its
Advisory Committee except to say that although the autonomy proposed in
the Panel's report was never achieved, the MSD did become an area in the
District school system in which experimentation and innovation were more
possible than elsewhere. Additional, albeit limited, funds from the anti-
poverty program provided the MSD with a staff of people whose job was to
think about innovations to improve the school system. The rhetoric about
autonomy, even when it was not intended to be taken seriously, created
a tension that these people could, and did, exploit. Thus, for example,
it was the availability of the Advisory Committee's staff member and funds
that enabled the MSD to conduct its first Summer Institute in 1965.

One of the basic purposes of the Summer Institute was to introduce MSD
teachers to new curriculum and teaching methods which would presumably
make the classroom learning situation more exciting and dynamic. It was
expected that those teachers first familiarized with the new curriculum
materials would eventually be prepared "to act as local resource teachers
for the rest of the staff in their school."

The 150 Summer Institute participants returned to their classrooms in the
fall, and many tried to implement the new ideas and methods they had learned.
But, although the Institute planners had spelled out a follow-up strategy
that involved continued consultant support through Saturday workshops, the
numerous administrative problems that plagued all the MSD programs in the
first few years of operation interfered with these plans.

The following year (1966), when teachers trained in a second Summer

Institute returned to their classrooms, the same support problems were

raised. Moreover, by the spring of 1967, the MSD had a cadre of almost

300 teachers, many of whom could be master teachers. There obviously

existed at this time both the need for greater coordination of the MSD func-

tions and the people trained to fill the need. Recognizing this match

between needs and resources, the assistant superintendent of the MSD

(Norman Nickens) and the science consultant from EDC (Mary Lela Sherburne)

asked fifteen MSD teachers to become members of what came to be called

an Innovation Team. The teachers were to be freed from specific class-

room duties as they took responsibility for training other teachers in

new materials and methods and helped coordinate MSD functions and services.

TEAM BUILDING AND PLANNING. The Summer Institute of 1967 focused primarily

on building a team of fifteen into a cohesive working unit. A report by

two consultants from EDC Pilot Communities describes the initial training

of the team at the Institute.

> A week of sensitivity training brought into focus, and
> out in the open, some of the driving and countersurging
> forces for change working in the sub-system. The lack
> of communication between all levels of administration and
> teachers continued to be a theme. It was a common feeling
> that decisions were made by a few people, and that the
> opinions of the majority counted very little. The role of
> outside consultants in the system was questioned. . . .
>
> At the end of the week, the group produced a detailed list
> of factors which they felt were threatening the forward
> movement of MSD, and those which they felt were pushing
> it forward. This formulation became the basis for the
> planning of the operation of the Staff Development Conference
> for the next four weeks. During that period the group
> operated a small laboratory school for use in working
> through and discussing curriculum problems.

More importantly, its members communicated with each
other about their special programs, and problems, and
the whole group entered into discussion of plans as to
how the team of fifteen teachers would function in the
coming school year. Dr. Cernius remained with the group
as a consultant on group procedures and operations. He
worked, as he expressed it, "to help the team members
free themselves from self-imposed psychological restraints
which stifled their functioning both as people and change
agents." A prime need was to get the group thinking in
terms of the needs of others, and to consider alternative
change strategies.*

A summary of the early history of the Team by Mrs. Sherburne, the science

consultant from EDC, lists both what the Team decided its functions should

be and what conditions must prevail if it were to succeed.

Major functions of the Team:

1. To help teachers see themselves as potential instruments
for initiating change in their own behavior. . .

2. To help teachers improve instruction in the classroom to
the level that teaching and learning are both more pleasant
activities. . .

3. To increase the power of teachers in decision-making in
the school, especially in the area of curriculum. . .

4. To provide a coordinating function for services, resources,
and school programs which assist a teacher to look at her
classroom unit as a whole. . .

5. To provide a channel for experts, specialists, and people
from many walks of life to enter the school system. . . at
a level which will affect teaching and learning.

Conditions Necessary for Success

1. All classroom teachers had to have some opportunity for
on-the-job training. . . (As a consequence, release
time was built into the program.)

2. Teachers had to have the right to choose among new pro-
grams, to exercise options, and to feel they
could make choices and exercise responsibility for the
instructional programs they carried out.

*Mary Lela Sherburne and Vytas Cernius, The Innovation Team: A Model for
Change in Inner City Schools? Pilot Communities Program: Newton, Mass.,
1968.

3. Teachers had to have access to new curriculum materials, equipment, and supplies on an immediate and responsive basis. . . (Therefore, the team set up its own purchasing and distribution system for special and innovative materials.)

4. The authority of the team should be that derived from its own competence and ability to deliver services to teachers. It would have no direct administrative, evaluative, or supervisory role. (Consequently, the team members retained their classification as teachers and worked with a teacher only when she exercised the initiative in requesting help.)

The summer experience was important, less because of the goals or conditions established for success, than because at the Institute the Innovation Team came to understand group process and group process techniques (which they later used in their own relationships with other teachers) and to know each other as potential colleagues. The process of building Team cohesion and establishing operating procedures continued into the fall.

TEAM OPERATION.* Mrs. Sherburne, although white and not a MSD teacher, was elected the first Team leader. A training center for teachers was established in an old furniture store. The Team also decided to set aside Fridays of every week to continue their own growth in both skills and group process with outside consultants.

The Team decided that it would function in the fourteen schools, not as individuals, but as sub-teams. Each sub-team, composed of three members with different subject matter specialties, was to be responsible for three buildings. This division was conceived as a way of increasing the variety

---

*Logs of Team meetings and the Team members' meetings with teachers, principals, and other school personnel have unfortunately been lost. Thus, much of the reconstruction of how the Team operated day-by-day is from the proposals and reports of those who were intimately involved in the Team. Although activities may not have been carried out as smoothly as some of these accounts would suggest, they are useful as an overview of Team operations.

of talent, skills, and personalities available to each school. It also was a way to permit Team members to support one another in a working situation. The Team also agreed that, as a general policy, any Team member could be called on for use in special situations in a school by any other member if his particular specialty were needed.

The Team's first efforts were directed at introducing themselves to the principals and assistant principals of the schools where they would work. In a series of meetings, they exchanged ideas on how to maximize the Team's effectiveness. However, the Team was not accountable to these principals but rather to the Assistant Superintendent of the MSD. In fact, this independence from the principals seemed so important to the Team that it went so far as to obtain the right to enter and leave any of the fourteen buildings without having to announce the fact to the principal. (After a few years of working almost entirely with the teachers, the Team was to turn to more direct involvement with the principals as initiators of change. But its independent relationship with them always continued.)

The sub-teams then met with the faculty of each of the schools where they would be working to describe the ways in which they might be of assistance. Ike Gordy, a member of the Team, listed a number of these functions:

1. Converse with teachers about their needs

2. Order materials for teachers

3. Conduct classroom demonstrations for new and tenured teachers

4. Substitute for teachers who were either ill or attending workshops

5.   Put up bulletin boards

6.   Assist with the writing of lesson plans

7.   Assist with the physical examinations of children

8.   Conduct and organize workshops

9.   Provide moral support for teachers.

The Cernius and Sherburne report catches some of the flavor of the first

months.

> The first year was characterized by ebullient spirit and
> immediate successes. Team members found friends and
> supporters among the teaching staff and the supervisors
> and administrators, especially those who had been part of
> the summer conference. In general, the team met positive
> and well-disposed attitudes, or at the worst, questioning
> and wait-and-see ones.

> There was an immediate need for the Team's services with
> seventy new, mostly inexperienced teachers, entering the
> Model Schools. These new teachers were the victims of
> their lack of familiarity with the style of the children whom
> they were to teach in the inner city. First week classes
> were often chaotic. Where and how did one begin?

> The friendly, experienced hand of a Team member was more
> than welcome. They would teach a lesson and give the new
> teacher a chance to rest and observe. They would reorganize
> the room, and be off, only to be back in a while with some new
> piece of equipment or educational game which could occupy
> overactive students and grant the new teacher precious
> learning time to grab hold.

> Even more astonishing, they would finish and would ask, "Now
> what would you like in the way of new materials, or workshops
> to help you do a better job?" And in a few days they would
> be back with a list of offerings and the suggestion that the
> teacher make her choice. Old and new teachers alike welcomed
> the materials and workshops the Team offered. Initial gains
> were easily made in this atmosphere. Feedback, both from
> team to teachers and from teachers to team, was reinforcing.

> The team set up procedures for ordering and distributing sup-
> plies. They were responsible for their own purchasing. A
> contractual agreement with EDC provided ready access to funds
> and rapid purchasing to meet daily and changing needs of
> teachers.

Until the end of October the team was immersed in formu-
lating its new role. All relationships were new and
exciting. The easiest tasks came first. The consultant,
Dr. Cernius, reminded the team in one of its weekly
sessions in October, "This is the honeymoon."

Among the activities conducted the first year, the volunteer workshops in

reading, mathematics, social studies, and science involved the bulk of the

Team's time. Not only did the Team members schedule the workshops, they

arranged for the appropriate consultants, handled enrollment, obtained the

necessary substitute teachers to free the teachers to attend (since they

were held during the school day), and helped lead the meetings. The following

sample from the January-May, 1968 schedule is illustrative.

Tuesday, February 20 INDIVIDUALIZED READING   (Beginning)   Grades 1-6

This workshop is open to those teachers who have ordered
the SOUNDS OF LANGUAGE reading series and OWL series, or
who wish to order them and begin an individualized program.

The extent of use of individualized materials, and the tran-
sition to the program can be gradual and modified to your
class and needs. Therefore, there is no need to fear be-
coming involved at this time of the year. You can use what
you learn--now and later!

        Consultant: Mrs. Peggy Brogan
        Instructors: Edith Baxter and Annie Neal
        Workshop open to 30 teachers

Wednesday, February 21   AFRICAN WORKSHOP   9:30-2:30

Enrichment for teachers who are involved or have been
involved in the study of Africa. Workshop will include
curriculum evaluation, resource people, books, records,
materials available, listed trips and artifacts necessary.
Correlation with Negro History as a new unit of a cul-
minating activity from Mr. Penn, Director of History
Department, D.C. Public Schools.

        Consultant: Dr. Bernard Coleman, Assistant Secretary
                           of African Affairs, State Department
        Instructor: Donald Greene

Monday, February 26   BRINE SHRIMP AND GROWING SEEDS   Grades K-2·

> An introduction to two of the most successful units on
> living things which are in use in the Model Schools.
> Both are useful in the primary grades and <u>Brine Shrimp</u>
> can be used in a more intensive way in Grade 4. You
> will learn the techniques of culturing brine shrimp and
> will observe and learn more about these animals by watching
> them. Likewise, you will work intensively on the methods
> and ways of using <u>Growing Seeds</u> graphing.
>
> Materials will be provided.
>
> Instructors: Vivian Lightfoot, Flora Hill, Annie Neal
> Workshop open to 30 teachers

Wednesday, February 28   SMALL THINGS   (Advanced or Beginning) Grades 5-6

> This workshop will prepare you to begin teaching <u>Small</u>
> <u>Things</u> and will provide assistance in advanced problems of
> the microscope, culturing protozoans or continuing with
> the study of pond and water life. (See March 27 workshop
> on <u>Pond Water</u>). Materials will be provided. When you
> sign up, indicate whether you're beginning or advanced.
>
> Instructors: Ralph Jenkins and Flora Hill
> Workshop open to 30 teachers

As the workshop program suggests, the Team focused on introducing new

methods and new curriculum that emphasized the use of concrete learning

materials and individualized and active learning experiences. Gordy's

recollections express some of the tensions this Pilot Communities' approach

imposed on the MSD teachers:

> The consultants did not simply bring "innovative", mani-
> pulative materials, but also a strange and different
> teaching style--a style which appeared permissive in
> nature and contradictory to the current of successful
> methods employed by these teachers. Many of us "urban
> teachers" had been led to believe that in order to survive,
> we had to have a disciplined class, operating according to
> strict rules. The proposed style required an individual
> to relinquish the role of the authority figure and to share
> the responsibility for learning with the student. This
> idea was quite frightening. Most humans find it difficult
> to alter behavior, particularly if the repercussions of
> the change are an unknown quantity.

The Innovation Team conducted 68 workshops during 1967-68, involving more
than 2,000 teacher days in training. (Each MSD teacher was entitled to
four full-day workshops.) About one-half of the sessions made use of outside
consultants in association with Team members. Every teacher who attended
a workshop was given the necessary materials to begin teaching or using the
new methodologies. Approximately half of the sessions were related to
reading and language arts. Some workshops were single, day-long interven-
tions only; others were sequential and required attendance of the same
teachers over a period of weeks.

In the spring of the first year, the Team arranged and secured support for
two summer Institutes the largest of which was a Reading Institute for 65
K-3 teachers.

The second Summer Institute on the teaching of a social studies unit was
organized and conducted by one member of the Innovation Team, in cooperation
with the Smithsonian Institution and under a grant from the National Science
Foundation.

Finally, the Team engaged in on-site curriculum development. One of the
efforts was a booklet "Names You Hear in Cardozo," a biographical work on
the Negroes for whom the schools in the Cardozo area were named. A second
book, "Tell It Like It Is," was produced in response to the riots of April,
1968, following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

The publication of the children's book made the Team an "instant" success.
A veritable deluge of demands suddenly descended upon it. Although greatly
warmed by this response, the Team was initially unable to deal with the
multitude of requests for its time and assistance. For a time,

things floundered as activities were overscheduled, under-organized, and
no one had yet learned to say "no."

TEAM LEADER. During the Washington Team's second year, although activities
continued much as they had before, more attention was focused on managing
priorities. The second year was also marked by a significant shift in
leadership from the white, outside consultant to a black teacher as elected
Team leader. Ike Gordy, the new leader, attempted to re-organize the team.
He, too, encountered numerous problems, all of which had to be worked out.
He wrote, in retrospect:

> My initial operating style was one in which I was a nice
> guy, responding to the whims and/or concerns of every
> individual. Foremost in my mind was the fact that I must
> be "successful" and must be liked by my peers. I say peers
> because to be an elected leader means only that I am respon-
> sible for the coordination of the Team's activites, for
> chairing meetings, and for representing the group when
> necessary. This is in no way a promotion, nor does the
> appointment elevate me.
>
> My initial way to do what I knew I must do was to set up a
> pilot or steering committee to assist in the decision-making
> process. Prior to this, most of the decisions for the group
> were made by the Team on Fridays. A second task for this
> group of Task Force chairmen was to decide, by consensus, the
> agenda for Friday's meetings and, finally, to determine the
> order of priorities for the group. During this period, the
> overt concerns were again to develop group cohesion and
> remain at individual tasks, decided and controlled by the
> group. Many efforts were made by members of the Team to
> break from the group tasks and seek fulfillment from self-
> motivated projects.
>
> The efforts of these persons, who initiated their own projects,
> were stymied or halted by the Team. Questions such as,
> "Where are you going?" or "What are you doing?" were openly
> addressed to Team members. Later, I recognized these to
> really mean "How do your self-initiated tasks relate to the
> group tasks?" Very few, if any, Team members felt comfortable
> responding to these questions. Meetings in which members were
> confronted concerning their activity were very solemn and left
> me with a feeling of being completely drained. Many times I

wanted to answer or support an individual, but I was
afraid that the interruption would halt the discussion.
Team members viewed this as a laissez faire
attitude and would try to capitalize on this by asking me
to make announcements for them. Within, I tried to display
a behavior which would foster and promote interactions. I
felt that interactions and confrontations were healthy in
that they reflected the kind of leadership and group atmos-
phere necessary for action-oriented programs, and provided
a real experience for prospective leaders.

The Steering Committee idea seemed appropriate at that time.
Tasks were given to volunteers and the committee gave the
leader a direct line to the task groups. However, I did not
have any way to hold individuals accountable for the tasks.
If an individual neglected to do his task, the chairman had
to rely on the group to take action. If no action was taken
(this happened many times), the individual got away with
doing nothing.

The basic program changes that occurred during the second year reflected

the changing needs of the schools and the changing demands placed on the

Team as a result of its experience and success. As Sherburne's history

of 1968-69 indicates, its program focus included:

1. Expansion and follow-up in the teaching of Beginning
   Reading in the classrooms of teachers trained in the
   Summer Institute. This program involves extensive
   testing of children and a series of workshops for
   teachers on how to give and make use of information
   derived from tests. The tests being used are a battery
   of new ones designed especially for inner city, urban
   cultures.

   Also a grant from the Polaroid Corporation has made it
   possible to emphasize the development of language skills
   through the production of children-made, illustrated,
   and written books.

   A second grant from a private foundation has made it
   possible to extend to the upper grades the program of
   having children write their own books.

2. Extension of staff development programs to the adminis-
   trative level in the Model School Division. . . This
   was begun during the current year with a two-day weekend

conference on human relations in which principals,
administrators, and Innovation Team members of all
the schools in the Model School Division participated.

3. Dissemination and extension of the ideas of the Model
School Division to other school systems and schools
within the D. C. system. A large part of the time of
the Team is currently being spent in telling others
about its work, how it functions, and the programs in
use. Team members have participated in national meetings
all over the country, have served in advisory capacities
to departments and programs within the school system,
and have talked to numerous local and civic groups.

4. Expansion of the Team's workshop operation in the area
of reading. It continues to support teachers with work-
shops in mathematics, science, and social studies. Special
development programs are also in operation in a half-dozen
classrooms in music and drama. In social studies, two
workshops have already been conducted for teachers on the
subject.

LONG TERM INFLUENCE. The Team has continually had to face some questions

about the larger issues of change. How could the power and effectiveness

of the Team become transferred to principals and teachers in such a way

that the Team did not always have to maintain the load of an accelerating

demand? How could the findings be disseminated to the larger system? Would

they work in other areas of the city? In March, 1970, the Team made its

first move outside the MSD to the Georgetown area where three troubled schools

sought assistance. The combination of Team skills in human relations, prob-

lem diagnosis, and curriculum expertise were useful there. During the summer

of 1970, the Team undertook the largest operation of Summer Institutes it

had ever taken, reaching large numbers of teachers outside the Model School

Division and up into the junior high level. The Team extended its exper-

tise through differentiated institutes: an Open Classroom Workshop; a

Man-A Course of Study Workshop; a Reading Institute; a Mathematics and Science

Institute.

The 1970-71 school year posed the greatest challenge to the Team's educa-
tional values. The school system adopted a plan for encouraging academic
achievement in a way that went counter to the Team's mode of operations.
The Team's central belief that change should be generated and planned by
those who have to carry it out was not supported by the Board of Education
when it adopted the Clark proposal for a system-wide reading plan. Similarly,
the Team's belief that there should be differential solutions to instructional
problems was not upheld by the unitary proposal on reading. How the Team
could continue to function in a helping and innovative role, and yet pursue
the stated goals of the system became a crucial issue.

The Team met the problem creatively, using the resiliency of its members
to respond in planning and problem diagnosis. It refused to politicize
its informal power but used its human and physical resources to help princi-
pals and teachers, to the best of their ability, to respond to the system-
wide reading plan. The Team conducted workshops for principals, trained
teachers for reading, and assisted the superintendent in a planning and
organization effort.

EXIT. In 1970, individual Team members became involved in the formation of
new groups that could expand the Innovation Team philosophy throughout the
city. One Team member is now the developer and leader of a Team and a
teaching center being organized in the Model Cities area of Washington. A
second Team member is organizing an advisory service in open education to
connect public and private school teachers, parents, and administrators
interested in experimenting with alternatives in education. (The connecting
link between the people in this group will be their philosophical commitment

to experiments in open education.) A third Team member desires to create

an experimental school which will explore new ways of management and or-

ganization of a single school. A fourth Team member is the director of a

project in the Baltimore City area that offers an innovation team and

learning resource center for teachers in the Model Cities target schools.

Other Team members have produced plans for expanding the present Team

operation and Resource Center to serve the training purposes of the

larger D. C. school system.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (V)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities' experience
concern the tenuous balance between too much team initiative
and too little.

Operating
Principle

INTERACTION WITH THE CLIENT SYSTEM. Team members must walk
a difficult path, midway between evaluation and passive service.
On the one hand, they must never take part in the system's
evaluation of its teachers; on the other hand, they must be
able to state clearly their own educational beliefs and biases
and must not shrink from critical interaction with teachers.

_____

Evidence
from the
Four
Sites

In terms of identifying their educational beliefs, the Team
members in the Pilot Communities Program were aided by their
relationships with EDC. By 1967, teachers had a general know-
ledge of the learning principles EDC espoused. Many Team
members, from the beginning, and increasingly so over the years,
were open education advocates. They sought to encourage in-
creased openness, student-initiated learning, and individualization
in the classroom. Only the Boston Team had a sizeable minority
of members who were frankly skeptical about the efficacy of open
education for urban children.

Teachers at the four sites entered into relationships with the
Teams, more or less expecting the Team members to offer curriculum
wares that would embody these discovery principles. However, they were

soon to find that EDC had done little work in some curricular
areas, and they often resented the slowness of the development
process, a difficulty compounded by poor organization at EDC-
Newton for the delivery of curricular aid to the Teams.

But, even when they could not or would not provide handy
curriculum packages, the Team members were often invaluable
to new and old classroom teachers. They were in touch with
new ideas and procedures; they had the time to hang around
and help. And, most important, their opinions about an
individual teacher's performance would not "leak" back into
the evaluation networks of the system. Although they never
passed on evaluative information gathered from their classroom
visits, the Team members were not simply passive, non-directive
visitors. They were not ashamed of their pedagogical biases,
and they did not shrink from private praise of teachers or
disagreement with them. In addition, they had to be able to
demonstrate their own beliefs. Eloquent theoreticians who
are scared of children are out of place on Innovation Teams,
and so are "natural teachers" who cannot or will not articulate
their good practice. A continuing complaint of teachers during
the first two years in Maine was that some Maine Team members
refused to reveal their educational beliefs. Teachers came
to believe that they had a "hidden agenda."

Operating
Principle

RELATIONSHIP-BUILDING WITH INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS. This
process builds on the whole-Team contracting process, and

is analagous to it. Team members should go only where they

are wanted. They should respond to specific needs, and

build relationships with individual teachers in an atmosphere

of mutual respect and learning. If they become passive de-

liverymen or zealots for single solutions, their effectiveness

is lost.

Evidence
from the
Four
Sites

Once the initial contract was made between the Team and several

schools, Team members ran workshops, institutes, conferences,

and lecture series, but attendance was never compulsory. They

carefully followed-up teachers who attended their group activi-

ties, but never trespassed where they were not wanted; they

only visited the classrooms of those teachers who invited them in.

On the other hand, they made every attempt to be wanted. They

were willing to gradually soften-up resistant teachers by

dropping by when their classes were not in session and by

using other teachers to encourage their friends to coop-

erate. Cooperating teachers often received curriculum

materials without the delay usual in many school systems;

the Washington Team set up a quick delivery system. (Their

popularity as deliverymen of materials made some Team mem-

bers uneasy, but they soon realized that service was des-

perately needed, and that it helped gain them entry for

work they considered more important.) Team members had

other tangible goods to encourage cooperation; classroom help

in teaching, discipline, and organization; released time and

substitutes when teachers wanted to attend workshops as well as in-service credits, and (often) extra pay for attending Team-sponsored activities. The Boston Team in its last year of operation devoted much energy to an in-school Resource Center for children and teachers. In short, the Teams actively enticed teachers into their orbit.

The tension between being "experts" or "process consultants" remained in the foreground in the operations of all the Teams. Teachers welcomed the expeditious delivery of new bits of curriculum like the E.S.S. kits. They eagerly sought specific ideas and were wary when Team members pressed them to take time to ponder the larger implications of their adoption of these ideas.

Successful Team members saw themselves as "consultants", not "experts". As one Maine Team member said, "I see a consultant as someone who can help facilitate the process of people helping themselves. A consultant, for example, can help you work out the process by which you can meet your own needs. An expert, on the other hand, would make specific suggestions as to the kinds of programs, materials, or procedures you might follow."

The four Teams often made use of "experts", especially in short-term workshops and teachers' institutes. There was ample recognition of the useful role people with very specialized skills can perform. Many Team members had special talents.

Dr. Curtis' considerable expertise in reading programs

exemplifies this. The "consultant" mode described

above was clearly the preferred role. "Consultants,"

in this sense, seem to come closer to the Leistershire

idea of "advisors." They come in only on teachers'

requests, armed with solid classroom experience and

teaching skill. They are not judgmental; they are not

afraid to articulate their own values and demonstrate

them with a class. As a Bridgeport Team member said,

"We are outside people helping to release insiders'

energies." The successful Team members seem to have

many of the helping qualities of the best teachers in

open classrooms. This analogy might be a helpful one

for selection and training purposes.

CHAPTER 5

BOSTON, BRIDGEPORT, WASHINGTON AND MAINE--A COMMON EVOLUTION

The four teams, in their separate sites, never worked together which

probably accounted in part for the extreme differences in their develop-

ment. Seen from another perspective, however, all four teams underwent

a general evolution that makes them look very much alike.

For the first year-and-a-half the teams seldom dealt with parents or

"community," and they communicated only very infrequently with the other

adults (employers, ministers, or social workers, for example) who are

part of the total educational process of children.

Furthermore, the Teams' whole attention in the early stage was devoted

to the dissemination and development of curricula for classroom use,

usually in those areas in which EDC had been specializing as a curriculum

development organization. Most of the initial Team members at all four

sites were "master teachers" with considerable classroom experience. Many

had been involved with EDC's curriculum development "shops."

Much of this teacher-to-teacher activity was exceedingly slow and frustrating.

Some Team members had little to offer teachers; many teachers and adminis-

trators were incurably suspicious of outsiders. All of the Teams experienced

great difficulty working with EDC. The original hope that the Teams would

purvey new and exciting EDC curriculum materials to urban and rural schools

often foundered because the EDC curriculum development shops seemed to

have little interest in bending their work schedules to fit the needs dis-

covered by the Teams in the field. And many of the needs, like reading,

bilingual education, and black identity curriculum were not areas of
interest for the various EDC shops.

At the end of the first two years, money for the Program became tighter.
The Office of Education began to cut funds, insisting on more con-
centration of resources and more centralized evaluation and training
functions in Newton. Because of these and other difficulties with the
original model of teacher-to-teacher help and because of the reduced
resources, the Maine and Bridgeport Teams stopped working with experienced
teachers in classrooms. The Maine Team shifted its efforts completely
into pre-service education, supported partially by EDC, but with most of
its funding from other Federal sources. Its program with teacher-trainees
is exciting, but it has very little in common with the original Innovation
Team notion that we have focused on in this document.

The Bridgeport Team was disbanded after the second year. It had foundered
from the beginning. One Team member continued to help teachers with math
curricula in the new middle schools, but here was a solo venture. Other
EDC personnel developed a very successful teacher-aide training program
at East Side Middle School, and tried unsuccessfully to help the Bridgeport
schools initiate a Model School Division like Washington's. These were,
however, isolated projects, not a concentrated Team effort to help classroom
teachers with curriculum revision and development.

After the original activities of the Maine and Bridgeport Teams were
halted in 1969, most of the available resources of the Pilot Communities
Programs were split between central administration, training, and evaluation
at EDC-Newton, and the two remaining field Teams in Boston and Washington.

This is not to say that the 1969-1971 work in Bridgeport and Maine was
insignificant. But, by 1969, work at those sites had moved far away
from the original Innovation Team concept.

If we concentrate on the first two years in Bridgeport and Maine and
the four years in Washington and Boston, we can begin to see an important
change in the original concept of an Innovation Team, a change we have
indicated in the Bridgeport and Maine narratives. Over the four years
of the program, Team members gradually saw themselves less and less as
"master teachers" and more and more as "change agents." This shift sig-
nifies far more than a mere change in nomenclature might indicate. The
very notion of "master teacher" carried with it a connotation of expertness
that individual Team members found both inaccurate and inappropriate.
From the beginning, their goal was to encourage teachers to work out their
own curriculum and changes in classroom organization, not to serve teachers
as instant "experts" in new curricula. They also disliked being deliverymen,
mere conduits of "the latest and the best" in curriculum innovations. They
wanted to help teachers discover their own resources, just as they encouraged
teachers to help the children in their classrooms discover their own resources.
As experienced teachers themselves, the Team members had seen first-hand the
short life of "teacher-proof" curriculum packages handed over to teachers who
adopted them wholesale, with little or no thought about their relation to
individual children's needs.

Furthermore, the Team members began to see the critical necessity of work
outside the classroom that could reinforce their work with individual
teachers. From the beginning, all the Teams had relied on workshops and
institutes to unfreeze groups of teachers and to encourage them to

communicate with each other, instead of hiding behind closed classroom

doors. Gradually, they began adding workshops for parents, hoping to

help the parents understand the changes that teachers were trying to

accomplish. In Washington, parent workshops, organized ostensibly to

teach parents how to help their children with homework, turned into

fundamental math and language literacy sessions when parents admitted

their own basic educational needs. The Boston Team added members whose

principal responsibility was the organization of Dearborn School parents.

The Teams also increasingly worked with school administrators. The

Washington Team gradually had a significant change of heart about working

with principals and other supervisors. Initially, the Team members had

gone directly to classroom teachers, bypassing building principals. In

the fourth year, they were heavily engaged with principals, not only in

the buildings where they worked with teachers, but throughout the system.

In addition, the Teams came in contact with other educational institutions

and reform groups in their communities. The Maine Team spent more and

more time, even in its second year, with local universities and colleges

and the State Department of Education. From the beginning, the Boston

Team was heavily engaged with private community schools in Roxbury, Boston

State--the largest teacher-training institution for Boston schools--and

literally dozens of agencies and groups trying to improve Boston schools.

The Boston Team trained adults as classroom aides and organized parents,

and, for four years, operated a community resource center. Work with

non-classroom educators, especially supervisors and teacher-trainers

increased the Teams' impact on formal instruction, and helped to prepare

the way for policy changes that might permanently implement some of the

helping work of the Teams.

Although the organizational mode of each site was different, in the first

year of operation approximately two-thirds of the total resources of the

Pilot Communities Program was spent on Team members who were to act as

master teachers. By 1971, however, the proportions had reversed; less

than one-third of the Program's resources were spent on master teachers.

Funds spent at Newton for training, documentation, evaluation, and adminis-

tration absorbed more than half of the Program's resources. The Maine Team

had left classroom materials and master teachers completely for an emphasis

on effective pre-service teacher education; and in Boston only $60,000 out of

a total estimated budget of $141, 000 was directly committed to "classroom

support." These proportions may be inexact, but they indicate the shift

away from the initial emphasis on master teachers and new curriculum

materials towards a view of educational change that included many other

components. By 1971, only the Washington Team remained heavily committed

to the initial notion that an Innovation Team would consist principally of

master teachers working with experienced classroom teachers·on curriculum

improvement. And even the Washington Team members had extended the concept

of master teachers far beyond its 1967 definition.

At the end of four years, then, the Teams were composed of "change agents"

who had developed skills that extended far beyond the original conception

of their roles as master teachers. In the words of one Team member,

change agents were not so much "to teach, to demonstrate, or to do" as to

"work intensively with training and generating, in other people, behaviors

that can bring about change." In the process some of the Teams laid aside

or periodically neglected the original mission of the Innovation Teams. But through their own organic development, they demonstrated graphically that change in classrooms cannot be dealt with as an isolatable phenomenon.

One final question about the common experience of the four Teams remains to be asked--but unfortunately cannot be answered: How did the four Teams go about withdrawing or exiting from the host system?

The whole issue of exit--or orderly departure of an Innovation Team--was never squarely faced in the Pilot Communities Program. The reports of the Program frequently characterized the Teams as "temporary systems," as task groups that would go out of existence once their task was performed. But the tasks proliferated; there was always a new project to undertake. The Teams in Bridgeport and Maine left their original tasks, not primarily because they had finished them, but because Pilot Communities funds were cut back and were concentrated on the Boston and Washington Teams. When the Office of Education announced in the fall of 1970 that the 1970-71 school year would be the last year of the program, the remaining Teams were caught off-guard, without plans for orderly disengagement. The Boston Team, in fact, was beginning anew with a new leader. The Washington Team had elaborate expansion plans, not plans to contract.

The Pilot Communities experience gives little evidence of successful exit; therefore, we cannot presume to construct an "operating principle" about the process, but we can at least attempt to make some common sense observations. A Team should not, it seems to us, simply fizzle out without working with the

system to plan and fund the next steps and the long-term strategies for

continuing change once the Team has left. A Team should plan for an

orderly departure well in advance of the moment of termination. Hopefully,

careful planning, assessment, and modification will be activities built

into the on-going process of the Team. However, a final assessment is

particularly important. An Innovation Team should not exit quietly,

but with very definite events to delineate its termination. These events

should encourage reflection on the Resource Team venture by Team members,

teachers, students, administrators, and parents. This will be an im-

portant learning experience for continuing efforts at improvement and

will encourage all participants in the system to assume some responsibility

toward this end.

CHAPTER 6

THE POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF INNOVATION TEAMS

The planners of the Pilot Communities Program and the Team members who
implemented it were principally absorbed in doing their innovation work.
When they were reflective, they tended to be concerned with immediate
problems, with daily decisions, and not with questions that related to two or
three, or five years hence. Just as they avoided thinking about exit--
their immediate future--they never faced adequately the longer, larger
implications of their work.

This lack of critical reflection on what the Teams were doing, why they
were doing it, and what they hoped to accomplish, seriously affected the
functioning and final outcome of Team efforts. Problems which hampered
or, in some cases, paralyzed the Teams, could have been anticipated, dealt
with more effectively, or perhaps even avoided. Time might have been used
more wisely if the Teams had had a clearer sense of short- and long-term
goals.

For those communities who are considering instituting Innovation Teams,
we would like to highlight several issues essential to the success of
such a project.

Support for the Innovation Team. The planners of an Innovation Team pro-
ject should consider, from the very beginning, whether the system will
be able to support the project and the changes it generates in the long
run. "Support" is used here in three senses--ideological, fiscal, and

structural. Innovation Teams represent a particular kind of educational innovation: the development of a cadre of "helping" teachers, released from classroom duties, and with a mandate to improve instruction by working closely with teachers who invite their help. Until a system is willing to consider seriously the long-term costs and implications of such differentiated staffing, it should not start down the Innovation Team road.

Some personnel in the school systems will be unable to support the consequences of such an innovation ideologically. Building principals or supervisors, for example, may be threatened by a Team if its members encourage teachers to think of new ways of grouping children or of changing the learning situation to encourage more student initiative. The Washington Team approached this problem circuitously, first avoiding principals, but eventually involving them in workshops deliberately designed to introduce them to some of the new practices it was espousing. In the long run, a Team cannot simply avoid such opposition; it will have to find ways to change supervisors' attitudes and behaviors, if the teachers' changes are to endure.

Parents may also be wary of changes. The efforts of the Maine Team at one school foundered, because parents felt that changes were coming too quickly and breaking too sharply with established practice. Urban parents are especially likely to be suspicious of "open education" practices; they often feel that order and discipline are synonymous with learning, and that a shift to more student-initiated learning may impede their children's

chances of conventional academic success. In Boston, the Team found it
necessary to devote much time to parent education and organization.

The teachers to be helped by the Team will provide the swing vote on
the ideological side. If teachers want change and the extra responsi-
bilities that a Team can help them develop, their enthusiasm and
advocacy will make the difference. Whether or not a Team likes to think
in political terms, its efforts with teachers will be a form of teacher
organizing. A Team will be successful if it can bring teachers, super-
visors, and parents to see that learning conditions can be improved and
to insist on continued improvement once the Team has been disbanded. A
major test of such success will be the institution of teacher-helping
mechanisms in the system: system-sponsored resource teachers, as well as
principals who take the role of instructional leadership seriously.
Of the four "Pilot Communities," only Washington has begun to institute
these changes.

In the long run, support for the kind of change that an Innovation Team
will initiate will also demand structural changes. Status hierarchy,
power relations, and role definitions create vested interests, procedures,
and formal and informal rules that encourage behavior contradictory to
attitudes of openness, collaboration, and experimentation. These struc-
tural relationships will have to be changed if new attitudes are to be
given a chance to survive. Innovations in a classroom will not last long
if teachers are not supported in their experimenting, or if the norms are
such that teachers can only maintain a sense of security by emphasizing
discipline and achievement tests as indications of their success.

There will be some school systems that are so wedded to their structure
that the very notion of an Innovation Team would be ludicrous. We
suspect that Boston may be such a system; the Boston Team certainly
had very little impact on the system per se, although it was helpful to
children and some individual teachers. In some cities, people who want
to change the schools may have to turn, not to the evolutionary internal
kinds of change exemplified by an Innovation Team, but to the more
dramatic kinds of change that the cries for "community control" indicate.

The question of long-term fiscal support is also important. Releasing
teachers from classroom duties to help other teachers is expensive
as a small-scale experiment and even more costly in the long run. If a
school system should undertake to experiment with an Innovation Team,
it would have to be willing to release at least half-a-dozen teachers and
to provide them with funds to purchase materials and training. There would
also have to be access to groups of teachers through summer or
weekend workshops, and these teachers would have to be paid for their extra
time. Such a scale of effort would cost at least $100,000 a year. Over the
long run, it would cost much more to provide Teams of resource teachers
for every school in the system.

All the Teams in the Pilot Communities Program had these funds and this
access to teachers. They could provide consultants, take teachers on
trips, and deliver new materials rapidly, without the interminable delays
endemic in most school systems; moreover, the Pilot Communities Program
was federally-sponsored, and it was initiated when money

for this sort of experimentation was readily available. No one involved

with the Pilot Communities Program ever alleged that it was inexpensive,

nor were there discernible efforts to make it more cost-effective.

It may well be that future Teams established by school systems will be

at an advantage if they are funded from the beginning with school systems'

funds. Virtually none of the funds for the Pilot Communities Teams came

from the regular budget of the host school systems. This fiscal fact

may have helped the Teams to feel more freedom, but it reinforced their

"outsideness." The school systems had very little economic stake in the

success of the Teams. Only in Washington was the funding sufficiently

"local" (reinforcing the indigenous origins of most of the Washington Team

members) to force the school system to take the Team seriously. The

Washington Team had a better chance of surviving, because its members were

on the system's payroll from the very beginning. D. C. "owned" its Team while

the other Pilot Communities invested little or nothing in their Teams.

In the long run, a Team must prove its usefulness, or it will die. But

local investment in it, from the beginning, should improve its chances of

success.

Expansion of the Program. From the beginning, an Innovation Team will

need a long-term strategy that will enable it to spread its effect to the

whole school system. Most Teams will start with parts of the system,

with individual schools as the Maine and Bridgeport Teams did, or with

a sub-system like Washington's Model School Division.

The Pilot Communities Program may have been too optimistic about per-
vading the systems in which it worked with the changes generated by an
Innovation Team. The assumption seemed to be that the process of
expanding the use of Resource Teams to other schools would be automatic,
that adoption would occur in the natural course of events. However, on
the surface, at least, three of the systems "cooled out" the idea.
Bridgeport has some new curricula for its schools and an active teacher
aide program. There are fifty unusually trained new teachers in the
Maine schools. Boston has a bilingual cluster program and a new and
vibrant private community school. Some experienced teachers at all four
program sites have developed new ways to individualize instruction and
encourage student-initiated learning, but as of this date, none of the
"Pilot Communities" has adopted the Innovation or Resource Team notion.
We already know the fate of the Innovation Team notion in Maine and
Bridgeport, and it seems highly unlikely that the Boston Public Schools
will either find a way to continue the Resource Team there or start
another.

Only the Washington Team seems to have dealt successfully with the term-
ination of Pilot Communities funding. The second Washington Team leader
has moved on to start an Innovation Team in Baltimore, funded
by Baltimore's Model Cities Program. Other Team members in Washington
are continuing the work of the Team in various forms; the Team seems to
have established the notion of teachers helping teachers in the D.C.
Schools. In Washington, therefore, the system's apparent failure to
adopt the Innovation Team idea may be insignificant compared to some of
the other changes the Washington Team has helped generate.

Unless new Teams are more attentive to pervading the larger system than most of the Pilot Communities Teams were, they will run the risk of devoting all of their energies to the work immediately at hand, thus not being able to reach outward--to other teachers and to other schools.

One strategy that should enhance the possibilities of wider-scale impact would be to rotate Team membership. Team members could be assigned to the Team for two or three years, with the clear expectation that they would return to their "home schools" after learning how to work with teachers. The planners could build in the expectation that teachers rotated out of the Team would be allowed to carry out teacher-helping activities when they leave the Team.

Another long-run strategy might be to insist on the adoption of a plan that would promise the continued expansion of teacher-helping Teams to the rest of the system after an initial trial period. The original Team's efforts could be scrutinized by an independent observer who would evaluate its efficacy and allow expansion after initial performance criteria are met. Such an evaluation would have to use performance criteria consistent with the objectives of the Team.

Limitations of the Resource Team Strategy. Innovation Teams, as they were established and developed by the Pilot Communities Program, spring from a basic assumption that public schools can be improved in an evolutionary manner. The kinds of changes instituted by the Pilot Communities Program were more incremental than the sweeping reforms proposed by advocates of decentralization and community control, such as abolishing

compulsory schooling. One suspects that the latter kinds of interven-
tion should produce much more radical change, but that is only a suspicion.

There is no evidence presently available that will prove or disprove
the efficacy of the Pilot Communities Program in itself, or in compari-
son to other, more radical alternatives. It is for this reason that in
this document we have attempted to describe the Program, not to evaluate
it, and to accept it for what it was intended to be, not for what it
might have been if other people had set it up or funded it. Our inten-
tion is to help the next community set up such an Innovation Team by
avoiding some of the mistakes and paying attention to some of the suc-
cesses of four such Teams over four years of experimentation. The inter-
ested community must be made aware of the inherent limitations of an
Innovation Team approach to the improvement of education.

The notion of Innovation or Resource Teams was a major step forward from
the school curriculum reforms of the 60's. Helping a teacher on all
classroom activities--from curriculum to discipline to organization--
is potentially far more efficacious than plugging in a new science series
here or a language lab there. The range of help by the Pilot Communities
Teams still tended to be too narrow, focusing rather on some of the cog-
nitive curricula--especially science and mathematics--and often neglect-
ing the humanities and social sciences, as well as usually disregard-
ing "affective" curricula.

In addition, the Teams tended to work with isolated classroom teachers,
and too seldom worked on the whole professional atmosphere of any school.

Only rarely is there anything like a community of interested professionals
in a specific school. Only a very few schools have interesting, expand-
ing talk in teachers' lounges, useful faculty meetings, cross-visitation
of classes by teachers, and other forums for exchange of ideas. Good
teachers exist in every system, but they are almost always very isolated
from each other. Seldom do they share ideas; seldom do they talk in
any depth about individual students.

The Pilot Communities' ideology towards teachers fully respected indivi-
dual differences between them and tended to be relatively less concerned
with the climate of the school as a whole. The individual elementary
classroom--however "open" or "closed" it may be--was usually still age-
graded and isolated. And the individual teacher was primarily dealt with
as an individual teacher, not as a member of a faculty, not as a teacher's
union member concerned with whole-system politics.

In addition, the classroom-centered ideology of the Pilot Communities
Program seems to have been too little concerned with school administra-
tive officers to expect deep-seated changes. For example, Pilot Com-
munities Teams could have put much more money into intensive work-
shops for principals and supervisors. Instead, most of the resources
went to individual classroom teachers. There seems to have been a general
feeling that top-level liaison was needed: the superintendent of schools
needed to be courted, but there was too little middle-level liaison;
Bridgeport is the principal example of that failure.

Finally, there was very little attention paid to education outside school,
e.g., from families to church groups to the streets. There have been
neither street workers, nor social workers, nor any family visitors on
the Teams outside Boston. The whole Program was directed at working
with classroom teachers in (mostly) public schools, and there seems to
have been relatively little attention paid to in-home teaching, work with
gangs, or concentrated educational experiences such as camps or boarding
schools. The Teams did step outside the patterns of conventional, for-
mal schooling, often with great success, as in the aide-training program in
Bridgeport. They were constrained by their funding source: the Office
of Education was primarily interested in the improvement of deliberate,
in-school instruction; however, the Teams seem to have needed more thorough
discussion of alternative modes of change.

Alternative Strategies. If there is sufficient dissatisfaction among
relevant constituencies and sufficient support from the administrative
hierarchy, then an Innovation Team-type strategy can be useful for a num-
ber of purposes, so long as the obvious mistakes made by the Pilot Com-
munities are avoided. Although the Resource Team was originally con-
ceived as a strategy for achieving a particular objective, it was prac-
ticed in the Pilot Communities as a type of intervention which, in fact,
could be used for several purposes and not just delivery of new curricula.

If a school system is at a fairly low level of readiness for change,
then the Team is a non-threatening means for increasing this readiness,
by getting teachers accustomed to trying out new ideas and by discussing
problems in the classroom--reflecting on educational goals--on a

one-to-one supportive basis. The goal of introducing new curriculum

becomes quite secondary to the idea of increasing teachers' awareness of

their role as teachers. The Team can be opportunistic, using any chance

to respond to teachers' needs as a way of gaining trust and respect.

This develops in teachers an excitement about teaching, a sense of secur-

ity in trying new methods, and a sense of confidence that they might be

able to influence and make needed changes in conditions around them.

It is possible that the state of a system may be such that the primary

focus of a Team should be on delivery of new curriculum methods. In

this case, the system should be made aware that the presence of a Team

for a limited amount of time is not sufficient for any meaningful and

permanent change to occur. The Team should encourage the school to con-

sider alternative ways in which this delivery can continue in financially

feasible terms; for instance, a) making sure that materials, newsletters,

etc. are received from curriculum development centers; b) cutting back

the number, but still keeping master teachers as a permanent part of

the system; c) giving teachers release time either for independent

work or group seminars and discussions. This can be arranged by plan-

ning independent work for students (probably good only for upper grades;

younger kids still need supervision) or bringing in volunteer teacher

aides and scheduling outside people to give a class on a topic of their

expertise; or d) creating team structures of teachers, students, and

administrators, both temporary and permanent, so that the benefits of a

Team vs. a hierarchy can be permanently institutionalized, and teachers

can develop their own innovations (as opposed to adoption or adaptation

of innovations developed externally).

There are, of course, pros and cons to each of the above suggestions; consequently, we come to the purpose of a Resource Team, namely as a "change agent" for organizational development, engaging all members of the school in a self-study, with the idea of creating an environment for change. This method incorporates basic organizational principles: that those who must ultimately carry out the changes must be a part of planning them and that change must start with the actors' perception of the problems, etc. Other strategies can incorporate these principles too, but the organizational development approach makes them fundamental. This focus demands a different kind of Team, one in which the personal, interpersonal, sensitivity, and leadership-building skills are most important. Expertise in a subject matter may not be as necessary as is experience in school systems--important for trust and accuracy in the change agent's perceptions.

The Pilot Communities followed at least one principle enunciated by theorists of organizational development in identifying and energizing local strengths. Time after time, Team members moved into a situation, identified local leadership, helped that leadership get some skills-- or money, or ideas--and got out of the way. This happened at every level--in classrooms, in school buildings, in pre-school centers--and was often more useful than trying to stay within the original focus of working with individual teachers. Thus, the mottos change. At first, it was: "Listen carefully; make sure you know every step." By the end, the slogan is: "Get out of the way."

A second category of change strategies becom∘ propriate when precon-
ditions for a Resource Team are not met, when dissatisfaction is not
widespread, and/or support does not exist from the hierarchy. A number
of possibilities exist: 1) Attempt to enter a school at a very specific,
service-oriented level. (The personal friendships established may be
used as a vehicle for encouraging participation in workshops and finding
the sources of resistance to change.) 2) Set up an alternative school.
3) Organize students, teachers, or parents to be effective interest
groups, applying political pressure on the system, so that is is within
the self-interest of the system to respond.

The above discussion of change strategies in schools is predicated on
the assumption that ultimately the most important and necessary change in
schools is that they become capable of creatively adapting to internal
and external pressures; that a structure and culture is created which
encourages each member's curiosity to learn and gain respect for him-
self and others; and supports experimentation and risk-taking. All
other changes will otherwise have a limited effect and will be less than
satisfactory. We believe that the usefulness and outcomes of Innova-
tion Team activity--both within the Pilot Communities and in those
started independently in other communities--must ultimately be judged
with this perspective.