DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 793 PS 014 303

AUTHOR Smithberg, Lorraine
TITLE Follow Through: Illusion and Paradox in Educational Experimentation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 81
NOTE 70p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Beliefs; Children; Early Childhood Education; Educational Change; *Educational Experiments; Models; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Research Design; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; School Districts; Values
IDENTIFIERS Bank Street College of Education NY; *Program Modification; *Project Follow Through; Sponsors

ABSTRACT

The culmination of many years of implementing and analyzing the Bank Street model in Project Follow Through, this paper provides an extensive discussion of controversial and problematic issues related to the program and reviews what has been learned at Bank Street as a result of experience with Follow Through. Recommendations for program development and evaluation are offered along with suggestions for the design of future research efforts. The first section of the discussion indicates the significance of Follow Through; explores discrepancies between perceptions of the value and impact of the program; points out three illusions of the public concerning education; and discusses three paradoxes concerning belief systems, models, and program evaluation. The second section reviews old concepts reaffirmed and new concepts attained concerning children, adults, school systems, and sponsorship. It is recommended that, in the future, Follow Through include provisions for studying belief systems and for building in resources for documentation and dissemination, and foster inquiry into processes. In addition, it is suggested that the limitations of evaluation be acknowledged and the service component of the program be legitimized. Appended are program analysis materials used in implementing the model, a description of the model, and a flow chart of the change process in a local school system. (RH)

FOLLOW THROUGH: ILLUSION AND PARADOX IN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTATION

Lorraine Smithberg, PhD.
Director, Follow Through
Bank Street College

This paper was commissioned by
the National Institute of Education of the
Department of Education.
January, 1981

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

This paper is the culmination of many years of enactment and analysis of the Bank Street approach. Some sections are adapted from earlier efforts to articulate our point of view and to express our concerns. In this process, the members of the Follow Through staff have made important contributions. The contribution of each is immeasurable. The contributions of all are interdependent and complementary.

I cannot let this moment pass without a word about Elizabeth Gilkeson. As the first Director of Bank Street Follow Through, she set in place a climate of inquiry and commitment which has sustained us through many stressful transitions. At this very moment, she continues to ask hard questions, to hold out for quality, and to generate new approaches. By her example, we are never soothed-but forever confirmed and challenged.

As a field-based experiment, Follow Through owes its essential quality to the potential for growth and change at the community level. The children, parents, staff and administrators become our partners, our critics and our advocates. The relationships enjoyed in the communities in which we serve are among the most valued rewards of the sponsorship role. We look forward to another decade.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOLLOW THROUGH: ILLUSION AND PARADOX IN EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTATION

I. INTRODUCTION

A. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FOLLOW THROUGH

Follow Through represents a chapter of enormous importance in history of social policy. For those practitioners who have lived this program day by day, it has been an arduous but rewarding decade. As we enter upon a period of reflection and assessment, it is important to examine the past critically in order to be able to make valid judgments as to the impact of this program, the meaning and consequences of its assumptions in relation to what was originally referred to as "compensatory education" and the contribution of sponsors to this twelve year social experiment.

PREDICTION OF FAILURE VS. EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION

Among the questions we must continue to address are the following: what is the impact on each individual person of poverty, racism and cultural differences? What is the role of schooling in response to these formative forces? What are the best kinds of settings for child learning? In a field of inquiry in which much passion has been devoted to these questions, we find that there is more evidence for what factors are predictive of failure than there is reliable evidence for what interventions are supportive, compensatory or corrective in relation to humanistic goals for public education.

The knowledge gained in Follow Through addresses these concerns. Our understanding of the psychological processes of learning and

the support required for school development have been deepened by our work with diverse populations. Follow Through speaks to the enhancement and nurturance of the intellectual life of all individuals and the conditions under which both adults and children can be helped to thrive in the schools of our country.

THREAT TO CONTINUITY

This paper is presented at a juncture in the history of Follow Through in which the future scope and structure of the program is uncertain, if indeed there is a future. It is ironic that sponsors and stakeholders in the participating sites can look upon this program with a sense of achievement at the very moment efforts are underway to dismantle it.

There is some paradox in this turn of events: even as the program continues to stabilize, even as it gains the approval of parents, school administrators and superintendents, it is in danger of being terminated. Moreover, this discrepancy between local endorsement and federal support is but the final expression of a similar discrepancy between local indices of program success and the outcomes of the national evaluation.

The continuous climate of uncertainty and the threat to continuity precipitated by wavering leadership and dissonance in evaluation findings have worked against program goals which stress long-range systematic study and intervention. The education of all young children, but particularly of the economically disadvantaged young children served by Bank Street Follow Through, requires a high degree of staff organization, continuous training and appropriate interaction with parents. A good developmental program

for children is one which allows for adult development (of parents and teachers), and for school development (of programs and processes). Such developmental changes are not nurtured in an atmosphere of crisis.

B. DISCREPANCIES IN PERCEPTIONS OF VALUE AND IMPACT OF FOLLOW THROUGH

Let us begin with the most troubling questions: How is it that a successful program treasured by its consumers and widely defended by its practitioners is always under threat from the legislative body and parent agencies who should be its strongest advocates? Why is it that a program whose value and impact are a matter of record at the local level is not acknowledged for these same merits at the national level?

DIVERGENT DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM AND EVALUATION

It is the thesis of this paper that those of us who came together to develop and implement this program were handicapped from the outset by a number of illusions pertaining to the mission of the program and the evaluation thereof that were operant at the time of its inception. As the program evolved, the sponsors, the school people, the parents, all those engaged in the day-by-dayness of making it work, moved further away, in practice, from these initial illusions. All subsequent dialogue about the meaning and impact of the program can be understood with reference to which of these two divergent systems of thought and experience is regarded as the primary reality. Since there was not a commensurate evolution in concept and expectations at the national level that could adapt to the actual character of the program as it was lived

out, the national evaluation was conceived and executed and, predictably, yielded results that were not syntonic with the true character of the program either as it was intended by the by the Congress and as it was perceived by its client group or by a majority of its sponsors.

C. THREE ILLUSIONS

Let us define the term "illusion." "Illusion: 1. Deception by false appearances... 2. An unreal or misleading image presented to the vision; a deceptive appearance; false show; apparition. 3. State or fact of being deceived; false impression; misconception; as, illusions of youth."*

In the present context, an illusion is a statement of a wished for condition. It is an operative assumption which defines and interprets experience. In this section we examine a number of illusions that dominated p[illegible]thinking about education and its role in our society at the time that Follow Through was launched.

1. The First Illusion

Education was conceived of as a number of freestanding, distinct, often competing education models, the implementation of which could yield distinct outcomes (the Sponsor Models.)

2. The Second Illusion

The program recipients were conceived as a stable population with known characteristics (Disadvanted Children) who were to be found in settings with invariant charateristics (the Public Schools.)

3. The Third Illusion

The implementation and evaluation of these freestanding, coherent models was expected to yield information as to "what works best" for disadvantaged children. That is, evaluation data would

* Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (1979).

yield "evidence of model effectiveness." This data was to be collected, analyzed and interpreted by impartial evaluation specialists (the Researchers.)

These propositions present a picture of educational ideas and enactments that could be managed rationally, implemented systematically and evaluated scientifically. To say the least, these expectations did not sufficiently account for the durability and resistance to change of the culture of the public school.

This is not a critique of the Follow Through evaluation, nor a dissertation on problems related to model implementation. Colleagues from the Follow Through community and in the research community at large have debated these topics for years. The literature is extensive and inevitably contradictory. Walter Haney's history of the Follow Through evaluation stands as a most thoughtful and comprehensive attempt to grasp this history (18). The main lines of the debate can be traced in articles presented in the Harvard Education Review (Spring 1978). In rereading these discussions from the present perspective, we are struck by the tenacity of each position - a confirmation of the thesis of this paper that educational inquiry is fueled by values and beliefs not easily subject to proof. All writers agree on some aspects of the House critique, yet all include other evidence, reach differing conclusions and claim equal validity. All these positions can be carried forward forever.

D. THREE PARADOXES

In order to reconcile the power of the illusions cited above and the widened understanding derived from twelve years of experience

and analysis of the process of education, I will present a number of interrelated paradoxes. But first, a definition:

" Paradox: 1. A tenet or proposition contrary to received opinion; also, an assertion or sentiment seemingly contradictory, or opposed to common sense, but that yet may be true in fact... 3. Any phenomenon or action with seemingly contradictory qualities or phases."*

Paradox 1 - Everyone has a model/There are not 22 educational models.

In the history of ideas, two educational visions, given the nomenclature "humanism" and "behaviorism," are set in permanent relationship to one another. These are the two fundamental visions of human nature that have cast the search for meaning since the dawn of consciousness. All human enterprise, be it philosophy, art or science, is governed by the eternal struggle to reconcile the powerful strivings of the affective instinctual aspects of our being with the yearning for knowledge and the need for a rational basis for the conduct of human affairs. The dialectic between these forces is eternal.

An incisive discussion of these differing conceptual systems has been presented by W.E. Doll (11). I quote:

> As Piaget states, if the behaviorist view of cognitive functioning is accepted then the methodology carried out in most school curricula is perfectly acceptable. According to this view...knowledge is "given" from one mind to another. Curriculum then, in terms of ends, goals, plans, purposes, is removed from the classroom with its interaction among students and between students and teachers and placed in the hand of a special agency or group of curriculum specialists. ...However, if one accepts Dewey's dictum that "no thought, no idea, can possibly be convyed as an idea from one person to another," because ideas are constructed, not given, then one the basis of this different epistemological view

* Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (1979).

a totally different pedagogy is required. Piaget sums this up well when he says "The problem of intelligence, and with the central problem of the pedagogy of teaching, has thus emerged as a link with the fundamental epistemological problem of the nature of knowledge; does the latter constitute a copy of reality or, on the contrary, an assimilation of reality into a structure of transformations?"

Piaget answers this question by saying:"...intelligence, at all levels, is an assimilation of the datum into structures of transformation, and these structurations consist in an organization of reality, whether in act or thought, and not in simply making a copy of it." Thus, as the epistemological view changes so will the pedagogy to fit that epistemology change; and the view that knowledge is constructed, not copied, will necessarily bring forth a "radically different" pedagogy.

THE POWER OF BELIEF SYSTEMS

In this evolutionary process, the human ego continues to forge belief systems which allow us to reflect upon own own experience to weave human knowledge and human need in goal-directed behaviors. These belief systems embody the operating assumptions which govern all human enterprise, all social intercourse. Belief systems are a natural, necessary, healthy aspect of human thought. Belief systems are modifiable, continually shaping events and, in turn, being modified by the historical context in which they are expressed.

Belief systems are the means whereby human beings have always maintained a sense of meaning, of cognitive control, of activity in the face of random events, impulse-ridden human behavior and the incalcuable forces of the natural world. Belief systems are characteristic of the adaptive resilience of the human ego. They give value to experience and cause us to

make choices in the light of our values. They are founded on an ever-growing scientific knowledge base. They are also founded on experience, tradition and perceptions shared by a community. The power of belief systems to govern the choices made as to scientific analysis and methods of proof is exemplified by Follow Through.

EDUCATION AS A BELIEF SYSTEM

In all known human societies, education has been an important modality for the expression of the dialectic between humanism and behaviorism.

Within each of these two positions are embedded assumptions about the role of the child, the role of the teacher, the scope of instruction, the function of schooling in society. These assumptions are fueled by overarching belief systems, that is, values that are deeply held but often generally tacit and unstated. In each of the current Follow Through models and any possible subsequent models, are expressions of an idea system, which assumes a web of interrelated stated or tacit theoretical assumptions and values. Each model articulates a particular profile which reflects the historical development of its theories and of the individuals who are its current proponents. The model, as conceived in the earliest literature of Follow Through, is but a limited abstraction, a means of packaging assumptions, beliefs currently known and valued methods of education for delivery to new client groups. Examples of model profiles illustrate this phenomenon.

In 1974-75 Nero and Associates undertook a comprehensive catelogue of model descriptions and a materials review. It is noteworthy that each model was presented in terms of its "Basic Values and Beliefs" as well as its key features and other implementation requisites. (See Appendix B.)

Frequently, these beliefs, values or theories, were presented as polarities. Such was the case in Follow Through. The sponsor models were often conceived in terms of positions taken. For example:

- the child's autonomy vs. the authority role of adults
- the child's need for active investigations vs. the necessity for didactic instruction
- the perception of schooling as a life experience vs. the wish to limit the responsibility of schooling to strictly instructional functions
- the assertion of child development aims vs. the demand for achievement
- the emphasis on linguistic processing vs. the necessity to move to instruction in encoding and decoding.

Paradox 2 - Every model works/No model can ever be fully implement

No model could, in fact, exist with the purity required for its description in all our annual applications. What we believe we should enact, what we actually can enact, and the consonance between our theoretical structures and their actual enactment are all realities that form an existential whole that is far removed from the ideology and rhetoric of the public discourse in which we were purportedly conducting "controlled experiments" that would yield "data" about "what works best". We know now that nothing and everything works -- depending on the interplay of divergent forces and the capacity for collaboration and cooperation between the many shareholders. The features defining the concepts of

implementation implied in the term "it depends" are presented in the extensive literature that has grown up to examine and explain organizational development and the introduction of processes of change in existing systems.

SCHOOLING REFLECTS A VALUE SYSTEM

An educational model is based upon a conception of society's responsibilities to its children and its definition of the role of the school in the development of the person. Schooling reflects our basic views about human nature, it expresses our values as to class, race, sexuality, responsibility, citizenhood and power.

Each model attempts to present a desirable mode of education in terms of the perceived needs of the children. Whereas humanists emphasize social development and broadly defined psychological capacities, behaviorists emphasized more sequential, discrete linear objectives. But these are not necessarily incompatible positions.

A MODEL IS NOT A FINAL STATEMENT

The concepts of education we hold today are but variations of the fundamental questions that have been before us since the origins of consciousness. Socrates understood education as "discourse", a guidepost in the search for wisdom. He valued inquiry and intuition. In contrast, Plato conceived of the State as the repository of wisdom and the overseer of all human affairs, including education. He was the first manager. As so has it always evolved: Dionysian or Apollonian, romanticism or classicism, humanism or behaviorism. All such concepts are aspects of one another. They contribute to evolutionary balance. They allow for alternative resolutions to the same dilemmas and they foster evolutionary change. Thus, a model is not a fixed reality immobilized in time. It is, as described above, a belief system, an opportunity to structure and investigate a particular

modality, to be influenced by it and to change it by entering into its methods. The Bank Street model does not exist as a child-centered, humanistic, experientially-based approach standing clearly in opposition to teacher-centered, behaviorist modalities. These polarities serve more to define the perceived problem than they do to describe themselves.

PUBLIC EDUCATION: THE MODEL ALREADY IN PLACE

Each of the Follow Through models presents a discrete profile. But each also is drawn from a larger matrix which accepts the boundaries of our society's concepts about public education. In this, the fundamental 20th Century American model, children are assembled in groups, generally from ages 5 or 6 on. They are instructed by a teacher for fixed periods of time. They attend school 5 days weekly. The teachers are placed in a hierarchy in which a host of administrators, supervisors and specialists can impact their daily operations. A community determines if its' schools are successful by testing its children using standardized measures of achievement and so forth. Each of these statements is an aspect of the given model of public education into which the sponsor models were introduced. None of the givens were challenged. The sponsor models were to be evaluated with very little attention paid to a description of these givens. Thus, it is important to recognize that the burden of model implementation was superimposed on a model already in place.

The earliest mandate for Follow Through did not require adherence on the part of the receiving sites to any particular educational model. The perceived needs of the poor children and the ethos of Head Start as our society's response to these needs were sufficient to launch

the effort. Only as the Vietnam War was escalated and the funding shrank was the program recast as a Research and Development enterprise. It was at this moment that the illusions cited above were applied to the operational design. Sponsorships and the concomitant responsibility for model implementation were added to a program already in place and sufficiently burdened by the ideological and operational demands of the original guidelines. The sponsor model was, in effect, to be grafted onto the national Follow Through model, which was in turn to be delivered to the LEA's. Let us note that in all cases the local sites were already functioning in terms of their own tacit or explicit models.

Each sponsor, reasonably enough, was asked to specify the parameters of their given model. For purposes of clarity and in order to facilitate the evaluation task, these became codified and in most cases, vastly oversimplified statements of each approach. Not all approaches addressed the same issues, served the same client population or, in fact, strove for the same outcomes. There were, to be sure, overall generalizations shared by all - the language currently favored states that all intended to "increase the life chances of the poor children." Some sponsor models relied on interdisciplinary teams and adequate comprehensive services as well as classroom changes (Bank Street College.) Others sought to influence parents primarily (Ira Gordon.) Some addressed particular child populations (Bilingual children). Others extended the work of individual educators (Marie Hughes,

THE NEED FOR ALTERNATIVES

The question arises: if indeed there are no pure educational models, of what value is the generation of any at all? We would argue that the articulation of a model is a means for clarifying values, specifying objectives and planning procedures. In this sense, every educator has an implicit model and every educator needs to confront this model and make it explicit. Thus, although "planned variation" couldn't be as rigorous as it was purported to be, it was and continues to be a very desirable approach to the maintainance of quality control in our schools. Adherence to a shared model creates unity of purpose and facilitates a disciplined enactment. The existence of many models is consistent with the traditional American respect for pluralism and our present need for valid alternatives.

There was a ferment if ideas and much enthusiasm for the attempt to generate this much research and service in the schools. But very few sponsors assumed they would learn "what works best." Of interest to most sponsors were questions such as: why were approaches they had known to be successful in some settings so difficult to implant in others? what adaptations of the particular approach were needed as each community was studies? This process of continuous adaptation was of more than historical interest. It is easy enough to construct theoretical models. But it may be helpful in future programs not to take these abstract statements too seriously. As stated above, there were not 22 full-fledged educational models available in 1968, nor are there today. There are an infinite number of possible variations and approaches as we continue to search for the ideal accomodation between ego and

id, between experience and instruction, between individual and society.

In the tumultuous decade in which Follow Through flourished, one polarized and fundamentally erroneous concept continued to daunt us. At the inception of sponsorship, the (then) Office of Education proposed the placement of potential sponsor models within a purported continuum from the "cognitive" to the "affective." There is no such continuum. All educational models, in fact, claim both cognitive and affective dimensions. Presenting these as polarized choices contributed to many later muddles as to cognitive and affective outcomes. Despite this invincible ignorance, it is commonly understood among students of human development that phenomena such as thought, feeling, motivation and experience are interrelated and interacting forces, all of which play a role in the child's performance. What is of interest is how these modalities are expressed. What does each approach want the child, the teacher, the sponsor, the administrator, the researcher, to enact?

AMERICAN PRAGMATISM

American education is characterized, as are all other institutions in our culture, by a quality of pragmatism. In the case of Follow Through, the Disadvantaged Child in the Public School did not hold still to fulfill their designated roles as subjects. All these persons in these settings were continually evolving. Thus, as we made contact and began to move forward, there was a growing distance between outcomes that we and our client group could verify and the reported child outcomes that the national evaluation was able to verify. At the local level, observations related to child development, credibility of service and the shared responsibility for enactment were the features that became the

benchmarks for an identified series of program effects.

THE PERSISTENCE OF SCHOOL FAILURE AMONG POOR CHILDREN

We note that the persistence of the original problem is not an indication of failure. The "disadvantaged child" is still with us. Perhaps it is time to re-examine the perceived need and the stated problem. We have always objected to deficit theories which identify the victim in an ideological system which then does not allow for sufficient service. But if the child isn't deficient, then what? Do we help the parents, the school, the larger society? If we displace the problem of school failure, if we, in fact, give the problem away as often suggested, should we then give up our "illusion" that schooling can make an impact? What level of proof is required to justify adequate nutrition and preventive comprehensive health services? What debate can there be before we agree as a society that a welcoming school climate and a child's sense of well-being are worthy of our continued commitment?

Paradox 3 - Everybody believes in research/ The state of the art is limited.

Follow Through demonstrated that much can be studied but not much can be proven. The great majority of Follow Through models are authentic in that they were articulated out of genuine experience of success. They were known to "work" because their originators and clients had verified their value. But at no time were these models analyzed as to which factors contributed to the overall sense of success that motivated the widespread optimism at the inception of the program. In any case, even if such an analysis had

been made, it is doubtful that the dynamics of their enactment would have lent themselves to the narrow gauged measures of the SRI/Abt data.

To use our own model as an example, we advocate a core curriculum in which the tools of the social scientist are instilled from the earliest grades onward.

As Gilkeson and Bowman write, " Bank Street's approach to learning is predicated on the theory that school can be stimulating, satisfying, sensible and perceived by each child as an important part of his life. School is a place where children will approach any new experience with wonder, with questioning, with experimentation. It is a setting in which growing persons can exchange ideas and learn ways to express themselves and communicate with others who share in common enterprises--others whose ideas and desires may be different or like their own. Essentially, the classroom is a place where the child can construct--if tentatively and crudely at first--an age-appropriate, interactive world of work, creativity and social interaction." (14)

We knew then as we know now that this approach to schooling yields many rich rewards. The children are more engaged in their own learning. They become more interactive, more self-initiating, more competent linguistically and intellectually.

PRIOR EXPERIENCE AS VALIDATION

We had had substantive experience with this approach in our laboratory settings, in our teacher education programs and in our field-based training programs. We knew that school settings could become more responsive when they received support and stimulation. Parents and teachers were gratified by these changes and were increasingly more willing to cooperate in supporting the many adaptations in procedure required to provide the children with such rich experience. Simultaneously, we were becoming increasingly analytic about the more narrowly defined aspects of schooling commonly called "the academics." Our theory and our experience gave us confidence in our knowledge/belief that direct experience and language stimulation should take priority over premature didactic instruction in decoding. With time, we were able to refine our model to ensure continuous diagnostic evaluation in the context of the richness of experience we deem so vital to the nurturance of human capacities. Thus, the "academics" were to be taught with specificity for each child and with differing foci for subgroups of children as identified by our diagnostic tools. (See Appendix A.)

We and our client groups continued to believe that our model "worked" because we shared a common experience as to its power once we were able together to enact some of its key features. At no time did we assume this model was fully implemented. It is characteristic of our way of thinking and working that we were constantly adapting and negotiating in order to resolve the myriad

interpersonal and institutional conflicts that impeded model implementation. But we saw this as a natural developmental process. We recognized our need to be more communicative and more helpful. We were often frustrated at the slow pace of change, but we had not shared the original illusion that it could be any other way.

This is all stated subjectively in order to illustrate the original point that the majority of Follow Through models were known to have worked before the national evaluation was set in place "to find out what works." It is clear from the description of our approach and its processes that we were opposed to the national evaluation in terms of its assumptions and instruments and not because we oppose evaluation, either at that time or in the present, but because there was so little match between our methods and theories and the SRI test battery.

INFORMATION NEEDED AT INCEPTION

We would have welcomed a study of the characteristics of the incoming children that would have told us more about their language level, motivation and maturational needs. We would have welcomed an assessment of mathematical and reading competencies in which growth over time could be understood in terms of this initial information. We would have cooperated with all efforts to collect information as to program impact from the prospective parents, teachers and other participants. At many meetings and in many memoranda, the Bank Street Director and Bank Street Follow Through research staff attempted to influence the direction of this process to no avail.

We argued for caution in the use of standardized tests as measures of program effects for models such as ours. We hope, once again, through the decisions taken by NIE that these concerns will be honored.

The primary reliance on standardized, paper-and-pencil achievement tests in the national longitudinal evaluation of Follow Through was more appropriate for some models than others. Children enrolled in Follow Through models that are child-centered, individualized and interactive are at a disadvantage in responding to standardized achievement tests, because they are not accustomed to right/wrong response formats or to working independently for a long period of time in a large, silent group situation. Children in Bank Street classrooms work primarily in small groups where self-pacing and peer communication are encouraged. The rigid structure and time limits imposed in testing situations are unfamiliar to them and may therefore be perceived as intimidating and restrictive on performance. Furthermore, standardized achievement tests are not only inadequate for assessing even the academic skills of most young children in kindergarten, first and second grades. A Bank Street program emphasizes the development of productive language (oral and written), and skills in discourse and inquiry. To divert time and attention to training in test-taking skills would have necessitated a shift in curriculum. The results of achievement tests administered to third graders who are integrating many skills may be of some value, but such tests would probably be more appropriately administered to upper grade elementary grades.

MEASUREMENT AS AN END IN ITSELF

It is small comfort now to read the many critiques of the measures selected and to observe, with reference to the affective measures in particular, that its proponents continue to assert that "the evaluator faces a difficult choice - either not to measure their outcomes at all or to measure them with less than perfect instruments. In Follow Through we believe the better course to measure, albeit imperfectly, was followed." (-) In this assertion is revealed the imponderable tenacity of the belief in the validity and necessity of measurement per se. In our view, it was doomed to succeed. If an agency chooses to measure such delicate constructs as self-esteem "albeit imperfectly" it follows that measurements will of course then be available that can be endowed with the magical aura of scientific truth.

A further irony is that such a decision once taken affects the field as a whole since it creates a "data bank" whose very volume is seen as further evidence - of something. Thus, these authors go on to say that "several other panels" recommended the same two instruments "three instrument-selection panels (for evaluation of ESEB, Title I regular program, and the program for neglected or delinquent youth) recommended the Coopersmith. Two of the panels also considered locus of control, and they recommended the IARA." This is an excellent example of the perpetuation of error based on the wish to measure rather than the availability of suitable measurements.

House et al, criticize the sponsors saying "In spite of dissatisfaction with the evaluation, they continued to cooperate and to receive large sums of money." They do not say that the greatest proportion of these large sums was for direct service to the sites.

The remaining monies, in Bank Street's case, were used to create a variety of program analysis and assessment tools that would more appropriately identify program impact for models such as ours.

Even as our sites were being bombarded with evaluation feed back implying their worthlessness, we were developing instruments which identified significant differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through children in relation to cognitive functions not revealed by the MAT. (See Appendix A.)

These two worlds of discourse have evolved side by side. It would be helpful indeed if the knowledge gained from this experience would lead to some diminuation in the power ascribed to standardized testing in the future. For this writer, this seems more a wish than an expectation.

II. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED *

In that unique and extraordinary event in the history of American public education which is called Follow Through, there have been many shocking confrontations with reality for all eager innovators, many maddening frustrations, but also many rich and incredible rewards and fulfillments. A decade of concerted effort and study has altered the consciousness of all who were touched b the program.

What have we learned? We, at Bank Street, have not changed our theoretical approaches. We have, in fact, a renewed faith in our concepts of what schooling can mean for children. However, we have learned what it takes to educate within the culture of the public school, serving such diverse child populations. We have learned the important balance between the how and the why. We have learned what kind of education is truly compensatory and at the same time universal.

* This section was written by E. Gilkeson, G. Bowman and L. Smithberg. An abbreviated versions appears at the conclusion of Bank Street's chapter in Making Schools More Effective, Ray Rhine (Ed.). New York:

To explicate these learnings, we present below both those insights that have been confirmed and deepened by the experience and those new insights that are specific to Follow Through. These insights, old and new, are organized under what we have learned about children, about adults, about school systems and about sponsorship.

A. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT CHILDREN

Old Concepts Reaffirmed: We have renewed faith in the primacy of the developmental process and the urgency of studying early influences on a child's learning. We have a deeper realization of the enormous range of life experiences, capabilities and limitations that make up the portrait of the entering child. We recognize more than ever that a supportive transition process from home to the new school culture may affect the child's style and quality of learning throughout the years. Our belief has been reaffirmed that although each child learns in a different way, all will respond to opportunities for engagement, nurturance, redirection and appropriate stimulation. In this sense our model is relevant for children in many different cultures and circumstances.

New Insights: We who are engaged in what is called compensatory education must consider the question, "Who are the children we serve?" In any given school population there are children with diverse needs. At one end of the range there are always well functioning, self-integrated individuals, children who come to school with an understanding of their world and their place in it, with a serviceable means of communication and a readiness to meet the challenges provided by the school setting. At the other extreme are children who present a variety of severe physical, psychological or linguistic handicaps. Such children

will be able to use the school environment only with careful support and a maximum of technical assistance in the mediation of their experiences. Then there are the children in between these extremes -- that group of children who do not do well for what are typically vague reasons: children with low expectations of themselves, poor motivation, a lack of personal investment in their own learning, a sense of distrust of the school and the teaching. These are the children who typically do not "achieve", who are "below grade", not for lack of ability but for lack of readiness. These children are often cognitively frustrated, emotionally insecure. For them the school world is meaningless, capricious, threatening, unreliable. We have found such children in all social, economic and racial groupings. Most importantly we have learned that these children do not need to be typed as "non-learners", that all children are naturally learners if the school is adaptive to their needs and receptive to their unique potential -- in short, if school is an ego-building environment where children can learn to cope with difficult and destructive social influences.

The basic developmental needs of children cannot be superseded. Intervention must comprise motivation, positive self-perception, object relatedness, and intellectual vigor. For these qualities to thrive the school as a life force must be adaptive. Children are easily lost when bureaucratic necessities cause adults to lose sight of the need for intimacy and responsiveness in which human beings best learn.

B. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT ADULTS

Old Concepts Reaffirmed: We have been strengthened in our belief that adults can learn and change, but that they need time, psychological support, direct concretization of ideas, inspiration and good models for imitation. Our image of the effective teacher has been clarified. We believe that the teacher should be one of the most qualified professionals in society, combining the insights and relationship skills of the helping professional with scholarly knowledge of academic disciplines and the inventiveness to design appropriate curricula and learning environments. These challenges call for compassion, intelligence, organizational skills and stamina for a job that is never done.

New Insights: The aspect of change that is most difficult for teachers is that learning the Bank Street model requires a plunge into the doing of it. Enactment cannot be learned in advance and applied automatically. Hence, teachers are anxious lest they will not succeed immediately. They tend to feel overwhelmed at first by the responsibility that has been placed upon them. Hence, the continuing support of staff developers is imperative -- staff developers who carry a relatively small case load. We have found that it is not children alone who need individualized attention and guidance.

We have found that the same principle -- namely that understanding the Bank Street model is achieved primarily as one participates in processes -- applies to paraprofessionals and parents as well. We realize that although our model is stable insofar as it represents a consistent set of interwoven theoretical

tenets, it is forever fluid insofar as its enactment depends upon highly personalized processes of internalization. This is a slow process. We have learned not to expect miracles overnight, but we have also seen evidence that adults as well as children can learn by direct experience in a supportive and challenging atmosphere.

In Follow Through these direct experiences created many new constellations in the life of the teacher -- working in team with paraprofessionals, listening to as well as interpreting to the parents, interacting with ancillary staff and sponsor representatives -- all of which required a great deal of integration and mutuality of effort. We found that the supportive quality of the interactive process was one of the most undeveloped and elusive aspects of teacher's behaviors as they entered the program.

Another primary lack - a pre-requisite to sensitive interaction - was that of observational skills. We found that most teachers needed more background, more sophistication, not only in relation to the conventional tools of their trade, but also in relation to model-specific competencies such as how to study individual children and how to analyze one's own impact upon children's learning. However, we learned that our emphasis upon an analytic approach to teaching had to be balanced by the spontaneity, tempermental differences and naturalness of adult/child, child/child and adult/adult relationships. Team interaction is a specific, learnable skill. Its impact upon children extends beyond the craft of teaching on the part of any single individual. It undergirds and enhances

-- the shifting personnel at all levels, for the stated purpose of organization, with absolutely no concern for the clients - children, their families or the teachers.

-- the development of procedures without reference to the child and family needs.

-- the lack of flexibility of the system to provide time and personnel for in-service and continuous staff development.

-- The lack of expectation that the principal's role includes responsibility for educational leadership.

-- the myth that with a few courses educational competence can be learned.

In view of this deteriorating climate, we often hear the question: "Should we give up on our schools?" Bank Street's answer is a resounding "No." We have seen that nurturance during school -- thirty hours of each child's week -- can nourish the ego strength that enables the child to cope with destructive societal influences. Often, too, we have seen a dedicated principal, a group of eager teachers or an effective parent group able to serve as a pervasive force to change the total school life.

Although the power of a bureaucracy to deflect and defeat growth and learning was beyond our imagination before we experienced it, we still believe that it is possible for dedicated administrators, working with staff and parents, to encourage risk-taking, to support innovation and to set standards that school personnel and parents can live by.

We found that the professional training and personal expectation of the teaching corps were largely unmatched to the sophisticated role required for the effectiveness of our model. Therefore, there was need for continuuing education, individual challenge and high professional expectation. Growth and development for the majority of teachers was possible and rewarding only when there was endorsement from the educational hierarchy.

D. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT SPONSORSHIP

Old Concepts Reaffirmed: Among the most positive, in fact, pivotal, requirements is a sound working relationship between the sponsor and the local decision-makers, based on a clear understanding of respective roles and functions. In the wide world of enactment, educational decisions are rarely made with reference to a consistent theoretical stance. It is the responsibility of the sponsor to maintain the integrity of the model. Hence, the role of the sponsor has to be clarified at the outset and reclarified periodically, as needed, in terms of the following assumptions.

-- That the major role of the sponsor is to collaborate with school staff and parents in the development of a program that is consistent with the theoretical position to which all are committed.

-- That sponsorship by an outside institution or organization may be an important factor in achieving change because of the inherent difficulty of change from within a school or school system.

-- That child advocacy is the joint responsibility of the home, the school, the health and social service agencies and the total

school community, with the sponsor serving in a collegial capacity.

-- That joint planning and goal setting are essential in a spirit which preserves both the integrity of the model and the autonomy of the community -- that is to say, a spirit of mutuality.

New Insights: We have found that even when verbal agreement had been achieved, there was still a long way to go before understanding and acceptance could be translated into fundamentally different operating procedures.

Essentially, the chief deterrents to progress appear to have been: (1) the prevalence of a certain degree of rigidity about established procedures, (2) divergent and often conflicting value systems among the local implementers, and (3) resistance to change when the results are not immediately observable. These factors varied not only from community to community, but surfaced at different times and around different issues.

In contrast, a positive phenomenon was observed. Once a few innovations had been instituted and a few members of the peer group of professionals had observed their impact, a momentum was created. From that point on, one change led to another. In a sense, the children themselves became the primary change agents.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

It seems clear now that research and development in social settings requires broader definition, more realistic rules of evidence, more adaptive rules for discourse and different rules for the participation of the very subject under study.

Currently, code words such as "back to basics" and "accountability" are masks for the resurgence of a new educational imperialism. Having

given up on liberal ideals we will now focus on narrowly targeted goals, simply defined procedures and measureable outcomes. Thus, we carry forward all the earlier illusions in new disguises.

A. STUDY BELIEF SYSTEMS

THE VALUE OF BELIEF SYSTEMS

As delineated above, all models embody both theoretical scientific considerations based on study, research, and actual experience, and belief systems which grow out of the education, life experience and tempermental preferences of the individual or groups who formulate the particular model. These belief systems must be acknowledged, valued and incorporated as part of the generative energy for future educational development. Belief systems are a source of strength for both sponsors and potential client groups. Rather than submerge such powerful motivators it would be well to acknowledge their value and necessity. In such a climate, the dialogue between potential partners in educational development should be the first step in the creation on a contract that would bind the parties to future creative, cooperative, educational interventions. In this discourse, not only desirable outcomes but the structures needed to foster such outcomes would be articulated. A true contract would reveal not only what the participants would like to have happen, but, why and how and on what basis each partner is willing to cooperate and indeed, compromise.

As an example, the Bank Street model stresses direct experience and generates discourse about these vital experiences between adults and children. We found that the introduction of cooking, or the extension of curriculum to include trips, created multiple problems in some sites. The resistances were stated typically in terms of management problems. But, in fact, further exploration led to the conclusion that the value of such experiences was not understood or shared by the teachers and administrators who were delegated

B. BUILD IN RESOURCES FOR DOCUMENTATION AND DISSEMINATION

ILLUSTRATE GOOD PRACTICE

Across all models, for a diversity of child populations and with reference to distinct site conditions, there is an urgent need for instances of good practice which illustrates what is meant by our various theories as contained in a model description. It seems critical that we require of all participants descriptions of demonstrable processes of enactment. For Bank Street College this is particularly necessary. We found that most of the teachers and most of the parents with whom we interacted had not themselves had a life experience which gave them an inner sense of the meaning, the enactment, the value, the tempo or the framework for our kind of education. It was as if we were speaking another language. It does not seem useful to exort people to different behavior if, in fact, we cannot given them some internal lived-out understanding of the values of such new behaviors.

One of Follow Through's greatest contributions to public education has, in fact, been in this area. We, together, have generated much vital experience and many, many illustrations of good enactment. By these means the continual bridge between theory and practice has been built. To the degree to which we have tested out our assumptions, our beliefs, our theoretical premises in the lives of children, parents and teachers, to that degree have those experiences reconfirmed some values and beliefs and caused us to reconsider and restate various aspects of our model.

The Cross-Sponsor Task Forces, originally funded by the Follow Through national office, made a significant beginning, organized as they were to include all sponsors and representatives of all components of the project at the local level. They had already begun to pool experience, study resources and data and make

recommendations for future programs. This was one of several noteworthy efforts funded, begun and, unaccountably aborted.

A SOURCEBOOK FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Among the achievements of the past decade we consider the following as worthy of documentation and dissemination.

-- The conceptualization of a wide range of educational practices and long-term commitment to their enactment provided continuity and a sense of purpose which is supportive to local programs in the face of continuous upheaval. Sponsorship is a dynamic and stabilizing force for change.

-- With heavy emphasis on the importance of community and parent involvement, sponsorship offers an approach that community members may choose with full assurance that their concerns will be addressed within the framework of the educational philosophy and practice of the chosen educators.

-- Follow Through provides a unique opportunity for a community to combine the often isolated environment of the school with traditional community services. The demonstrated ability of this program to meld several too often separate services is one of its greatest strengths. Follow Through is a particularly appropriate approach to client-centered education.

-- Follow Through has an outstanding track record with regard to citizen involvement. The parents collaborate with the local school system in planning the use of federal funds to meet community goals. The fostering of parent leadership is worthy of further analysis.

-- Follow Through requires the collaborative efforts of the academic community, the federal agency, state education departments, the local school personnel and the parents. This is a coalition often visualized but seldom enacted. In this instance it was an acknowledged success. Higher education institutions and local school districts evolved a model of collaboration that had a direct impact on the educational experience available to the children. As a model for delivery systems it warrants further explication.

-- Follow Through, embodying the ethos of Headstart, stands as a beacon of hope in the low-income communities. The impact of poverty and its consequences continues to be documented. In the face of growing unemployment and other indications of growing social unease, the belief of low-income parents in their schools and in the merits of this program is untarnished--witness the flood of letters whenever the program was threatened in previous administrations. Such an alliance is of historical and social significance.

C. FOSTER INQUIRY AS TO PROCESS

EVALUATION AS DEVELOPMENT

The importance of appropriate evaluation for future intervention cannot be overestimated. The SRI/Abt report could not take into account the extraordinary outcomes of the coalitions created by the concept of sponsorship and encouragement of planned variation. The triangular relations among community, sponsor and federal government gave rise to many dynamic developments.

We are concerned that the reductionist spirit of evaluations such as that of SRI/Abt will dampen future efforts to offer federal

support to the poor children whose numbers and needs are increasing daily. The claim of effectiveness for a few competing models supported by a narrow spectrum of data is not justified.* To punctuate ten years of Follow Through with the flawed (tenuous) conclusions of the Abt report seems to us a serious error in judgment. It is necessary to admit more evidence in such a manner that the Abt report is presented as one study among many--all having greater or lesser claims to validity--all struggling with the problems of sampling, test relevance, model variations, attrition, and so on. Why does the federal government not take pride in a program that generated so much change in the education community?

Given the voluminous testimony to the many limitations inherent in the state of the art, it seems credible to present honestly the fact that educational practice and educational evaluation are permanent developmental processes.

IMPACT ON THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

It is clear from the outpourings of analysis, reanalysis, debate and dialogue as to the intent, the findings, and the general administration of the Follow Through evaluations at the national level, that research itself has been affected by the extensive rethinking of all these issues. In a new round of Follow Through, in new settings, we should have an opportunity to revitalize and legitimize a more appropriate role for evaluation. This is now the primary challenge to the research community. We require flexible, serviceable, useable methodology that allows for adaptability the situation and for the generation of meaningful information. We need program analysis and research structures that

*The Stanford Research Institute data (Cohort 3, Spring '75) rests on a sample of 256 children, not randomly derived, from a total population of 8000.

create more active roles for all parties to the contract, in terms of setting research goals, supporting research and evaluation processes at the site level and adapting services on the basis of what has been learned in a fairly rapid and flexible manner. Fostering a spirit of inquiry as an end in itself seems a more meaningful pursuit than claiming to be able to prove outcomes.

D. ACKNOWLEDGE THE LIMITATIONS OF EVALUATION

CONSUMER SATISFACTION

This recommendation is conceptually a corollary of the discussion presented in C. above. It is time for us to find methods whereby the testimony of the consumer is valued as a primary indicator of validation. As an example, there may be no measure for a child's love of schooling, but it is, in our view, a program effect that is verifiable to all. We need more agreement that such "naive" indicators do reflect program efficacy. When, as another example, parents report tangible improvement in their evaluation of a school lunchroom, that then becomes, in our view, an indicator of the effectiveness of the school and its programs.

The support for documentation and evaluation depends on built-in roles and meshing with ongoing programs. The federal office, sponsor and site personnel must all contribute in a way which is properly conceived, designed and funded so that research, evaluation and documentation activities are dynamic, ongoing and non-intrusive.

More attention must be given to the accomplishments of Follow Through. Phenomena like comprehensive services, parent support of the program, parent participation in the program, teacher-training and staff development, the problems of educational change and

implementation - all deserve more extensive study and reportage. Clearly, the technology of evaluation lags behind the art of education. Meanwhile, program planning and policy development will continue to rely on a broad spectrum of supportive information, analysis and documentation.

Even a $97 million evaluation could not "prove what works." Neither the past not the future interests of the federal government or the public can be well served if conclusions about Follow Through and programs like it do not reflect the broader scope of the program than simply the four measures emphasized in the earlier study. Local evaluation, sponsor evaluations, site documentation, non-O.E. evaluations - these have been given too little attention. All are worthy of study. All contribute to the proper image of Follow Through and its true history.

E. LEGITIMIZE THE SERVICE COMPONENT

SERVICE AND RESEARCH AS INTERDEPENDENT

The conceptualization of service and research as opposing functions creates a false dichotomy. In fact, wherever site and sponsor relationships have been appropriately forged, there has grown a unique constellation of capability in support of child development, parent development, teacher development, school development and research development. In well functioning sites, each of these strands can be observed in a living context. It is these distinct and complex ecosystems which are now often referred to collectively and generically as educational laboratories." It seems wasteful to discard these accumulated services. They were generated in a climate of optimism and funded in an era of abundance.

NEED TO CONSERVE RESOURCES

Now, as the financial resources of the federal government, the LEA, and the academic sector are becoming more limited, we must think in terms of conservation and careful management. We may never again initiate programs with such intellectual audacity and financial generosity. It does not seem wise to discard such an important program, whose key features may never again be reconstituted. Still less indicated, it would seem to us, is the re-design of a program which eliminates those aspects having to do with support for family life and psychological service for children. We can never dispense with such basics. The disarray, the lack of consistent care available in the health service delivery systems in our nation at this time, is in and of itself an argument for careful consideration of the continuance of Follow Through and comprehensive programs like Follow Through which, in fact, harness the community's capability to deliver adequate services along a broad continuum of need. The relationship between those needs and the effectiveness of an educational program cannot be underestimated.

IV. FUTURE DESIGNS

Equality of educational opportunity remains a stated goal of our society. Follow Through has demonstrated that it can play a vital role in the attainment of this goal.

It is our hope that Follow Through will be retooled and extended, that it will be given permanence and stability as a comprehensive, cohesive, interdisciplinary Child Advocacy Program serving low-income children. A new plan must allow for participation

of responsible government officials, legislators, sponsors and local site representatives in the evolution of a national policy for the education of its poor children.

We urge that all future designs include structures which allow for a deliberate planning process to be carried out. Such structures will assure the best use of our resources, as we bring to bear the experiences of the past upon our planning for the future.

In the recommendations which follow, the individual school is the organizing unit. This approach is based on the assumption that community planning for a comprehensive program is most feasible and appropriate at the school level. The propositions represent a widespread consensus developed by participation among all shareholders.

A. ESSENTIAL INTERACTIVE COMPONENTS

As we begin to conceptualize the potential for outreach in current sites, we discover that the salient features which we would wish to preserve in Follow Through are also the elements we believe to have the greatest potential for impact on the quality of public education. Among these essential components are:

--An outreach service from the school to families in the immediate neighborhood in order to serve children from birth through the elementary grades, typically to grade six.

--Early and continuing assessment of individual children; their strengths as well as their needs, utilizing a variety of diagnostic instruments rather than relying on standardized tests alone.

--Differentiated and carefully guided learning experiences for children which are planned to maximize their strengths and meet the needs revealed by early and continuing assessment of individual children.

--Active and meaningful involvement of parents in the classrooms and in school and community activities as colleagues and participants in decision-making.

--Joint planning by school and community for the integration of educational, health and social services for the school population.

--Training of supportive staff for teachers: staff developers, sometimes referred to as resources teachers, or master teachers.

--In-service programs for teachers and paraprofessionals toward the development of of a repertoire of skills and teaching strategies which will enable them to provide differentiated learning experiences for individual children.

--Career development for paraprofessionals who desire to increase their competencies and contributions to education.

--Team training, the principle objective being to develop understanding and acceptance of different perceptions of the educative process and through discussion (and sometimes through negotiation) to seek mutuality as to educational goals for children.

--Continuing education of all adults involved in children's education and development, both separately and together, including parents, instructional staff, ancillary personnel and administrators in order to make child advocacy a reality.

--Cooperation between staff of the school and an outside sponsor in conjunction with a local institution of higher learning in both

in-service education and on-going evaluation.

-- On-going formation analysis to foster the cycle of analysis, feedback, individualizing learning experiences and reassessment.

-- Assessment of progress through an integrated research design using various diagnostic instruments and through multiple perceptions.

B. DEMONSTRATION-DISSEMINATION FUNCTIONS

FOLLOW THROUGH AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

If Follow Through is strengthened and perpetuated as a dynamic child development program with a broad national constituency, each site should be conceived as a demonstration/dissemination center - a significant source of strength and continuity - within a program whose overall mission is as an educational resource.

We urge that resource centers be established in sites in which there is already a commitment to the spirit of the Follow Through program and the goals of the particular model chosen by the community. These successful sites could then facilitate the creation of new centers and new approaches to training.

We conceive of these centers as study-learning centers responsive to developing goals of educators and parents--not "lighthouses" casting beams on the darkness. This added capability for demonstration would then be developed in reference to an on-going well-implemented educational approach. The centers would serve as the necessary bridge from present qualitative educational settings to new communities and constituencies seeking to reach their poor children and families more effectively.

The demonstration-dissemination component should be planned to ensure adequate (additional) staff, facilities and accessibility.

The added goals of regional training, dissemination and educational research should be considered only with reference to the primary criteria of on-going qualitative experiences and services for the children and families now served.

C. EXPANSION TO NEW SITES

DIFFERENTIATED FUNDING OF SERVICES

Before estimating the cost of a new Follow Through program in a given community it would be necessary to review existing resources. Certain components such as parent coordinators, psychological and social service staff and in-service trainers are essential to the continuing vitality of Follow Through. However, the per pupil cost would vary greatly in terms of the extent to which needed services are already in place. The entire array of needed services will not add substantially to the per pupil cost in communities that already offer these services, provided that such functions can be redefined and integrated in relation to the goals of the chosen model. The principle additional cost would then be the initial and on-going training of personnel to perform the services in accordance with the model goals and practices.

GOAL-SETTING AS A SHARED PROCESS

Training should begin <u>before</u> the program is actually operationalized and be stressed continually thereafter. Workshops for parents and local staff would enable the community to make an educated choice and ensure commitment to full enactment by the shareholders. In such workshops shared goals are defined and necessary practices agreed upon.

Among the strategies and procedures to be built in as new sites become eligible we recommend the following:

-- A coalition between sponsor, community and local colleges and other centers where teachers receive pre-service and in-service

training, exchange faculty, and develop joint projects for study and demonstration.

-- The structuring of a period of initiation involving the assessment of educational needs of children, services already available, shared values of sponsors, parents.

-- The provision of lead time for the shareholders to establish priorities and sequencing of activities and to plan each stage of development.

-- The requirement for integrated settings: economic, racial, social - perhaps priority should be considered for those communities working toward desegregation.

-- The design of schooling as comprehensive with continuing health, guidance and psychological services.

-- The redefinition of the role of the principal--who would share responsibility for model implementation.

-- The negotiation with unions and LEA to ensure staff flexibility.

-- The renegotiation of load to permit availability of teachers to work with parents, participate in staff development, child assessment and staff selection.

-- The definition of a permanent role for paraprofessionals--selection, staff development and career ladder to be built in with the requirement that paraprofessionals be parents of children in the program.

-- The establishment of a paraprofessional role as home-school liaison--selection, staff development and career ladder to be established.

-- The building in of staff development programs to facilitate objectivity, feedback and an emphasis on self-analysis.

-- The building in of feedback from formative research and program analysis to influence the course of the program while it is in the process of development.

-- The funding of sites at varying rates depending on initial assessment of local resources, training needs and other factors influencing overall implementation potential.

V. CONCLUSION

Public education will never be the same. Follow Through created a model for growth and change which touched the lives of thousands of children, teachers, parents and administrators. It became a movement by virtue of its power to generate hope, commitment and a sense of purposeful growth in public education. The design for the National Follow Through Program is a model overarching all the very real differences resulting from planned variation. National Follow Through insists upon coalition of the local school, sponsors and the federal sector. This coalition, in our view, remains our best hope for the future. The care of young children, the protection of their intellectual promise and the support for the natural settings -- the home and the school -- in which to enact these responsibilities remain the unfinished tasks of the twentieth century.

VI. Sources

1. Biber, B., Gilkeson, E. and Winsor, C. (1959) Basic Approaches to Mental Health: Teacher Education at Bank Street College. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

2. Blank, Marion. (1973) Teaching Learning in the Preschool: A Dialogue Approach. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Co.

3. Bloom, Benjamin (ed.) (1972) Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain; Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co.

4. Bock, G., Stebbins, L.D. and Proper, E.C. (1977) Education As Experimentation: A Planned Variation Model, Vol. IV-B, Effects of Follow Through Models. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates, Inc.

5. Bowers, C.A. (1979) "The Ideological-historical Context of An Educational Metaphor" in Theory into Practice, Vol. XVIII, No. 5, (Dec. 1979), pp. 316-22. Ohio State University.

6. Bruner, J.S. (1962) The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

7. Burns, G. P., Jr. (ed.). (1977) Sponsor Evaluations: Patterns of Effects (Volume III of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment Series). Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

8. Cazden, C. B. (ed.) (1972) Language in Early Childhood Education. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

9. Coleman, J. S. and others. (1966) Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

10. Dewey, J. (1934) Art As Experience. New York: Minton, Balch and Co.

11. Doll, W.E., Jr. "A Structural View of Curriculum" in Theory into Practice, Vol, XVIII, No. 5, (December, 1979), pp. 336-348. Ohio State University.

12. Elmore, R.F. (1976) Follow Through: Decisionmaking in a Large Scale Social Experiment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

13. Fishbein, J. and Emans, R. (1972) A Question of Competence: Language, Intelligence and Learning to Read. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

14. Gilkeson, E. and Bowman, G. (1976) The Focus Is on Children: The Bank Street Approach to Early Childhood Education as Enacted in Follow Through. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

15. Goodlad, J.I. "An Ecological Version of Accountability" in Theory into Practice, Vol XVIII, No. 5, (December, 1979), pp. 308-15. Ohio State University.

16. Gordon, I. (1966) Studying the Child in the School. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

17. Greene, M. (1978) Landscapes of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

18. Haney, W. (1977) A Technical History of the National Follow Through Evaluation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Huron Institute.

19. House, E.R., Glass, G.V., McLean, L.D. and Walker, D.F. (1978) No Simple Answer: Critique of the Follow Through Evaluation. Harvard Educational Review, 48: 128-160.

20. Houts, P. L. (ed.) (1977) The Myth of Measuribility. New York: Hart Publishing Co.

21. Hunt, J.M. (1969) The Challenge of Poverty and Incompetence. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

22. Jackson, P.W. (1968) Life in Classrooms. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

23. Jansky, J. and deHirsch, K. (1972) Preventing Reading Failure. New York: Harper & Row.

24. Judd, D.E. and Wood, S.E. (1973) Follow Through Materials Review. Portland, Oregon: Nero & Associates.

25. Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. Development As the Aim of Education. Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, No. 4, November, 1972.

26. Krulee, G.K. (1973) An Organizational Analysis of Project Follow Through, Final Report. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University.

27. Lindblom, C. E. (1979) Usable Knowledge. New Haven: Yale University Press.

28. McDermott, R.P. and Avon, J. "Pirandello in the Classroom: On the Possibility of Equal Educational Opportunity in American Culture"

29. Minuchin, P., Biber, B., Shapiro, E., and Zimiles, H. (1969) The Psychological Impact of School Experience. New York: Basic Books.

30. Mitchell, L. S. (1950) Our Children and Our Schools. New York: Simon & Schuster.

31. Nash, Paul. "A Humanistic Perspective" in Theory into Practice, Vol. XVIII, No. 5, (December 1979) Ohio State University.

32. Omwake, E. (1963) "The Child's Estate" in Modern Perspectives in Child Development, ed. A.J. Solnit and S.A. Provence. New York: International Universities Press.

33. Piaget, J. (1954) The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Basic Books.

33. Piaget, J. (1963) Psychology of Intelligence. Patterson, New Jersey: Little,Field, Adams and Co.

34. Polyani, M. (1966) The Tacit Dimension. New York: Doubleday.

35. Rath, S.W., O'Neil, B.B., Gedney, B.D., Osoria, J. (1976) Follow Through: A Resource Guide to Sponsor Models and Materials. Portland, Oregon: Nero and Associates.

36. Sapir, S.S. and Nitzburg, A.C. (1973) Children with Learning Problems: Readings in a Developmental-Interaction Approach. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

37. Stebbins, L.B., St. Pierre, R.G., Proper, E.C., Anderson, R.B. and Cerva, T.R. (1977) Education As Experimentation: A Planned Variation Model, Vol. IV-A, An Evaluation of Follow Through. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates, Inc.

38. Sutherland, C.L., Middleton, T. and Wright, A.R. (1976) Spring 1975 Teaching Staff Questionnaire Cross-Tabular Findings. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute.

39. Tucker, E., Iwamoto, D., Wisler, C.E., and Burns, G.P. Jr. Follow Through: A Synthesis of Findings. (Vol. I of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment series) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education. In press.

40. Wisler, C.E., Burns, G.P., Jr., and Iwamoto, D. "Follow Through Redux: A Response to the Critique by House, Glass, McLean, and Walker" in Harvard Educational Review, Volume 48, Number 2, 1978, pp. 171-185.

41. Wright, A.R. (1976) Spring 1975 Parent Interview Cross-Tabular Findings. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute. (Sponsored by U.S. Office of Education).

APPENDIX A

Program Analysis Materials Used in the Implementation of the Bank Street Model

Since the beginning of Follow Through, Bank Street has been developing a Program Analysis system which is designed to meet the need for ongoing formative and summative evaluation data appropriate to our model.

I. Rationale

The Bank Street program has been referred to as a "developmental-interaction" approach to education.

> "Developmental refers to the emphasis on identifiable patterns of growth and mode of perceiving and responding which are characterized by increasing differentiations and progressive integrations as a function of chronological age. Interaction refers, first, to the emphasis on the child's interaction with the environment--adults, other children, and the material world--and second, to the interaction between cognitive and affective spheres of development. The developmental-interaction formulation stressed the nature of the environment as much as it does the patterns of the responding child."[1]

The educational program which rests on this theoretical foundation is characterized by individualization and various degrees of flexibility in curriculum development and sequence. This approach is in sharp contrast to the type of program characterized by a predetermined and inalterable curriculum sequence. In the latter program, performance criteria reflect expectations which are established as a consequence of the interaction between curriculum sequence and rate of progress.

Within the Bank Street Approach, program evaluation, to be effective, must yield information about the characteristics of performance which, in turn, can be used formatively as a basis for program development. In the other type of program, performance characteristics are predetermined by the nature of the instructional materials.

Kohlberg and Mayer have discussed the basic dilemma which is introduced into programs similar to Bank Street when achievement tests are used to measure educational objectives.

> "From the ethical or philosophic point of view, the use of achievement tests to measure educational objectives rests on a compounding of one type of relativism or another. The items composing an achievement test do not derive from any epistemological principles of adequate patterns of thought and knowledge, but rather represent samples of items taught in the schools...There is no internal, logical or epistemological analysis of these items to justify their worth..."[2]

---

[1] E. Shapiro and B. Biber. "The Education of Young Children: A Developmental-Interaction Approach," in Teachers College Record. Vol. 74, No. 1, September, 197

[2] L. Kohlberg and R. Mayer. "Development as the Aim of Education," in Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 42, No. 4, November, 1972.

The purpose of the program analysis tasks and observation instruments developed by Bank Street College is to provide information about the characteristics of performance which, in turn, will allow for logical and epistemological analysis as a basis for establishing goals for program development within the individualized framework. As a result of application of the tasks to many children, teaching teams will collect their own "data banks" about specific aspects of children's performance. With this information, teaching teams with their colleagues can articulate their own expectations for increasingly differentiated child behavior -- in terms of both developmental and interactional goals. This is a significant aspect of the staff development process.

II. Aspects of Child Behavior

Following are selected aspects of child behavior which are of central concern for program development within the framework of the Bank Street program.

1. The structural organization of the child's knowledge. This refers to the differentiated and integrated quality of the child's thought process. For example, in the Social Studies area of the curriculum, are the children able to specify the complex relationships which underlie the organization of a society? (e.g. What are the steps between growing food and buying it at the local store and how does that affect the price charged as well as the availability of the commodities? What are the conditions Woodland Indians lived under and what were the effects of these conditions on the life styles of the people?)

2. The modes of representation that are available for expression of knowledge. How articulately can a child communicate using three-dimensional, two-dimensional pictorial and formal symbolic modes? More importantly, how can the child represent concepts simultaneously through the modes?

3. The personalized quality of the child's knowledge. How available are personal experiences which the child can use to identify with a situation and reason through the ramifications of the situation? For example, in the interview centering on social studies scenes which will be described, an important dimension of the analysis is the extent to which children associate their personal experiences with the picture. In terms of the spatial and temporal limitations of children's thought at this age range which has been described by Piaget, this is an index of the child's ability to structure his thought processes by associating and projecting personalized time-space patterns on a situation and, subsequently, extending his understanding beyond the personal level.

4. The child's ability to make inferences and hypotheses based on his understanding (through identification with personal experience) of a problem and consideration of the constraints inherent in the problem. One illustration of this is often found in the dramatic play encouraged in Bank Street classrooms. For example, if a group is studying about an American Indian culture, they might put together a play about a phase of life within that cultural context. The educational goal of the play is to integrate all the aspects of the culture which have been studied into a dramatic illustration. The degree of authenticity is the measure of the child's understanding of the culture. For this age range (6 to 8)

the play is the equivalent of the presentation of a "sociological" study. The simultaneous use of bodily gestures, three-dimensional replicas of culture artifacts (which have been made by the children), two-dimensional pictorial representations and language to summarize and communicate is an example of the construction of an elaborated and differentiated time-space pattern around the study of a culture which has never been experienced first-hand. It is the transitional stage between learning from a personal life experience bounded by temporal and spatial constraints to learning through vicarious participation.

5. General information children have about the purposes and processes related to the functions of persons and objects in his world. This refers to the range of evident knowledge which reflects children's awareness of the multiple roles a single person might play in the normal course of life (e.g. mother, wife, doctor, teacher, housekeeper) as well as the competencies for each role and the tools which enable the enactment of the role.

   Additionally, it refers to a more general knowledge about the functions of objects such as machines (e.g. trucks, busses, automobiles, etc.) and the relationships of these functions to meeting human needs within an elaborated social organization.

6. Language ability of children. This includes the children's ability to use language in a specific manner to differentiate and elaborate these ideas and feelings as well as a measure of the range of vocabulary available to children to describe and label objects which they have had experience with.

III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. The Overall Goal

The ultimate goal of the development and use of program analysis materials is to enhance the learning-teaching process.

2. Goal-Related Objectives

a) To interpret the educational program in terms of individual children.

b) To observe and assess child performance.

c) To deepen the insights of teaching teams about individual children and the dynamics of behavior.

d) To create a more objective and useful methodology for record-keeping and reporting about each child's learning and growth.

e) To help teaching teams master more effective teaching strategies which match their increased understanding of children.

f) To create new modalities for building mutual understanding and positive interaction between and among teachers, paraprofessionals, ancillary staff and parents.

IV. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CONTENT AND PROCESS FOR USE OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS TOOLS

Diagnostic tools have been developed by Bank Street or selected from other sources. In the latter case, instruments have frequently been modified or expanded in terms of the Model's objectives. Some of these instruments can be used for either summative research (evaluation) or formative research (feed-back for staff development). Their use for purposes of evaluation is described below in the section on Program Analysis. There follows a description of the diagnostic tools assisting in child development and adult education.

1. The Child as Learner

The following instruments are all administered to individual children except ACE and DCB which can be used with either one child or a group.

a) The Roster Profile

Content: A grid to provide an overview of all the individual children in a given class, with respect to their strengths, observable needs, and motivation for learning, along a dimension which defines the areas of Social Skills, Learning Styles and Interests.

Process: The form should be used several times during the year to reveal individual growth and group changes.

Analysis of the results by teaching teams and staff developers form the basis for group and individualized planning. The implications for individual planning and program development stem from analysis of the 29 variables which differentiate the major categories. Group planning may result from the identification of similar interests and/or needs for several children.

b) Individual Child Assessment Form

Content: A more elaborated form to make a closer look at particular children, based upon observation of their actions in class and at home conversation and/or play, interviews with families, and conversation with other children. The form suggests what to look at closely with respect to: what each child does, how he allots his time, what kinds of support he seems to need, and priorities for treatment.

Process: Teaching teams and staff developers may wish to use this form to look more closely at a child who seems to need special support or to sharpen and deepen perceptions as recorded in the Roster Profile. This more elaborated form is particularly valuable for individualized curriculum planning.

c) Anecdotal Records and Report Form

Content: A list of possible dimensions to be described in anecdotal records covering: Self Style, Working-learning Style, Interests, Social Interactions. The sub-headings under each of these major categories suggest specific areas of concern with examples of what to look for in each area. The summary report guide known as "The Child in School" provides guidelines for informal day to day observation and record-keeping as well as the format for a more extensive final summary.

Process: It is recommended that running anecdotal records be kept on at least three children in each class, with particular emphasis upon observable changes, which may indicate progress or the reverse. Discussion of these changes should focus upon the possible causal factors and treatment. The assistance of ancillary personnel in this analysis will be particularly important.

d) Reading Assessment Form

Content: Three instruments: (1) a grid for a Group Assessment to check various elements of language for each child, with respect to Language, Comprehension, Physical Development Related to Reading Skills, Encoding and Decoding; (2) a Check List for Assessing Individual

Development with specific examples of what to look for grouped under Beginnings, Initiation to Reading, Middle Reading, and Later Reading, and (3) a Key to explain the categories in the Group Assessment Form, and to relate these categories to the items in the Checklist.

Process: Curriculum plans may be made for both groups and individuals based on the Group Form and the Checklist. Discovery of weak places in a child's growth in reading and language does not necessarily indicate the need for immediate or intensive drill in the areas of weakness. The child may have a learning style which is incompatible with the manner in which he has encountered the skill or he may be developmentally unprepared. The teacher should strive to provide experiences in the child's areas of interest and competency to build reading on strengths rather than to drill on weaknesses. Drill on weak spots usually provides little besides more failing experiences in an area in which the child has already experienced failure. If, however, testing shows weakness of the whole group in specific areas, the teacher should be sure the children are developmentally ready for each area and then provide opportunities for the children to experience these areas in a variety of ways. Teaching teams will want to review and discuss the forms with staff developers who will clarify and assist in planning.

e) Differentiated Child Behavior Form (DCB)

Content: A grid for systematic observation of children in a learning situation, recording the frequency of child behavior under the following major categories: Giving Information, Asking Questions, Expressing, Behaving Aggressively, Autonomy, and Communication via Symbolic Play and Representation. There are sub-categories under major categories to identify specific behaviors. The form can be used for groups of children or individual children. It provides quantitative and qualitative data regarding children's verbal and non-verbal communication in classrooms. The nature of the interaction is coded: child-to-child or to adult; adult-elicited or non-adult elicited; individual or choral responses. The referent child's sex is indicated in each instance.

Process: The form can be used live after a rigorous and prolonged period of training. It does not lend itself to use by teachers or to immediate feedback. The form is essentially suitable for summative research but the results of the analysis of aggregate scores serve as valuable feedback for staff development and program development, when interpreted by competent persons.

f) SPACHE Diagnostic Reading

Content: A diagnostic reading test which yields information as

to the child's overall reading performance. It is scored as to Instructional Level, Independent Level and Potential Level. It identifies not only the child's decoding skills but also the critical skills related to comprehension.

Process: This test is administered to all second and third grade children who have progressed beyond the initiation stage of reading. It is administered early in each school year to each child individually by the teacher or assistant. The resultant Reading Test Record is then the basis for the individualized reading plan for that child.

g) STAR (Screening Test of Academic Readiness)

Content: A test which yields information about the child's language development, his ability to identify likenesses and differences and therefore his capacity to differentiate his environment. It also gives indications as to visual motor development. It includes Picture Vocabulary, Letters, Picture Completion, Copying, Picture Description, Draw a Human Figure and Relationships.

Process: The test is administered to all incoming kindergarten children by the teaching team in September or early October. It is administered to nor more than five children at a time and provision is made for those children who may need a one-to-one setting. Each child's test is reviewed by the teaching teams with the staff developer. It serves as the basis for planning individualized experience. In addition, this test provides important clues which alert the staff to the need for additional diagnostic or remedial support.

h) Parent Report Form

Content: A comprehensive periodic survey of the child's growing interests, skills and competencies. It consists of a teacher's guide which suggests areas to be covered and an outline form on which the teacher writes. Areas to be reported upon include: Interests and Concerns, Social Studies, Language and Reading, Mathematics, and other curriculum areas.

Process: The report form is filled in in writing by the teaching team, with the participation of the staff developer. It is sent home to parents 4 times yearly. There is space for the parent to comment in writing. In addition, the social work staff assist teachers in planning follow-up parent conferences at least twice yearly. As the form of the report is cumulative, space is provided for consecutive entries at each marking period.

i) Individual Folders

Content: The items described above plus the results of the battery of selected achievement tests administered by each community will be kept in each child's folder, plus records of parent conferences, home visits, reports (if any) from ancillary staff, and the individual data required by the local school system. Each teacher may have special ways of looking at children which will be high-lighted in the collection.

Process: The folders will serve as the basis for analysis of and planning for individual children by teaching teams and supportive personnel. They will also provide material for personalized records to parents.

2. The Adult as Enabler

a) Portions of the Self Study

Content: A series of questions on which teaching teams are asked to rate themselves. The portions which are applicable to the adult as enabler are related to Children's Learning: What and How, Classroom Climate, Parent Involvement, Patterns of Interaction: Adult-to-Child.

Process: The form can be used either as a completely confidential method of self analysis or as a basis for team work or for discussion with the staff developer, leading to identification of areas where help is needed and wanted.

b) Teacher Assessment Form

Content: A series of scales to assess Room Arrangement, Classroom Management, Opportunities in the Classroom for Learning, Teaching Strategies, Interpersonal Relationships, Attitudes toward the Model, and Professional Development.

Process: This form may be helpful at the point of selection but it is intended primarily as a basis for continuing dialogue between the evaluator and the teacher in order to support the change process on which the teacher must embark in order to move toward effective implementation of the Model.

c) Parent Interview

Content: An interview schedule designed to explore and reinforce Home-School Relationships, Parent Participation in the Classroom and in the PAC, Compatibility of Home-School Concepts of Educational Principles and Practices.

Process: The involvement of parents as interviewers of other parents served as a stimulus to those who did the interviewing to learn more about the Model and to participate more actively in the planning and the enactment of the program.

APPENDIX B

Excerpt from Materials Review
Nero and Associates, 1975

OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL

Basic Values and Beliefs

The Bank Street model is a developmental-interaction approach concerned with:

1. The growth process of individual children through various stages of development.
2. The quality of their interaction with people and with materials which foster such development.

Building a total environment--social and physical--in which children can develop and interact productively requires a highly competent staff, skilled in using materials and establishing processes. Hence an initial thrust and a continuing concern of the model is staff development.

Essential is the Interpretation of Goals for Children

The essential ingredient of Bank Street's staff development program is interpretation of its goals for children, which may be described in terms of the kind of people the children could become: confident, inventive, constructive, coping human beings. Thus, they need not only basic skills but also a high level of cognitive

development (not merely simple recall or recognition of facts), a good self-image, a probing, exploratory attitude toward learning, the ability to solve problems, healthy emotional development, the ability to function autonomously, and sensitivity to the rights and feelings of others. Educational Goals for the Bank Street Approach to Follow Through (1) outlines more fully these desired outcomes for children and goals for the staff development process. This growth and development on the part of the child is believed to occur in classrooms in which careful planning and structuring by the teachers and paraprofessionals are combined with self-selection and self-determination by the children, within the context of the choices available.

Many Mechanisms for Children to Structure Their Choice

Bank Street has developed many mechanisms which make it possible for children to structure their choices, such as planning charts on which children record their individual and group work activities. This knowledge of the child's activities and progress enables the teacher to help the child make choices which extend his learning.

Key Concepts and Perceptions

A set of key concepts and perceptions appears to give directions to much that Bank Street does.(2)(3) Among these concepts and perceptions are the following:

1. The principles of educating all children, i.e., Follow Through and non-Follow Through, are the same.
2. Each child must be considered individually, not simply for rate of growth and learning, but also for style and

individual interests. This means that, in essence, each child has his own curriculum built by the child and the teacher around the child's special interests, strengths and needs. This curriculum shifts and changes as the child develops and as new opportunities and challenges occur.

3. The learning environment is built around normal work and play activities, which are indicators of out-of-school interests, concerns and experiences. This concept influences the selection of learning materials, the manner in which the classroom is organized, and the home-school interaction that is planned.
4. The child can become a self-directed learner. He can enjoy learning and knowing how to select and develop his own learning resources.
5. A child needs opportunities and guidance for working effectively in groups. He can learn to like working with other people; he needs skills which enable him to work cooperatively; he needs to understand the importance of working with others.
6. The processes which enable the child to learn and develop at school are based upon years of study and experimentation by the sponsor. Developing understanding and use of these processes by staff, parents and children is the most important task of the sponsor.

Classrooms Have Standard Materials

Bank Street classrooms contain certain standard kinds of materials: a wide range of trade books, Bank Street Readers, language stimulation materials and Cuisenaire rods are among the materials commonly found in their classrooms. Most importantly, the classroom is characterized by a wealth of natural materials including plants and animals indigenous to the region and materials and tools for experimentation, construction and expression--many of them teacher-made.

Bank Street classrooms are busy places but do not give an impression of chaos. Typically, each child is engaged in some readily identifiable learning activity, either individually or in a group. Usually the groups are small, two or three to give children at the most. Seldom is the entire class working on the same thing at the same time. The adults work with individuals or small groups, but they also keep in close touch with other children in the room and are available to support and evaluate independent activities.

A Commitment to Self-Evaluation

An overview, Bank Street Approach to Follow-Through: Position Paper, 1973, describes the sponsor's positions and general implementation procedures for staff development, parent involvement, school community relations and program analysis.(4) Bank Street assumes that when a school system selects their approach, this school system is making a commitment to self-evaluation and change. Bank Street's thrust in this change

process is to include in its training the staff of the entire school--upper grade teachers, the principal, and other school administrators--as well as Follow Through staff.

Rationale for Development and Use of Materials

Consistent with its emphasis on staff development, most of the materials produced are either for inservice training or intended as teaching tools. These materials include slides, filmstrips, films and video tapes.(5) A listing of materials available for distribution has been compiled by sponsor staff.(6) These materials are used in Bank Street, on-site and regional workshops.

Project sites are provided lists of recommended instructional materials(7), e.g., unit building blocks and accessories. Teams of sponsor staff also review and select what they feel to be quality reading materials. Catalogues of recommended books in the Bank Street Collete of Education Bookstore are made available to the local districts on a regular basis.(8)

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Curriculum Developed from Classroom Activity

The focus of the Bank Street classroom is to develop curriculum on the basis of the experiences of the children. The teaching role is critical in the learning process although not always that of "instructor." In the areas of social studies, mathematics, science and reading, recommendations are made as to what books and materials would be helpful, but much of the curriculum-building occurs through

other activities. A key paper from Our Children and Our Schools, "Learning Through Play and Experience in the Here-and-Now World," describes this curriculum-building process.

Each Child Has His Own Reading Program

Language and reading pervade every activity in a Bank Street classroom. Children learn to read through the recording of their own experiences, as described in The Initiation to Reading.(10) Throughout the reading program, comprehension or reading for meaning is the major goal. Toward this end, silent reading is emphasized early in the program. An essential component of this approach is early and continuous diagnosis of each child's potential strengths as a reader determined by a standardized diagnostic test chosen by the model and administered by the teacher. Guidelines have been written to assist the teacher in the development of each child's own reading program, drawing upon a variety of methods and materials. A detailed paper describes the classroom program which supports an individualized reading approach*. Certain reading and reference books are suggested by Bank Street, which also has developed a bibliography with an accent on Afro-Americans.(11)(12)

Bank Street Classrooms Seen as Workshops

Essential to the Bank Street approach is a classroom arrangement that allows children to choose their activities, to work individually or in groups, and to have access to a variety of materials. There must also be understandable rules and well-defined

*Available in fall 1973.

structure so that children can regulate and organize themselves. Bank Street classrooms are seen as workshops with various interest areas separated from each other by shelves or dividers. Children can move from one area to another according to their needs. There are sections for blocks (13)(14), games and counting materials; easels for painting; and quiet areas with rugs and comfortable chairs for reading or other individual work. Desks and chairs are movable.

In addition, a Bank Street classroom provides materials and facilities for an art area, science area, woodworking area, mathematics area, cooking area and an area for indoor play. Printed materials have been written to provide a guide to the teaching staff for working in each area.* One such example is a four-page paper describing how language and mathematics experiences, dramatic play, and social studies and science questions can evolve from cooking activities in the classroom.(15) In addition, the Bank Street social studies program views the community as an extension of the classroom.(16)(17).

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Teamwork Emphasized

Bank Street College has worked out a model for staff development. A recent position paper describes the various training roles.(4) Central to the Bank Street approach is the concept of teamwork.

*See Appendix A for selected printed materials.

Each of the classroom teaching teams plays an important role in the education of children. The following objectives are emphasized in staff development:

1. To differentiate children's motivations, needs and ways of learning.
2. To become knowledgeable in current theories of cognitive development.
3. To communicate with families in order to respond to the goals, ideals and values held by parents and the community.
4. To establish a climate in school that will foster the growth of a positive self-image for the children.
5. To foster individual learning for each child through imaginative use of varied materials and techniques.

In addition to its emphasis on classroom teaching teams, the Bank Street approach emphasizes the auxiliary teamwork of psychologist, nurse, social worker, etc., working with the teaching teams.(18)

The responsibility for intensive training of the eight to ten teachers in a teaching team is carried out by a local staff developer experienced in both guidance and instruction. This person has special training at Bank Street and continuous interaction with sponsor field staff on site. The Field Representative is an integral part of the support system and a vital link between sponsor and community.

Workshops and conferences both on-site and at Bank Street, and continuous local service training are the components of staff development. The sponsor has been responsible for the development of new training classroom studies, film clips and newsletters.(5)(19)(20)(21) Appendix B contains an annotated list of films and

film strips considered especially important for staff development; brochures and order forms are available from the sponsor.(22)

Self-Study to Determine Team Progress

A self-study tool has been developed by sponsor staff as a means for teaching teams to pinpoint their own skill development in implementing the model. The self-evaluation guide is directe toward understanding children, the physical environment, classroom climate, classroom management, patterns of interaction and parent involvement.(23)

The regional staff development institutes enable interaction among the staff of several projects and more contact with the Bank Street staff. Undergraduate credit for inservice training at Bank Street is often arranged on an exchange basis or in a joint training program with local community colleges for paraprofessionals. Graduate credit is available from Bank Street for those staff who can participate in extension courses.

PARENT EDUCATION/INVOLVEMENT

Although the exact manner of parent involvement varies from school to school, all of the schools using the Bank Street approach to Follow Through have a parent education program which is seen as crucial to the model. One of the major emphases is to help parents become valued participants in the planning and development of school and community programs through more understanding of the learning-teaching process. This involves more parent participation in the classroom, more effective organization of the Policy Advisory

Committee and more two-way communication between parents and teaching teams regarding children's learning and development. A Parent Interview Form provides a means for two-way communication between teachers and parents concerning the child. Bank Street staff view institutes and intervisitation as essential to strengthening parent involvement. A majority of the projects have their own newsletters written by and for the parents. These newsletters are exchanged across projects and are on file at the college.

EVALUATION SYSTEM

Instruments Developed to Improve Approach

Criteria for evaluating the implementation of Bank Street's Follow Through model (25) parallel criteria for Bank Street Early Childhood Education programs in general.(26) As Bank Street began working with more communities and more classrooms in each project, the need became apparent for a more sophisticated evaluation and monitoring system. A number of instruments have been developed and are being used to assist in monitoring and improving the implementation of this approach. The Analysis of Communication in Education (ACE) is a classroom process instrument used to study the adult/child and the child/child interaction by analyzing the mode (such as expressing one's self voluntarily, asking and responding, etc.), the substance (such as information, thoughts, ideas and feelings, etc.), and the flow (who speaks to whom) of communication.(27) This instrument has been used in the past to

FLOW CHART FOR THE CHANGE PROCESS WITHIN A LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM