6-1977

Educational Change in a School Mandated "OPEN": as seen through the eyes of an advisor

Helaine R. Meisler
Bank Street College of Education

Educational Change in a School Mandated "OPEN": as seen through the eyes of an advisor

by

Helaine R. Meisler

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of
Master of Science in Education
Bank Street College of Education
June 1977

ABSTRACT

This paper is a study of educational change as I observed it during my experience as an advisor in a public school in East Harlem. I had been hired by Creative Teaching Workshop as an advisor in its Advisory Service program. Schools which were involved in the program received two full days per week of advisory time.

The setting is a brand new school architecturally designed as an open space school and educationally planned to become an open education school. The principal and staff were geared to expect and to effect change: change in educational philosophy, change in teaching styles, change in relationships among staff, and change in relationships between staff and administrators. My role was to support the members of the school in effecting these changes.

In this paper I discuss my work as an advisor as it relates to this particular school's changes. I discuss my work with the administrators and teachers, and analyze the changes which did or did not occur. I examine how this type of intervention strategy relates to the work accomplished during my six month stay at the school. And, I review the literature in the field of educational innovation and change so as to "ground" the work described in this paper in a historical perspective and theoretical framework.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the people who supported, encouraged, and "pushed" me to work on and complete this thesis. First, I want to thank Nicholas Abramson and Chris Abramson, who lived through the entire experience with me -- providing much needed support, understanding, and love. Second, I want to thank Judith Neaman, a friend who worked long, hard hours editing the final draft of the paper, in addition to spending time talking with me so that I could clarify my own thoughts. Third, I want to thank Sue Ginsberg, my thesis advisor, who gave me much of her time, energy, and suggestions, which helped me get the paper to where it is now. And finally, I want to thank the people at CTW and the "New School" with whom I worked, for providing me the opportunity for working and learning with them.

"The journey of 1000 miles

begins with the first step"

Ancient Chinese Proverb

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a study of educational change as I observed it during my experience as an advisor in a public school in East Harlem. The setting is a brand new school (opened in September 1975) architecturally constructed as an open space school and educationally planned to become an open education school. The principal and the selected staff were all geared to expect and to effect change: change in educational philosophy, change in teaching styles, change in relationships among staff, and change in relationships between staff and administrators. Throughout this paper I shall preserve the anonymity of the school and the people involved, and therefore not mention the name or number of the school or the names of the various people with whom I worked.

My particular perspective on the change which occurred during the first year of this school's existence grows out of my role as an advisor. I had been hired by the Creative Teaching Workshop (CTW), a teacher resource and educational research center, as an advisor in its Advisory Service program. This program offered services to schools on a voluntary basis. Schools which were involved received two full days per week of advisory time. In addition to conducting this program, CTW was also working with principals from New

York City public schools in the Principal Leadership Study (PLS) -- a study designed to examine the role of the principal as educational leader and promoter of growth and change within his/her school. The principal of the school in which I was advisor was also involved in the PLS. It was CTW's hope that the Advisory Service and the Principal Leadership Study would dovetail, and thus the effects from the work done in each would be maximized.

In this paper I shall discuss my work as an advisor as it relates to this school's changes; I shall analyze the changes which did or did not occur; and I shall examine how this type of intervention strategy (that of an advisor's coming into a school to support growth and change) relates to the work accomplished in this particular school.

Before discussing this process, however, I shall review the literature in the field of educational innovation and change.

OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE*

The following section is not intended as a full review of the body of literature in the field of educational innovation and change. Rather, it is intended to place the work described in this paper in an historical perspective and a theoretical framework.

Historical Perspective of Educational Innovation

> It is not possible to spend any period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere: mutilation of spontaneity of joy in learning, mutilation of pleasure in creating, mutilation in sense of self.
>
> And it need not be -- public schools can be organized to facilitate joy in learning and esthetic expression and to develop character in the rural and urban slums no less than in the prosperous suburbs.[1]

Silberman's statement, written in 1970, is a sharp attack on the state of affairs of the public schools and a clear call for educational change. In no way did, or does, Silberman stand alone in his analysis and feelings of the situation. Public schools have long been in the limelight. It seems, however, that as the gap increases "between what we know about good educational theory and practice and what

---

*All of the authors and works cited in this section are fully noted in my bibliography. In cases in which I have listed authors of articles appearing in books, the title of the book in which they appear is indicated at the bottom of the page.

is happening in our schools,"[2] interest by people both inside and outside the school system ever increases. In a Bank Street College Report on School Intervention, Richard H. Feldman states, "In the literature one can find evidence that teachers, parents, students, school boards, school administrators, community agencies, university faculties and leadership staff, the federal government, and foundation representatives are all acknowledging and supporting in various ways change efforts on the part of the schools."[3]

And, over the past twenty years American education has undergone numerous changes. Henry M. Brickell states, "The rate of instructional innovation in New York State public elementary and secondary schools more than doubled within fifteen months after the firing of the Soviet Sputnik I on October 4, 1957. Changes swept not only foreign languages, mathematics and science -- which led the field by tripling their rate of change -- but all other subjects, non-academic as well as academic."[4]

The years 1955-66 particularly abounded with attempts at educational innovation. Richard I. Miller summarizes the attempts during that decade, noting such efforts as: "Supreme Court rulings on desegregation; programs for the gifted as well as programs for the culturally deprived; unprecedented Federal Aid Bill in 1965; substantial assistance to vocational education; considerably liberalized provisions

under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), and new programs such as Operation Headstart; team teaching, non-gradedness; teaching about communism; foreign languages in the elementary schools; major curriculum studies in physics, mathematics, the biological sciences, and other subjects; educational television; and programmed learning and teaching machines."[5]

While the above list in no way itemizes or details all of the attempts at educational innovation, it does give the reader some insight into the extent of efforts made. It is apparent that a tremendous amount of time, work and money have gone into trying to change the schools in order to improve the quality of education for children.

Now it is obvious that so many of the changes were simply cosmetic. As Dale Mann stated in 1976, "The problem is more profound than simply the unrealistic impatience of the 60's. Programs were planned, curriculum was developed, teaching-learning units were packaged, teachers were trained, and the results were frustrating, uneven, unexpected and temporary."[6] Supporting this statement Richard H. Feldman adds, "Each of the programs, particularly as it sought refunding, could provide an extensive catalogue of its successes, and yet each today represents another entry in the catalogue of failures to produce educational reform and improvement of massive proportions, commensurate with the scale

of the stated intent of their programs."[7] Various strategies for educational intervention are identified as supporting or, conversely, as undermining the process of educational change.

Strategies to Implement Change

According to Miles, and Berman and McLaughlin, the installation of an innovation in a system is not a mechanical process, but a developmental one, in which both the innovation and the receiving system are altered.* Often, however, much more attention is given to constructing the innovation than to planning and carrying out the strategy for winning its adoption. Yet, as Miles points out, "it seems clear that for almost all innovations the process of implementation itself needs careful study, planning and experimental work."[8] For example, Lassar G. Gotkin and Leo S. Goldstein found that effective use of programmed learning materials requires as much energy in working out changes in teacher role, administrative support and classroom organization as in creating the hardware.[9] The understanding of change efforts and the planning of action steps thus becomes very important to the success of the innovation. This plan is

---

*See Miles, Innovation in Education, and Berman and McLaughlin, "Implementation of Educational Innovation."

referred to as the strategy.

In a Rand Corporation study of funded U.S. Office of Education change agent programs, Berman and McLaughlin state, "In particular, the strategies that significantly promoted teacher change included staff training, frequent and regular meetings and local material development. The absence of any one of the above elements was likely to reduce the perceived success and the amount of teacher change on projects. The lack of teacher participation in day-to-day implementation decisions also reduced perceived success."

Fox and Lippitt conducted a study in 1959 on "The innovation of classroom mental health practices." It is their contention that teachers' participation in intensive workshops, periodic meetings of teachers (which provided support and sharing of ideas) and experience with consultants resulted in the highest level of involvement and produced a high rate of innovation in classrooms. In addition, they found "the collaborative effort of school administrators, teachers, and outside resource people (as represented by the teacher-principal-consultant change-agent team) provides a more vigorous and productive leadership arrangement than does reliance on any one of these roles alone. Innovative efforts by the classroom teacher, with informed and sympathetic support from school administration and professional

colleagues are much more likely to succeed than attempts without such support."[11] Likewise, Brickell, Mackenzie, Griffiths, and Atwood* support the premise of the importance of support from the administrators. Thus, there is agreement that successful innovation is likely to require work with the entire organization rather than solely with individual teachers.

Additional support for this idea is provided by Niemeyer who states, "Institutional change (i.e., change effected by a process which, itself, becomes embedded in the school system) cannot be accomplished at the interface between teachers and students (the classroom) and the school unless the social system of the total organization of schools is brought to function in support of this change."[12] To accomplish this systematic change Niemayer proposes a strategy which takes into consideration three domains: the individual, the organization, and the materials and resources. The change agent is, therefore, interested in creating changes in: the competencies of the individual, the structures of the organization, and the allocation of materials and resources. Since Bank Street's orientation is that of a teacher training institution, the aim of their intervention is seen as bringing about positive changes which will facilitate the

*See Miles, Innovation in Education.

teaching-learning process at the teacher-child level as well as at the school-teacher level. "Ultimately, the quality of what happens in and for the lives of children rests on the competencies of the individuals who interact with children and those who interact with the adults who work with children."[13]

Matthew B. Miles' concept is that a strategy is aimed at getting an innovation implemented and embedded in a "target" system. The strategy may be initiated by the target system itself or by other systems. The strategy developed by either of these systems may involve the use of existing structures or the creation of new structures. Thus Miles envisions four ways in which a strategy may be initiated. Miles then borrows from Rogers (1962) his construct of the stages of the diffusion process, as the sequence through which the innovation moves before its adoption into the target system. The stages according to Rogers are: awareness, in which people recognize the need for innovation; interest, in which people explore its potentialities; evaluation, in which people determine its applicability to their own situation; pilot trial, in which people try the innovation. If people find the innovation produces positive results, adoption of the innovation will probably occur. Finally, there is a process of diffusion by which the innova-

tion spreads to others -- individual(s) or system(s). Miles adapts this construct to his own work and sees the stages as: design, awareness-interest, evaluation, trial. These four stages, prior to the adoption of the innovation and the four types of initiation, generate a sixteen cell grid, which Miles refers to as "A typology of change strategies."[14]

Change as a Process

In looking at these various attempts to change schools, it becomes important to examine why the innovations have not taken hold and, to do so, change agents must shift the focus from the content of the desired change to the process of change. Numerous people have pointed, however, to educators' inadequate knowledge of the process of educational change as one of the many factors inhibiting change (Havelock, Miles, Miller*). In 1970, at the Michigan Conference on Educational Change Agent Training, the participants compiled statements about the change process grouped according to the major designs that Havelock categorized in his 1969 review of the literature. These are: Change as a Problem-Solving Process; Change as a Research-Development-and-

---

*See Havelock, Training for Change Agents, Miles, Innovation in Education, and Miller, Perspectives on Educational Change.

Diffusion Process; Change as a Process of Social Interaction; and Change as a Linkage Process.

Change as a Problem Solving Process

A few of the major advocates of this approach to change are Lippitt, Watson and Westley (1958), Goodwin, Watson (1967), Charles Jung (1967) and Herbert Thelen (1967). Many of the advocates of this orientation are social psychologists in the group dynamics - human relations tradition. The primary assumption of this orientation is that innovation is a part of a problem-solving process which goes on inside the user. The focus of this approach is "The user, himself, his needs and what he does about satisfying his needs." The role of the outside change agent is, therefore, consultative, providing either new ideas and information specific to the user or guidance on the problem-solving process.[15]

The following propositions are derived from this orientation:

1. The user's need is the paramount consideration in any planned change activity.

2. Users' needs cannot be served effectively until an effort has been made to translate and define those needs into a diagnosis which represents a coherent set of problems to be worked on.

3. User-initiated [or at least user-involvement] change is likely to be stronger and more long-lasting than change initiated by outsiders.

4. The user system should have an adequate internalized problem-solving strategy, i.e., an orderly set of processes for need sensing and expression, diagnosis, resource retrieval and evaluation.

5. Change agents work more effectively if they employ a non-directive strategy. [Much debate over this item, which suggests that the "when, where and how" of the non-directive approach needs to be spelled out clearly before it can be accepted as a general principle of change agentry.]

6. Change agents are primarily helpful as process consultants and trainers, helping users understand the human relations of decision-making and changing. [Many participants in the debate over this item have felt the need for the change agent to be an activist partisan in many situations.][16]

Change as a Research-Development-and-Diffusion Process

The most systematic conceptualization of the change process related to education is that first developed by Brickell (1961) and later by Clark and Guba (1965) under the heading "Research, Development, and Diffusion."* This orientation assumes there is a rational sequence of activities in innovation which includes research, development, and packaging before dissemination. RD&D concentrates on the nature of the innovation and the work necessary to develop and diffuse it. Since some aspects of the change process are determined by the nature of the innovation this type of focus is important.

---

*See Havelock, Training for Change Agents.

The following propositions are derived from this orientation:

1. Successful innovation usually requires formal planning, short-term and long-term.

2. Innovation is made more effective if there is a rational division of labor to carry out the necessary functions of diagnosis, information retrieval, research, development and application.

3. Effective utilization of complex innovations must be preceded by coherently coordinated research, development, and evaluation.

4. Innovation is more effective when innovators start out by stating their objectives or desired outcomes in behavioral terms.

5. Innovation is more effective when evaluating, preferably in formal quantitative terms, is employed at each step of development, diffusion, and installation.

6. Innovation is more effective when it is guided by an analysis of the cost-to-benefit ratio of specific alternatives.[17]

Change as a Process of Social Interaction

This orientation focuses on the patterns by which innovations diffuse through a social system and the network through which information spreads. The major advocates of this approach have been Mort (1964), Ross (1958), and Carlson (1965).* The following propositions are derived from this orientation:

---

*See Havelock, Training for Change Agents.

1. Effective dissemination and utilization are facilitated by informed opinion leaders, particularly when these opinion leaders are innovative in orientation and have considerable influence over a large number of colleagues.

2. The adoption of new ideas and practices is strongly influenced by the perceived norms of the user's professional reference group. If the new behavior is seen as desirable or representative of the best practice "in my profession" it is more likely to be adopted.

3. Informal person-to-person contact is an important factor in effective dissemination, particularly when the user is at the trial stage.

4. Individual adoption behavior follows a sequence which includes the steps of "initial awareness," "interest," "evaluation," "trial," and "adoption."

5. Users who have proximity to resources are more likely to use them.

6. To achieve utilization, a variety of messages must be generated pertaining to the same innovation and directed at the potential user in a purposeful sequence on a number of different channels in a number of different formats. The resource system must act synergistically, bringing together a variety of messages and focusing them in combination, in sequence, and in repetition upon the potential user.[18]

Change as a Linkage Process

Each of the above theoretical frameworks for observing and effecting the process of change grows out of a specific focus and viewpoint. Havelock contends that it is important to combine these three into a single framework which utilizes the strengths of each to its fullest. Havelock refers to

this concept as "linkage." The Linkage model attempts to emphasize factors that are important to the research approach, the communication network approach and the user approach.

The propositions derived from this orientation are:

1. To be truly helpful and useful, the resource persons must be able to stimulate the user's problem-solving processes.

2. To derive help from resource persons and resource systems the user must be able to simulate resource system processes, e.g., to appreciate research knowledge, the user must understand how research knowledge is generated and validated.

3. Effective utilization requires reciprocal feedback.

4. Resource systems need to adapt reciprocal and collaborative relationships not only with a variety of potential users but also with a large diverse group of other resource systems.

5. Users need to develop reciprocal and collaborative relations with a variety of resource systems (cosmopoliteness).

6. A willingness to listen to new ideas (openness) is an important prerequisite to change. This applies both to resource persons and users.[19]

The Role of the Change Agent

Daniel E. Griffiths states that it is a strategy of administrators to employ the help of outside agents. He claims that "practical administrators" know that the major thrust for change in organizations is from the outside.

"The use of consultants, evaluation teams, citizens' committees and professional organizations to bring about change to an organization suggests a clear recognition on the part of administrators that an organization is more apt to change in response to an external force than to an internal force.[20]

It is the role of the change agent (consultant, advisor, enabler, intervener, teacher trainer, supervisor) to support, encourage, and/or create a change in a situation. Miles says that change "implies that, between time 1 and time 2, some noticeable alteration has taken place in something."[21] For the purpose of this paper change is related to alterations in competencies, values, attitudes, goals, structures, or processes of the school and its members.

Feldman makes a distinction between the role of the intervener and the consultant. The intervener is seen as being more deeply involved in the actual implementation of the program and is held more responsible and accountable for the results than the consultant. However, similarities do exist between these roles. Both consultant and intervener enter a situation to serve the needs and wishes of the school with "a deep commitment as to how a situation should be handled, and to help the individual or system learn a different way to achieve the desired outcomes of a good education for children."[22] The consultant offers advice and makes recom-

mendations, but is aware that the system may accept or reject them and leaves hoping that "the system will adopt some of [his/her] recommendations, and that [he/she] will have affected some of the individuals during the course of the consultations."[23] Using the above framework, I would classify my work as advisor in one school for a period of six months as that of the consultant.

Gordon Klopf speaks of the role of the consultant as one that can be performed by an administrator, supervisor, trainer, or counselor. "This term means a whole range of activities which are used to enable a person called the consultant to assist another individual or small group of individuals to become more compentent in a particular situation."[24] He sees the consultant as being able to utilize the processes of dialogue, encounter, confrontation and counseling as he/she deems necessary and relevant to the needs of the individual and situation. The goals of the consultant are to help the individual(s) recognize their strengths and weaknesses in the particular situation and to "help them help themselves as they relate to a task or a set of functions."[25]

André Morin classifies five traits important to the person in the role of change agent. These are that the change agent: (1) must enjoy high professional esteem; (2) must be

able to stimulate and inspire others; (3) must be open to changing points of view and aware of their implications; (4) must be capable of working with others; and (5) must have leadership qualities and be influential.[26]

L.W. Hughes and C.M. Achilles discuss the role of the supervisor as that of a change agent: a person who can improve the quality of instruction through new and better methodology and techniques. They classify change as "process" rather than a "thing," and they point to the work of Everett M. Rogers, Egon Guba, and David Clark in this area. In each of these cases, change is seen as a process of discrete stages. The implication of this work is that the person in the role of change agent can facilitate the process of educational innovation and change. This is done by assessing the situation, deciding at which stage to enter and at which point to encourage movement to the following stages in the change process. This person need not design or create the innovation. He/she does, however, have the responsibility either to initiate movement along the stages of the process or to enable the process to grow and develop so that change does come about.[27]

Louise F. Waynant of the University of Maryland speaks of the importance of effective in-service education. She presents the following guidelines for planning in-service work, which has direct implications for the role of the

change agent: (1) identify teachers' strengths, interests and concerns through observation and discussions; (2) utilize teachers' strengths, interests and concerns in planning and conducting the in-service program; (3) provide a feedback system whereby teachers can inform the consultants if information is useful, relevant, and clear enough for implementation; and (4) guarantee consulting results in performance terms.[28]

The Educational Development Center (EDC), of Newton, Massachusetts, deals directly with the role of the advisor. Their objectives are: (1) "To help schools create classroom environments responsive to the individual needs of children as well as to the talents and styles of the teachers;" and (2) "To develop the advisory concept -- ways of facilitating growth and change in schools."[29] To do this, advisors work upon the request of administrators and teachers. Advisors respond to the needs and desires of the school and the situation, by assisting schools in assessing their own strengths and weaknesses, and by facilitating movement to the next steps. This work is done by focusing on the needs of the individual(s), within the context of a trusting relationship. The advisor's responsibility is to recognize and build upon the individual(s) strengths, and to encourage movement along the change process.

Lillian Weber of The Open Education Advisory also speaks about the role of the advisor. The focus of the Advisory's work is mainly on the advisor's work with teachers, para-professionals, and parents. Weber sees the advisory role as including: building on the strengths of the adults; conducting workshops using materials; acting as a sounding board; supporting and encouraging; and modeling behavior. It is her contention that "on-site assistance to teachers in solving problems of classroom re-organization and in adjusting to the demands of individualized instruction" is crucial to implementing change.[30]

Project Outcomes Depend on the Quality of the Settings

Another series of factors alluded to both directly and indirectly in many of these formulations on the nature of school intervention is that the fate of innovation depends heavily on pre-existing conditions in the target system. These conditions may either facilitate or hinder the implementation and adoption of change.

Berman and McLaughlin find in their study that "project outcomes depended more on the characteristics of the project's setting than on any other factor."[31] They delineate these factors as: (1) local organizational climate; (2) motivation of participants; (3) teacher morale; (4) degree

of principal support; (5) degree of superintendent and district support; and (6) teacher willingness to expend extra effort. It is their contention that since change means alteration, the school organization itself must be receptive to alterations. Receptivity is a necessary pre-condition for successful implementation.[32]

The findings of several studies in the literature (Bennis '66, Beckhard '74, Beisser and Green, '72, Glaser and Taylor '73) suggest that when an organization becomes involved in critical self evaluation, its own staff tends to seek new ways of improving performance and, in so doing, creates a climate which makes for openness or readiness to consider innovations. Edward M. Glaser adds to these findings that this is likely to hold true when: (1) the climate for self evaluation is hospitable, encouraging, and rewarding; (2) there is relative freedom from serious internal power struggles or animosities; (3) the proper authority figures in the situation are committed, follow-through, and give positive reinforcement to the innovation.[33]

Matthew B. Miles (1964) makes a distinction between substantive and adoptive failure. Substantive failure is described as the inability of the innovation to achieve the desired results. However, Miles quickly adds that since evaluations are conducted so infrequently this type of fail-

ure often goes unnoticed. Adoptive failure is described as the phenomenon which occurs when the target system either rejects or discontinues the innovation, or more subtly, when it does not take full responsibility for facilitating the innovation. When this occurs, the innovation is unlikely to survive, regardless of its value.[34]

SUMMARY OF THREADS IN THE OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE

The foregoing research studies of educational change have many common threads and elements.

1. The change process has stages.

   Individual or system:

   - readiness and anxiety
   - dissatisfaction with present
   - awareness and interest
   - exploration of new ideas
   - settings goals (short and long term)
   - experimentation
   - adoption and application
   - evaluation
   - diffusion

2. Certain elements are essential to facilitating change in adults.

   - Individual skills, styles and attitudes must be recognized.
   - Individual strengths must be recognized and worked from.
   - An individual needs to experiment with new behavior.
   - An individual needs to feel committed to change.
   - An individual needs to feel supported.

- An individual needs to feel information and ideas are relevant to his/her situation.
- An individual needs to internalize change.

3. The role of the change agent has a number of important aspects.
   - The change agent is a facilitator and enabler.
   - The change agent is supportive.
   - The change agent responds to the needs of the user (client) -- change is not imposed.
   - The change agent furthers mutual trust and respect.
   - The change agent encourages peer support.
   - The change agent is sensitive to individual differences.
   - The change agent provides feedback.
   - The change agent is open to new ideas.
   - The change agent is concerned with the process of human growth.
4. There are general guidelines for working towards educational change.

   Change agent's:
   - awareness of complexity of school as a social system
   - recognition of the uniqueness of each school situation

- support by the Board of Education
- support by the district superintendent
- support by the school principal
- support by the teachers
- support by the parents and community organizations (in some instances)
- obtainment of commitment from all essential components which is based on a realistic understanding of innovation
- obtainment of involvement of participants in process
- awareness of receptivity and "readiness" of system
- provision of help to participants in learning the new competencies
- encouragement, support and reward of participants' progress
- willingness to take risks

CREATIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP: ADVISOR'S HOME BASE

Since its beginning in 1968, the purpose of CTW has been to work as an outside agency with the NYC public school system. CTW supports changes which will improve the quality of education in schools. Over the years the name has been changed to Experiential Systems Inc., and the focus has changed from working primarily with teachers in the area of curriculum development to working now primarily with school and district administrators on their roles as educational leaders.

Knowledge of the history of CTW is important to an understanding of the Advisory Service in which I was involved. The philosophy of the organization has always been that one learns through direct, first-hand experience. CTW refers to this as "hands-on-materials" and "experiential" learning.

From 1968-72 CTW worked with individual teachers from various schools at CTW's resource center. People experimented with materials and explored ideas to develop curriculum for use in their classrooms. Individual teachers found the work they did at the resource center rewarding to them, both personally and professionally. However, they were unable to transfer much of this learning into practical application in their "home" situations -- their own classrooms.

They felt isolated from other teachers in the school as well as from the administrative staff. They said they did not have the support they needed to experiment with the new curriculum ideas and ways of approaching teaching. So the next step in the development of CTW in 1972 was the formation of the Advisory Service.

The Advisory Service was concentrated in three NYC public elementary schools. CTW staff worked with interested teachers in small groups and individually from these particular schools. The staff conducted curriculum workshops for these teachers at the resource center. In addition, the staff worked directly with each teacher in his/her classroom to help teachers set up learning situations based on the work they had done at the Resource Center. The work of the Advisory Service was structured to encourage teachers to work together and to build a support system among themselves, as well as to provide teachers with direct help in implementing some of their new ideas about curriculum and teaching methods into their classroom situations.

CTW, as was the case with many groups supporting educational change, it its initial work with schools, focused on the teacher as the key to change within the whole school. While the principal had initially agreed to have the Advisory Service in his/her school, CTW failed to see the import-

ance of involving the principal in this work. It became apparent that, despite the support the teachers felt from each other and from the advisory staff of CTW in their efforts to restructure their classrooms, they often felt a lack of understanding and support from the administrative staffs of their schools. The methods and curriculum ideas teachers were trying to implement were not always in agreement with the desires of the administration, and in some cases, teachers were prevented from making changes. This situation led CTW to realize the importance of involving the principal in on-going work with the teachers. In January 1975, monies were granted to CTW to institute the Principal Leadership Study, a program designed to involve principals in examining their roles as educational leaders and as supporters of positive educational change within their schools. One aspect of the PLS was the continuation of the Advisory Service. CTW hoped the Advisory Service would serve as a model for principals in their support and supervision of teachers. To look at the effect of this service, three principals whose teachers worked with the Advisory Service and three principals whose teachers had no Advisory Service participated in the first term of the PLS. CTW was now administering a program which was to effect educational change through its work with principals.

The structure of the PLS was similar to that of the Advisory Service. Principals had the opportunity to meet together in weekly two-hour sessions in a peer support group. Principals also had the opportunity to be visited by the PLS coordinator to look at issues or concerns in their schools.

The PLS weekly sessions at CTW's resource center were structured so that each principal would look at his/her learning style through curriculum workshops. A secondary concern for the sessions was the consideration of the principal's role as educational leader in relation to curriculum development. The PLS coordinator also worked with principals at their schools. This work was to implement what they had learned at the weekly sessions. Initiative for this work in the schools was clearly left to the principals. They had the responsibility for requesting visits from the coordinator. In addition to this, the three schools which had the Advisory Service had an advisor to work with their teachers two days a week.

During the second term (September 1975 - January 1976) of the PLS several new principals who did not have the Advisory Service joined the PLS. In January 1976, a third party evaluator interviewed all the participating principals. From these interviews and from the coordinator's reports it became evident that the principals particularly valued the

opportunity to meet and talk with other principals in a group. They felt less isolated and felt supported by each other in discussing their common problems. Principals found coming to CTW's resource center and meeting with CTW staff a way to revitalize and renew their thinking. Principals stated that this was not happening within the school system. Those principals whose schools had the Advisory Service and those principals who requested visits by the PLS coordinator found this in-school support very helpful and wanted it on a more regular basis.

Certain deficiencies in the PLS also became apparent. Principals who did not believe in curriculum development through the "hands-on-materials" approach were dissatisfied and eventually dropped out. Principals voiced a concern that immediate problems in their schools were not being addressed in the group sessions. Principals who could not clearly define what work they wanted to accomplish did not request visits by the PLS coordinator in their schools. Principals whose schools had the Advisory Service depended on the advisor to support and train their teachers rather than using the advisor's work as a model for their own behavior. In addition, these principals felt their in-school needs were being met by the advisor so that they did not ask the coordinator to work directly with them.

In October 1975, I was hired by Floyd Page, the director of CTW, to be an advisor in one of the schools whose principal was involved in the PLS. I was to replace the original advisor in this particular school who had left CTW the month prior to my arrival. The agreement I had with CTW was that I would work two days a week in the field (at the school) and one day a week at CTW. In the field I would be working with the principal and staff on problems they were facing and needs they had. At CTW I would be working with our staff, sharing my experiences and perceptions about my work at the school, in order to gain support, encouragement, and information which would provide more effective services in the field. (See Appendices I and II.)

BEGINNING WORK: UNDERSTANDING THE CULTURE OF THE SCHOOL

> The more new people who flood a school, the more questions school personnel will have about their relationships, role functions and so on. The more "experts" who come in the more likely it is that the principal will not view himself as the principal. The greater the number of outsiders who do not know the culture of the school, the more time they have to spend learning and during this time the amount of help they can give is small. (Of course, if they, from the beginning, fall into the trap of acting as if they were knowledgable and expert, tragedy is in the offing.)
>
> Seymour Sarason[35]

This statement had a tremendous impact upon me during my initial advisory work at the school. It validated my belief that every school is a mini-society with a set of beliefs, procedures, relationships and patterns of behavior -- and, in order to work effectively with people, adults and children alike, it is important to understand and be sensitive to this "culture." I therefore decided to find out as much as possible about the school and the people involved before I even ventured into the school.

My investigation entailed reading the reports written by the original advisor to this school and speaking with the director of CTW and the coordinator of the PLS. The information gleaned from this investigation raised a number of issues and questions for me, and I began to formulate ideas of which areas I should be aware of and sensitive to when I actually visited the school and met the principal and the staff.

THE HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL

The school in which I was to advise (to be referred to as the New School) was a brand new building replacing the Old School which had been built in 1895. The principal, assistant principal, fifteen of the thirty teachers, para-professionals and other teaching personnel moved, along with many of the children, from the Old School to the New School in September 1975. All of the people with whom I was going to work were embarking on a new adventure -- moving to a new building, working in open space environments (without walls), working towards an open approach to teaching and hoping to improve their relationships with one another.

The Old School was quite delapidated and old fashioned. Therefore, it had been agreed in 1967 to begin planning for the New School which was to be a "replacement school." During the 1960's the school had been a More Effective School (MES). This was a federally funded program whereby schools received additional monies for materials, equipment and extra teaching personnel. It was hoped that these additions would begin to improve the reading and math skills of the youngsters in these schools. However, during the 1970's, monies for MES were diminishing and teachers were being "excessed." The younger teachers with least seniority had to leave, and many of the more senior teachers, who had been

working outside the classrooms as specialists, had to be brought back inside the classrooms. With fewer materials, a reduced teaching staff, and a higher ratio of children to teachers, feelings among the teachers were not positive.

During this same time, however, the principal was becoming increasingly interested in open education and experiential learning. While he wanted the school to move in this direction his feeling was that, because of all of the excessing, he was left with "a core of old timers, many of whom did not buy new philosophies or methods."

Compounding the situation was the fact that both parties (principal and staff) agreed that the relationship between them was marked by mistrust, alienation, hostility, and poor communication. The teachers saw the principal as cold and authoritarian, and the principal saw the teachers as traditional, inflexible, and unwilling to try new methods. The principal went so far as to say that the relationship between himself and the staff was an adversary one.

In the area of staff relations the principal and teachers were again in agreement. Both parties agreed that there was friction among the teaching staff and that the teachers did not function as a cohesive group. Cliques existed and some teachers felt tension and even hatred. Some teachers state that the principal did nothing to stop this pattern of behavior, while others state that in actuality the only issue

which did unify the staff was their common mistrust of the principal.

Teachers varied in their styles of teaching and in their philosophies of education. While the emphasis of the school was in the teaching of skills, the "how" of this teaching was determined by the individual teacher. Self contained classrooms were the order of the day and team teaching had been supported by neither the assistant principals nor principal. In the heyday of the MES monies, there were five assistant principals, each in charge of a specific grade, and each operating very separately from the other. So, here too, on the administrative level, there was little sense of cohesion and cooperation for common ends. Therefore, when the principal began to push for openness, hands-on-materials, and experiential learning as a style of and approach to teaching, the staff felt "that it was being forced on them" and resisted giving up their freedom to choose their own teaching styles and methods.

In the midst of this mistrust, the planning of the New School had begun. In the beginning stages, the architect, principal, staff, and parents had input into the design. However, as time went on, it appeared that more and more of the decisions were being made by the principal and the architect. While the school had originally been designed for the MES program -- self-contained classrooms were designed to

accommodate approximately twenty children -- somewhere along the line, the plans had been altered and the new plan was to construct an open space building (also called open plan or a school without walls). It is clear that from the teachers' point of view they were in no way involved in this major decision.

The teachers' memory is that they were informed about the new design of the New School in the Spring of 1975, at which time they were also informed that they would be moving there the following September. Some of the teachers had never heard of an open space school, few of them had ever seen such a school, and certainly none of them had ever taught in such an environment. The teachers, whose previous teaching experience had been in self-contained classrooms, were fearful and anxious about this monumental change.

While the teachers were feeling anxious about the move and changes implicit in it, the principal was involved in deciding which teachers would be selected to move to the New School. His vision was "to develop and operate an educational facility which will excite the imagination of all concerned and be a model of excellence," and he wanted teachers who were in agreement with the philosophy of open education, experiential learning and hands-on-materials to realize that vision. The New School was smaller than the Old School, and the principal was in the position to select fifteen out of

the thirty teachers present at the Old School to move into the new facility. He had been informed by the superintendent that he could not recruit teachers from outside the Old School, and, after many negotiations with the Teachers' Union and School Board, it was decided that the principal had the right to select his ten most senior teachers from the Seniority List and then every third teacher from the remainder of the list. This method of selecting teachers infuriated all of the teachers -- those selected and those not. They felt that selection of teachers to move to the New School should have been made solely on the basis of seniority. The teachers felt that the administration alienated everyone by choosing teachers in this manner. They felt that somehow the principal had "rigged" the entire process of selection, "so that he could get whom he wanted."

Once the principal selected these fifteen teachers, they each had the option of moving or not moving to the New School. In numerous memos, the principal asked teachers to consider their decisions carefully. He clearly stated certain conditions they needed to accept, he availed himself to them to discuss and clarify the situation, and he encouraged teachers to make the right decision for themselves (see Appendix III). However, in the Spring of 1975, the threat of city-wide budget cuts, excessing, lay-offs, etc. were in the wind and seemed to have a tremendous impact on the teachers' final

decisions. Teachers were unwilling to take a risk and transfer to an unknown school -- with unknown administration, staff, parents, children, etc. As the principal later said, "The devil known is better than the devil unknown. At least the teachers knew that at the New School calm would prevail and they would be able to teach." So, in the final analysis all of the teachers who had been chosen by the principal to move to the New School accepted their positions. Some of the teachers did so not because they necessarily agreed with the philosophy of open education or because they wanted to work in an open space school, but because of other complicated, personal and professional reasons.

The effect of this process was to aggravate further a situation already filled with mistrust and alienation. The teachers at the Old School were now split into two camps -- those who were and those who were not selected to make the move. Teachers were filled with anxiety about the coming year, feeling unsure if they would be able to "succeed," and the principal, although he had selected some of the people he wanted, felt stymied by the process and frustrated by the fact that he did not have total freedom in choosing teachers whom he felt were in agreement with the philosophy of open education. He was not convinced that the group of fifteen teachers were willing to work hard to make the New School a success.

In January 1975, when the principal knew that the New School was going to be a reality the following September 1975, he began to explore alternatives for in-service training for the staff. The teachers had always worked in self-contained classrooms and saw themselves as fairly traditional teachers. They were now being asked to work together in teams of three within communities (large open spaces without walls) towards an open approach to education. They were confused, anxious, and very frightened about making the move, and the principal was aware of this. The principal contacted Lillian Weber's Workshop Center for Open Education at City College and arranged for his staff to receive training from this group. In the Spring of 1975 courses were given to the selected teachers in Open Education. The courses ran the gamut from the theory of open education to science and reading in the open classroom to body awareness. The teachers were dissatisfied with the courses. They felt the courses dealt more with the "why" than the "how" of open education and open classrooms. They felt "talked at" as opposed to "talked with." They needed to be reassured that they were good traditional teachers and that they could begin to "open up" their classrooms from where they were at, from their strengths, and from the knowledge they already had about teaching. They wanted specific ideas about "what you do on the first day," "how you set up an open classroom,"

how you think about beginning," "how you set up individual and small group projects and keep on top of it all." The courses did not meet these needs, and by the end of about eight sessions, attendance had declined and the principal agreed to disband the sessions. Thus, the principal's first attempt to support and train his teachers was unsuccessful. The teachers were still feeling unprepared and terribly uncertain about their abilities to perform in the New School.

During this time the principal had heard about Creative Teaching Workshop's Principal Leadership Study and Advisory Service. He learned that, if he joined the PLS, his school would be chosen to receive the Advisory Service two full days a week. Since the principal's priority was training his staff, he decided to join PLS. The teachers had not requested an outside consultant or advisor. The force behind getting the advisor, who was to work with, support and teach the staff about experiential learning and open classrooms, lay with the principal. Some teachers were excited by this offer and were quite receptive to the advisor. Other teachers "wouldn't touch her with a ten foot pole." However, both the original advisor and the principal made it clear that only those teachers who wanted the help and support would receive it -- the work was to be done on a voluntary basis. The teachers who chose to work with CTW's

original advisor were pleased with the relationships they established with her. They found her supportive and non-threatening and felt they could go to her for suggestions, materials, ideas and conversation. It was clear that she was not part of the administration. She was seen as an "outsider" and most teachers were not threatened by her. Both principal and teachers agree that the advisor was helpful and met the needs of teachers who were just beginning to think seriously about working towards opening up their classrooms.

In exploring people's expectations of themselves and each other in the New School, I clearly observed certain problems. The principal obviously expected the teachers to move in the direction of open education. He wanted children actively involved in learning, working individually and in small groups. He expected teachers to work in a cooperative way with each other within their communities. He hoped that teachers would be willing to read materials related to open education, to meet within their communities to discuss issues and share ideas, and to work with outside advisors. However, the specifics of the "what" and "how," and the time element involved were not clearly laid out. One year later (Spring 1976), the principal acknowledged, "I didn't really know myself what I wanted at the beginning." The teachers acutely felt this lack of clarity. While they were aware

that the thrust of the New School was towards an open approach to education within communities, they were confused about the meaning of this movement, and the speed at which the principal expected it to occur. Seymour Sarason referred to this phenomenon when he said,

> Let us assume that the agents of change have worked out in a systematic fashion the relationship between their conceptions of the setting and a time perspective by which the intended change should be judged. A second aspect of the time perspective problem then arises: comparing the time perspective of the agents of change with that of those who are the targets, and that of those who will, in one way or another, participate in the process. This comparison is crucial because if, as is usually the case, the differences in time perspective are great, the seeds of conflict and disillusionment are already in the soil. In practice, the desire of the agents of change to get started -- not only because of the internal and external pressures but also because of the awareness, sometimes dim, that the road ahead will not be smooth -- results in bypassing the different aspects of the time perspective problem, a bypass that may have no immediate adverse consequences, but can be counted on to produce delayed, and sometimes fatal, difficulties.[36]

Thus, in June 1975, the staff was afraid and concerned about their preparation and readiness for this new venture, and worried about the time perspective involved in the unspecified expectations of the principal. The principal was equally worried. His anxieties focused on the extent of the willingness and skills of the teachers to work towards openness, his relationship with teachers, and the over-all success of the school, in his eyes as well as in the eyes of the children, parents, teachers, district superintendent and school board. The pressure was on.

SETTING THE TONE: THE ADVISOR'S FIRST DAY AT THE NEW SCHOOL

The following section is a description of my experiences during my first visit at the New School. As stated before, the original CTW advisor had left and I was coming to the school as the "new" advisor. This will be an account of what transpired during this visit, as well as an analysis of the salient issues. I shall focus on the problem areas raised in the previous section as I believe this focus sets the stage for my subsequent work with the administrators and staff of the New School, during October 1975 - April 1976.

The Physical Layout

When I arrived at the school I was immediately struck by the newness and uniqueness of the physical structure of this open plan building. The ground floor had self-contained classrooms which surrounded a large inner-room which was the gym. Kindergarten through grade three was located on this floor, as well as a home economics and industrial arts room. The first floor also had self-contained rooms, used for special purposes, which surrounded an inner-room which was the students' cafeteria and auditorium. The second and third floors of the building were open in design. Each of these floors had four communities -- large open spaces, without

walls, designed to accommodate three classes. Within each community there were small "seminar" rooms for individual and small group work, bathrooms, and an art area. The second floor was utilized by the second through sixth grades communities, which surrounded the library. The third floor was utilized by one of the district Mini-schools.

Rationale for Open Plan Schools

Open space or open plan schools vary in design one from the other. However, the overriding concept of the design is that children and teachers in schools work and learn together. In this particular school building it was hoped that teachers, children, para-professionals and volunteers would begin to work together and develop a sense of community within their spaces. The spaces were called communities. (See Appendix IV.)

The Initial Meeting

On the first day, Floyd Page, the director of CTW introduced me to the principal. Our initial meeting was quite brief, and the thrust of it seemed to me to be the principal's attempt to ascertain how qualified I was to do the job. I felt that I had to prove myself to the principal, although it was unclear on what grounds I would be doing so. During this meeting we did not discuss my role and function

in the school. As will be seen later, the principal and CTW had markedly different concepts of the advisor's role. Nor did we discuss the school -- its strengths, weaknesses, needs, etc. In short, we did not lay the groundwork for what needed to be done or how we would work together to accomplish the work. As will be apparent shortly, this interaction and lack of communication led to my inability to take an active part in a meeting between the principal and three teachers which I attended later that morning.

The Walk-Through

During our walk through the school the principal asked Floyd Page whether my presence was permanent. He obviously was hoping that the original advisor would return to work with his staff. Floyd Page made it clear that the change was indeed permanent, and that I was at the New School as the advisor from CTW. I understood that the principal was disappointed. I also knew that I needed to speak with the principal about his expectations. I believed that through the quality of my work with the principal and teachers I would begin to gain his trust and respect.

The Principal's Attitudes

The principal was clearly disappointed about the quality and styles of teaching and learning taking place. He

made comments, in various communities, about the unsatisfactory physical set-ups of the rooms, the lack of connection to the immediate environment and the general lack of use of materials. The tone in his voice was one of grave disappointment, anger and frustration. The fact of the matter is, however, that they were only one month into the school year, and already the principal was feeling that teachers weren't changing fast enough. In addition, during the past month the teachers had not received help and/or training from the principal. The teachers were still feeling anxious about working in this new setting, and were just beginning to settle into working in a space shared by other teachers and children. The principal, however, appeared to be unconcerned with the teachers' feelings. His main concern was that the teachers were not moving along quickly enough towards openness.

The Principal Sets the Tone

When the principal introduced me to the staff he said, "This is _____'s replacement," regardless of the fact that some of the teachers were new to the school and had never met or known the work of the original advisor. The teachers who had known the advisor were shocked by this change and wanted to know what had happened. The principal had known before my arrival at the school that the original advisor

was not returning, but he had not shared this information with his staff. I felt that by introducing me to teachers in this manner, the principal was showing a lack of respect for me, both as a person and as a professional. This was consistent with what I had learned during my pre-visit investigation about problems in the areas of relationships and communication between the principal and teachers.

Principal Meets With Three Teachers From One Community

The principal invited me to attend a meeting between himself and three teachers in one of the upper grade communities. He called this meeting with the hidden agenda of getting the teachers to rearrange the furniture, which they had been using to divide space, to separate their classes and to set up clear boundaries between their classes. He began the meeting by commenting on how he felt these teachers had begun to work towards developing their community. However, his second statement was that he felt they should visit one of the other communities which "was really moving in the direction of openness and togetherness as their walls were down." The teachers said nothing. They sat silently, listening to the principal speaking about the importance of breaking down the walls and using the open space. He felt that it was important for the children to learn not to depend

on these artificial walls. He said that he had time "right now" to help them rearrange the furniture in order to open up the space. One teacher finally mustered the courage to ask, "But don't you think this will cause confusion when the children return from the gym?" He answered in a hostile way that it was their job to teach the children how to respect each others' space. With this as the principal's final answer, he proceeded to remove his jacket and to begin to move furniture around. The teachers were silent -- they apparently did not know what to do or how to respond. They finally rose and began to move things about. They were visibly upset, but the principal did not respond to their obvious feelings. When the children returned to the community they were bewildered and excited by the change. However, when any child ventured into the space of another teacher and class, the principal or teacher yelled, "You know you don't belong there." Something had obviously been lost in this process.

My First Reaction

Because the principal and I had not established the nature of my role and relationship with him, I did not know how to respond to what transpired during the meeting. I felt terribly uncomfortable during the meeting and about how it proceeded. Yet, I did not want to say anything which

the principal would find subversive to his agenda. I had only been in the building for two hours and I did not know the history of what had taken place before the principal had this meeting with the teachers.

It was, however, becoming clearer to me that the principal was more interested in the product, i.e., the layout of the community, than in the process, i.e., helping teachers get to the point where they would be working and sharing together, the consequence of which would be for them to want and need to "take down the walls." The principal's opening statement to the teachers was an empty formality, designed to lead to his real agenda which was to rearrange furniture and space. The principal and teachers had not been fully communicating with each other. The principal did not ask for the teachers' ideas, feelings, needs. The teachers, likewise, did not share their ideas, feelings or needs. I was now witness to the lack of respect and trust and poor communication between principal and teachers that I had learned about before my arrival.

After the meeting, the principal left me on my own to look around and meet the staff. I met a number of teachers. Their responses to me varied from enthusiastic receptivity, to coldness to total absorption with the loss of the original advisor.

Advisor's Interaction with Principal

Towards the end of the day I decided to return to the principal's office. He asked if I had returned to the community he had met with earlier in the day, to help them rearrange their room even further. I explained that I had chosen not to do so, as I felt the teachers were unhappy about the rearrangement, and would not be amenable to such an offer. The principal's response was, "I'll break down the walls, otherwise they'll never do it. You'll be the mender -- the person whom the teachers go to for support and ideas to get away from me." I felt uncomfortable with this set-up. I did not want to play the saviour to help teachers escape from the grasp of the devil. However, I also did not know how to share my feelings with the principal. Instead of dealing with this directly, I began to speak about my ideas about how people change. I shared my belief that people need encouragement and support when they are struggling to change, and that people must themselves want to change. Change is a process that requires much attention and energy, and is usually facilitated by having clear short and long term goals. I felt that in helping teachers move towards more openness it was important to: (1) assess where they were now; (2) define short term goals which would lead to feelings of accomplishment; and (3) continually support this work towards the change desired.

(See Appendix V.)

The principal voiced some agreement with these statements. He claimed that if he saw teachers moving in the direction he wanted, the end result being the children's learning through the use of materials in small groups and through individual projects, no matter how fast or slow, he would feel good about their work. However, he did make it clear to me that he wanted to see movement. As it turned out, the principal did indeed care about how rapidly teachers moved and changed, and as the year progressed so did the pressure.

Principal's Expectations of Advisor

I asked the principal to share with me some of the priorities he saw in the school as it related to the work I could be doing. He offered the following: (1) setting up a teacher resource room; (2) working with the "difficult" community; (3) working with teachers who were receptive to help; and (4) working in rooms with children, alongside the teacher. I said that I could certainly envision working on priorities one and four, but that I needed to spend more time in the school observing, meeting and establishing relationships with teachers before it became clear with whom I would work and how I would work with them.

The final meeting of the day was successful in that it began to lay the groundwork for our work together over the coming months. We began to share with one another our thoughts about the process of adults' growth and change, the direction the school was moving in, and my role in the school. More generally, we began to talk together with a beginning sense of mutual respect.

PLAN OF ACTION

My first visit to the New School had been exciting, frustrating and difficult. I left the school with many feelings and questions about my role and how I was going to work with the principal and teachers. From the information gathered during my initial investigation and from my experience during this first visit, I began to clarify both my role as an advisor in the school and the problems and issues I felt were important to think about and work on during the next six months. My plan of action in supporting growth and change in this school was to be aware of and to work on the following issues:

Working Towards Change with the Principal

1. Establishing a working relationship based on mutual trust and respect.
2. Helping principal examine his own behavior and its effect on staff.
3. Working to clarify the term "open education."
4. Working to clarify the term "community."
5. Working to clarify the principal's expectations of teachers, i.e., the implementation of open education in an open space school.
6. Through working with teachers, beginning to "model" behavior for principal.

Working Towards Change with Teachers

1. Establishing a working relationship based on mutual trust and respect.
2. Working to define teachers' needs and problems.
3. Working alongside teachers in their classrooms, with children and materials.
4. Working with materials and curriculum development.
5. Working towards "opening up" the classrooms.
6. Through working with children, beginning to "model" behavior for teachers.

Working Towards Change with Principal and Teachers

1. Working to improve relationships.
2. Working to improve communication.
3. Working to help clarify goals, expectations and objectives.
4. Working to develop a sense of group cohesion.

I did not realize at the time how monumental a task this was. Over the course of the next six months I worked with the principal and teachers on a number of these issues. However, I did not work in depth on all of them, and I do not feel that "great" changes occurred in many of them. The following sections will be a discussion of my work with: the

administrative staff -- the principal and assistant principal (hired in February 1976); the teachers; and the Open Education Committee towards change in the school. (See Appendix VI.)

ADVISOR'S WORK WITH ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

The Principal

> The principal, as chief administrative officer of the school, was the key agent of change.
>
> John I. Goodlad

It was CTW's belief, as it is so many others', that the role of the principal is crucial in supporting and adopting educational change, and therefore I was supposed to work with the principal as well as with the teachers. One of my goals was to establish a positive working relationship with the principal, based on mutual trust and support. The principal, on the other hand, envisioned the role of advisor as that of a teacher-trainer. He did not expect me to work with him. However, after about two months of my initiating meetings with him and working effectively with teachers, the principal became more amenable to doing so. He was beginning to respect my skills and to trust my intentions.

Our work together consisted principally of discussions of various issues of importance in the school. They were: becoming more aware of problems in communications and relationships; understanding human growth and development as it relates to the process of adult change; defining the terms

"open education" and "open space;" clarifying the principal's expectations of teachers. These discussions were important both to the principal and to me, and formed the basis of our working relationship.

Relationship with Staff

One of the problems in the school, and a concern of the principal, was his relationship with teachers. In the section on the history of the school, this relationship was characterized as "adversary." The principal wanted this to change. He wanted teachers to feel invested in the school. He wanted them to work cooperatively with one another and with him. He wanted, in summary, to begin to establish a positive school climate. However, certain events retarded the process.

Sometime in November 1975, a convocation was held to celebrate the opening of the school. Major community figures were invited to attend this gala event. However, the group not invited was the teachers. Understandably, the teachers felt hurt and angry. Their feeling was that they had worked hard since September to get the school where it was, and that they deserved to be invited. They had also heard the principal allude to the fact that he wanted to improve his relationship with them. Now they doubted the truth of this statement. I was privvy to the teachers' feelings. After

much deliberation I decided to raise this issue with him. I believed that it was important for him to examine the effect of his behavior on his relationship with the teachers, if he was going to attempt to improve it. At first, the principal was quite resistant and did not want to discuss the event. However, I decided to stick with it. I pointed out that it was he who wanted to improve his relationship with teachers and that, by not inviting them to the convocation, he was hurting his own chance to do so. The principal "heard" what I was saying and became more willing to discuss the event. In so doing it became clear to both of us that he had "forgotten" to invite them because he was not pleased with the progress they had been making.

The result of this discussion was that the principal began to look more closely at the effect of his behavior on others. He began to recognize and to verbalize that he too was part of the problem. He became more willing to engage with me, in discussions of a similar nature at later dates.

I had planned to confront the principal with his behavior because I felt that he could handle it and because I felt this particular event and the behavior he displayed typified the problem he had raised with me. I knew that I was taking a risk in using this technique. Gordon Klopf said that "the user must always keep in mind, however, that the behavior of the confrontee may not change and that the

interpersonal dynamics may become so strained that the helping situation is destroyed completely."[37] It is my feeling that the risk paid off, because this confrontation changed the tide in my relationship with the principal. Discussions between us would now begin to focus on the principal's role, as well as on the teachers' role.

Role of the Principal as Change Agent

Throughout the year the key question the principal and I discussed was: "How can we be supporters of change?" The principal did indeed expect changes to occur in the school. I emphasized my belief that, as educational leader in the school, the principal had to be a supporter and an enabler of such change.

The principal, however, did not operate as a supportive person. He had high ideals, tended to demand exactitude and perfection of himself and others and had difficulty trusting people to fulfill his expectations. He also believed that teachers are professionals with a job to do, and that praising teachers "for every little thing they do" is tantamount to "babying" them. Consequently, he rarely praised teachers for the small changes they were attempting to make. Thus, the teachers felt unappreciated, unsure of their competence in the eyes of the principal, and unsupported in the changes they saw themselves making.

Clarifying Expectations

In supporting teachers, it is important to be clear about the kinds of behavior and changes you want to encourage. As I spent more time at the school, I became increasingly aware that the teachers still did not know what the principal expected of them. This had been true at the Old School, and it continued to be true at the New School. It appeared to me that the effect of this was the teachers' sticking more to their old ways of doing things. The more the teachers did this, the more frustrated and angry both they and the principal felt. Margaret S. Dwyer speaks of the leader's role in supporting change. She said, "An important key is the leader's understanding of when and how to set forth clear expressions of what must be achieved. This ability -- expressing explicit expectations -- is probably the most universally underdeveloped and underused management skill, in and outside of education.[39]

During our beginning months together the principal did not agree that he needed to spell out his goals for himself or with the staff: the philosophy of the New School; the meaning of an open approach to education in this school; the meaning and operational functioning of the communities. He believed that he and the staff had a common understanding when they used these terms. Dwyer comments on this phenomenon

when she said, "To avoid uneasiness and potential problems that demand-making might bring, administrators may rationalize away their vision of better performance, i.e., asserting that everyone already knows what needs to be done, so there's no need to tell them."[40]

During December it became evident that this was not the case. The principal and staff did not have common understandings of definitions and goals. The principal was dissatisfied with the speed at which he perceived teachers to be moving. Teachers, on the other hand, felt they were moving towards opening up their rooms and making changes. However, since the principal did not reward or praise teachers, most of them felt uncertain about the principal's evaluation of their work.

The principal and teachers came to realize the importance of clarifying goals and expectations. They decided to take this up at the Open Education Committee (a voluntary group which met weekly). The result of this joint effort by principal and teachers was a written statement of school policies of teaching and learning (see Appendix VII). As a group they came to the following agreements: that children would be involved individually and in small groups with materials and activities in a structured, unchaotic atmosphere to help them develop and grow intellectually, emotionally and physically, and that these activities and materials

would be related to the teaching and learning of academic skills as well as creativity and socialization. The list was a general outline and a beginning statement of school policy. It was not a final version, nor was it a statement of the what and how of open education. It was, however, the first jointly written document of an agreement between the principal and teachers which began to clarify the direction the school was heading.

The Handbook: A Joint Venture of Administrators and Teachers

The principal and I continued to discuss the need for clarity of expectations and goals as well as the need of a Handbook. When I spoke with the principal in June 1976, he and the assistant principal and some of the teachers were beginning to write a Handbook (which he had originally hoped to have written by September 1975). The Handbook was to clearly state the standards and expectations of the school. Topics to be covered included: minimum community standards; curriculum expectations in relation to experiential learning; the development of common routines; the use of space; individualized needs -- of students and teachers.

A Change in the Principal

The principal had indeed moved from a position of not wanting, or not feeling the need, to clarify goals and expectations to a position of seeing the necessity to do so, and then acting on this awareness. Klopf described adults' need for clarity: "Rigidity in behavior may be in considerable part the result of not knowing why, what or how to do something. Adults tend to act and behave in certain set patterns until they are convinced of the significance and practicality of some new information or techniques. New concepts and techniques will be more readily understood and accepted by adults when presented in concrete terms and related to pragmatic goals."[41]

Factors in and Motives for Changing

One of the reasons the principal included teachers in the writing of the Handbook was that he wanted them to feel a sense of ownership in this endeavor and in the school in general. According to Nick Cowell from the Northwest Labs Rural Education Program, "to 'own,' one has not only to experience but also to help define and create that which is to be owned. This is true whether the issue be an idea, a process, a procedure, a series of activities or whatever. The more they are there when the program's 'big decisions'

are made and the more they have a direct hand in helping make these decisions, the more they will own the program. Principals will facilitate teacher ownership of curriculum and school growth by facilitating joint principal-teacher planning and by trusting teachers to paln on their own."

Areas of Change

The principal and I had spent many hours together, discussing various issues and feelings. In some ways our work was quite separate, and in other ways our work overlapped. We had succeeded in establishing a working relationship and we had dealt with the problems of communication, relationships, clarity of expectations and the role of a supporter of change. The principal had become more aware of his own behavior and its effect on teachers. He had made small changes in his behavior to encourage and support teachers' growth. He had become more aware of the importance of involving teachers in decisions that directly affected them and towards the end of the year had involved them in the writing of the Handbook. However, the principal did not spend much time working with teachers directly in their classrooms. He depended on the assistant principal and me to do this work. By the end of April our relationship had become important to both of us, and through the discussions

we had, the principal began to make changes in his style of leadership: small changes, but changes nevertheless.

The Assistant Principal

Motives for Hiring

In February 1976, the principal hired the new assistant principal. She came from a New York City public school where she had organized and taught in an open corridor setting. The principal had known this woman from previous years when they had both worked in an elementary school in East Harlem. She had then gone on to work with Debbie Meyers (who is now the director of an open education mini-school) and had learned about open education. The principal was very impressed with the program she had begun in another district, her classroom and her knowledge about and experience in the field of open education. He was, however, concerned about her ability to work well with teachers. He knew that she tended to work fast, and to push hard, and to have little patience with people who tended to work more slowly than she. Yet, he wanted her as his assistant principal because he trusted her knowledge and drive.

Before the assistant principal arrived, the principal shared with me his perceptions about her. By this time in the year the principal and I were working together on his

concerns, and now the arrival of the new assistant principal was on his mind.

Rationale for the Advisor's Work With the Assistant Principal

The principal asked that I work with the assistant principal, individually, and with him, on her approach to working with teachers. I agreed to do this, not only because the principal requested that I do so, but because I had worked hard to develop on-going relationships with the principal and teachers. My efforts with the principal had been directed to slowing him down, to increasing his patience and support of teachers. I worried that a person coming in "with little patience for incompetence" could reinforce some of the principal's old patterns of behavior. In addition, I knew that she was a member of the school and administrative staff who was going to be working with teachers, as a supporter of change, long after I left the school. In the same way that the principal is a "key agent of change," so is the assistant principal. Therefore, for all of the above reasons, I expanded my work to include the new assistant principal.

Teachers' Reactions

The assistant principal felt much tension and resistance from teachers when she arrived. She had, in fact, gotten the position for which a number of teachers within the school had applied. The teachers resented her presence and saw her as an "outsider." Compounding this situation, she arrived at the school like a tornado. She assumed that all of the teachers in the school were committed to the open approach and she felt that all she needed to do was to "get in there, do it and then the teachers would get excited and pick up on it." She did not expect teachers to procrastinate about making plans and then carrying them through, for this was antithetical to her style.

Work Begins: Assistant Principal's Style

The principal, assistant principal, two consultants (whom the principal had hired in December) and I met together to discuss what had been happening in the school, what changes had been made, and what work needed to be done. The assistant principal decided that, since she knew the teachers in one of the communities, she would begin her work there. This was a poor decision, since one of the teachers in that community had applied for the position of assistant principal and resented her presence. However, she began

her work in this community fast and furiously. She ran in and out of the community, telling teachers what she felt they needed to do, and expecting "to set the example by going into the rooms and giving demonstrations." She informed one teacher that children needed the experience of cooking, and then proceeded to set up a cooking area with procedures, recipes, sign-up lists, etc. She did not involve the teacher in the process. In fact, she totally by-passed the teacher and then was quite surprised when the teacher not only did not pick up on the work the assistant principal had begun, but also resented her very presence in the classroom.

Because I had also been working with this teacher, she shared with me her feelings of anger and frustration. She felt that the assistant principal had disrespected her and had refused to take into account her philosophy and style of working. Once the assistant principal walked into her room, she no longer felt it was her classroom, her children, or her time. The teacher added that many of the other teachers felt similarly about the assistant principal's approach to working with them.

Continuing Meetings with Assistant Principal

The principal and I had been discussing the function of a "supporter of change" and we continued these discussions with the assistant principal. We spoke of her approach to

working with teachers and the successes and failures she was facing. Because of her style she moved out of the community she had first attempted to work with in a few weeks and had moved into other communities. She was busy racing all over the building, working with children, telling teachers what she felt they needed to do, and bringing in materials. She spent no time talking with teachers about what they felt they needed or how they wanted to work with her. She spent little time getting to know the teachers, either personally or professionally, or they her. Yet, she expected instant change.

During our discussions we examined the teachers' reactions to her -- many of them negative, and as a result of the discussions the assistant principal decided to work in communities in a more concentrated way. She would work in each community for a week at a time, as opposed to one day a week. In this way, she hoped to have time to speak with teachers about where they saw themselves going and what types of support and help they felt they needed from her. This change did not come about, however, until two months after she had arrived at the school and the assistant principal found herself dealing with much pent up anger from the teachers.

The Assistant Principal Observes The Advisor's Approach

In March 1976, the assistant principal asked if she could observe me helping a teacher rearrange his room. The teacher agreed to have the assistant principal present during the change. In working with this teacher I first re-explored with him how he worked with children and the changes he felt he needed to make. I offered suggestions and gave him feedback on his ideas. We then proceded to make the necessary changes. The end result was a new room arrangement which he felt he was willing to try, for it was a reflection of the growth he had made over the past months of work. The assistant principal and I discussed the sesson afterwards. She was struck by how I had involved the teacher in the process. She was becoming more aware of her need to work WITH teachers as opposed to working around them.

Changes in the Assistant Principal

In June 1976, the assistant principal said that she was much more aware of the importance of examining her style of working with teachers. "In February, when I first came to the school, I didn't even think about my approach to people." Now she was looking much more carefully about her approach and how it affected teachers. She also said that she had

learned the importance of working with teachers, rather than walking into a classroom "and doing it for them." It was her hope that, in September 1976, she would put this new awareness into practice.

Analysis of Reasons for Change

Thus, my work with the assistant principal had been focused on looking at her style of working with and supporting teachers. She had been willing to work with me, partly because the principal had encouraged her to do so and partly because she herself was interested in improving her skills. And, while her behavior had not substantially changed during the three months we worked together, she felt that she would begin to see the effects of our work together the following year.

ADVISOR WORKS WITH TEACHERS

> Demonstrating and modeling specific methods and techniques of teaching are a typical activity, but major emphasis is also needed on being a facilitator, on helping the teachers in any way possible to move towards the stated objectives. This may mean locating institutional material, physically rearranging the classroom, and sharing the planning of programs for the year as well as day to day. Supportive feedback from classroom observation is usually seen as an essential component for this new role.[42]

The above description by Gordon Klopf is an accurate account of my work with teachers. I did indeed become a resource person -- gathering materials for projects, categorizing, arranging and listing curriculum materials available in the various school storage closets, and "scrounging" items such as wood scraps and stocking boxes. I also worked directly with children and teachers in various curriculum areas with various materials such as building with tri-wall, and working with planting, animal care, painting, block building, bookmaking, and social studies. I worked with teachers in rearranging their classrooms on the basis of the needs of the children and the teachers. I spent time talking with teachers about their classrooms, their children, their goals, and themselves.

Beginning Work with Teachers

During my first few weeks at the school I spent much of my time visiting communities and speaking with teachers. It became apparent that there were some teachers who very much wanted to work with me, and that there were others who did not. I decided that since my time was limited because I was only slated to be at the school two days a week, it made most sense for me to work with the receptive teachers. I also felt very strongly that it would be beneficial to involve teachers in this decision. I believed that, by approaching teachers from this vantage point our work together was being built, right from the outset, on a spirit of collaboration. During these same weeks I began to set up the Teacher Resource Room, which had been one of the principal's priorities. I collected various materials (cardboard, yarn, magazines, teacher-made materials, styrofoam, etc.) and set up work displays of bookbinding, children's creative writing newspapers, puppet making and printing activities, along with two teachers who were involved in a special reading program. I then sent a letter to teachers explaining what I had been doing, asking for their suggestions, and inviting them to come down to the Resource Room to work with the materials, browse, talk, etc. (See Appendix VIII.)

Teachers' Responses and Needs

A number of facts became apparent during these beginning weeks. First of all, teachers were working independently of one another, even within the communities, and they wanted individual assistance and support. They wanted to work with me with their individual classes, and in their own space, on their particular concerns and problems. They did not want to work with me collaboratively with the other teachers in their community. This desire on the part of teachers had tremendous influence on my method of working. Instead of working with groups of teachers on community issues or projects, conducting workshops for the entire staff or for teachers of a specific grade, I worked with teachers on a one-to-one basis. Teachers were feeling so overwhelmed by their work in their own classes that they did not feel they had time to come to the Resource Room. Since teachers were not coming to and using this room, the principal and I agreed that I should stop putting energy into it. Thus, I began to direct my attention to working with teachers in their individual spaces.

Factors Shaping Working Method

During my six-month stay at the school I worked with nine of the fifteen teachers. The depth of this work varied

and was determined by: (1) how much assistance the teacher wanted; (2) the amount of time and energy I had; and (3) my ability to meet his/her particular needs.

In the following pages I shall discuss my work with teachers in more specific terms. The case study I shall present is an example of my most successful work with one teacher, with special attention to the kinds of changes he made in his classroom. I am choosing this "success story" because I think I found in this experience the elements of working successfully with teachers towards change -- change in attitude about children and learning; change in methods of teaching; and change in physical arrangement of classroom space.

Case Study -- Advisor Works with One Teacher

Initial Request

In January, 1976, one of the teachers requested that I visit his room. He had not felt ready to have anyone visit his room as he had been on leave and needed time to adjust to the children and to the school. He was having a difficult time and felt that he needed support and assistance. I had already been working with a number of teachers whom he knew and trusted, and he had heard that I had been helpful to them.

My Method: Observation

My first visit lasted approximately thirty minutes. I observed the children and the teacher. I listened to and watched the interactions between the children and between the teacher and the children. I looked around to see what materials were available and in what areas the children were working.

The classroom was bare, save for a few posters and charts which had obviously been up for months, paper clocks made by children, and a display of "things that are red." On one shelf there were some phonics games, placed one on top of the other, with box tops off and game pieces strewn around on the shelf and floor. In the "library," books were displayed in similar fashion. The room had no other materials, and what was present was poorly arranged.

The children were seated in groups, according to their reading ability. They were working in workbooks, readers, worksheets, notebooks, etc. Their materials were pencil and paper. The atmosphere was cold, tense, and hostile. The teacher wanted the children to sit, work silently, and finish their assignment. The children were unable to do so. Consequently, there was a major and continuous yelling battle between the teacher and the children, as well as numerous small fights among the children themselves.

Advisor's Initial Feedback

I met with the teacher during his lunch period to discuss my observations and his needs. I wanted to meet with him on the same day I visited his room, so that the visit would be fresh in both our minds. He immediately asked me what I thought about his room. I decided to focus on the classroom atmosphere. I felt that it was important to acknowledge the fact that he was having a difficult time with the children, and that they were having a difficult time with him, and with each other, before the issues of curriculum development, material-use, and room arrangement were dealt with.

As soon as I shared my perception with the teacher, which was that there was a mini-battle going on in the room, he agreed and spoke for about five minutes about how difficult, unruly, undisciplined, hostile and aggressive the children were. He felt that he had tried everything from praise, to rewards, to punishment, and that he no longer knew what to do. I asked if he had heard of William Glasser's book, Schools Without Failure, which speaks of the success of class meetings in dealing with children's attitudes and behavior. He had not, and he also voiced sentiment that he did not feel ready to hold such meetings. I then suggested that perhaps, if there were more materials in the class,

more things for the children to choose to do, other than workbooks, the children would settle down. Since the teacher felt that one of the main problems was the children's inability to positively interact with one another, I suggested the possibility of introducing a number of board games into the classroom. I felt that games would be a non-threatening first step in the introduction of materials into the classroom -- for the children and for the teacher. He responded positively to this suggestion. However, he worried about the children's ability to take good care of the games and their ability to play well together. Hearing his reservation, I offered to work in his classroom with the children, teaching them the rules of the games, dealing with any fights that arose, and teaching them how to care for the games. The teacher felt comfortable with this, and our first agreement had been reached.

Advisor's Working Method

I worked in this room with the children for one hour, two days a week for three weeks. I worked with small groups of children, with games, and then suggested that each of them teach another child how to play with and care for the games. We made charts of who knew how to play which games and who wanted to learn how to play. Over the course of these weeks the teacher and I spoke about this work and he

stated that he had observed some differences in the children's behavior. He felt that they were fighting less, and that they were completing their assignments more quickly because they knew they could choose to play with the games (checkers, dominoes, Candy Land, Chutes and Ladders, puzzles). He also found that after locking the games in his closet for about two weeks the children were showing that they could be responsible in taking good care of these games and he was becoming more willing to leave them out on the shelves -- labelled and well organized, as opposed to randomly strewn about. This change was the result of a discussion the teacher and I had about the importance of good classroom organization.

We continued to discuss the progress and problems in the room. We analyzed why some things were working and why others were not. He spoke of a disastrous experience he had had painting with all of the children at one time. Using his experience as a jumping off point, we discussed how he could attempt to introduce painting in the classroom in a more successful manner. He asked if I would be willing to set up a painting area with a small group of children, teaching them procedures and techniques. I agreed to do this and we gathered the necessary materials. We spoke of the importance of painting, and how it provided the children the opportunity to explore their thoughts and feelings

in a medium other than pencial and paper, and how children could work in this area independently. We spoke of the possibilities of integrating the painting with the language arts and social studies curriculum. I recommended a number of children's art books, and over the course of the next few weeks I brought them in for him to read. Thus, the second step of our work together had been reached.

I again worked in the room with small groups of children. I taught them how to set up their easels, use and care for the paper, paints and brushes, hang up their finished paintings to dry, clean up the area. (Each child had his/her own bucket and sponge.) The children became very involved in the entire process, from beginning to end. They also knew that, if they did not work responsibly in the painting area, the teacher would undoubtedly close it off. The children were becoming more aware of the needs and expectations of the teacher, and they were willing to respond accordingly. Painting became a hit in this room, and after a month, the teacher had an Art Show of the children's paintings on the bulletin board on their floor, with their accompanying stories.

During the next few weeks, the teacher and I decided to set up an Audio-Visual center, with a film strip projector, record player, and cassette tape recorder. We chose films and stories related to their social studies

theme and to the children's general enjoyment of seeing and listening to stories. Here too we worked with the children, teaching them how to operate the equipment, care for the materials and sign-up for working in this area.

Another activity area planned and implemented was a planting project. We used the Board of Education Science Manual, ESS guides on planting and various library books to guide us in this project. We collected the necessary materials and planned to involve the children in the actual planting, caring for, and growing their plants. We also planned to have the children keep graphs on their plant's growth as well as written logs on the progress they were making. This work continued for a number of weeks, and I learned after I had left the school, that this teacher worked with the assistant principal, two other teachers and all of their children to plant a vegetable garden in the playground outside their rooms.

After Four Months

Thus, in May, this classroom looked and felt quite different than it had in January. The children still had their assigned seats and work to accomplish, but the room was much richer and warmer. There were activities the children enjoyed doing and the teacher felt comfortable allowing them to do. There were fewer fights among the

children and the teacher yelled less. The teacher still considered this group of children difficult, but he was also aware that he had some responsibility for the situation. He had personal problems and he realized that this had an effect on how he reacted to the children. He did feel, however, that the situation in the room had improved and he felt good about his own growth and change.

Analysis of Results: Factors in Success

The success of my work with this particular teacher is due, I feel, to a number of factors: (1) both of us agreed to work together; (2) I was willing to listen to the teacher to find out who he was, where he had come from and where he felt he was ready to go; (3) we worked together on solving the problems in his room, in a give and take situation; (4) I was willing to come into his room and work with the children, both independently of him and cooperatively with him; (5) we shared our ideas and perceptions about children, learning and teaching; (6) I was able to give him honest feedback about what I observed in his room; (7) we involved the children in the process of these changes.

The Teacher's Feedback

In June, this teacher said, "You were helpful to me. You listened to what was important to me about the way that

I worked with my class, and you respected that. You were able to help bring out of me what I needed help with. You have a soft sell -- you don't push. You present information, but in a way that doesn't seem pushy. You made me feel that I was part of a learning process. You got right in and did things, but I didn't feel pushed aside. You showed me how to do it by doing it, but I didn't feel apart from it, I felt part of it. I felt that I learned along with you and the children and I felt included. And I feel good about the changes I made in my classroom." (See Appendices IX and X.)

OVERALL STRATEGY: THE OPEN EDUCATION COMMITTEE

In October, the principal mentioned that on Open Education Committee had been formed the previous year and that he was interested in its revival. This committee was a volunteer group of teachers who met weekly to discuss educational concerns. I saw that this committee had the potential to begin work on some of the problems the principal and teachers had been facing, in both the Old and the New School. I believed that the re-establishment of the committee was important, because it was the single organism for unified change in the school -- a composite of administrators and staff coming together in a group situation to share concerns, ideas, and feelings about the changes they each were involved in.

Principal's Rationale

The principal had been struggling with the issue of ownership and shared decision making. He wanted teachers to become more involved in their classes, in their community, and in the school as a whole. He wanted them to feel committed and to put more time and energy into their programs. He believed that if teachers were more involved in the decision-making process on issues that directily affected them, they would begin to do so. He also hoped that,

through discussions about educational concerns, the teachers and he would improve their working relationship. Amidst his hopes there was also an element of fear. The principal worried about the implications of joint decision-making. Would he lose control in the school? He also tended to doubt the success of the committee. However, he decided to call the first meeting of the committee at the end of October.

First Meeting: Principal's Dreams

During the first meeting of the Open Education Committee, the principal stated that the purpose of the committee was to create a forum for a "joint effort of principal and teachers to deal with many of the issues involved with open education." He wanted this committee to be a place where ideas, plans, concerns and procedures could be discussed. Most important, he stated that he wanted this to be "a co-operative venture between staff and administration in decision making -- an alternative to decision-making solely by administrative fist."

Teachers' Reactions

The principal's statements were quite impressive and certainly showed teachers that he had an ideal vision of how he would like to work with teachers. However, many of the teachers who had worked with him in the past did not

believe him. Their perception of him was that he was directive and dictatorial, and they did not have faith that he too was struggling with making changes.

Clarification of the Structure

After the first few meetings, it became evident that there was a core group of about nine people who were coming regularly to the meetings, and about three people who were coming irregularly. It also came to pass that the principal became involved in supervising the children in the lunchroom during the time the committee met. Thus, he was unable to attend the meetings from beginning to end. The principal's absence from the meetings had several noticeable results: (1) I became the facilitator of the meetings. (2) Teachers raised issues and feelings they might not have shared directly with the principal. (3) I became liaison between the principal and teachers.

Advisor and Principal Work Together

Since the principal was not present at the meetings, we did not become co-facilitators. We did, however, spend many hours planning sessions, sharing ideas, and processing the outcome of the meetings. We spent time dealing with the principal's reactions to some of the topics and feelings raised by teachers. There were times when the principal was

quite angry about the direction of the discussions and, in these instances, I played the role of the interpreter and clarifier of what I perceived the teachers were saying.

Emerging Work Methods: Setting Priorities

During the course of the year, the agenda was set by the various parties -- myself, the principal, and the teachers. Some of the issues were common concerns of the principal and teachers, such as the goals of the school, the meaning and implementation of open education within a community, the method and rationale of record-keeping. Other issues were more specific to the principal's concerns, such as: the use of the space within the community; community projects; the use of the Home Economics room; enlarging school to encompass a seventh grade community. Still other issues were more specific to the teachers' concerns, such as: daily problems they were facing in organization, structure and children's behavior; their feelings about administrative pressure to change, and change fast; the meaning of community and the principal's expectations of how it should be operated.

Analysis of My Role

In looking back on my role in these meetings, I think that it had both positive and negative effects. Since

communication had been, and continued to be a problem in the school, the principal needed to engage teachers in face-to-face communication for this to improve. Because of his absence this was impossible, and I wonder if my role as liaison made it that much easier for him to abrogate this role. Perhaps, the principal and teachers would have been forced to communicate directly with one another had I refused to play the intermediary role. On the other hand, the feeling of both principal and teachers was that they were not ready to discuss some of these issues with each other, and perhaps the role I played made it safer for these issues and feelings to surface. Precisely what the effects of these circumstances were is, of course, unknown. However, what did happen at these meetings was positive and the work accomplished was important to the development of the school.

Results of the Open Education Committee Meetings

The following is a list of the results of the committee:

1) Relationships and communication among teachers are improved.
2) A peer support system for teachers develops.
3) Principal begins to "hear" and become more aware of teachers' feelings.

4) Teachers become more involved in discussions and decisions which are directly related to their work.
5) Teachers and principal work together to write a clarification of their goals and expectations, regarding open education and open space (community).
6) Teachers work on compendium of various forms of planning and record keeping.
7) Lists of all educational materials in the school are compiled.
8) Teachers and administrators work on Handbook of School Policy.

Extent of Changes Brought About by Committee

As the list indicates, the changes brought about by this committee were small. Work was accomplished, but it was not the work the principal had initially called for. The committee did not significantly improve the relationship or communication between the principal and teachers. The group did not change the decision-making process or principal's style of leadership in the school. In fact, the Open Education Committee did not bring about sweeping changes in the school. Had the principal been present at more of the meetings, had the two parties actually worked together in a joint effort, had I not become the facilitator of the sessions, the

effects would undoubtedly have been different. However, the work of the committee was in its formative stage, its first six months, and, in small ways, it was a success.

SUMMARY

> ". . . the rewards to be realistically hoped for are the indirect ones, as was the case with the sons who were told to dig for buried treasure in the vineyard. They found no treasure, but they improved the soil." (Rappaport, 1960). Many of our social institutions cry out for vast reform. Innovators know, however, that institutional change comes about very slowly and in limited ways. Thus, they find no buried treasure in the vineyard when they dig, but they do improve the soil; and in so doing they increase the possibility that human beings may have the opportunities to grow and enrich their lives.
>
> Gluckstern and Packard[43]

It is well-known that the process of change is indeed slow. This holds true for changes in individuals, for organizations in general and for schools in particular, as I found in my work in the New School.

While it had been CTW's hope that the work of the advisor and the coordinator of the Principal Leadership Study would dovetail, this did not come to pass. Since the principal had initially joined the PLS for the Advisory Service, he did not request to work with the coordinator. He felt that his in-school needs were being met by the advisor. Thus, the principal's participation in the PLS meetings was quite separate from his work with the advisor.

In addition to the lack of coordination of services between the PLS and the Advisory Service, there was a misunderstanding between the principal and CTW about the nature of

the role of the advisor. In June 1975, CTW had decided that the work of the advisor would be more effective if she worked with the administrative staff as well as with the teachers. This is what I understood my job was when I was hired as advisor in October 1975. While CTW claimed that the principal had agreed to this change, the principal was not observing the agreement. It became clear very shortly that the principal was still expecting the advisor to function solely as a teacher trainer. Thus, a major part of the advisor's work during the first month and a half were spent trying to establish a working relationship with the principal. Had the misunderstanding not taken place, it is possible that the work of the principal with the advisor could have progressed further than it did.

As an advisor to the administrative and teaching staff of the New School, it was important that I be knowledgable about open education and "hands-on-materials." While I had never worked in an open space school, I had taught with other adults, and I could empathize with the feelings and situation of the teachers. I was present in the school during the stages of awareness-interest, evaluation, trial, and (partial) adoption. I worked with people in a supportive manner on issues of special concern to them. I attempted to start working with people's strengths and "where they were" while also trying to be sensitive to their readi-

ness to move on to new stages. My role, in short, was to support people in their growth and development in the changes they wished to make.

The changes that were expected to take place in this school were massive. Changes in philosophy of education, styles of teaching, attitudes towards children and other adults, quality of relationships, patterns of communication and decision-making were among the priorities. These issues are of vital importance to a school. They are also areas which require a lot of time, energy, thought, and planning to work through, improve and change. The literature on change points out that innovations requiring large outlays of time, energy and money from the adopting individual or group are likely to move slowly (Miles, Mort, Rogers). It has also been shown that high complexity (Carlson), difficulty of implementation (Miles), and the requirement of value changes (Fox and Lippitt, Sarason) are factors which make adoption of change more difficult.[44]

In looking back on the pre-existing conditions of the school, I find that the situation was not ripe for acceptance of major changes. Teachers were anxious, and in many cases unwilling to expend the additional time and energy to "run an open classroom" and meet the needs of thirty children. The entire concept of open education and working in an open space with other teachers and children was alien

to the attitudes and values of the staff. While the principal wanted change to occur, he had a difficult time supporting teachers in their efforts to do so. In general, the climate of the school was tense and the relationship between teachers and principal was poor. And, in the final analysis, the principal was not ready to change his style of leadership or the decision-making process. Despite these hindering factors, changes in this school did come about. They came about in small ways during my stay at the school. It is important to remember that "People learn by doing" and this takes time.

The principal's main strategy for change in the school was the teachers' and his involvement with CTW's Advisory Service and Principal Leadership Study. In addition, the principal hired two other consultants to work in the school in December 1975. As was pointed out in the section on the overview of literature by Daniel E. Griffiths, change is facilitated by the inclusion of outside change agents. The principal was aware of this phenomenon and thus initiated relationships with such agents. The principal was supported by the district superintendent in so doing. Thus, the initiative to implement change was coming from the "target" system itself, and the initiative to work with the outside agent, the advisor, was likewise coming from the "target" system.

The principal believed that the teachers would feel freer to work with people from outside the school. He also believed that an advisor from CTW would be knowledgeable about open education, experiential learning, and working with materials and curriculum development. Numerous studies point to the importance of "built-in-implementation support" (Brickell, Fox and Lippitt).[45] It is their contention that in many instances, user inability and lack of know-how are more important factors in hindering change than are user resistance or sabotage. It was my experience in the New School that people were feeling anxious and insecure about their abilities to work in new ways -- this was true of the administrative and teaching staff. Thus, their relationships with me and with the other consultants were very important during this first year in the school.

It was CTW's contention that the Advisory Service and the Principal Leadership Study were positive intervention strategies. Each was attempting to work with various components in the school towards implementing educational change. The advisor was to work with and support various members in the school, to assist and facilitate in the development and implementation of the innovative program (open education in an open space school), and to assist members in creating internal processes and structures to support and sustain the changes when the advisor left the school.

In reviewing my work in the school, I have come to believe that the Problem Solving and the Social Interaction perspectives towards change best describe the methods I used in working with the school administrators and teachers. The problem (regardless of its nature) belonged to them -- the principal, assistant principal, teachers. They had to "own" the problem and take responsibility for working on it. My role was to work with them in a supportive way, in an atmosphere of mutual trust, to help them define the problem, to observe, to offer suggestions, to demonstrate and to give feedback. I established relationships with people on an "informal person-to-person" basis and I made myself available to people as a resource person. I worked with people who were both "opinion leaders" in the school and who were interested in the innovation (open education). Through my individual work and contact with people, on both a formal and informal basis, and through my involvement with people in the Open Education Committee I had hoped to capitalize on the network through which information spreads. In so doing, I hoped to foster the acceptance of changes in curriculum, relationships, communication and decision-making.

In my advisory role I attempted to assist participants with their individual competencies and skills, and tried to work on the organizational structure of the school, on changing roles, and on availability and use of materials and

resources. The work had various degrees of success. On a small scale, I worked with the principal, assistant principal, two other consultants and teachers to implement and institutionalize change in the public school system. All of the efforts were conducted with a spirit of collaboration with the participants who were themselves working towards educational change.

AUTHOR'S PERSONAL COMMENT

In conclusion I want to say that, through my work with the administrators and teachers in the school, I became acutely aware of the complexity of working with individuals and organizations towards change. The process of change is indeed complicated and difficult -- with many factors coming into play. I became increasingly aware of the importance of people's learning by doing and the necessity for people to "own" their problems and take responsibility for their solutions. As Margaret S. Dwyers said, "If change is to occur it will be because those actively engaged in the educational process want change, expect change and are rewarded by the changes that take place."[46] John I. Goodlad speaks to this same concern when he says, "Adults in schools ultimately must learn to help themselves. Nobody can or should do the job for them." "This means that they must think together, plan together, decide together and act together in dealing with the problems inevitably inherent in schools. This is not easy; in fact it is extraordinarily difficult."[47] And, to accomplish this task, schools need encouragement and support -- from inside their system as well as from the outside.

It was my goal to help the members of this school work together more effectively so that they could work on and

solve their problems. It is my belief that patterns of behavior, attitudes, and interacting are crucial in the development of a healthy environment for children and adults. Until trust and respect are present in the school, there will be no substantial changes. It is my feeling that unless some of the very basic forms of school structure, organization, and administration are changed, this statement will unfortunately remain true. Substituting one set of books for another, or one set of projects and activities for another, or one room arrangement for another will not really amount to very much, if this is all that is changed. If, however, these changes are made in the context of changes in attitudes, beliefs, values, roles, communication, and involvement in decision-making, I do believe substantial change can occur and be sustained.

APPENDIX I

Creative Teaching Workshop

Job Requirements: Advisor*

Minimum: B.A. or B.S.

Two years of teacher training experience or equivalent.

Experience in the field of adult education, specifically related to teacher training:

A) Familiarity with the development and use of "hands-on-material" as a process for adults and children in learning.

B) Familiarity with and ability to transfer this knowledge experientially to others.

C) Experience as a teacher, or in working with teachers, on K-6 or 9 level.

D) Willingness to go into schools and work with school as an advisor toward that school's growth and development as a whole.

*See page 31.

APPENDIX II

The Role of an Advisor and the Coordinator of the P.L.S.*

1. To work with teachers in defining their styles of teaching and to assist in creating a room which will foster their styles of teaching, only insofar as this involvement is generated by active collaboration with the principal and serves to aid that principal in developing their role as supporter of experiential learning.

2. To be sufficiently flexible to help people problem solve those problems they pose and work WITH them to foster their future independent solutions to problems which arise.

3. To become aware of OVER-ALL function and design of school in order to identify the individual needs and the way these create "group" needs in the school.

4. To be in constant communication with the principal in order to identify and share knowledge of school needs in order to work together to devise ways to solve these problems in a peer modelled relationship with the principal.

5. To work with the principal to create mechanisms for establishing a sense of the natural community that already exists within the school.

6. To work with the staff and principal on reaching agreement about what the shared goals (as identified in curriculum) of the schools are. To work with teachers on where they are in relation to these shared goals and to work with them in moving towards reaching these goals.

7. To help teachers and principals see relationships between different subjects and projects so that they have a more integrated view of learning which will enable them to be more creative in broad curriculum development.

---

*See page 31.

8. To help principals and teachers utilize the internal resources already present in the school, and to share these resources in a constructive and non-threatening way. Helping to maximize skills in the school by exposing children to other teachers, and, ideally, by facilitating adult to adult sharing of skills.

9. To think through ways of and resources for solving problems with the administration and staff in contrast to implementing imposed solutions to their problems.

APPENDIX III

Memo from Principal to Staff, Spring 1975*

The following is a list of conditions the teachers were expected to accept should they agree to move to the New School.

1. A commitment to explore the possibilities and make changes in the direction of creating an environement of: decentralization of learning and teaching, active involvement by children, decision making and options for children, individualization of learning tasks, encouragement of cooperative tasks, etc.
2. A commitment to work in cooperation with other teachers within a cluster (later called a "community"); share materials, observations, ideas, etc.
3. An active interest in outside advice from trained advisors which includes openness of the classroom to prolonged visits, meetings to discuss mutual observations, ideas, problems, etc.
4. Interest in studying the literature regarding open education, curriculum in an open environment, use of materials, etc., through reading, but also occasional workshops.
5. Willingness to meet together with the cluster as the group feels it necessary or useful -- for a workshop, discussion, sharing, etc.
6. Willingness to maintain suitable records and plans.

---

*See page 37.

APPENDIX IV

Charity James, Beyond Customs, an educator's journey. (New York: Agathon Press, 1974), pp. 63-65, excerpts.*

"I have found an extraordinary amount of confusion between these two terms (open education and open space education). In some parts of the U.S. the phrase 'open education' denotes excellent programs such as Lillian Weber's Open Corridor in New York City or the Follow Through programs supervised by Bank Street College of Education, the Educational Development Center, or the Chicago Institute of Juvenile Research. But in others it seems to connote one of two things: either chaos or recent open space buildings. It seems urgent to me that the difference between open space education and open education be made clear, for it is possible to work in a diversified and responsive way with children in any old building; and open spaces unwisely used create opportunities for educational practices that are totally antithetical to the values for which the proponents of open education stand."

"Open planning is, of course, an intelligent attempt to cut costs and to avoid obsolescence by making buildings internally flexible. The problem lies not so much in the building as in the attitude that goes with them. At worst,

---

*See page 44.

they are the crassest form of human engineering, an attempt to force people to work in a certain style. It happens to be a style I approve of, but I do not approve of strong-arm methods even in a good cause; and of course, teachers who are not willing, not able, or not ready to move away from the formal class lesson recognize this as a strong-arm move, so that like other people under threat they regress, become more rigid and more uncommunicative, and have more headaches and other anxiety symptoms."

"If open space buildings are intended, as the rhetoric proclaims, to provide for flexibility, then the wherewithal for flexibility must be provided. The wherewithal is of two kinds: one psychological, one physical. Psychologically there are a number of requirements: it is essential to prepare teachers for working collaboratively and with unfamiliar techniques and also to support their early efforts. This requires workshops and also a kind of non-threatening intervention in planning and carrying through initial programs. It is no less important to recognize that for some teachers, and not all of them old, working in open spaces is not now and perhaps may never be the situation in which they can best work with youngsters. It should be possible for such people to be free to work in other ways. If physically they need to work in more differentiated areas, they should be able to spend at least some time in seminar rooms or even in standard classrooms."

APPENDIX V

How Does Change Happen?
Twelve Factors That Facilitate
Attitudinal and Behavioral Change*

Persons tend to change when they have participated in the decision to change,

Persons tend to change when the rewards for change exceed the pain of change,

Persons tend to change when they see others changing, particularly when the change direction is supported by valued persons,

Persons tend to change more readily when they have the competencies, knowledge, or skills required by the change,

Persons tend to change more readily in an environment free from threat and judgement,

Persons tend to change to the degree they trust the motives of the persons trying to induce the change,

Persons tend to change more readily if they are able to influence reciprocally the person or persons attempting to influence them.

Persons tend to change either in a series of small steps or as a total change in their life,

Persons tend to change to the degree that they see the change has been successful, especially if they are able to gather data for themselves,

Persons tend to maintain change if there is a public commitment to the change,

Persons tend to resist change to the degree that they feel it is imposed on them.

National Training Laboratories -- Bethel Maine

---

*See pages 50-51.

APPENDIX VI

Helaine Meisler - Personal Contract - 11/30/75*

GOALS (LONG RANGE):

Establish a framework for working relationship with principal and the staff in an advisory, consultative role. The basis of these relationships is communication, trust and respect. The staff will look at the educational process and the implications of what they do, and how they do it, as individuals, in groups and with the children.

GOALS (SHORT RANGE) ON-GOING:

1. Helped people recognize and articulate problems; communicate with one another about problems; work together to solve them.

2. Helped develop a sense of trust between the staff-staff and staff-administration by assisting people in making their actions congruent with their words.

3. Created a supportive environment where people are not threatened and fearful.

4. Gave tools they needed to people, so that they could develop their own knowledge and power to DO, and to grow toward collaboration.

---

*See page 55.

CRITERIA:

1. Meet with principal each day I am at school to discuss observations, perceptions and feedback.

2. Make contacts with individual and groups of teachers to find out: their needs, questions and problems.

3. Help teachers focus clearly on a problem as in #2.

4. Work as a resource person based on #1, 2 and 3, i.e., role of advisor re: function.

5. Create a resource room which will meet the needs of teachers so that there is a reason for them to come. This room is used for working with materials, and discussing concerns, etc. -- based on #4.

6. Meet with Open Education Committee -- to be part of the on-going discussions, and processing of the personal and educational dynamics of the school.

7. Discuss, at CTW weekly staff meetings, advisory work and progress of P.L.S.

APPENDIX VII

On Clarifying School Policy*

The following is the list prepared by principal and teachers in the Open Education Committee meetings describing the direction they would be moving in the school:

1. Children should be involved in activities as part of every day's work.
2. Teaching and learning will be related to the activities with respect to academic skills, socialization, creativity, self expression, etc.
3. To be successful our program must be structured so that children know what to do, what they may choose to do, and what is expected of them.
4. As the need arises, children will learn to work individually, in small groups, in class groups or in larger groups with self confidence.
5. Children will use materials to learn and to reinforce learnings.
6. Our standards must be high, and must be taught, and must be understood by ourselves and the children.
7. Children will be given the opportunity to explore materials and discover new learnings in order to help them develop their own standards.

---

*See page 62.

APPENDIX VIII*

To the Staff: 11/10/75

I am working at the school as an advisor from Creative Teaching Workshop, a teacher-resource center down in SoHo. My role is to support teachers in the work you are doing with children -- to be a resource person -- and to meet your needs.

In the past month I have met a number of people. I have been visiting classrooms and working with individual teachers. We have worked with Tri-wall, building cubbies, dividers for learning areas, chairs, and a puppet stage. We have worked on room arrangement -- labelling areas and materials in the room, and re-arranging furniture to create different spaces. We have had discussions about children and learning, and record-keeping (seeing which of the various forms would be suitable for individual teachers' needs). I have brought in materials that teachers have requested such as: book-binding materials for children to make their own diaries; boxes for teacher-made games; various resource books.

I have also been working in the Resource Room. This will be a place where you can: work with materials; create games and sample work for your class; build with tri-wall;

---

*See page 74.

talk about your class; exchange ideas and get materials and "goodies." The "reading program" people and I have set up displays on printing; puppetry; book making; teacher-made games; tri-wall. We want any suggestions you have for things you would like to see in this room -- things to build, make, see, discuss, dream about. Please put any suggestions in my mailbox. The success of this room depends on your participation and how well it meets your needs.

THANK YOU!!!!

APPENDIX IX

Characteristics of the Person Serving as Consultant*

1. Belief in others with a positiveness and genuineness that builds a trusting relation.

2. Competency as a diagnostician of the persons in the situation.

3. Sympathy for others, ability to comprehend feelings, and perceptions of others.

4. Sense of concreteness, capacity for being specific.

5. Ability to reduce anxiety.

6. Responsiveness to clues in behavior of others.

7. Ability to understand motives and needs of person in a situation.

8. Ability to deal with a person in terms of an idea, situation, or problem.

9. Skill in working with people from their specific strengths.

10. Ability to facilitate, enable.

11. Interest in learning and communicating this interest to learners.

12. Openness to others and their ideas.

13. Awareness of the dynamics of any social interaction and the related systems and subsystems.

14. Ability to search out relevant and pertinent factors.

15. Authenticity in style, knowledge, and conviction.

These steps are quoted from: Gordon Klopf. The principal and staff development in the elementary school. (New York: Bank Street College of Education, n.d.) pp. 49-50.

---

*See page 84.

APPENDIX X

Some Aspects of the Consultation Process*

1. Consultant begins interview with spirit of warmth, respect and openness.
2. Consultant clarifies who he is and why he is present, if necessary.
3. Consultant solicits response and listens.
4. Consultant facilitates clarification and definition of situation -- goals, issues, needs and problems.
5. Consultant shares relevant knowledge and experiences as situation calls for it.
6. Consultant makes pertinent referrals for specific kinds of assistance.
7. Consultant eventually enables possible solutions and approaches to arise from mutual interaction.

These aspects are quoted from: Gordon Klopf, The principal and staff development in the elementary school, p. 50.

---

*See page 84.

APPENDIX XI

Charity James. Beyond Customs, an educators journey. (New York: Agathon Press, 1974), p. 64.

If open education is to be used with justification as a "hurrah" term, it must come to be associated with openness in many well-established senses. It should mean the collaborative learning of teachers and students; it should mean candor, so that students are not processed according to a hidden agenda but are able to understand the meaning of their education and to make shared decisions about it; it should mean as seldom as possible closing a door to a student's effectiveness by doing for him what he can do for himself or what another student can do for him; it should mean to the greatest possible extent open access among students and teachers and breaking down of formal scheduling barriers; it means a flexible curriculum in which children's and teachers' diversity is respected; it means that no one is imprisoned by a role; it means using the environment as an open resource; it means open doors to parents and community aides and others in the community; it means that sharing is not cheating; it means open-ended studies that go beyond what teacher or child has envisaged; it means that although teachers vary greatly in the degree of delegation they can handle, even the more directive types are always on the lookout for

keys to unlock the creative energies of individuals or groups. It does not mean an open conduit polluted by the disorder of the streets; nor does it mean that every question is so open a question that it is somehow demeaning to come to a decision.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Silberman, Charles E., Crisis in the Classroom, (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 10.

[2]Miller, Richard I., ed., A Multidisciplinary Focus on Educational Change, 38, 2, (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1965), 7.

[3]Feldman, Richard H., Horton, Donald, and Niemeyer, John H., Report to Edna McConnell Clark Foundation on the School Intervention Study Project, (New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1961), p. 18.

[4]Brickell, Henry M., Organizing New York State for Educational Change, (Albany, New York: New York State Department of Education, 1961), p. 18.

[5]Miller, Richard I., ed., "An Overview of Educational Change," Perspectives on Educational Change, (New York: Appletone-Century-Crofts, 1967), pp. 1-2.

[6]Mann, Dale, "Making Change Happen?" For the Record, 77, 3, (1976), 1.

[7]Feldman, Richard H., "Some Ways of Looking at and Understanding the Concept of Intervention," School Intervention Study Project, p. 57.

[8]Miles, Matthew B., "Innovation in education: some generalizations," Innovation in Education, pp. 647-648.

[9]Gotkin, Lassar G., and Goldstein, Leo S., "Programmed instruction in the schools: innovation and innovator," Innovation in Education, pp. 231-248.

[10]Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbery Wallin, "Implementation of Educational Innovation," The Educational Forum, 40, 3, (1976), 359.

[11]Fox, Robert S., and Lippitt, Ronald, "The innovation of classroom mental health practices," Innovation in Education, pp. 296-297.

[12]Niemeyer, John H., "Introduction and Overview of Bank Street College's Experience in School Intervention," School Intervention Study Project, p. 12.

[13]Ibid., p. 65.

[14]Miles, Matthew B., "Educational innovation: the nature of the problem," Innovation in Education, pp. 19-21.

[15]Havelock, Ronald G., and Havelock, Mary C., Training for Change Agents, (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973), p. 12, hereafter referred to as Training for Change Agents.

[16]Training for Change Agents, pp. 9-12.

[17]Training for Change Agents, pp. 14-18.

[18]Training for Change Agents, pp. 20-25.

[19]Training for Change Agents, pp. 29-32.

[20]Griffiths, Daniel E., "Administrative theory and change in organizations," Innovations in Education, p. 432.

[21]Miles, Matthew B., "Educational innovation: the nature of the problem," Innovation in Education, p. 13.

[22]Feldman, Richard I., "Some ways of Looking at and Understanding the Concept of Intervention," School Intervention Study Project, p. 78.

[23]Ibid., p. 79.

[24]Klopf, Gordon J., The principal and staff development in the elementary school, (New York: Bank Street College of Education, n.d.), p. 48.

[25]Ibid., p. 49.

[26]Morin, Andre, "An Innovator's Odyssey: How to become a thoughtful change agent," Educational Technology, 15, (November, 1975), 42-45.

[27]Hughes, L.W., and Achilles, C.M., "The Supervisor as a Change Agent," Educational Leadership, (May, 1971), 840-847.

[28]Waynant, Louise F., "Teachers' Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences," Educational Leadership, (April, 1971), 710-713.

[29]Armington, David, A Plan for Continuing Growth, (Newton, Mass.: The Educational Development Center, 1969), pp. 1-17.

[30]Alberty, Beth, and Dropkin, Ruth, The Open Education Advisory, (New York: The Workshop Center for Open Education, 1975), p. 2.

[31]Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbery Wallin, "Implementation of Educational Innovation," The Educational Forum, 40, 3, (1976), 359.

[32]Ibid., pp. 360-366.

[33]Glaser, Edward M., Consultation in Institutions for Child Development," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 1, (1977), 101.

[34]Miles, Matthew B., "Innovation in education: some generalizations," Innovation in Education, p. 659.

[35]Sarason, Seymour B., The Culture of the School and the Process of Change, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 215.

[36]Ibid., p. 219.

[37]Klopf, Gordon J., The principal and staff development in the elementary school, p. 53.

[38]Ibid., p. 24.

[39]Dwyer, Margaret S., "Mastering Change in Education: New Concepts in Leadership," Educational Technology, 16, 11, (1976), 57.

[40]Ibid., p. 58.

[41]Klopf, Gordon J., The principal and staff development in the elementary school, p. 17.

[42]Ibid., p. 33.

[43]Gluckstern, Norma B., and Packard, Ralph W., "The Internal-External Change-Agent Team: Bringing Change to a 'Closed Institution'," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 1, (1977), 41.

[44]See articles by Carlson, Fox and Lippitt, Miles, Mort and Rogers in Innovation in Education, Matthew B. Miles, ed. Also see Seymour B. Sarason's The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.

[45]See articles in Innovation in Education.

[46]Dwyer, Margaret S., "Mastering Change in Education: Getting Started, Readiness for Change," Educational Technology, 16, 9, (1976), 53.

[47]Bentzen, Mary M., Changing School: The Magic Feather Principle, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1974), p. XIV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberty, Beth, and Dropkin, Ruth. The Open Education Advisory. New York: The Workshop Center for Open Education, 1975.

Armington, David. A Plan for Continuing Growth. Newton, Mass.: The Educational Development Center, 1969.

Atwood, M.S. "Small-scale administrative change: resistance to the introduction of a high school guidance program." Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, 49-78.

Bentzen, Mary M. Changing School: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbery Wallin. "Implementation of Educational Innovation." The Educational Forum. 40 (1976), 344-370.

Brickell, Henry M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany, New York: New York State Department of Education, 1961.

Carlson, Richard O. "School superintendents and the adoption of modern math: a social structure profile." Innovation in Education, 329-342.

Dwyer, Margaret S. "New Concepts in Leadership." Educational Technology. 16 (1976), 57-58.

Dwyer, Margaret S. "Getting Started: Readiness for Change." Educational Technology. 16 (1976), 52-56.

Eicholz, Gerhard and Rogers, Everett M. "Resistance to the adoption of audio-visual aids by elementary school teachers: contrasts and similarities to agricultural innovation." Innovation in Education, 299-316.

Feldman, Richard H., Horton, Donald, and Niemeyer, John H. Report to Edna McConnell Clark Foundation on the School Intervention Study. New York: Bank Street College of Education, n.d.

Fox, Robert S., and Lippitt, Ronald. "The innovation of classroom mental health practices." Innovation in Education, 271-298.

Glaser, Edward M. "Consultation in Institutions for Child Development." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 13 (1977), 41-52.

Gluckstern, Norma B., and Packard, Ralph W. "The Internal-External Change-Agent Team: Bringing Change to a 'Closed Institution'." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 13 (1977), 41-52.

Gotkin, Lassar G., and Goldstein, Leo S. "Programmed instruction in the schools: innovation and innovator." Innovation in Education, 231-248.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administrative theory and change in organizations." Innovations in Education, 425-436.

Havelock, Ronald G. and Mary C. Training for Change Agents. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973.

Hughes, L.W., and Achilles, C.M. "The Supervisor as a Change Agent." Educational Leadership. (May, 1971), 840-847.

James, Charity. Beyond Customs, an educator's journey. New York: Agathon Press, 1974.

Klopf, Gordon J. The principal and staff development in the elementary school. New York: Bank Street College of Education, n.d.

Mackenzie, Gordon N. "Curricular change: participants, power, and processes." Innovation in Education. 399-424.

Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen?" For the Record. 77 (1976), 313-322.

Miles, Matthew B., ed. "Educational innovation: the nature of the problem." Innovation in Education. 1-48.

Miles, Matthew B., ed. "Innovation in education: some generalizations." Innovation in Education. 631-662.

Miller, Richard I., ed. A Multidisciplinary Focus on Educational Change. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1965.

Miller, Richard I., ed. Perspectives on Educational Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Morin, Andre. "An Innovator's Odyssey: How to become a thoughtful change agent." Educational Technology. 15 (November 1975), 42-45.

Mort, Paul R. "Studies in educational innovation from the Institute of Administrative Research: an overview." Innovation in Education. 317-328.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Waynant, Louise F. "Teachers' Strengths: Basis for Successful In-Service Experiences." Educational Leadership. (May, 1971), 710-713.

Wickens, David. "An Overview of the Literature on Innovations and Change in Relationto Establishing Settings." Parent/Child Development Project, paper. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1976.