

CHAPTER VI

IN THE SCHOOLS BUT NOT OF THEM:

SEA K-12 SERVICES

Southeast Alternatives was not schools alone, but additionally a small host of project-wide enterprises which impinged on the schools. These were the SEA K-12 Services, co-ordinated and at least partially funded through the project director's office. Some of them operated as semi-autonomous components of the organization, much like the schools. As a group, they played three vital roles.

First, they all existed to be directly useful, and thus directly influential, in the internal workings of the alternatives themselves. They were to help each school do a better job of what it wanted to do. They were, precisely, services.

By being project-wide, moreover, neither emanating from nor directed toward any single school, they had a further function. They provided several sorts of professionals who had to be owned by all the alternatives in common. For that to be possible, their activities and agenda had to span the spectrum, from Contemporary through Free and from K through 12. Inherently, therefore, the K-12 services could be integrators in the project as a whole. They dealt with concerns about which people with single-school priorities and people with project-wide priorities would sometimes have to make common cause -- and on which people from different schools might have reason to work together.

Third, the director and central services cluster of SEA were not simply a passive resource, waiting to be called on by the schools. They were instigators and promoters of what they had to offer in their own right. With built-in interest in making their own organizational specialties characteristic of the whole, they became program centers themselves, as well as integrators of other centers. As such they generated ideas, information, and influence of their own, contributing importantly to the stepped-up activity level throughout Southeast. The K-12 services, in short, were part of the critical start-up mass for self-sustaining comprehensive change.

Public Information

Because it rested on people making choices, Southeast Alternatives required from the start that its own public know what their options were. Because it was a federal project, with large investments of interest and self-interest from Washington, it required that people from far afield know of it and think well of it. Because it was a seed-bed for system-wide change, it was required that all Minneapolis became knowledgeable about what the change involved. There were thus three broad publics to be served with information, all in a competent public relations way: the public internal to Southeast itself; the overlapping public of the Minneapolis system; and the indefinite public external to both.

Internal information had an easily stated prime purpose, "to help parents make wise choices" -- and to make them happy. Tending to that purpose began very early, with the hiring of parents for community liaison. In year two, public information activities were greatly expanded under the leadership of Sally French, the newly appointed public information specialist, who was herself a Southeast parent and resident.

In visibility and volume the main means of broadcasting what people needed to know in Southeast was an SEA newspaper. From the fall of Year-1 it went bi-monthly, by mail, to all school families, and of course to all the staff. In 8-12 pages it combined the practical and the promotional. There were full bus schedules, details of transfer procedures, and general program descriptions of the different schools. In each issue French was careful to include feature material from each school, and often from SEA's non-school components. The stories and photos on particular programs or people were balanced by equal space for general matters that touched everyone -- the results of evaluation surveys among parents, for instance, and the question of merging SEA with a larger administrative area. By regularly sending every home both school-based and project-wide articles together, the newspaper medium itself was an up-beat message of SEA unity in SEA variety.

In addition to the paper were numerous other ways of spreading information. Like the paper, most were developed first with a Southeast audience in mind, but also served much more widely for orienting visitors, sharing with the press, sending along to education conferences, and mailing to distant inquirers. An SEA slide-tape show provided visual introduction to the alternatives, as well as verbal. Each elementary school and the Free School produced its own professionally coached brochure. For Years-2 and -4 there were comprehensive text-and-photo booklets displaying SEA as a whole. There was a cheerful anthology of children's writing and artwork. For Year-5 there was a 120-page collection of essays by SEA participants, from teachers to the superintendent. It was a sort of Festschrift, from SEA to SEA.

All these items (some 70,000 pieces in all) went routinely to school

board members, all Minneapolis school buildings, and sometimes to all the teachers in the system. Besides that, if a PTA or group of teachers anywhere in the Twin Cities area wanted to know more, the public information director would find someone to tell them. With heavy reliance on parents from each building, there developed, in effect, an SEA speakers bureau.

The most direct and obvious way for people to see alternatives in action was just that -- to visit the schools. By the end of Year-5 fully 7,000 people had done that, by formal arrangement. Scheduling and co-ordinating the Wednesday visitor program quickly became a major facet of public information. It, too, required a person in each building to handle hospitality and logistics.

Visitor days were popular and manageable, but in terms of system-wide impact they were haphazard. There were lots of people from out of town, but not enough who could practically ask about offering alternatives in Minneapolis itself. Often, moreover, the quick walk-through tours left visitors without sufficient chance to reflect on why such unaccustomed activities as they saw were actually considered desirable. It was easy to be attracted or repelled by the trees, but miss the forest. Even though the schools were willing to be looked at, not enough was being seen -- especially by the most critically important audience, Minneapolis school people.

For the fall of Year-4, therefore, Jim Kent and Sally French designed a more strategic approach. On a large scale, people in the local system should have opportunity for concentrated, systematic exposure to the Southeast experiment. Temporarily, the usual outsider visits were suspended. Instead, for a week at a time, SEA was host to just one of

Minneapolis' three large administrative sub-areas. From each, about 100 people who were likely to be involved in developing alternatives in their area, came to spend four full days observing and questioning SEA. They were teachers (with substitutes provided), parents, and administrators. In addition to half a day in each alternative school, with time to talk with their own counterparts and students, they had substantial meetings with Teacher Center staff, the internal evaluation team, project-wide lay leadership, and the SEA director. As nearly as possible, it was a total-immersion experience.

Together with their packets of prepared material, these system-wide visitors took home their own assessments and a realistic feel for what is entailed by making alternatives the pattern for public education. That was the point of the whole massive effort -- that the "relatively secluded" experiment should be considered throughout the system for its bearing on K-12 teaching and learning in all the system's parts.

Staff Development and the Teacher Center

Staff development in SEA began with simple recognition that an alternatives program has special training needs, and with the naming of Fredrick Hayen as staff development director, to pay attention to them. From that beginning it mushroomed into a complex organization pursuing its own purposes not only within SEA, but alongside it and far beyond. The rather breath-taking growth stages are fairly easily listed. Keeping them within the perspective of this report will be more difficult.

First, for a year, there was only ad hoc organization: the schools did what seemed important or feasible; Fred Hayen worked with principals and teachers who wanted help identifying their needs.

Second, at the start of Year-2, an SEA Teacher Center emerged. It had a teacher-controlled board, to allocate staff development funds and use the director as its staff.

Third, staff development replaced governance and operation of Southeast schools as the ground where school system and College of Education interests most naturally met. At the end of Year-2, Minneapolis Public Schools and the University of Minnesota contractually created and funded the MPS/UM Teacher Center, with a new and more potent board. This new board hired SEA's director of staff development for its own.

Fourth, the original teacher-controlled SEA board became the SEA in-service committee of the larger MPS/UM entity. They acquired their own in-service coordinator as staff, and continued in charge of all federal funds for SEA staff development.

Fifth, from Year -3 on, the MPS/UM Teacher Center developed remarkable expansionist momentum. It became the umbrella organization for a diverse array of pre-service, in-service, and community training activities. In behalf of the alternatives idea, Hayen and a now numerous staff sought system-wide for ways to export the skills and experience being gained in Southeast. By Year -5 MPS/UM was proposing to manage a nation-wide dissemination network among big-city school districts.

So much for bare outline. In an open-ended project devoted to comprehensive change one should not be surprised if there are some surprises. Here we have a service unit of the alternatives program which by the end of the trial period is in many ways more extensive than the experiment itself. There will be (and are) very varied opinions of the program strategies and organizational entrepreneurship which make up this story. Some

will understand an imaginative and far seeing effort to insure SEA's long-range change impact on both the school system and the professional preparation of future teachers. Others will judge that SEA conceded too much too soon to the self-interest of an entrenched professoriate, at the expense of careful staff development in SEA proper. Some will see Hayen's organizational style as catalytic and creative, relaxing bureacratic constraints and enabling people to combine their energies in new ways. Others will dismiss it as sophisticated empire-building, a bubble bound to burst.

To give texture to the story, the bare outline deserves some additional detail. Most important for our purposes are the beginning and the middle.

There was no hint of a Teacher Center in the SEA proposal. Nor was there any defined staff development strategy for the project as a whole. There was a double-cadre (elementary and secondary) of specialist resource teachers. There was allowance for released time from classrooms during the school year. There was the title of staff development director. When Fred Hayen took up that post, after the first summer activities, he brought no package of staff development techniques or content ready for delivery in alternative schools. He did not believe there was such a package. He had not yet thought of a Teacher Center, either.

What led him to think of it was the nature of staff development needs and wants during Year-1. They might clearly cluster around new curriculum materials, as in the Continuous Progress and Contemporary Schools. Or they might grow from a plunge into organizational and governance changes, as at the Open School. Or they might be a function of constant tension between individual and institutional claims, as in Free School. Or they

might be scattered through the generally skeptical context of Marshall-University. Whatever the specifics, Hayen believed from the start that they must be identified from within each organization before any outside help could be useful. He therefore chiefly worked by inviting people to talk about their own perceived problems, and about what they thought might help to solve them. It was an informal, voluntary, short-range approach.

If people were willing to meet -- as the three elementary principals were -- Hayen met with them. If they could clarify a question or problem-solving idea -- finding a particular kind of consultant, for example, or attending a particular conference -- he provided money or people to follow it up. If they wanted to wait-and-see about SEA in general, or keep to themselves -- as at Marshall-U and the Free School -- that was all right too. The stance was to reaffirm constantly that what SEA staff were doing was important, and that they were probably more expert about its difficulties than anyone else.

Quickly, the director of staff development found himself in a broker's role. He had the budget, and sometimes the concrete suggestions on how to use it. He was coordinating the elementary resource teacher cadre and talking frequently with the community liaison parents. He was informally in touch with people at the University or elsewhere who might be useful on this or that occasion. Pratt-Motley staff, for instance, spent one weekend with the leadership trainer from a Lutheran seminary. Putting people in touch with what they themselves wanted right away was more important than over-arching design or a syllabus of workshops.

The most particularly productive brokerage, however, seemed to be

among SEA people themselves. Many elementary teachers wanted to visit each other's alternative schools. Staff development money made that possible, and allowed also for the teachers released on a given day to have lunch together as a group with Hayen. From these connections came further exchanges of techniques and skills -- as when one Contemporary teacher spent a day in a Marcy classroom showing the Open teacher who invited her how to teach math with an abacus. All the staff development director did was approve the idea and pay for the substitute. It struck him strongly that, "If this is really the process, then this is where the decisions should be made: by the teachers."

A means for institutionalizing and expanding this example of the abacus seemed ready at hand. Professional and popular journals were reporting on British experience with local resource centers initiated and controlled by teachers as places where they could exchange and develop new tricks of their trade. What happened through such a center was up to the teachers -- not to education professors, administrators, or text-book publishers. Helping them make it happen -- not telling them what it should be -- was the teachers' own hired hand, a warden of the center. Hayen and Kent talked it over. They both warmed to the notion of adapting the British idea to the SEA setting. At mid-winter Hayen distributed a brief concept paper. Others like the idea, too. It was consistent with the stated commitment to decentralized governance. It was a way for people from all the alternatives to work strategically together. Within the framework of teacher control there was room for representation of administrators, parents, and even students. Why not try it?

To the surprise of SEA, Washington raised objections. At first there was merely a delay of final approval, pending clarification of the plan.

Then, two weeks before schools re-opened, the plan was rejected. This time the grounds were directly substantive, and expressed with interventionist vigor by Experimental Schools' new project officer for Minneapolis, Cynthia Parsons. There was not sufficient guarantee, she felt, "that teachers would really have control over budget." Even if that were taken care of, there was little promise that a "center as such" would be created. British example, "along Leicestershire lines," called for a welcoming walk-in place where teachers gather to swap ideas, develop their own materials, and strengthen their differing styles. The SEA model seemed more like a board room for voting on budgets. Why?

For the theoretical question, Hayen had a theoretical answer. It was essentially that the sociology of American education systems did not allow for simply imitating British precedent. In an environment of administrative lines and controls, the first necessity for change was "an organization which can live within a rigid system, and through its own structure protect the freedom of its constituency." That was the Teacher Center board, in charge of dollar resources and reassuringly visible on an organization chart. The Teacher Center center would follow, but in Minneapolis context it could not precede. In reality, after all, decentralized staff development was beginning with administrators' ideas and administrators' budgets. SEA was not Leicestershire.

Cynthia Parsons remained unconvinced, but besides the theory of the matter, she had to deal with the politics. Meeting some of her objections and getting Teacher Center approved became an important teething exercise for SEA's fledgling community governance group, the Southeast Council. For this new body of parents, teachers, and community figures it was the

first big issue. As school started in Year-2 they worked with Hayen to enlist more teacher involvement and teacher support in his plan. They played a critical role in re-writing and legitimizing. At the end of September the Council, not just administrators, met with the project officer. They persuaded her to reconsider.

In early October 1972, finally, the staff development budget was given to an SEA Teacher Center board. Its majority was seven faculty from the five schools, with one principal, three parents, and two secondary students. From then on, this board was to make the decisions about staff development priorities, programs, and funding. Fred Hayen would see that those decisions were carried out. The director would be the directed.

The directed director, however, had much to fill his days besides direct staff work for the new board. Already by the end of December, he reported, "the time required ... to follow up on staff development programs is not available." His time was going instead to "planning and making contacts required for future roles of the Center."

What that reflects is that simultaneous with the birth of the board other people were beginning a serious search for some new linkage between Minneapolis Public Schools and the University of Minnesota. The idea of continuing Marshall-U's joint policy board in K-12 governance and operation of the schools had been decisively defunct for months. Southeast Council was doing fine without University participation. In the persons of several administrators and faculty, however, both institutions still wanted a contractual arrangement for working together in Southeast. The arena of common interest was pre-service and in-service teacher training. A means for mutuality might well be -- the Teacher Center.

Thus through the fall and winter of Year-2 a high level "significant group" exchanged, discussed, and modified concept papers. Among them were associate deans, associate superintendents, and directors, but not the Teacher Center board. In spring Jim Kent and a College of Education associate dean drafted a new contract. It called for an MPS/UM Teacher Center, encompassing SEA's federal funds for staff development, more than doubling that amount by equal dollar allocations from school board and regents, adding University office space and staff time, and vastly enlarging the potential scope of work. The initial hard-won Teacher Center board became a subsidiary in-service committee. It would preside only over SEA funds for SEA use. For the new and more ambitious entity there was an eight-member new board, half appointed by the superintendent of schools and half by the College of Education dean. Community voice was limited to an assurance that Southeast Council would nominate school people, and that each institution would name "at least one community representative." Holding review and veto power even above the new board was a four-man administrative committee, two second-level deans or superintendents from school system and college.

Both school board and university regents approved the contract. In July 1973, the start of SEA Year-3, the MPS/UM Teacher Center came into existence. It moved on campus, into Peik Hall, as the 7th - 8th grades of Marshall-U High moved off. After a brief fuss about who would really be in charge, Hayen or Kent, Fred Hayen was chosen by the new board as director.

It is understandable, if regrettable, that all this groundwork "for future roles of the Center" robbed support from the present role, Year-2, of the Teacher Center board. They did gradually develop a process and some

priorities for receiving proposals and dispensing funds. By having its members from the schools negotiate for the schools, the board built project wide perspective while at the same time honoring each component's priorities. It could not move far, though, toward the goal of identifying common training strands and weaving them into cross-component training programs. Nor, in the midst of all else, was there much evidence of the "center as such" that Cynthia Parsons had tried to insist on.

With Hayen branching out as director for MPS/UM, the new in-service committee wanted staff of its own. The name for the position was in-service coordinator. The work was a kind of administrative assistant version of responsibilities which Hayen had held for SEA alone at the start of the project. To do it, in Year-3 and thereafter, the committee chose a teacher from the high school. She stayed on top of details that previously had tended to get lost. She provided fast response to small requests, and helped people define or budget their proposals for large ones. She prepared agendas for the committee, managed the paper flow, and kept to deadlines. Above all she kept in touch with teachers and schools, and coordinated the committee's annual project-wide needs assessment. By that process, each spring, 80 - 85% of the in-service budget could be committed in advance to known priority programs of the alternatives. The rest remained available for short-term response, and for strategic initiatives by the committee itself.

Though it intermittently talked of wanting to, the in-service committee could actually do little by way of either strategy or initiation. Institutionally, each school made its own large plans for extra meeting time, curriculum consultants, volunteers training, and the like. Individually, teachers and others submitted hundreds of requests for trips to conferences,

registrations in workshops, and time to write curriculum. With so many little things to do, the committee found no time for conceptualizing objectives of its own. They had logs and lists of what was happening, but no corporate criteria for assessing its effectiveness. In any event, by a rule of Senatorial courtesy, they were not about to intervene in each other's school's decision making.

Essentially, then, the Teacher Center in-service committee developed as a fund-granting forum for balancing requests. Almost entirely, they approved or adjusted what others proposed, without advancing to advocacy on their own. SEA staff development strategy remained the sum of individual strategies, school by school and teacher by teacher. Except that most of the money passed pretty much en bloc to the schools, that was not so very different from Year-1. What was different was that while a director could help people clarify problems and brain-storm solutions, a coordinating committee could not.

That is not to say that Teacher Center staff and the director himself did not continue to influence staff development in Southeast. Cadre teachers, now including the former Free School theatre teacher, offered training experiences ranging from integrated math/communications methods, to industrial arts, to science on snowshoes, to creative movement. The in-service coordinator kept people informed of what was available, in SEA and out. A group of British primary teachers came through, on a University project, and spent a working day in Southeast classrooms. One community liaison parent put on a seminar for parents with teen-agers; another offered futures studies for principals. Fred Hayen pushed the idea of a reorganized school week for greater staff development time.

Such activities now occurred and were made possible, however, as the smaller part of a much larger enterprise. The new Teacher Center quickly reserved its MPS/UM program funds for proposals that brought school and University people together for city-wide service and impact. Easily combined with this was a concept of Teacher Center itself as ideal agent for systemic change. Experienced teachers and administrators could take internships and course-credits in Southeast, and then return to other Minneapolis settings as trained advocates of an alternatives pattern. Enhancing this strategy there could be satellite teacher centers based on clusters of schools not unlike SEA.

Thus the grand design emerged of a new service delivery system for educational training, oriented to alternatives. By sophisticated matrix-charted organization, artful combinations of hard and soft money, and personnel time-sharing with other units of school system or University, Hayen added pieces to the package in bewildering array. Community liaison parents, for example, were partially supported by Teacher Center as trainers of volunteers. District funds and staff for all aide training were transferred to the Center. A Teacher Corps grant supported one satellite center, and separate NIE funds another. Title III was tapped for two new staff (an Open School parent and a Free School teacher) to interest schools or districts from 18 Minnesota counties in exemplary programs from across the country.

It would be premature to predict where the grand design will ultimately lead. For a significant number of individuals -- not just teachers -- Teacher Center has plainly been a breeding ground for new ideas and new program action. There are signs, though, that it has not quite caught hold as intended. The Year-5 proposal, that Teacher Center should disseminate alternatives

know-how nation wide, was rejected by NIE. More ominous, it took last minute Southeast lobbying to save any MPS support for Teacher Center at all in Minneapolis' stringent budgeting for 1976-77. Hayen's complex and unusual organizational concept does not sell itself easily in a time of retrenchment. The conglomerate change-agent Center often seems remote from day-to-day school programs. "I want to see it survive," said one friendly top administrator while struggling with budget cuts; "I wish to hell I knew why."

Meanwhile, the College of Education apparently does know why. Its vested interest in training educators, after all, is more immediately apparent than the educators' interest in systemic change. While MPS funding for the Center has been cut in half, UM's stays steady. For its extra share, however, the University will insist an "outreach and regionalization of services of the Teacher Center beyond Minneapolis Public Schools". In short, the risk grows greater that Teacher Center will belong more to the professors than to the teachers.

Be that as it may, it is a rare principal, teacher, or active parent who does not answer "staff development" when asked what resource, more than any other, has fueled SEA's vitality. The extra money dispensed through the in-service committee bought extra people, extra time, and extra stimulus for all the alternatives to work to their limits on all the changes they were willing to try. The extra skills, specialties, and linkages made available under Teacher Center auspices, provided more of the same. SEA staff did "develop", from not knowing quite where to begin in Year-1, to not even imagining an end after Year-5. It is a safe bet that without exuberant attention to making that happen, it would not have.

Student Support Services --

Deliberate Psychological Education

By comparison with other activities in SEA, these two were very quiet. They generated no great controversy, had uneventful organizational histories, and were content with limited institutional impact. Their effective work, moreover, was with individuals or small groups, almost always in the context of some other program. One was concerned to facilitate, integrate, and improve a range of traditional services. The other set out to produce some quite non-traditional curriculum. Starting in charge of the first, then developing the second, was Kenneth Rustad.

There was early hope that within the relative autonomy of SEA counseling, social work, nursing, and psychological services could be closely interwoven on a K-12 and project-wide basis. The aims were very general. Overlapping concerns and skills of the separate disciplines should be acknowledged in ways that integrated, rather than fragmented, service to students or families. Instead of being isolated from each other, support programs in the separate schools should develop common perspectives on their work with the Southeast population. There should be special coordinated attention to the process of students moving from alternative elementary programs into junior high. Everywhere, student support professionals should be understood as developmental, preventive resources, not just called on for remedial trouble-shooting.

To Rustad also fell the administrative work connected with transfers and annual option choices within SEA, and with the large number of transfers into Southeast from outside. The latter was particularly complicated because of racial-balance requirements on both the sending and receiving

school in each transfer.

As part of the overall enrichment of resources, each elementary alternative started with a full-time counselor. Later there was extra social-work time, too, and the supervised help of eight social-work interns. For schools coping with program and population changes together, and new parent involvement at the same time, these added people made an important difference. Free School, also, moved from not wanting the counselor and social-work labels, and rejecting the idea of outside psychological services, to insisting in Years-4 and 5 that all were vital.

Coordinating them K-12 and project-wide from the start, however, was simply not on anyone's urgent agenda. The first demand was to build strength and working relationships in each place. Integrating support service, teachers, aides, volunteers, and administration in one building was task enough. Collaboration across school lines could happen as occasion required, but not for its own sake. The general inter-school goals were quickly put aside, in favor of specific attention in each building to its own student support team.

Not until the end of Year-4 did the project-wide team idea emerge again -- and then largely as a strategem to gain extra Minneapolis funding, as the federal came to an end. A proposal was drawn that shared social work skills, especially, across the project. Social workers and counselors, plus two community liaison parents and a community education coordinator were to meet and parcel out common tasks as a K-12 team. Part of the rationale was to break new ground on behalf of similar K-12 clusters being developed in other parts of the city.

In its first year the team achieved mixed success, at best. Its achievements were chiefly administrative; a shared review of 6th graders

moving into the Marshall-U options; a consistent written policy on student transfers in SEA; and improved handling of the social workers' perennial headache, free and reduced-price lunch lists. Beyond this there was little. As before, the press of particular responsibilities in separate schools was stronger than the impetus to teamwork. Whether the team will be continued is uncertain. If at the expense of anything in a team-member's home building, said one principal clearly, it should not be.

For Ken Rustad, meanwhile, the chief attraction of working in SEA was a chance to work on two specific interests in combination: changing the role of the counselor, and developing personal-growth curriculum for high school students. With only light demand for coordination of services, and a social work supervisor to help him, he could give these interests full-time attention. The result was the project known as deliberate psychological education.

Without that name, the early Southeast beginnings of DPE were in the guide groups at Marshall-University. As already related, they did not go far in practice. To Rustad's thinking, they did not go nearly far enough in theory, either. Before Year-1 was out he had made contact with Norman Sprinthall, who had begun some highly praised high school work in Massachusetts, and was about to leave Harvard to become professor of counseling at the University of Minnesota. Sprinthall was glad to work with Rustad on curriculum, using SEA as a laboratory and training site for their common goals. Jim Kent, knowing something of Sprinthall from his own Massachusetts days, allocated initial funding for Year-2. For Year-3 and beyond, after convincing Experimental Schools that it was not just "Esalen for staff," DPE became part of the 1973-76 contract with NIE.

What is the deliberate psychological education project? Alone in SEA,

it is a research and experiment based effort to produce discrete affective curriculum materials at secondary level. The academic connection is important in two respects. First, it has reinforced a strong theoretical framework which guides the curriculum try-outs. Second, it has kept the emphasis on achieving a product for later use, rather than on a process of present change. In SEA context both these are unusual qualities. They account for much of the difficulty people have felt in trying to fit DPE with the overall alternatives pattern.

DPE is also unusual in having clearly limited goals. It does not aim to reshape or reorganize any whole system -- except possibly, by indirection, how counselors are trained and spend their time. It does not promise a radically different affective environment. It simply says that specific elective courses, for regular curriculum credit, can help meet the general failure of high schools to promote positive personal growth. Not as a by-product, but as what is deliberately taught, students can learn more complex and integrated self-understanding, stronger personal identity and autonomy, improved ability to communicate with others, and more complex ethical reasoning. Such courses are not offered as therapy, either. They should be as effectively taught by subject-matter specialists in their regular departments, as by counselors.

Basic to the DPE model are certain well known current theories of developmental psychology: Piaget on cognitive development; Kohlberg on moral; and Loevinger on ego stages. Teenagers' personal growth can be nurtured when they take perspectives different from their own on a continuum of stages. They learn to "experience the world differently." An effective way of "taking the perspective of others" is to practice the

skills of others. Thus involvement and reflection on "significant adult experience" becomes central to the teaching/learning strategy.

Beginning in Year-2 Rustad and colleagues began trying out their theory and strategy in new course-offerings at Marshall-U. Besides Sprinthall and University associates, the colleagues included high school teachers and counselors. They participated in a training seminar, helped design the new materials, and co-taught with Sprinthall or Rustad. Their first offerings were psychology of counseling, and moral dilemmas. The former emphasizes empathic listening and response, and students' teaching of these skills to each other. The latter works with discussion of value conflicts in both personal relationships and public policy. Both courses were social studies electives, and it was social studies teachers who first worked on the techniques of "learning psychology by doing psychology." Both courses attracted good enrollments, mostly from among academically above-average students.

In the following two years these courses were revised, and a total of six others satisfactorily developed. Among them are titles such as women's growth (English teacher), child development, and two-person relationships (both in home economics). By enlisting the counselors and some teachers at Marcy and Pratt-Motley, DPE made teaching of elementary children part of the "significant adult experience" for its students. It also began a class at another high school. By Year-5 nine teachers, 11 counselors, and a social worker had taught or co-taught at least one DPE course. During Year-5, on the basis of accumulated experience and evaluations, the DPE team prepared six curriculum guides, plus two companion monographs on theory, design, and evaluation. In their judgment, the product is tested and ready to use.

In SEA and Minneapolis, however, that use is very slight. The trained teachers are doubtless using DPE skills in other classes, but not the DPE curriculum itself. Counselors in general "are not running to pick it up," probably because it is too sharp a break with their accustomed remedial and one-to-one roles. A practical difficulty almost anywhere is the need for two-or three-hour blocks of relaxed time for the courses to be effective. A particular problem at Marshall-U is that most of the open and interested teachers had low seniority, and were lost to the school as enrollment declined.

It looks unlikely that DPE curriculum can come off the shelf without unusually strong administrator commitment, together with teachers specifically wanting to "experience the world differently" themselves.

Business Advisor Services

Business and financial services in SEA might have been just balancing the books and filing the requisitions. In fact, the thrust was to make them much more than that. The business advisor from Year-2, Rodney French, preferred never to think of budgets apart from governance. Governance is decision-making about the use of resources. Financial reports are information about the use of resources. Decision makers require information. Only people with information can make decisions, or effectively influence them. If governance is to be put in many hands--decentralized -- then so must financial reports be.

French did require books to be balanced and requisitions filed. He also ran interference with purchasing and payroll, dealt with contract monitors in Washington, and juggled route schedules for 16 SEA buses. For three years, however, the heart of his work was to teach people to think

process.

Of particular interest here, however, are the ways in which after-school and school-day programs have impinged on each other in SEA context. There are several. In one form or another all raise the question whether overlap and integration are desirable, and if desirable, whether they are feasible. Taken together, they make a mixed story.

One such question has been mentioned earlier: whether or not high school students can receive credit for Community Education courses. In Year-2 the Marshall-U faculty approved a specified list of evening school classes for elective credit each quarter. This practice continued thereafter, but on a diminishing scale. At the end of Year-4 and beginning of Year-5 the basic question was being raised again, almost as a new issue. With it, administrators were discussing the parallel question, whether adults might enroll in some daytime courses. Both the Community Education coordinator and the principal affirm advantage and opportunity for students in crossing the traditional age boundaries. But they also cite "obstacles", and the matter remains at a discussion stage.

Simpler and more familiar is the question of facilities. Afternoon and evening activities use the same space as "regular" school during the day. Usually they need the same furniture, and often the same equipment and materials. Opportunities for friction are obvious. In Southeast they were perhaps more numerous than usual because of the differing physical arrangements and in-the-building lifestyles of the alternative elementary programs. It was essential that community education people who wanted entree into the elementary buildings understand and value those differences, just as elementary people must understand the values of

Community Education. Because administrators and other staff regularly met together, with parent involvement on both sides, there was enough personal familiarity and trust to encourage the expansion which occurred. Even at Free School, with the highest internal stress levels and the least neighborhood identity, sharing facilities was quite easily accomplished.

In addition to administrative support, the major drive for knitting community and school-day education together came from the people known as CRC's. The initials stand for community resource co-ordinator. They label a significant and novel staff position whose history and uncertain future well illustrate the personal and organizational dynamics of SEA. The position evolved from a coalescing of the original neighborhood-based community liaisons with parent or volunteer co-ordinator positions which had arisen in the schools almost as soon as alternatives began. By the summer after Year-2 it seemed time for a general review and some specific planning about community participation and resources throughout Southeast. Jim Kent asked Becky Lattimore to convene a task force including her own community school co-ordinators, the schools' parent/volunteer coordinators, and his community liaisons. She did so.

From that meeting came the general description, community resource co-ordinator: a person in each building to develop volunteer contributions of all sorts, strengthen parent participation, and maintain school-community communication generally. There was more than the title, though. The task force proposed an ongoing K-12 community resource team, to be headed by a project-wide CRC of its own. In a regular, structured way the team would bring together three distinct but overlapping interests:

(1) the in-school CRC's, working daily with teachers, parent, and non-parent volunteers, parents as such, and often children; (2) the Community Education afternoon and evening program leaders, serving some of the same children or families, and knowledgeable about Southeast teachers and learners from a different perspective; (3) the new MPS/UM Teacher Center, through which the CRC's were funded, in whose space Community Education for SEA was now officed, and whose plans looked forward to training of volunteers and teachers to work together. As so often in SEA, an enriched ferment of new roles, new resources, and new rewards was producing its own pressures for change.

The summer task force proposal took effect. Community liaison positions, linking neighborhoods, schools, and the SEA office, were phased out. Community resource coordinators, linking school constituencies, volunteer skills, Community Education, and the Teacher Center, were phased in. Two of the original liaisons were now CRC's, and the third was involved with Teacher Center in other ways. Two parents shared the position at Marshall-U, working with volunteers only, not organizing parents. Free School hired one of its own Southeast aides, the only non-parent CRC. Job descriptions varied somewhat from school to school, but common concerns and esprit de corps were strong. By October the CRC's had their own coordinator, chosen by a committee from all the schools and Southeast Council. The team met bi-weekly. They pooled efforts in listing, recruiting, and screening community volunteer resources. They trained and offered training together. They wrote an SEA volunteer handbook. They became familiar with strengths and weaknesses in each other's schools, with what was happening in Community Education, and with the Teacher Center. They were an important mutual support group.

Three further facts must be noted about the CRC's. First, through Years-3 and -4 they grew steadily more important to program maintenance at the elementary schools and Free School. As federal funds for extra staff dwindled, organized and reliable volunteers became more vital. The CRC and her colleagues on the team were each school's link to a resource it must have -- the community. It was a position which no principal or advisory group was willing to phase out.

Second, by their very existence, their way of working, and the make-up of their team the CRC's helped blur the line between Community Education and the defined school day. It was not only that they were bringing the community into the schools as educators. They also encouraged programmatic connections between day and after-school activities (especially at Tuttle and Pratt), and were an essential communication link between Community Education and regular faculty (especially at Free School).

Third, despite all this, the CRC's were very vulnerable. Their funding, too, was federal, and quickly disappearing. In the structure of Minneapolis schools, they had neither professional standing nor even the security of para-professional aides. They were neither fish nor fowl. Despite what almost everyone agreed was their near indispensable function in an alternatives ecology, they were an endangered species.

Putting these facts together in the winter of Year-4, Jim Cramer (now Community Education co-ordinator for Southeast) and Jim Kent drafted a clearly argued position statement. Its basic concept was "to expand the substance of Community Education into the regular school day." If that could be accepted, then local Community Education funds could go to support a CRC's organizing of community volunteers, even though much of the

community program with children took place during school, rather than after. The CRC could have a dual report line to Community Education and to the building principal.

It was a careful effort, but it failed. The new concept could not be accepted by the central administration of Community Education. It flew in the face of long-standing arrangements and settled budget policy. Community Education must happen after the teachers went home -- in which case, moonlighting, a daytime CRC was certainly eligible to coordinate it. Whatever an earlier program might look like, it was not Community Education. The discussion came to an end, and "Our attempts to further the relationship," Cramer reported, "have been thwarted."

Back to square one. By other budget strategems (including the fractional use of teacher allotments), and by cutting back their time, CRC's were saved for Year-5. The title has also gained currency and legitimacy outside Southeast. For 1976-77 there is a tiny allocation of one salary to go toward 10 CRC positions in the administrative area of which SEA is now part. Whether that can somehow be parlayed into larger support for the work to be done, remains to be seen.

Internal Evaluation

Of all K-12 services begun outside the schools, internal evaluation developed the closest and most constant relationship with programs inside them. Emphasis and degree of intensity varied, but sooner or later every alternative -- in the elementary schools almost every classroom -- came directly in touch with evaluators. Internal evaluation was highly visible at project-wide levels also. Through regular surveys and a steady flow of written reports it asked the attention of

every home and every staff member.

Both these aspects of internal evaluation -- school based and project-wide -- carried out some of the rather vague promises in the original SEA proposal. How they would develop, however, only began to come clear toward the end of Year-1. Until then, most of the available energy was used up in a battle over boundary lines between evaluation Level I and evaluation Level II. Experimental Schools had said, it may be remembered, that they should cooperate.

They tried, but for reasons both methodological and personal it turned out they could not. Internal Level I was to collect and provide immediate useful information for people making decisions within the project. Its audience was Southeast or Minneapolis, and it was responsible to SEA's own management. External Level II was also to collect useful information, but for purposes of summing up later how and whether the project succeeded or failed. Its audience was Washington, and it was separately contracted by Experimental Schools. In the terms of the trade, one team was formative, the other summative.

When they came to work together on an overall evaluation design, they could not agree. In fall of Year-I Level II produced a bulky plan which Level I director Dale La Frenz invited community meetings to criticize, and recommended Washington reject. Washington did, but offered nothing helpful in the way of guidelines or directives for a second try. The most problematic bones of contention were how much influence SEA schools would have on the design of external evaluation instruments, especially testing; and how freely Level II could send people into the schools, especially participant observers. Over these and other issues relationships deteriorated steadily. Neither team

got much actual evaluation work done.

In April, finally, Experimental Schools asked SEA to submit its own internal evaluation plan for Year-2. Some 21 discrete tasks were defined and approved. About the same time Level II sent Washington its separate second design. With detailed critique from each component, SEA volunteered a highly qualified recommendation that it be accepted, too. That did not help at the relationships level, and neither did Level II's release to the press, two months later, of a summary Year-1 evaluation in adversary format. In fact, nothing helped, until agreement on a live-and-let-live truce in summer, and eventually some extensive changes of Level II personnel.

Meanwhile, a pattern for internal evaluation had begun to emerge. Schools were asking for very different kinds of services, feeling pressed by very different needs. At the same time, as basic measures of choice-making effectiveness, SEA and Minneapolis management needed to know what sorts of students were going where, and how well families were satisfied with the alternatives available. Together these requirements posed two different sets of tasks. There must be intra-school services specifically and flexibly tailored to the differing programs. There must also be project-wide analyses of student characteristics and movement, and of parent opinion. To get the work done in co-ordinated manner, it was not realistic to rely on a two-man staff plus occasional contracted services. There needed to be an enlarged evaluation team, some very closely identified with individual schools, others chiefly at work on wider tasks, but all responsible to a common concept of formative evaluation.

Such a team began to develop with the hiring of part-time evaluators for the Open and Free schools in winter of Year-1. When budget tripled

in Year-2, the team expanded more, allowing service not only to every school, but to summer projects and to components such as the Teacher Center as well. A crucial organizational decision was to make even "live-in" evaluators formally accountable to the Level I manager, rather than to a building principal. That helped insulate evaluation from political currents within the building, and provided important protection against their being used as utility infielders for ad hoc trouble-shooting. By keeping each evaluator familiar with all the evaluation output, also, the team structure increased the likelihood of useful data from outside a school being brought to people's attention within it.

The program-specific use of evaluators indeed varied widely from school to school, and changed over time. In the Contemporary and Continuous Progress schools evaluation service was linked closely to curriculum change in basic skills areas. Tuttle used evaluation budget for University help in systematizing an eclectic reading program. This led to the Tuttle pupil progress chart, and then to assistance from Level I staff in simplifying and summarizing the data which it recorded. In Year-4 Tuttle and Level I devised a brief affective survey to give staff a picture of how students felt about school and themselves.

At both Tuttle and Pratt-Motley -- and briefly at Marshall-U -- there was heavy investment in Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring (CAM) for math. Throughout the project the Continuous Progress teachers were assessing and re-evaluating their IMS math curriculum. Level I helped with special testing to measure students' retention of math skills, and with gathering parent feedback. Helping interpret CAM reports for parents at Tuttle was an ongoing project, which doubtless explains in

part that school's desire, at the end of Year-5, to continue CAM despite the expense.

La Frenz and others initially hoped that CAM would provide a way for criterion referenced measurement to become "the foundation of evaluation activity in Southeast schools." That was not to be, partly because few people felt kindly about CAM's ultra-detailed computerized criteria, partly because such criteria proved all but impossible to develop in such areas as social studies and physical education, and partly because CAM was unmanageable without extra funding for aides. Finding all that out was part of Level I's in-school work.

With Continuous Progress Level I evaluators moved in "softer" areas, too. Data from the Torrence creative thinking test gave staff one kind of information they wanted. Classroom observations of where and at whose instigation children used math, writing, and reading skills offered another. Interviews with both students and staff about the Pyramid reading materials were important to the ongoing revision of that curriculum.

Pratt-Motley and Tuttle never had full-time evaluation service. For almost two years, both Marcy and Free School did. In both places evaluators were clearly chosen as people indigenous to the culture of the school itself, and committed to its purposes. For Marcy it was one of the organizing parents; for Free School it was first a friend of the staff, and later a parent. Their work was strongly oriented to observing, describing, and clarifying with their in-school peers what was going on as the school developed. It rested heavily on the evaluators' abilities to suggest or find out the questions people wanted to answer, and then to come up quickly with data to help them do it.

At the Open School that entailed a great deal of close classroom observations related to particular concerns of individual teachers. On a broader scale it led to observing and interviewing children as a prime source of data for assessing Marcy's fidelity to its own goals. Students' perceptions of how they could spend their time, of who and what were available to help them learn, and of what the staff expected all became grist for the mill of program decision-making by Marcy council and staff.

Especially influential in the Open School was a theoretical stance advanced by the evaluator and endorsed by the Marcy council. It argued that the primary accountability of a school is for the learning environment, which it controls, rather than for what students learn, which it does not. Environmental decisions are about the use of time and space, the materials and activities to be made available, and the nature of adult-to-child interaction. Evaluation concentrates heavily on developing a fully-dimensioned portrayal of the school environment in this sense, and especially of how children are responding to it. School decision-makers can assess such information in light of the school's goals, and be held accountable for adjusting the environment, not the children.

Free School worked in more ad hoc ways. Its evaluators were frequently involved in procedural suggestions for responding to immediate problems. Designing questionnaires and interviews for a personnel committee was one instance. Tracing the movement and influence of highly disruptive students was another. When the school changed buildings there was much attention to traffic patterns and use of space by students and staff. Free School evaluators, as at Marcy, labored long to help with record-keeping and reporting procedures. They had much less

success than at Marcy in winning the time of staff or governing board for reflecting on data in relation to policy. Still, there was much data. At the close of each year it was summarized and made available, with recommendations, in an internal evaluation year-end report.

The chief internal evaluation service at Marshall-University was to new projects such as AWARE and the guide-groups, early, and then to the middle school and senior-high open alternatives, late. Near the end of Year-5 a great deal of data was reported from a student opinion survey, and from analysis of the choice-making process among both students and parents. These are quite detailed studies. The problem in the high school, as anywhere else, will be finding a forum which was time to use them.

Close to half the Level I budget has gone to gathering and disseminating project-wide information. Two major and repeated types of analysis were parent opinion surveys and studies of student mobility. Parent surveys were annual and asked for response from every family. They basically had to do with how satisfied families were with various aspects of their children's schools and of the project as a whole. In addition there was room each year for each school to find out parent sentiment on current school issues or questions which would have to be decided in the future. With results summarized in the SEA newspaper, parent surveys were probably the most widely and carefully looked at of any SEA evaluation data. They could be formative in their influence on staff and advisory group decision-making. As a whole, they are also summative. They answer the question whether people approved the project.

Mobility studies, at the end of the project, can also be considered summative. They show a stable percentage of Southeast elementary children choosing some other alternative than their nearest school, and

a dramatically increasing percentage of elementary transfers into Southeast. By showing how some student and family characteristics vary significantly from school to school, while others do not, these studies provided a basis for searching questions about the alternatives. Sometimes such questions did get asked. But sometimes they got shunted aside, too: on two occasions the SEA Management Team blocked publication or further pursuit of data analyses tending to show socio-economic stratification among the elementary alternatives.

A few level I project-wide efforts have been responsive to requests for formative information by administrators or non-school groups. The Teacher Center, for example, asked for logging and analysis of staff work patterns, and of how the Center was perceived in the schools. Three staff surveys have provided some measure of teachers' and aides' satisfactions, or otherwise, with working in SEA. The Year-5 student support services team used observations on its functioning gathered by a Level I evaluator.

One question which SEA addressed in various ways through internal evaluation, but did not solve, was how to measure and report on student achievement. In every school there were attempts to design an apparatus for performance-based records. In Year-3 Level I reported that SEA elementary principals considered standardized test scores of little or negative value in making decisions about general program or individual students. Each school considered its own record-keeping system far more useful. There was fairly widespread hope, both inside the project and out, that something might emerge from SEA to replace and overthrow the city-wide norm-referenced measures.

But in fact nothing did. The reason is that each school's

system was peculiar to the school itself, at some particular and im-
permanent stage of its development. Marcy's language arts and math grids,
for example, were radically changed at least twice, and in Year-5 had been
largely supplanted by teachers' private records. That may well be the
most authentic and practical way of obtaining records that help teachers
teach and children learn. But it could not satisfy the demands of out-
siders for quantified achievement results, comparable from school to
school and year to year.

The formative evaluation which SEA staff and parents will probably
miss most is the close-to-home information which helped them see what
they were doing as they moved into major program change. In some pro-
grams the internal evaluator position was itself an influential sup-
portive innovation. Everywhere it served a very different function
from the research and evaluation studies which most districts conduct.
Both intra-school and project-wide, Level I aimed to strengthen cur-
rent decision-making by providing a reliable base of shared information.
A particular emphasis of the Level I manager since Year-3, Thel Kocher,
has been to document such information in disseminable form, even after
the fact of its local use. There is therefore a formidable library
of internal evaluation reports for any who now want to research a mode
of evaluation which is itself very different from the usual research.