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INTRODUCTION

It is a well-accepted principle among modern existentialists that, if one needs to call himself an existentialist, he isn't one. The existential life style is such that it is easily identifiable without fanfare and without advance notice. To see life with the wisdom of Descartes's classic, "Cogito, ergo sum," (I think, therefore I am) gives rise to the arrogant, yet, bewildering notion that all of life comes together inside man.

This is not to doubt the existence of other life nor to underplay its importance. Martin Buber put it like this, "I must assume my own existence as a fact before I may reflect upon the existence of other occupants of the world. This does not mean that nothing exists except man. But all else lives in his light."¹ An interpretation of this belief and a translation of it into the life of a person directs him to see his life with all its uniquenesses and then to formulate the phenomenon of his own selfhood.

For one who chooses to live his life with the root in the recognition of his uniqueness and the loneliness of individuality, the world which surrounds him appears both awesome and precarious, especially this world. The life quest of contemporary man searching for his own

identity outside himself seems unnecessary and out of keeping with evidence he has available to him.

If it is true that each man is searching for his freedom, as the ethic of Western man surely indicates, then it seems paradoxical, indeed, that he should strive so hard and for so long to discover his category and his classification. For all during the quest to discover freedom, man is free and elects to disregard his true one-and-only-oneness for an attempt to "fit" a community. The results of man's reaching out to discover his place frequently leads him to realize his utter non-value in terms of his world. It is only when he turns inward that he can sense his own significance and the reason for him to continue to live.

From another perspective this paradox could be reasoned this way. There is little use for most men when they are measured on an absolute, empirical base that would reflect their contributions in a broad totality of time and space. Subjectively, however, a man has confusion and difficulty imagining the world (or his world) without him. For example, to consider one's death against the backdrop of a whole state is much less traumatic than to consider that event for his immediate family. This logic probably lead Emerson to urge man to "stay home, hoe your own garden and be a hero in your own country."

To become a professional, that is to learn, explore, test-out, and report in the name of having something to contribute that is of

---

value to at least a portion of a community within a society, requires a break with the existential posture in its strictest sense. The existential notion would easily entertain the learning, the exploration, and the testing; but those behaviors would have to be seen as having prime value for the person who undertakes them and not for eventual contributory purposes.

It is in the face of that dilemma this dissertation is undertaken. The Urban Teacher Education Project provided me the opportunity to learn, explore, and test myself. Much of what was discovered was necessarily translated to very personal "feed-back" and history. Existentially, the experience was a life encounter that gave life and took it away; it gave freedom and enslaved; it illuminated hope and obscured hope, too. But to attribute all of that to "the experience" is to deny man his rightful place.

The Project was people, people operating on their own uniqueness, looking through windows constructed out of separate, individual experiences to obtain private as well as public ends. The intent of this report cannot be laid in any terms other than those directly related to the writer of the report. It is clearly a view from one perspective and its generalizability is limited by that perspective.

The nature of the Project was such that it engaged the whole man. It would have been impossible to function and interact in the Project and not challenge one's total humanness beyond his professional self. The inner city environment, in which the Project was set and for which it was to prepare teachers, sucks the vitality from people; even those who are only passing through! It is where men are destroyed,
not created and where life is questioned, not sanctioned. There is little wonder that when man lays claim to a segment of space in that degenerative environment, he begins to behave in ways that are not consistent with his intentions for himself.

The complex environmental setting, added to the uncertainties of the experimental design, created an insecure base from which the Project was to operate. Few elements could be held constant enough to place confidence in them. Usually reliable indicators did not hold up when predictions were based on them. Teachers who were known for their competence were unable to come across and gave sub-standard performances.

What caused these discrepancies between expectation and reality? It was partially the environment and partially the experimental model. But something else effected us, too; that something else was self. The struggle to make sense out of confusion, to absorb hostility and convert it into positivity, to find some truths that would be repeatable, and to maintain one's own dignity and personality was the personal challenges of the Project. Could a person go into an interpersonal, intercultural maze and return so that he could recognize himself philosophically? That was the question of the individual in the Project.

This dissertation set out to explore the reasons for the inconsistencies and sometimes violent changes in the original Project plans. The description of these changes is not to be taken as a compilation of opinions, but only as the perspective of one staff member. In other words it is as much reaction as reflection.
A road map

The substance of this report is contained in three sections. Each has a completeness of its own. This is because each reflects a set of attitudes, ideas, or beliefs that existed at a specific time in relation to the Project. Chapter One is a backdrop for Chapter Two. It sets down a personal orientation from which the activities in the Project were undertaken. In a sense it could be referred to as the planning or preliminary stage.

Chapter Two is to be taken as a case study of the Project, not in the traditional case study form, but a personal account of some of the Project events and the reactions to those occurrences. There are a number of assertions contained in Chapter Two which are distillations from direct experience in the Project. These differ from the assumptions of Chapter One as the Chapter One assumptions are, for the most part, beliefs which were held prior to the experience.

Chapter Three is a drawing-together of some of the reflections and perceptions held regarding some of the issues contained within the Project. It would be impossible and not too useful to attempt to describe the attitudinal shift that did occur from the planning phase to the evaluation phase of the Project. The reader can probably detect some of the differences, but some are even too subtle for the writer to describe accurately.

The Appendix contains a formal mission statement of the Project, along with some other information that might amplify the message of the text. Here, perhaps, the reader will get a view of the writer as
a person outside of the academic world. A sample of a variety of media (both traditional and electronic) is included. All of these inclusions are for the purpose of research, but for the writer the Project was a metamorphic experience of great proportion which has not yet climaxed. Events that occurred in relation to, within, or because of the Project have seriously affected the life-style of the writer. Close friends were alienated, one was killed and several felt badly used and put upon, perhaps not because of the Project directly, but clearly because of the existence of it.

Composing this document was in response to a requirement that had to be met so that further growth could occur and new roles could be assumed; there can be no doubt about that. But far beyond that, the writing had to be done so that emotions which were gathered during the last year-and-a-half could be ventilated and redirected. It is written the only way it could be honestly written, as a "birthing place," secure for the personal generation of a fresh new beginning for the enterprise of educating self and others.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS ON
THE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT

The following four pages are reproductions of the original document that Dean Luvern Cunningham prepared as a direction for the Urban Teacher Education Project. The Project was funded by the Ohio Board of Regents, the Cleveland Public Schools and The Ohio State University. It was a co-institutional Project developed originally to improve teacher education for students wishing to teach in the inner city environment of large city school systems.

Much of the "on paper" planning was done in the autumn of 1967, and the actual working plans were developed in the winter and spring of 1968. The main project operation occurred during the 1968-69 school year and took quite a different form than had been originally intended. An abstract of the mission statement that was written after the pilot program is included in the appendix of this document.

One of the satisfactions of working in a developmental project must be seeing dreams some men have transformed into action. Many people worked very hard to bring two educational institutions together and to just do the maintenance work necessary to make the attempt. The potential existed, within this Project, for everyone associated with it to come out a better man. The question that confronted each
of us was how we would uniquely use the space. I do not believe I ever want that much space again.

"Concept of Clinical Teams for Teacher Education
Prepared by
Dean Luvern Cunningham
January, 1968

1. Produce professionally capable persons
2. Link the university more powerfully with the field
3. Break down the theory - research - practice barriers
4. Bring the child, teacher-to-be, graduate students, master teachers (field and campus) and professors into new proximities and sustained relationships
5. Build a new milieu within which professional education can go forward (human and physical)
6. Perfect an environment which permits specializations to integrate their strengths productively around problems and ideas
7. Blend a complex set of new inputs into the professionalization process
8. Refine a content-experience continuum from neo-teacher to accomplished practitioner
9. Build the professional phase on the assumption that substantive (subject matters) and educational foundations proficiencies have been substantially achieved
10. Establish clear criteria for entrance into the professional phase
Capabilities of the professional team

1. Perfect teaching skills
2. Establish a set of professional values
3. Construct a complex set of institutional understandings
4. Build the "experience" parameters of professional study
5. Possess strong performance appraisal capacity
6. Incorporate a continuing research input into professional work
7. Manage only a structured number of teachers in training

Composition of the professional team

1. Subject matter person
2. Adjunct field person
3. Learning specialist
4. Environmental specialist
5. Graduate student cadre
6. Appraisal specialist
7. Master teacher

Composition of the client groups to be served

1. Twenty-five pupils
2. Twenty-five professional phase I students
3. Twenty-five professional phase II students

Special features

1. Entry criteria carefully drawn
2. Block of time credit arrangements
3. New system of financing possible
Professional Education for Teaching

Professional Phase

Sub-Phase I

25

Sub-Phase II

25 certification

Pre-education

Curriculum

Subject Matter

Educational Foundations

General Education

Entry

Screening

1. Subject Matter
2. Foundations
3. General Education
4. Personal Characteristics
5. Committed Vs. Non-Committed
6. Teaching Skills

Essentially
Campus

Essentially
Field

Curriculum to be developed
by Professional - Clinical Teams

Exit Screening

Early Counseling
Freshmen at Ohio State

Under Professional-Clinical Teams
4. Additional advantages for graduate students

5. Clarifies what is "professional"

6. Growth in the production of teachers could be more carefully controlled—add professional teams each time numbers to be increased

7. Potential for holding more teachers in service

8. Establishes a new laboratory school concept

9. Provides a continuously open environment for professional preparation

10. Calls for end to traditional practice teaching designs

11. Links the university with the field

12. Has demand for continuing professional growth built in"

The Person and a Project

When I was invited to become a staff member of the Urban Teacher Education Project, I was teaching some loosely designed Education courses which emphasized the need for educational change and personalization of the field of teaching. I had been fortunate to have worked with very bright, able young people who shared a common faith in the rightness of education and a desire to try to confront some of the big issues of our times. I was stimulated to try myself to see if I could produce any of the visions I had had in reality.

Therefore, when asked, I accepted with hope and with great desire. What I heard the project planners say sounded like a challenge of trying to bridge a credibility gap not only between the university and the public school, but more exciting to me, between the public school and the public it served. I was well aware of both
gulfs. The first one I learned a lot about after I returned to the university; the second I had learned about as a public school administrator.

I knew, for example, as a school principal and an Assistant Superintendent, that much of what our beginning teachers were being taught was irrelevant to the task we were asking them to perform in the classroom. Public school people mistrusted university training probably for reasons of status as much as reasons of fact. Yet, the two were very interrelated and self-complexifying. We were always somewhat proud and a little embarrassed when we tried to show and tell the new teacher that she was not fully prepared to teach in our school system.

After several years at the university, I modified much of my position on the beginning teacher issue. Two things probably effected that modification. One is that after teaching teachers-to-be myself I recognized more clearly that a lot of the bifurcation was due to the impossibility of preparing a teacher for a multi-environment future. The second affect came from the fact that I changed sides. The comfort of being able to be theoretical without having to watch the theory crumble before my eyes was a relief, indeed.

Somehow knowing that the teachers-to-be that left my classes would be told by principals to ignore what I had told them haunted me, as it must have the college teachers who had gone before me. Thus, the opportunity to see if the College of Education staff could relate to a public school staff meaningfully was tempting. Beyond that, to have an opportunity to test out whether a relationship between two
educational institutions could have a positive result for people who were the "fall out" of the establishment nearly forced me to accept. And accept I did.

Going into the experience I had a set of prejudices which I had to deal with and that I forced other staff members to confront too. I wish I could report that the presentation of those beliefs, or disbeliefs, was an intellectual exercise, but it was not. For the most part, it was emotional. Here are the ones I remember best to have affected me and to some degree the whole Project operation. As it developed, some of these positions were modified and some were supported by the Project experience.

1. **It is not possible to intellectualize about socio-emotional problems such as poverty with any positive result.**

During my early Project experience I became very angry when proper, well dressed, affluent people sat around big tables in air-conditioned offices and discussed poor people. How easy it was to talk and talk and to arrive at conclusions on how we could help. There seemed to be real resistance to actually doing anything except talk and then to talk about talk.

These were well-intentioned people who were concerned about a social illness and who were using their professional talents to do something. Yet, it seemed so woefully inadequate and grotesque when the realization dawned, which it frequently did, that we were much more the journalist than the soldier. Before our very own eyes we reduced hunger, sickness, and hopelessness to words so that we could put them in an order and come out with "workable definitions."
2. Public schools would not suddenly change their posture to make provision for individuals that had so long been rejected. The effort would be, at best, semantic.

There is some very convincing historical evidence that the schools are not able to respond to the needs of children who are not rooted in the white, Protestant middle class. School teachers are traditionally part of the striving middle class and, therefore, believe because they are representative of social momentum that with effort "anyone can do it." School children are all too often told how the teacher's parents had begun in poverty and how the teacher herself had worked her way through college to her reward.

Furthermore, the same sort of men are making educational policy decisions in the public school as are in the university. A bit more pragmatic perhaps but socially and intellectually the same. One of the characteristics of this sort of man is that he is not sympathetic with the plight of being poor. Frequently they impose the same prejudices on poor people as does the general non-impoverished society, i.e. Poor people are lazy, irresponsible, and could "overcome" if they would only get a job and stop drinking. Even among the most devout Calvinists there is some possibility that some of the chosen may turn up in the ghetto; not so among intellectuals.

3. College professors have such little truck with undergraduate students that they cannot relate to them closely enough to mine their creative insights on teaching. The low status of the undergraduate increases the distance between the generations and substantially reduces the chances of open, meaningful communication.
It becomes apparent very quickly, when one begins teaching in college, that there is no professional status in teaching undergraduates. They are a sort of necessary evil, a pool from which graduate students come but not a rewarding group to confront intellectually. Their low status keeps them out of consideration in much educational planning above the level of the custodial.

The creative talents of these young people is not honored by the establishment and, therefore, the individual must find other means of expressing himself, sometimes in very unconventional, distressing ways. Once the undergraduate student is aware of his status, he can easily option to be hostile, negative, and even rebellious.

When the institution does include undergraduates in the design of a project, it is often a co-opting job aimed at keeping peace or at demonstrating an interest that is paper thin. The co-opting powers of the establishment are strong and, much like being bilked by a professional criminal, hardly anyone admits it.

4. Efforts to "do something" for the poor are often non-violent ways of containing poverty and keeping the poor placated by tokenism.

So many governmental and social agencies have "come down" to help the poor make the best of it that there is a natural suspicion of helpers. People who wish to assist the poor are frequently certain that the poor will always be in that condition. The feeling is that each person who is not poor ought to "do something" for the less for-
tunate. There is no respect for the human dignity of the people or for the creative courage or utter numbness that is required to "keep going."

The riots frightened many people into some action. At least some of the effort on behalf of the impoverished, (this is not fair to a number of people) is an insurance against insurrection. Surely government-inspired programs have a riot prevention provision written somewhere in the mission statement formal or informal. Improvement of the ghetto school could mean that poor people might not be so anxious to move out into the rest of the city. In this way, poverty can be contained so that those of us outside the ghetto know where it is and that we are not part of it.

5. **Without a program which encompasses substantial "inputs" from people living in poverty or people who are affected directly by poverty, the typical educator lacks appropriate direction for his efforts.**

When the educator views a poverty-ridden community, he is apt to miss much of the positive possibility which exists below the surface. It is difficult to assess whether the ghetto school is a cause of the environment, or if the environment has caused the deterioration of the school. Most are inclined to accept the latter to the exclusion of thinking about the former.

It may well be that having such difficulties as the inner city school only amplifies the philosophical weakness that exists in the belief that all of the children of all of the people can be educated with the same facilities and techniques. Out of frustration a signifi-
cant number of teachers who teach in the inner city have interpreted
the function of the school to be custodial and management-oriented
with teaching material which will prepare the child for participation
in the mainstream of American life. The assumption seems to be that
the child cannot learn, and so he should be taught how to "make it"
without learning.

Inner city people resent this fact about the school more than
any other single issue. They suspect, and rightfully so, that the
teachers may not be competent to teach reluctant learners or children
who have special socially caused learning problems. In order to com­
penstate for their own inadequacies, teachers write off the child as a
non-learner and relegate the classroom to the posture of a reform
school.

Also, the ghetto dweller does not see that the school is a top
priority item in the life of the poor. While education is a social
elevator for some groups of people, it is not for the bulk of the poor
and particularly not for the black poor. Employment, the ability to
earn some money, is much more an immediate need. Logically, one would
conclude that education would offer that possibility but historically
it has not.

6. **Highly personalized educational programs are necessary to
properly prepare a student to teach in an inner city environment. Presu­
sumably, that kind of program would be valuable not only in serving
the need of the pre-teaching learner, but would also serve as a model
for teaching when the learner became teacher himself.**
Whoever is responsible for teaching a pre-inner city teacher to teach ought to know a great deal about the person's uniqueness; he could then assist the teacher-in-training to develop his strengths and overcome his deficiencies. This requires a reasonable student to teacher ratio. It also requires a teacher who can draw together needed resources for the individual students. More than the usual adviser relationship is required; the teacher needs to take a personal responsibility for seeing to it that the student is prepared to serve children's needs or else see that the student is redirected in his teaching ambitions. In either case the adviser would have to have a set of criteria in mind to direct the student successfully.

The ramifications of such an arrangement are many and complex. Young people undergoing intricate professional preparation in concert with their own private becomings are frequently confused and can become quite dependent. To act in their best interest one needs to know how to mine their talents for professional application and yet leave enough for use in the private sector of their lives.

The teacher's teacher under these conditions must be willing to undergo a great deal along with his students. He needs to have courage enough to confront them with issues that may be painful and disconcerting. His own self confidence must withstand wrong interpretations and his energies and creativity levels must be high. Finally, he must be willing to give of himself without reward and risk his own beliefs with flexibility.
Young people who are entering teaching do not typically possess the personal characteristics which are needed to produce educational change.

Assuming that some of the qualities one should have to produce change are qualities of the revolutionary, the typical Education student is woefully lacking. Many factors go together to create a reasonably reserved, unaggressive pre-teacher student. Several factors can be singled out to explain the conservatism:

A. Any student who has succeeded in being successful in the public school for twelve years has learned that "rocking the boat" is not applauded and not rewarded. Breaking rules is punished and even examining them is discouraged. One only need look at a Student Council to see that even the students that teachers and administrators trust most are closely supervised when in the most fundamental decision-making position.

B. Females coming into teaching are hoping not to spend much time in the classroom before being snatched into marriage. Their semantic commitment to a new cause may be quite convincing but it is based on the assumption that the situation need not be endured very long. The commitment is shallow.

C. The possibilities are high that the students come from the middle class and that their parents are conservative in taste and habit of mind. Since the parents are likely to be paying much of the education bill, the students may feel their parents have the right to affect their views, even though the students may occasionally be willing to do a certain amount of
adventuring on their own. "The man who pays the fiddler has the right to call the tune."

D. Unless one has experienced the degradation of poverty, he never can sense the urgency of transcending the condition. Non-poverty people tend to treat the condition of poverty as if it were a romantic, temporary affair. It is easy to be deceived into thinking that talking about poverty is acting on it, even if you are talking only to yourself. The talk medium has had little effect on hunger, sickness, and strife.

8. Projects set in an inner city environment regardless of their primary mission should, in some way, directly benefit some of the residents.

Ghetto dwellers have seen an astonishing number of projects, with a variety of purposes, come into their neighborhoods and eventually leave without much noticeable effect. The local resident therefore has not much respect for the implantation of a new system in his block because he now knows that the prime benefactors are people living outside the area. This is not totally true but it is sufficiently true to be taken as a working generalization by many in the ghetto situation.

Professionals are paid handsomely to design sophisticated ways of dealing with poverty but they rarely undergo the effect of their plan at the scene of the action. Whether one suspects that some of these plans have failures purposely built into them or not is unimportant but that so many fail to accomplish is somehow revealing.
Any inner city project should directly benefit a portion, at least of the neighborhood residents. Effort should be made to see that the benefit of the project is not limited to the life of the project itself. Too many people have been employed by a project and then returned to their previous circumstance when the project terminated. Ghetto people closely involved are left without support and feel they have been "used," once again.

9. Highly organized efforts require so much energy in keeping their organization intact, they drain off energy needed for the possibility of creative production. Too much energy is expended keeping the system rather than developing vital ways of behaving.

There is a tendency among administrators to set objectives that cannot be fulfilled, and then set an organization to fulfill those objectives, thinking the organization is the end, not the means. What they do is fail systematically, all the time deluding themselves. Meanwhile individuals who might find creative ways of dealing with the situation, following their uniqueness, have no place to operate. The conflict between the plan and the individual working in it is frustrating; the one blocks the other. Sometimes the plan is ignored; sometimes the individual staff member withdraws.

Allowing freedom of organization so that the staff, on the spot can develop its own pattern of operation is more likely to be productive. Administrators fear such developmental system, however, because of the possibility that "proper" evaluation would be difficult and because preset objectives might not be attained. It could be argued that previously developed objectives are not valid after a project is
in motion and that evaluation of the creative impact of individual performance is the only true indicator of success.

10. **Success based on goal accomplishment is too limited a means of viewing the value of a human undertaking.**

Administrators are too frightened to base the success or failures of a program operation on the human condition. Setting artificial "check points" which are non-human in nature is to avoid the real event of an operation. Developing relationships with fellow human beings is a tricky business, indeed. It requires that each person be willing to expose himself and exhibit his capabilities.

Particularly in matters that are not authentic in their nature, individuals tend to want to avoid personal investment and limit human contact. To do otherwise often exposes the shallowness and the insincerity of one's efforts. Artificial goal accomplishment takes the attention off the individual and his authenticity and places it on non-human events.

There is also far too much need to have a project look as though it has been successful at something. In the success-oriented society, even experimentation is designed so that it appears successful. Actually, when a number of individuals come together to attempt something of mutual interest, that, in itself, is success. What happens beyond that can only be viewed as success or failure by the single person. That person cannot then speak of his own success as though it was common to the whole group.
11. Some of the traditional cultural attitudes held by people in some sectors of our society are as effective at holding people in poverty as are the facts of direct impoverishment.

Due to the popularity of the "self-made man" concept, this society has looked upon being poor as the first hurdle over which the stout-of-heart must pass in order to begin their true evolution. Since so many Americans draw their geneological lines directly from poor immigrants, they are romantically involved in a rosy picture for people, once they act to get past being poor. Their stories always have a happy ending, preceded by a lucky break, or heavy hours of diligent labor. In many cases these tales are true and are, indeed, indicative of the evolution of the American spirit.

However, hard, terrifying reality has now come to this generation. Factors not present in previous generations now operate to keep people poor. We have not really faced the facts. We engage in solutions that are subterfuges, arranging not to become directly involved ourselves or personally anxious about their plight. One of our deceptions has been to build our cities around, over, or on top of the poor. Freeways often "cut off" the poor from the rest of the city, and we don't have to look at them and their dwellings. Or, we have ordered the poor out and torn down their neighborhoods for renewal purposes. Or, we have built a twenty-story slum to replace the old one and have then seemed "surprised" that the poor were not grateful.

Going into the Project I mistrusted the motives of the Project planners and those who offered financial support. I doubted if they could become deeply involved with the humanness of the problem they
wished to attack. One could easily detect a strong desire on the part of the Project principles to remain above the "nitty-gritty" of being poor. They appeared to want to sterilize the environment so that they could use it without having to become involved in it. These attitudes did not grow out of only "snobbery," although that was surely in the mix, but it also stemmed from misunderstanding and the cultural gap.

Somehow it seemed ironic, sitting around the big tables, talking about improving ghetto education with people who had made substantial contributions to the sickness we were not going to cure. Some of those very people were ones who never trusted college students, never having learned to trust themselves when they were college students. They had resisted curriculum revisions, refusing a broader view of humanity, and they were racially and socially prejudiced.

Some of the language we used to discuss the poor and the inner city environment reflected our sense of superiority, socially if not racially. We expected to be thanked by the less fortunate for our interest in them. Most startling, however, was our overpowering desire to remain apart from college students. It took great effort and tenacity to gain permission to bring undergraduates into the planning phase of the Project! From the moment of their arrival, the planning group was more guarded and less enthusiastic about the Project. It was almost as though the enemy had arrived.

It was with that tone that the Urban Teacher Education Project began its mission. Regardless of the spirit or the attitude of the early planners, undergraduates did sit in planning sessions and some of their observations were heard. A pilot project did run for two
quarters (winter and spring, 1968) and two black men who were community people with some college background were employed and served as staff members.

Twenty students simulated the Project program we had hoped to develop the coming year when the Project was to come into full operation. Those students risked much and probably ultimately grew a great deal. Yet, the difficulties all of us encountered were many and some of them hurt specific individuals very much. Some will never recover from the trauma and will always fear the complexities of such a dramatic undertaking.

Because of my feeling for, and outlook on, life, and because of my personal history, I made a sizeable personal investment. Meeting after meeting in the early months of the Project, I suffered; first, trying to understand what the establishment was saying and why its representatives behaved as they did; second, coming to terms with my personal conflicts. I liked the big tables and the proximity to institutionally important people. Attending sessions with the Dean and having him call me by first name was satisfying to me the same as it was to the rest.

But there was something wrong with the whole thing that nagged at me for months. It was more than my personal limitations, although they were clearer now than ever. It was more than my mistrust of administrators, even though many of my dislikes were confirmed. It was the extreme difficulty in seeing myself legitimately belonging to a group that had power and status and space to use it in. Some of the behaviors I disliked in others I could suddenly see in myself, too.
I was confronting myself on the grounds the establishment had given me before people who did not like me and in the name of the alleviation of human suffering!

Much of what I enjoyed most about life, my new colleagues disliked. People whom I trusted, they mistrusted; rules I resented, they had made; words I avoided, they used; and hopes I had, they did not have. I was a stranger to them and their world, and they did not want me to become a resident. Yet, they did need some of my insights, and they did let me speak. The only reason I could have stayed on was that I was convinced that they needed me more than I needed them, and I could leave without personal regret.

Our meetings were often stormy and complicated by conflicts in age, status, and personal life-style. Yet, for the sake of accuracy, it must be said that many of the positions I adopted and stood for were integrated into the plans and others were given full consideration. Even though there was considerable hostility about my being part of the group and even more about my philosophy and behavior, I was frequently listened to and heard. There was a sort of respect in existence that was difficult to identify because it was often clouded by the moment. Yet, there was no question that the posture I represented was not popular or was not familiar.

It was not until the planning group had dissolved and the people who were to actually shoulder the responsibility for the pilot program and beyond that I found, or in some cases made, any common ground to work on. And then the ground was always a bit shaky due to the status differences and the almost complete opposite way of viewing. Common-
ality of position was developed, not by common goals, but by common reference points. The time did come when we could agree on what we were seeing develop, but hardly ever during the duration of the Project did we agree on our purpose and our hopes.

Hanna Colm summarized best the dilemma that I met squarely in the Project. It was a human encounter, one I hope to have learned from and the reports from which I hope will give strength and reference points to others who may pass through a similar experience.

Living, being human, implies limitations. Each person must come to terms with his limitedness, with the fact that he does not know where he comes from, who he is in terms of his capacities and abilities, and where he will go—his fate and the meaning of his life. This is the overall existential limitation, the non-being in living. In the course of his life, man will make what he can out of the unknown challenge that is given him.

In addition to the existential limitation, there are limitations inherent in the specific situation into which each man is born and which, in the course of his living, he learns to accept. Or, he denies the limitations and strives to achieve the impossible; then the only avenue of escape is neurotic defense.1

---

CHAPTER II
THE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT

Introduction

The following paragraphs are taken from the Urban Teacher Education Project and are presented here in digest form in order to give the reader a view of the Project from a conceptual position. This statement was written prior to September, 1968, and therefore was written before the Project staff for 1968-69 was assembled. However, the document was a sort of rationale for the operation of the Project even though it eventually was not significantly relevant.

A digest of the Project prospectus

"The activities and experiences of clinical teams during the pilot phase suggests that the approach is a useful way of creating and implementing teacher education programs with teacher candidates. Clinical team behavior manifests itself within a range of broad to narrow activities: In general terms the team engages in programmatic planning, execution, and evaluation of group and individual student progress and achievement. In specific terms, the team engages in clinical sessions with students which involve prognostic inputs (pre-active), diagnostic analyses (interactive), and prescriptive feedback (post-active). A clinical team is in fact a staff of professionals who put their collective competencies on the line in an open and genuine way with teacher candidates."
The teacher education staff will be composed of a clinical team which will include clinical professors of the following designations: instructional specialist (team leader), sensitivity trainer (psychologist), environmental specialist (sociologist), appraisal specialist (process-product evaluator), inner city teacher (master teacher), and a ghetto contact person. This clinical team will serve as the primary group which will work closely with the teacher candidates and with the implementation of the program.

Beyond the clinical team structure and process, it is necessary to identify and use additional personnel and resources. A secondary group of resource persons who do not work as closely and intimately as the primary group with the teacher candidates will be composed of subject matter specialists in reading, mathematics, science, etc. inner city neighborhood leaders, social workers, and other teacher education personnel. These professionals will serve as inputs toward a better understanding of knowledge and practice during specified periods of the program.

The teacher candidates will be organized into teams of 40 to 50 students. Their program will be composed of activities provided by the clinical team (primary group) and auxiliary personnel (secondary group). These students will be organized in ways that will insure solidarity and esprit de corps among them. While there is value in including sophomores and juniors within the group, the preponderance of students will be those who are entering their senior year.
The curriculum and instruction of the teacher education program will be organized into seven cycles of ever-increasing knowledge, practice, and responsibility. The cycling of the program means an articulated sequence of content and activities that becomes cumulatively more relevant to the teacher candidate. The actual experience of becoming a professional teacher for an urban setting requires a reorganization of experience throughout training. The program will be organized into the following seven cycles:

1. Teacher as Self (3 weeks)
2. Cultural Sub-cultural Settings (6 weeks)
3. School as Institutional Reality (3 weeks)
4. Subject Matter Knowledge and Teaching Concepts (9 weeks)
5. Inquiry Training for Feedback and Diagnosis (3 weeks)
6. Autonomous Teaching in Classrooms (10 weeks)
7. Post-Active Phase of Evaluation and Self-Direction (4 weeks)

The program will be organized for a period of three quarters or 38 weeks, although the seventh cycle will continue into the first full year of teaching during employment. The clinical approach will be used during that first year of teaching which we recognize as the period of internship in teaching.

The content of the experimental teacher education program will follow from the seven cycles of experience mentioned earlier. The seven cycles will involve the following content:

I. Teacher as Self
   A. Analyzing the self as a person and prospective teacher through discussions, role playing, and peer feedback sessions
   B. Studying the professional literature of perceptual psychology and existential philosophy
   C. Engaging in sensitivity training sessions
D. Self-analysis vis-a-vis group dialogue relative to motivation and commitment to teaching the urban poor
E. Acquaintance with knowledge regarding teacher career and investigations of educational and professional roles
F. Confrontation of self in a teaching role through tutoring a child and under simulated conditions

II. Cultural and Sub-cultural Settings

A. Knowledge of cultural and sub-cultural conditions in an urban area
B. Knowledge of values and aspiration of the urban poor
C. Observation and participation in residential lifestyles of inner city families
D. Knowledge of leadership patterns and wage-earning capacities of urban residents.
E. Knowledge of urban inner city realities as viewed by insiders and outsiders
F. Participation with families and community agencies within the inner city

III. School as an Institutional Reality

A. Knowledge and observation of school-community gap
B. Observation of varied teaching styles within inner city students
C. Observations of learning difficulties encountered by students
D. Awareness of the institutional press schooling brings to teaching and learning
E. Knowledge of the varied roles school professionals play in a school day
F. An increased awareness of the neighborhood school concept and its influence and function in urban education

IV. Subject Matter Knowledge and Teaching Concepts

A. Subject matter competencies and concepts which are necessary to teach a structure of knowledge
B. Short courses in teaching reading, mathematics, etc.
C. Technical skills of teaching are acquired
D. Simulated sessions of teacher-pupil and teacher-parent relationships
E. Learner response probabilities and learner difficulties
F. Simulated sessions of classroom organization and management
G. Analyses of teaching styles and personalized teaching
H. Teaching trials with small groups of children in classrooms
V. Inquiry Training for Feedback and Diagnosis

A. Skill development to obtain feedback relative to teacher behavior through uses of interaction analysis, micro-teaching, and simulation
B. Skill development to analyze and to use feedback data in subsequent teaching performance under real and simulated situations
C. Inquiry skills to diagnose learner difficulties and learning problems
D. Feedback sessions of teacher performance which lead to attempts to change behavior
E. Clinical team sessions become an integrated way of analyzing feedback

VI. Autonomous Teaching in Classrooms

A. Teaching performance analyzed and feedback provided
B. Teaching styles analyzed and previewed
C. Becomes an agent for curriculum change
D. Various teaching strategies employed to effect learning
E. Self-testing of teaching abilities and skills
F. Autonomous teaching in classrooms with full responsibility and clinical behavior achieved

VII. Post-Active Phase of Evaluation and Self-Direction

A. Self-evaluation phase leading toward independent study and self-direction for learning
B. Program evaluation phase with student serving as adviser and counselor to staff
C. Begins employment as teacher in urban area serving in an internship role with opportunity to use the resources of the clinical team
D. Serves as an active professional in continuing teacher education programs

Conceptual elements

At this particular point in the history of the clinical team effort with the students, it is especially appropriate to outline some of the major elements appropriate to preparation and training for teaching in inner city schools. A listing of those primary elements is as follows:
1. Student involvement in a deeper and more experiential relationship with inner city schools and ghetto communities.

2. A spiralling set of meaningful field experiences connected to the urban child, school, and community, which required early and continuous contact with children and adults in urban settings and varied school situations.

3. Sensitivity training to develop an awareness and empathy for children in many contexts and under varied conditions as well as to improve the personal effectiveness of the teacher candidate.

4. Contacts with community agencies whose range of activities permitted more insight into the life styles of the urban community and its students.

5. An inter-disciplinary approach to course and reinforcement of field experiences by the clinical team.

6. Specialized short courses of content to replace the traditional methods courses in what and how to teach.

7. Greater exposure to diagnostic and remedial procedures for the purpose of individualizing instruction.

8. Use of video-tape sessions and other media to prepare students to teach and to obtain feedback.

9. Selection of cooperating teachers who would permit flexibility and freedom in matters of curriculum and instruction within the classroom. Students have opportunities to try innovative approaches and to relate to children with more humanity and commitment to their education.
10. A teaching practicum experience in an inner city school with the support and feedback that the clinical team provides.

11. Student opportunities to evaluate their experiences through their contacts with the clinical team and others.

In view of these elements the pilot project forms the base for the experimental project for the 1968-69 school year. The design of the program, the sequence of activities, and the clinical team's function for the pilot project will be extended into the coming year and will serve to give the kind of direction and purpose to the teacher education program.

Clinical team approach

Members of the staff component of the clinical team are recognized as clinical professors. These team members include an instructional specialist, psychologist, sociologist, master teacher, ghetto liaison specialist, and appraisal specialist. These professors work together as a team in order to coordinate their own activities with those of the teacher candidates. They serve the program and the students as inputs to knowledge, as interactants, and as sources of feedback. Clinical team behavior can be exhibited and observed vis-a-vis individual and collective contacts with students. A clinical professor works in ways to insure that a teacher candidate receives the best available knowledge and judgment from the clinical team.

The clinical staff performs the primary functions of providing prognostic, diagnostic, and prescriptive information to teacher candi-
dates. This information bears directly on the abilities and skills that the candidate is developing in his roles as a teacher. In one sense prognosis, diagnosis, and prescription are clinical actions taken with the candidate to further his self-development and direction. In another sense these actions relate to the teacher candidate's ability to use a clinical approach toward residential life in the inner city and student learning in the school. Clinical behavior is viewed in these two ways: it represents actions taken with teacher candidates and it reflects a strategy of action toward learning contexts.

The clinical staff members are well prepared in their disciplines and have broad experience in their understanding of inner city life, schooling, and teaching strategies. They have competencies in linking the theories of their specialties to practice and experience. Their work with teacher candidates converts theoretical foundations and academic courses into viable teaching strategies which meet the test of the reality of classroom teaching. The clinical charge is to provide relevant information and practice in the identification and analysis of problems.

A clinical member is ever alert to the possibility of providing relevant inputs and concurrently turns to the teacher candidate and to the team for clinical assessments. Team members relate to each other as critics and colleagues and provide similar relationships with teacher candidates. The personal requirements of team operation and student involvement are immense, but these humanistic demands are balanced with task achievement. Clinical professors are prepared to
put their competencies on the line with other team members and with students.

In short, the clinical professor provides his expertise and knowledge to clinical operations, but it is not a singular and unilateral input; for he teaches for change and is himself transformed by it; he guides other team members, but is guided and directed by them; he teaches the candidates but learns in the process as well. Although a professor's specialized competency is needed and respected, it is never inviolate within the arena of experience with team members and students. The clinician's role and function, then, is far more process-oriented than product-centered."

The Project

The Urban Teacher Education Project was the incubator in which many of the ideas and reactions expressed in this paper were hatched. The Project's mission statement has been included in the appendix and presents the basic facts of the Project; the reader can see the intent of the Project at the outset.

As with any developmental project, much of the superstructure was modified as plans were translated into action. The notion of the "clinical team" as described in the statement, for example, went afoul for two reasons. First, the Project was unable to attract professionals who would devote sufficient time to the process. Then, attempts that were made to have a multi-discipline approach to problem-solving were
frustrated by the lack of definition of the leadership role\textsuperscript{1} and the failure of the people involved to stay together long enough to develop communications which could expedite the semantic and value difficulties they experienced.

The "clinical team" approach was not given a fair trial for the reasons given and also because of the press of time. There was some urgency about the entire Project. The Cleveland Public Schools wanted to begin soon and Ohio State wanted to demonstrate good faith. The pressure was good, in the sense that it did move the typically reluctant college to action, but some reasonably sound ideas in the original plan died because of the swiftness with which the process was initiated.

Beyond the malfunction of many of the technical procedures, there were great difficulties in holding the task in perspective. The highly-charged emotional climate of the inner city tended to distort the view that one was able to take of the task in that environment. There was a tendency to try to amass a full-scale assault on poverty and to go outside the boundaries, not only of the institutions involved, but of the capability of individuals.

When one was able to see the insignificance of his small effort posed against the social and psychological difficulties which abound

\textsuperscript{1}In our efforts at the clinical team approach there was some problem with leadership. It seemed only natural that the educators should take the lead in the team, but representatives from psychology, sociology, etc. were not convinced of that logic.

Some of the principles from group dynamics could be helpful in building sensitivity and confidence within these groups. Some standard operational procedures should be agreed upon from the outset.
in the ghetto, he felt he just must do more. In consequence, he scattered his efforts and did less. What he was able to do he did with less vigor because he was torn, trying to marshall a fuller response. This dilemma plagues many efforts in poverty environments, not only by educators, but by other social agents as well. There is no question of the need for coordination and development of effort for a unified front among agencies in order to come at the causes and symptoms of poverty. It is difficult to confine oneself to only one's trade when the need for so much is so easily identifiable. Hunger, sickness, and general decadence scream out.

Some of the efforts to unify action in recent months have caused considerable harm. The structural development of the unification has brought about traumas that have shaken some agencies beyond repair. If quick and decisive common agreements and understandings cannot be reached under such circumstances, then the attempt should be discarded. The formation of a unifying structure does not, of itself, assure the value of the contribution of the individual agency.

The Urban Teacher Education Project suffered from, and benefited from, the coming-together of some rather diverse positions regarding race, poverty, and education. The Project was effected by many confusions about these issues as they related to teacher education. Should there be only black teachers in black schools? Can white men prepare teachers-to-be to function in an all-black environment? Does the middle class college student have the obligation or the right to prepare himself to teach in poverty-stricken neighborhoods? Those questions were asked, in addition to, "Will well-prepared teachers be
a sufficiently positive influence on the community to make 'specific environment teacher education' worthwhile?"

These questions were not answered to the satisfaction of either the staff or the students. Only small parts of each question fell into perspective at all. For example, feelings were expressed by the student teachers which ran strongly like those of their cooperating teachers. That is, the teachers felt that their best efforts were inadequate in overcoming the out-of-school world of the poverty-ridden child. An outside observer cannot be certain about what effect that sort of mind-set had on the teacher in terms of continued effort and/or self-concept. It does offer a convenient "cop-out" for less application and, to some extent, it is probably used in this way. But this discussion simply ends in the same dilemma stated earlier: "Can multi-lateral action have functional value in a social setting? There was no correct answer.

Partially because of the confusion in the area of teacher education, and partially because of the pressure of poverty in the environment in which student teaching was to be played out, the preparation of classroom teachers did not receive top priority in the Project. Some staff members felt very strongly that teacher education, in the more traditional sense, should have received more attention. The writer was on the opposite side of that question. It seemed that history had not been on the side of educational tradition and that the role of the teacher needed to be redefined.

The original proposition was that time segments were to be parcelled out to each issue that was felt to require attention. On paper,
the approach was sound; but in actual practice, the interests and ideas of the students got in the way. There was considerable tension surrounding the non-school matters, i.e., black identification, etc. and no great interest in the classroom issues, i.e., underachievement, etc. was generated.

While the remainder of the Project went through a miniature sequence of typical method-course experiences, a graduate student and the writer undertook to provide a comprehensive, experiential approach to teacher preparation. Eleven students were set apart from the original forty-four, and they were given experiences and opportunities quite different from the larger segment of the students. The three weeks directly before the classroom internship experience was spent by our eleven students in elementary schools (in a variety of environments) on an active participation model.

Great effort was made to personalize and individualize these experiences for the eleven and to get close enough to the students to hear and see their reactions to this approach. The personal attention, we felt, was as important as the environmental experiences; we attempted to be as sensitive to the vital signs of personal change and professional growth as we could be. These eleven students were not matched nor selected in any way, except on very crude, nearly undefined terms. They were in the 20 to 22 year age group and all were female save one. Three were black; but for the most part, the notable differences were individual rather than racial or sub-group.

Three (3) strands were to be woven together to form the fabric on which we wanted and expected the teachers-to-be to depend in later
classroom performance for the eleven students: (1) Direct experience in classrooms with children from all social-economic classes, though emphasis was placed on the inner city environment; (2) skills and techniques were to be presented by practitioners in the field rather than by people from the university; (3) special interest and attention was to be given each student by the writer and his colleague. This was to be an active case-study approach which was to be both supportive and informative.

Before undertaking this task, we had a set of assumptions we wanted to test. Some of them held up, but others were simply negated from the beginnings. Many other premises were hidden, and never came to light; some new assumptions appeared during the course of events. The ones which can be dealt with at this time will be discussed in this document; others surely will arise as the sparks from the practice cool into history. The author suggests that for the reasons given above, attempts to reduce the past year to statistics and graphs could only result in futility or "structured failure!"

All of the students who were in our group were there because they responded positively to an invitation to come along. The word volunteer is purposely avoided, since the hierarchical system of the university makes it extremely unlikely that a student who would receive such an invitation would refuse it. In fact, every student who was "officially" invited, accepted. Again, it should be stressed that students were not chosen on any predetermined criteria.

Some of the flaws in our original assumptions were more serious than others. For example, it was not until nearly the end of the
Project that we discovered that almost every student had had a reason for wanting to be in Cleveland for a longer period of time than the Project had intended to be there. These reasons were quite apart from the business of becoming a teacher for the inner city school. They ranged from being near their fiancés to having a strong desire to be away from the campus in Columbus. This, of course, in some ways could well be expected, but it did affect the educative process both positively and negatively.

 Probably the most important two factors not included in the planning position were: 1) the hidden agenda of the individual student and 2) the generation gap. Before discussing these factors, it should be noted, that because these matters eluded us intellectually for a number of months, it could not be expected that the discussion of them now could be complete. To be sure, there are holes in our observations and blind spots that will not be delineated. By the same token, then, we should assume that if there are eliminations that prevent clarity, there must also be inclusions that are just as obstructive.

The example used above, of the secondary interest in being in Cleveland (perhaps it was primary), was reflective of an item on the hidden agenda. More basic and more potent was the direct question of student commitment. That question, too often raised, does need to be explored in this context. It is easy to charge students, and teachers, for that matter, with not being committed. To simply say that someone is unwilling to totally commit himself is in the same category with the logic of saying that a child does not work to his fullest capacity. It says everything, and it says nothing. Total commitment is
a rare human commodity, indeed, and it well could be an undesirable one from a mental health point of view.

To discover why someone wants to teach school is challenge enough, let alone to discover why someone with a choice wants to teach school in the inner city. The classic, "I want to help people," is not sufficient for much more than a discussion opener. It is surprising how frequently that sentence is said and how meaningful it can be if held in perspective. Career choice is a highly complex, personal matter and frequently even the person himself is unsure why he chose one vocation over another.

For the developing adult, particularly the developing female, career choice may not be a top priority item. Of course, during a three or four year incubation period, vocation is given serious thought and frequent discussion. Further, given the fact that these particular individuals had expressed a desire to at least experience the inner city, we feel that they acted on some information about themselves that is not common to all teachers-to-be. The point is that this set of students probably had some soul searching experiences that put them where they were, but it was possible (but not probable) that the choice to become part of the Project was in part accidental.

In spite of these facts, and without exception, it could be stated that the females in the group were not able, or did not choose, to place teaching above other life objectives which were in consideration at the same point in time. Impending marriages, reaction to parental urgings to get married (and to marry well) and the struggle to keep life's emotions stable drained off large amounts of physi-
cal and mental energy. It could well be that some of this drain was subtle or even sub-conscious and, therefore, was not open to direct confrontation. The effects of the energy drain and the effort to cope with and compensate for it were apparent. In fact, the guilt that was aroused by external stimuli and internal resistance played a significant role in the frustration discomfiture and the eventual production of the students.

Because of the private nature of this kind of personal dilemma, the results manifested themselves in behavior which at times was badly misinterpreted by the writer and by some other observers in the environment. For example, it was hoped that the individuals would, because of their supposed common interests, form a support group which would have value in the process of becoming a teacher. That group formation never occurred, not even on minor issues that seemed to loan themselves to group action and interaction. The belief that there was a common bond of wanting to attack poverty, or at least the symptoms of poverty, was wholly in error. The common focus of the group was, in fact, quite apart from professional matters.

The students were concerned, and some appeared deeply so, about the plight of the urban poor, but that concern was not more important than getting their personal house in order. The quest to find support for self-identity was more crucial to the students than was their concern for external social ills. Learning to teach and, indeed, teaching causes one to become quite introspective about himself, both because of his authority status and because of his being confronted by other learners who, in many ways, are searching for themselves with the same
intensity. Frequently, the teachers-to-be reported that they felt as frustrated and confused as the behavior of their pupils indicated that the students felt.

It is not being said here that the students did not want to become teachers nor that they would not teach. The majority did want to become a kind of teacher, and most of them will become teachers. However, during this teacher education project, many other issues of personal growth and development were equally as important as, or more important than, that of the "becoming a teacher."

Generally, the ongoing press of finding one's way through life (as he desires to live it) is only briefly interrupted by vocational interests unless there is a fusion of personal and vocational life. This fusion is becoming less necessary for all sectors of the culture and, in the impersonal-personal service institutions, is becoming nearly extinct. The professional role has been so carefully refined that much less is left to personal endeavor and more is being done by "job description."

Thus, one of the first lessons the teacher-to-be learns upon contact with the establishment is "don't take the job too seriously" and "you can't do everything." It is clear that, for the teacher-to-be, this is just further enforcement for a series of learnings which have been ongoing. Personal security, comfort, and societal expectations are not to be offended for the commitment of oneself to a task which is disproportionate to one's ability to act. It would seem that the student is caught in a dilemma which is larger than his
ability to break out of it, and probably, in the long run he should not.

The negative result of that dilemma is, for the most part, one of verbiage. The guilt one suffers (subtle though it might be) from being encouraged to state his commitment, and then to support that commitment with some acts which are not consistent with his nature is, in many ways, potentially more dangerous than non-commitment itself.

What about the generation gap?

The generation gap is being used to describe all sorts of ills; the term is not a very useful description for anything. The difficulty which the previous generation has in "understanding" the present generation is the result of several factors. Most important is the fact that sounds and symbols are mistaken for the deed, and therefore much of the visible reaction that is taking place in the "gap" is symbolic reaction rather than authentic. What most people mean (educators in particular) by "bridging the generation gap" is control-oriented. "Know your enemy's language, and he will be yours," Napoleon said. And so it is with the seniors of a society interested in forcing behaviors on the young.

For teacher educators the problem is different but yet similar. If one accepts the notion of personalized educational development, then he must seek levels on which he can relate intimately with the students. Even symbolic differences on those levels can be deceptive and can disrupt relationships. It could be argued that the student's
non-professionally involved life is "off limits" for the educator, and experience in the Project speaks loudly in support of that position. The complexity of the student's development and growth inside professional activities is sufficient to confound the educator, to say nothing of the morass outside those behaviors.

Even if one accepts without question the usefulness and the responsibility of being related to students on personal levels, the question of the educator's ability to function successfully in this way is dubious, indeed. Academically, one could speak of psychological training and insight to prepare for dealing with encounters with students. Yet, while it is clear that psychological technique would be of value, one needs to go beyond that. One needs to be able to see the unfolding of a student's life. Whether one can sustain the desire and energy to continue a relationship that is for the most part being "switched on," is doubtful, but it could be argued that "switching on" exists in media more than in deed. What this generation has that previous generations did not have is perhaps instantaneous media to perform on and in, and further, the "kids" know how to use them.²

²The automobile, for example, has evolved from an alternative to walking into a means of compressing time, to a way of saying something about what one thinks and how he feels. Certainly the use of the car as a broadcast media is not limited to youth, but their distinctive use of it is the point. Surely, they use it to challenge authority, to flirt with death, and to announce difference, but that is not new. What is new is the use of the automobile as a way of talking to people. Clubs and formal organizations form around Mustangs and rally-packs. Cultures develop at performance tracks and drag strips. For the sake of argument, then, one could conclude that car enthusiasts place machines between themselves, and that life
Having the central theme, learning to teach, that officially existed at the stem of the whole relationship, forced the student-college supervisor interchanges to be generally both guarded and strained. The points of sharing equally were few and as a result a considerable amount of deception took place on important issues. The teacher-to-be must have felt the necessity to be constantly identifying himself with the needs and problems of educating and the teacher educator felt the responsibility of casting most of the life space into educational procedures. Both of those conditions are psychologically rigid and not meaningful in terms of successful teaching and learning.

in those circles revolves around questions of man's relationship with things as well as man's relationship with other men. The point to be made here is not that there is not a great deal of creativity and self-development at the drag strip. There is, that is clear. But the car, as a central issue, drives the individual to commonality and not toward uniqueness. It gives him a way of looking and a way of feeling that is not uniquely his but is rather shared by enough other people to bring strength and support to him in his position. The psychologist might argue that the issues around which the individuals come together are not human ones, but he could not deny that there is a culture or at least a coming-together.

Here is the dilemma. The misuse of the car in the "terms of the older generation" creates a culture that has a language, a literature, and a life that can be only appreciated and understood by other misusers. As soon as one rebels at the misuse, he separates himself from the culture and begins to seek ways of responding as an outsider. Some of these ways are often violent, hostile, and create guilt, withdrawal, and further alienation. Most issues which separate the thoughts of the generations exist in the use-misuse argument. Examples can be explored from drugs to music and similar patterns drawn as with the automobile.
Personal reaction from the distance of time

"If we had it to do over again" should always announce the beginning of a new era, but it seldom does. History makes a person more conservative and less courageous. Thus, a redoing is always a non-rewarding exercise. A redone task is a less giving one. If Rogers is correct about the way people learn, and if teachers are to be prepared to confront real life, then it would seem that the teacher-educator would have to be prepared to "get involved." The "getting involved" is a difficult art and requires energy as well as skill.

My experience was not very successful in the "close personal relationship" arena. Not only were the energy requirements extreme but the very fact of staff interest appeared to inspire some students to conjure-up artificial complexities as attention-getting devices. When I responded to those complexities as well as to the actual behaviors, soon I found myself seeking "pat answers," developing "cover-all" speeches and being "dulled" into boredom. The twenty-year-old was much more able and more willing to act on a number of levels than was this teacher-educator. At times the psychological mosaics become so multiplex that it was easy to become confused and at times to be short-circuited into disinterest. The difference may be naiveté and not courage, but the student will risk himself in a variety of ways; that was demonstrated.

While the twenty-year-old will handle a lot of information, he too is attempting to simplify as well as to complexify. It is as if the complexity exists on the outside, but on the inside issues are reduced to rather simple conclusions. This notion may negate the
popular belief that youth is multi-media centered. In fact, from this experience there is serious question about that belief. The literature is full of observations about the contemporary generation, but they are just making old mistakes in new ways. The next discussion of this paper will be an attempt to react to what happened to me from the point of view of review. Because the thought of doing the Project over sends chills down all our collective spines, it will be an exercise in avoidance as much as an exercise in openness. Therefore, if the reader has the impulse to smile during this part, know that the writer is smiling along with you.

The primary thrust of my effort was to guide the individual progress of each of the eleven students through their teacher preparation program. The main position was that, by close personal relationship, openness could be achieved and individualized experiences could be planned. It was felt that because each student had his own personal "hang-ups" and uniquenesses, they could be acted upon or compensated for by close supervision. This belief grew out of two sources that seem similar but are different.

First, the fall quarter or the first quarter of the Project (1968) was a difficult time for staff and student alike. To diagnose the tension and emotions at this distance would risk inaccuracy and not be too meaningful. But perhaps it could be said with some confidence that the expectencies of the students and the competencies of the faculty were not consistent. Further, because of the emotional tone of the university society in response to racial issues at that time, the black students and staff were often forced into a position of
defensiveness. Therefore, because the Project had clearly announced as part of its purpose to act on racial difficulties and benefit the poor, the white staff, consultants, and even some students were resented, not only because of their race, but for displaying what was interpreted as ineptitude relative to the problems, as viewed from a quite different perspective.

The hope had been that by interaction and interrelationships a group spirit could develop that would promote excitement for learning and develop a healthy attitude toward the Project work that was to be done. This hope was founded in the belief that the differences that pre-existed within the students and staff would be overcome by the needs of the situation which we had to confront. However, we were not able to rise above the interpersonal differences and our deficiencies became more pronounced than our strengths.

All of this is to say that all was not well in the Project from the very beginning. There were many sets of disharmonies caused by factors other than racial, however, some more subtle and some which surrounded issues that the staff never really got close to. Resentment ran high regarding some racial matters but so did it regarding time commitments for the students about course and hour requirements of the College and about what were thought to be promises made during recruitment the previous spring. Also, many other issues grew out of proportion due to a general communications breakdown resulting from the disharmonies which were going untuned.

The staff reacted in different ways to the mounting difficulty that needed to be faced. Several types of flight behavior were used to
avoid direct confrontation of the issues and the people who were related to them. All three senior staff members who were directly responsible for the Project program avoided confrontation. While I am included in that number, I cannot or will not report reactions first-hand with much more clarity than to report on group behavior. Perhaps time will release some more helpful insights.

At this juncture, however, I can say that the three people who should or could have had a direct positive effect on the disintegration factors of the Project did not respond. Many staff discussions were held to analyze the climate and out of the meetings came better understanding of each other within the staff, but we continued frozen in neutral position. We attacked the custodial problems but had little human contact with the central issues. My personal defense mechanism placed me in flight and so confused by ability to see precisely what was occurring that my value became little more than to react to side issues that had little or no relationship with the action that was needed.

Part of my assigned role was to be the Project's representative in Cleveland to prepare for the forty students' arrival at the end of the second quarter of the Project. That escape from the on-campus, Project trauma was probably responsible for my not leaving the Project. The hostility of the students, the failure of several consultants to meet the expectancies of the students and my personal inability to communicate openly about the critical issues nearly shortened all of my
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circuits. My previous professional experience and my personal history had led me to believe that I could deal with social difficulties in the academic arena with some deftness, but now, all of my old techniques were just that—old techniques! They did not have relevance with this set of students and so neither did I. Anger at times replaced my usual existential nature, and I knew even less about dealing with that self than I did about dealing with the ills of the Project.

After several weeks in Cleveland selecting schools, principals, and cooperating teachers I regained enough courage to return to campus and attempt to recover. The sudden and violent death of a good friend who was indirectly connected to the Project occurred at this time and to say that it further complicated my personal state is an understatement. This, added to all the other frustrations and disappointments, made it easy for me to retreat even further from the Project and to hide in unproductive activity.

On the basis of discussions with several trusted friends at this point we concluded that the only way for me to survive the year in the Project was to form the previously discussed mini-Project and concentrate on people becoming people in an existential way that I could understand. In the field, mainly in the Cleveland area, a graduate student and I offered the eleven Project students opportunities to participate in elementary classrooms in various environments and we tried very hard not to tell them what they saw but tried rather to listen to them describe what they really did see. Most of these experiences were meaningful, but in very different ways to each individual.
Frustration in our group was common and it centered around three issues: (1) The feeling that the teachers were not interested enough in each individual child. Our students felt that rather universally teachers were missing opportunities to be friendly and compassionate. They felt that when they taught they would be less severe and more gentle with children.

(2) The second discomfort that arose in our group was out of the feeling that children in middle classed suburban schools were "turned-off." Our students felt that schools had killed the children's creativity and that the pressure of the institution was so restrictive that children were only half-alive when at school.

(3) More psychological were the feelings that had little to do with teacher training as such. Those feelings surrounded the search the student teachers were carrying on for themselves. They were trying hard to find where they could fit harmoniously into adult life not as teachers but as professional people. The classroom experience was probably responsible for encouraging new feelings of inadequacy and amplifying old ones. Also, some classroom teachers and principals we met had some difficulty relating to college students in ways different from the skills they need to relate to elementary school children.

Underlying many of the frustrations and confusions we experienced were three other deeply rooted matters that were well suppressed and ignored until much later in the school year. (1) One was that the majority of our students did not really want to be career teachers. Teaching was a viable alternative to many other activities, but it was
by no means a personal felt need; (2) the second matter was the fact that by being displaced between campus and Cleveland some students' social life and security temporarily suffered, and they reacted to that negatively; (3) The tenuousness of our operation made it difficult to plan more than a week in advance and that insecurity was a point of some remonstrating, too.

The early phase of the Project developed student commitment into such an important issue that the students came to be careful about how they discussed their socializing with whom. They obviously feared negative staff reaction, and they wanted to avoid being made to feel guilty about that whole social life issue. Some did feel guilty about their lack of real commitment and often those guilt reactions interfered with their becoming quality student teachers.

The non in-group

While there were some feelings of "groupness," there was general disinterest in group spirit. The black students withdrew from the group on many occasions, either because as they said they knew all about the topic that we were discussing, or because they felt we did not know enough to inform them about what we were talking about or, and the most likely, they were reacting to some racial feelings that they couldn't express openly and could not suppress completely. Their withdrawal gave rise to other students questioning the value of the experiences they were having and the necessity for them to participate if they did not want to. All of the campus-bound activity was infected by this attitude, and we chose not to react to it in terms of program but rather tried to observe it and talk about it whenever possible.
The program we did put together for our group of eleven had very little to do with the ghetto or poverty as an issue apart from the school. In fact, the inputs regarding race were mostly all related to education and used as overlays rather than underlinings. We tried hard to focus more on learning problems to be met in the inner city school than on the social environment from which the children came. This represented a shift from the main Project. The shift of emphasis was from the more emotional, militant view of the problems of poverty and race to the perhaps less exciting and usually more complex problem of learning debilities. That change of pace may have caused some confusion in the white students' perspective and to some extent alienated the black students even further.

To assist us in discussing learning problems we enlisted support from practitioners from the public schools. They discussed reading, language arts, and general classroom operations with the students. In some cases demonstration lessons were taught and, as one would expect, the very practical was stressed. To a significant degree much of this information was not meaningful until the students got into the classroom on their own. Without experience, it is nearly impossible to know what questions to ask and what is really practical. Thus, a good bit of the practical was not seen as practical until there was practice. That is nothing new, but it made the practicality of the practitioner come to be treated academically.
Student teaching

When the students finally got into a classroom where they were to student teach they had had a lot of "stuff" presented to them to prepare them, at least, theoretically. The old question of general preparation for specific situations was still a useful one and prohibited anyone from concluding that the students were, indeed, prepared. On some levels they were. They were ready in terms of being given enough of a waiting and seeing period, and they were ready in that they really wanted to begin to test themselves. Some were ready because they wanted to get the experience over with and to get on with the business of life as they saw it.

Early reactions were similar to the ones from the participation experiences. Students reported that their cooperating teachers were severe, inhumane, and not very sensitive to the needs of children. Much discussion surrounded specific children that the student teacher had befriended and how these children were not being given a fair shake by the teacher. Nearly all reports were related to classroom management and control. Actual teaching skills were too subtle and elusive to be closely observed. Some of the students were asked to work with small groups of learners who were having difficulty, or with one individual who was in serious trouble with learning.

Again, because of the complexity of the teaching-learning task, many of the facts of learning debilities were thought to be teacher-caused. Building policies were questioned and, in general, the early days of the student teaching experience were spent reacting to some of the more obvious wrongs of the typical teacher and the typical
elementary school. To some extent, based on their education in the
preparation period, and, to a large extent, to keep their sanity,
the social-psychological dilemma of the teacher was reduced to its
lowest terms and made to seem easy to solve by a sensitive teacher.
This reaction is not unlike the usual student teacher's and was not
surprising.

As the students became more involved in educational activities
and had less time to build friendships on an individual basis, they
became more aware of the dynamics of group behavior and how difficult
it is to relate to it as a teacher. If the student teacher was naive
about the interaction of the teacher with the individual member of
the class during the very early experience, she was blind to the
teacher's relationship with the group during the next stages. The
inevitable questions began to arise and some good discussions were
held about management techniques. At this point, it was still too
early for questions of academic procedures to take shape because the
realization had just come to the students that it did not matter what
she had to teach if the pupil would not listen. And, in many cases,
the children were not listening.

Many questions of discipline and control were never answered.
If there was one issue that plagued the cooperating teacher and the
student teacher all quarter it was, "how can you gain control of the
class?" Finally, most of the students did learn to either apply the
techniques of the cooperating teacher successfully or develop their
own approaches (which produced some success) or learned to do their
teaching, probably ineffectively, to a less-than-well-controlled
classroom. During these discussions the cooperating teachers were consistent in their posture that the classroom had to be controlled with an "iron hand" and that efforts at less than stern control were simply exercises in futility.

On the other hand, our somewhat opposite position was equally consistent and nearly as inflexible. Good planning, provisions for individual differences, timing, and pacing were our formula to effective subject presentation and also to healthy environment building. While the students did work very hard to improve their plans, they sided strongly with the cooperating teacher's position on firmness. Students, who just two weeks before, had been admonishing teachers for their cold, humorless presentation and manner, were now emulating that posture as a primary survival technique. Again, we cannot be sure what effect rationalization and guilt had on the students' mental health, but surely, there must have been some personal reaction to such a psychological shift.

Clearly the view the student teacher had of the classroom and the children it held was much more related to conformity than to creativity. In fitting respect to that view they became quite good conformists and not creative at all. Other than the daily struggle with lesson planning and the daily challenge to "control" their classes, the students did not fully relate to the teaching-learning task. From what we were able to observe our students were as traditional as the cooperating teachers, if not more so. The need to "survive," in fact, was so delicately balanced against success and
failure that even the slightest deviation from the normal classroom procedure was carefully studied, indeed.

During the development of the quarter some of the students gained security, at least within their own classrooms. We could see less emphasis on precise lesson planning (in some cases it was almost scripting) and more time devoted to actual subject matter presentations related to the learning needs of the children. Some students demonstrated a fair degree of informality in spurts and it appeared at those times as though they may have been as creative as their limitations would permit. Only in one or two student teachers did we see any real settling-in in relation to the task in the classroom. Even in those rooms where we would eventually declare the experiences a success, there remained a gulf of uncertainty and a general air of traditionalism.

One should not underestimate the pressure placed on a teacher-to-be to be the same as the cooperating teacher in approach. The institutional press was oppressive in subtle, if not in overt ways. Surely this set of eleven students was not prepared to withstand the dictates of the institution, either from their university-directed training nor from their own personal desires. None of the students saw themselves as revolutionaries in any sense. The closest they were able to come on that issue was to demonstrate a bit more concern than one might typically for their youngsters and, even that was done in reasonably confined terms. There was some one-to-one relationship, student teacher to pupil; but when the child involved began to act out his needs, the student frequently recoiled and announced that the child
was overdoing a good thing. (See Appendix B—"Enter-Student Teacher.")

Three of our eleven students met with such frustration levels that the cooperating teacher, principal, and I mutually felt it better that they not continue teaching in an inner city classroom setting. After a period of five weeks it was decided that, for very different reasons in each case, the student could not manage the class effectively enough to risk the educational progress of the children. Two of the three were moved to the outer limits of the city where they were assigned to rooms in which they could experience some of the segments of the teaching role that were not dependent on complete class control. The other girl was moved to a different grade level, a different school, but still in an inner city environment. After being moved, all three seemed to eventually take a different view of the teaching task, though not necessarily a more sensitive one, and to reacclimate themselves to student teaching.

One would suspect that these students may have had some difficulty in the "normal" student teaching program. More likely, they could have succeeded there because they would have had different pressures to respond to and these would have been more consistent with their history and life style. The mere fact that they would have been campus-based where they could have more easily escaped into a life they were comfortable in would have helped. Also, the high expectancies surrounding the model inner city teacher and the close supervision doubtless served to complicate as well as ease the student teaching experience within the Project.
It would have been nearly impossible to compare the performance of the individuals in the inner city and suburban environment or to say that the geographic change actually changed the teaching attitudes and competencies of the people involved. It seemed that the change brought about an opportunity for the teacher-to-be to reassess her reactions to being a teacher and her relevance to the inner city environment. Further, assuming these persons will teach in the future, and I believe they will, the opportunity to relate to an experience where they could feel good about themselves and their performance was essential. The moves did accomplish these things and also it gave us a way to talk about non-performance or under-performance in one environment not necessarily meaning that a person could not succeed in teaching. That matter is yet to be decided, however.

Propositions from the Project operation

To summarize this section of the paper then, there are several points that should be reiterated. These are reports of observations and should be read with that in mind.

1. Because of the nature of the Project and the generalizable characteristics of the students selected to participate, there was little tendency to revolutionize the teaching act.

2. Our students had little compassion for the plight of the urban poor. They were so deeply involved in their own becoming that they only used the environment as a backdrop in front of which to stage their own dramas.
3. Cooperating teachers and the institutional function served to minimize the amount of flexibility a student could demonstrate in any innovative act. Even the simplest deviation from the norm is discouraged, both verbally and non-verbally.

4. Teaching techniques taught before the Project were relatively ineffective. Some pre-teaching was reenergized during the experience period but much was lost forever.

5. Academic, non-emotional discussion of poverty and, in fact, teaching generally, tends to reduce the impact of the actual experience and renders it academic. Giving students words to use to speak about poverty and race is simply developing a literature that insulates them from becoming involved with the real pangs of the environment. It is doubtful that any amount of inspiration could have gotten this set of students to involve themselves and, yet, it seems apparent that the early Project exposures repressed involvement and did not encourage it.

6. Tensions which developed within the group stemmed from, for the most part, pressure on individuals to become group-oriented. These students did not have any desire to become group-related and the more group involvement that was forced on them the farther apart they grew.

7. The student-to-staff and staff-to-student relationship remained traditional despite efforts which were thought
to break down that position. In fact, on the basis of the experience we had it might be concluded that much of the effort we put into dissolving the traditional relationship patterns caused more social gapping, not less.

8. It was amazing how we continued to treat the students as though they were intent upon becoming professional educators long after they stopped acting like that, and we had even come to this realization. One wonders if that was done to keep up our own interest or if it was just perseverance.

9. The public school people who worked with our students enjoyed the status and attention they received. They too had hidden agendas they were tending—the ones who did not seemed uncooperative, hostile, or disinterested. To some extent, these descriptions are correct, because those people did not need us, but we needed them.

10. About ten days before the end of the experience a number of our students quit working at teaching. They appeared to be getting ready for the next cycle of their lives. In a way, we resented their letting their children down, but probably we were disappointed that they could demonstrate so well that they did not need us any longer. Maybe that is just the generation-gap again.

11. The students who felt the most secure during the whole student teaching experience were those who professed a
deep and active belief in God. They did not need to be searching for a place to put their faith. They had found it, and they were sure.
The Project and the inner city

One of the most important parts of the whole structure of the Project was the belief that the Project could have a positive effect on people living in poverty. The college and the public school system, being equally threatened and, to some extent, equally concerned, seemed logically destined to join resources to consider poverty from education's perspective. Where these institutions are related, by all traditional patterns, is really in only three places: In teacher preparation, curriculum development, and student preparation. (1) In teachers who are prepared by the college to teach in the public school, the teacher preparation cycle seems to freeze the institution in its own tradition. All agree that there is something amiss about that arrangement, but, because all those who are aware that there is something amiss were prepared under that same system and are in some way (in many ways) a part of it, only talk of the misfitting goes on and on.

The second place (2) in which the institutions are co-institutions is in the curriculum. Much curriculum innovation for the public school goes on at the university (taxpayer's expense). The college people formalize their thinking and mail it off to the public school people who institutionalize it. Here again it seems strange that the
arrangement is as it is. Talk of "lay participation" has appeared in
the literature throughout the history of education, but the responsi-
bility of the professional usually supersedes the interest of the
public on curricular matters. However, now the private industrial
sector is becoming more of a partner in curriculum revision and will
have more of an impact on education than any "outside" group has ever
had. All the motives of that arrangement are not clear but "none
dare call it business."

The third place (3) where the institutions join is at the
180 degrees opposite of number one. While the college is busy pre-
paring teachers for the public schools, the public schools are busy
preparing students for the college. This begins to sound very much
like a jointure of inbred proportions. One must simply talk about
radical change within such a system, or he must be a radical. The
individual must choose with the knowledge that the first condition is
permitted, the second is not.

At any rate the underlying idea was to have a co-institutional
Project that would approach the plight of the poor through the pre-
paration of specifically trained teachers for inner city classrooms.
That thinking was consistent with institutional response to crisis and
is not to be sold short in terms of sincerity or intention. One might
question the rationale of preparing a "new" teacher for the "old"
school but then, no one has ever decided whether ill-prepared teachers
are a cause or an effect in the cycle of the irrelevant of the insti-
tution. Cleveland Public school representatives have stated that they
are willing to see rather complete overhauls of their schools, if there
is leadership, direction, and preparation for such overhauls. Knowing the men who make such statements leads me to believe their sincerity, but perhaps the question of feasibility of their dreams is still paramount.

The inner city, housing the crises that it does, will continue to teem with crime and hopelessness for decades to come if the stimuli for social revolution are to come from public education. No one really believes that the school will or should involve itself in revolutionary strategies, and surely, none of the Project planners meant to suggest such a posture. What could have been hoped for was a new look at some old problems. For example, to have teachers in the schools who could see themselves as concerned professionals working on behalf of children could mean a definite improvement in the life of a large number of children. The university could easily select and train students who could view teaching as a child-centered enterprise. These students might not conform to the usual model of a teacher-to-be, but if real institutional change is desired, then this would be a place to begin.

I have given much thought to the selection process for inner city teachers and have experienced much confusion in that thinking. The black militant sees color as the first priority for teachers in black schools but that, of course, is not a top priority from most other perspectives. Blackness may well determine one's dedication to the cause of oppressed black people and logically it should. Yet, the strong, forceful black man has long since written off public education as a social weapon and significant enough numbers probably
would not change their attitude now to serve in a historically white institution. Hence, the problem of obtaining sufficient numbers of blacks willing to serve in such roles is a difficult one, indeed. Perhaps some of the new programs such as "New Dimensions" will develop a way of attracting capable people into teaching by restoring their faith in the education enterprise.

Black control of black schools is next in the logical progression of thought on the inner city education issue. There is no question of the validity of the position, and even with the serious consequences that might arise from the separation of the school communities, it probably is worth the risk. Economics and personal resources notwithstanding, serious exploration of the matter needs to be given. It is difficult to know how to proceed on the reality without contaminating the new institution from the outset. Lots of pitfalls exist simply because the school is so deeply ingrained with the ethics of the white middle class. To turn the school over to black people would be a black extension of the white institution. Perhaps, to turn the education of black children over to black people without the school as the media would make more sense but that too may be a semantic trick of the white middle class.

A much more realistic approach to the black control issue is to call it "local community control" which, to some extent, removes the race issue. Decentralization of services, in general, not just in the school, is a prerequisite before even approaching the unrest of oppressed people. Central governmental control of our cities has killed the downtown business complex and forced blightedness into
being. Turning control of only social institutions over to the neighborhood is just another plan destined to failure, in the same vein as were early attempts at integration. If the control of education were packaged with general control of the neighborhood, however, the likelihood of social and personal success would be strengthened. At best, the education industry might be more responsive to local needs on both a short range and long range basis. At least, it would be difficult to see public education being further alienated from the people. Again, to have local control of the school without control of the police, firemen, and dozens of other public, social services would be futile.

It is well to keep this discussion in the perspective "of never coming to be." Political function being as rigid as it is, and the finance of public services being what it is, the possibility of poor people gaining control over their destiny is almost completely eliminated. The generally held belief that people who are not part of the mainstream of social, democratic life are unable and unwilling to accept responsibility for their own livelihood, further eliminates hope of local control as a reality. All the implications that affect the thinking surrounding these matters are of serious importance to educators. Recently some educational rehabilitation programs and general anti-poverty projections have been established for a ten-year period. The thought of nearly one-third of our people living in abject poverty for at least another ten years is appalling. How many more generations must do time in the hell of hopelessness? Why can we not act now? Is it inability or lack of desire?
Co-institutional programs of teacher preparation

The assumption must be that there will be no breakthrough in the local control issue and that the school will continue to be guided by the forces that guides it now. That being the case, co-institutional cooperation in the preparation of teachers might offer some little chance of change; very little real change for the urban dweller, to be sure, but maybe a shift in the way universities and public schools are able to view themselves. The most traumatic and dramatic change could occur at the university level since it would be forced to take a stand on some real issues, rather than only theoretical ones. (There is a slight move in that direction even now.) This could attract a different person into the college teaching business and could shake up some of the smug security on which the college depends for its independence.

However one views the future, the fact is, that for some time to come we will need teacher preparation programs and the college will continue to have a role to play in them. The hope might be that the college and the public school will permit and even encourage avenues to arise which will help people break away from tradition enough to cause a re-examination of what has been going on in our schools. It is unwise, however, to expect innovation to drastically reshape the traditions of either institution. History does not provide much hope for sweeping change or, for that matter, for much change at all. The educational institution has been bombarded with pressure to change but the guardians of the status-quo have, like a good hockey goalie, done well at protecting the nets.
If one accepts the position that there is not to be a revolution of any proportion, then the question of "How can that which we have now be made more liveable?" can be considered without having to prognosticate about the mysterious future. What this portends is a look at the individuals who will be carrying on the function of the educational process. Much has been written about the teacher as a person. There is wide agreement that what happens in the human-to-human relationship (teacher to student) is the true container of the educational message. What children learn does not have the life impact that how they learn does. Thus, the quality of the classroom life, the human essence, needs full consideration as a prior question to the content of the educational message itself.

On this basis, a developmental project could be seen as an opportunity for human beings to come together, to examine some life issues and to become more sensitive and more deeply introspective. This coming-together could be enough of an educational experience without having to direct all of the sharing toward the objective of preparing classroom teachers. For people to live out their hopes, fears, and uncertainties in a space which could be kept, at least, semi-private and accepting, would offer an opportunity to see if they then wanted to transform some of their collections of experiences into curricula that others could experience, too.

Perhaps we try too hard to "make" teachers into our own teacher-image, rather than providing environments where people can match that which resides uniquely inside them with what they interpret to be outside them. The depth of one's soul can never be
plumbed if he is in a frenzied climate where he must be trying to become what is already named for him. Hence, what a teacher education project could be is a place where students could come, unpressed by the institution, to fit their uniquenesses to the world or to decide that they did not care to make that fit at all.

The risk of a large number of students choosing not to become public people would be no greater than the risk we take now with our punishment and reward system. Having definite goals for people to meet does force temporary behavioral change, but as soon as the individual is given his own space back, he reforms it to fit his life as he sees it. Large numbers of people who go through teacher education programs never teach, and that is good. But why must we impose the need to be moving toward a certificate, which implies some standardization of personal qualities, when we know that the standardization only narrows the humanness of the standardized? Would it not be better to leave more room for personal inquiry and selection? Then we could certify those who are able to identify within themselves the need and desire to live a shared life. For those who do not arrive at that conclusion, the experience would have been a chance to gather many impressions about themselves and to continue growing as they will.

It would seem that out of an experience which encourages the personhood to develop would come people who could deal effectively with the human condition of others without personal threat. Further, eliminating the necessity of conforming to specific growth patterns might encourage new and useful ways of viewing old dilemmas. Thus,
to transcend the rigid, lock-step way that teachers-to-be have had to undergo could encourage them to look more creatively at their own lives and the lives of others, too. Under the traditional requirement-meeting system the person is lost in the function and the function then becomes the person.

The theory of non-directed education is probably not useful for the majority of college students. People who are highly task-oriented and outer-directed would not take well to the freedom that this theory implies. Much of the reward of day-to-day living is found in operational goal accomplishment. When the opportunity for immediate closure is taken away, some individuals demonstrate a great deal of anxiety about whether they are accomplishing anything. For these reasons, one must speak of the existential educational process in very limited terms and not as though it is applicable to a universal group.

Our experience with a teacher education project demonstrated that teacher preparation, like preparation for life, is for the most part, futile. Each unique personality has too many private sectors to be reached by a general educational process. At best, students are taught to deal with educational dilemmas verbally. Because of the economy of language and of linguistic living, the person need not invest himself in functional living. When the self is not invested, the activity is only "act" and the result is never real. Clark Moustakas said it well when he said, "Experience is real only when it is being lived; as soon as it is talked about or defined, the living moment is lost."
To conclude then, it could be said that the notion of bringing people together to search for communion and to attempt to orchestrate that search, not for objective but rather, for meaning, does make sense. The coming-together of people who have the freedom to express their lives in human terms is an exciting venture, indeed. The Urban Teacher Education Project gave us more than we can ever express in typical communication media. Our lives, having been invaded by the freezing and thawing of hopes and disappointments, must now stand for what they are; enriched in places, damaged in others; life goes on.

We would urge project attempts of the future to keep the human spark upper-most in the design and to be comfortable with failure as well as happy with success. Efforts toward allowing the human condition to change are never wholly successful by any measure other than those the human being can express for himself. The unrewarding part comes in the knowing that he is frequently unable or unwilling to share those successes with any outsiders.

Conclusions

My two years with the Urban Teacher Education Project gave me many opportunities to try out and test notions I have had about education; specifically, education of the poor and education of teachers for special environments. Of course, much of what I set out to discover was never found, or if it was, it was not clear enough to decode satisfactorily. Yet, despite the numerous new dilemmas to which the Project gave rise, some rather solid directions did emerge for me. Those are reported here with the reservation that they may be modified again and again over the years.
These points are ones in which I presently believe, and I trust that they are documented in my experience with the Urban Teacher Education Program.

1. **Colleges of Education and local public schools can successfully mate to produce new and exciting ways of educating teachers.**

   Each institution has a set of uniquenesses to contribute to a jointly conceived program for teacher education. If they are free from institutional restrictions and the conventionalism of administration to "free-wheel" with ideas and opportunities, there is no limit to what can be generated. The difficulty comes from the felt need to be conservative that seems always to reside in an institutional structure. These are ways to come at reducing that need which we found helpful within our Project.

   **A. Permit third and fourth echelon people to make decisions which can become operational.** We noted that while top level professionals often wanted to be avant garde, they felt too bound by tradition to expose themselves to any great extent. Further, it was noted that top level people had more than one task on their agenda and could not apply themselves fully to any single responsibility.

   **B. Be cautious not to overplan prior to any action that is to be taken.** Plans seem to retard variation and take on a mysterious rightness despite their utilitarian value in fact. It is well to underplan and leave much openness to the developing events. Being locked into specific means by precise plans is an unnecessary limitation.
C. Goal setting often has the same potential as does planning. If objectives are not thought of as only "sign posts along the way" in a developmental project, they become encumbrances. Goals are too easy to recite when describing the purposes for a task, and they sometimes become the object for accomplishment rather than to allow that object to grow out of human activity.

It was observed that goals were laid down to assist evaluators who urged staff to give them specific directions to measure. Surely goals of that stripe are not useful to the unfolding of a developmental task and should probably best be ignored.

D. The ceremony of budget making should be treated as just that. Again, trying to predict what will transpire after the human factors begin to interact is impossible. To restrict one segment or another by bugetary limitations is predetermined direction and acting against creativity.

Counter argument can be advanced regarding the fact of "limited funds." Staff should be aware of the limitations and should always be developing and redeveloping priorities for expenditures. But the pursestrings should not be held by people outside the Project staff nor should there be pre-destination of funds.

E. Any developmental project staff should make it clear and public that it must reserve the right to be wrong. This is somewhat related to goal accomplishment, but beyond that, it is
a matter of attitude. Being unwilling to take a risk for fear of not being successful has no place in a sincere investigation. Attempting to do everything right causes limitation that destroys courage and initiative.

Success has an aura of tradition about it. When one is told to be successful he is very often told to act the same as commonly prescribed. If new, creative ways are to be found, this kind of success will come from failure.

F. Frank discussions should be held early to identify some of the motivations which stimulate the participation of each institution. Although discovering and expressing motivation is difficult, the effort is worthwhile. There seems to be suspicion that each group is holding back a hidden agenda. If talk of this order is initiated, some of the suspicion may disappear. A sort of "What do you expect to get out of this" session is helpful.

G. Unilateral decisions must be made by each institution from time to time but there should be an openness about that, too. It should be understood from the outset that each will have to maintain its own identity and that maintenance may not be completely understood. Uninhibited liaison should exist between the two institutions. If this openness does not exist, there will doubtless be some inter-institutional scraping that could have been avoided.
2. Teacher educators should make a genuine effort to attract exciting young people into education regardless of how they are viewed by the establishment.

Marshall McLuhan said recently that "bright, creative young people are dropping out of college because they realize that that is not where the action is." The school, as an agent for society, has been very successful in rejecting non-conformists. We are reproducing ourselves and inside the reproduction we are regenerating our "stoggi-ness" and our elitest selves.

Numbers of young people who could contribute, not to our sameness, but to our differentiation and growth are "turning education off." Alienation of our youth is becoming a serious problem, not because they make us uncomfortable, but because this society desperately needs their talents. For a time the Peace Corps and VISTA offered the alienated a way and a place, but even those outlets seem to have been converted into mirrors of middle classed America.

What better place could the bright, original young person "do his thing" than in education? Here he has the chance of not only confronting his students, but also of confronting himself with his beliefs and his standards. If the institution set out to co-opt these people, they would flee and flee they should; but there is considerable evidence to demonstrate that the "hippy-type youth" is looking for an alternative to his hum-drums life, far beyond drugs and light shows. For the most part, these people are bored, disappointed, and searching.
The traditional institution has not much to offer these people. However, the revision, which many educators are calling for might offer a new "zing" for the alienated. It is not necessary for the typical educator to be so jealous of his attitudes that he must refuse to hear views which are contrary to them. It is not necessary for the professional educator to fear the overthrow of the establishment if fresh vitality is being generated in the course of the change; the establishment will be better, even for the professional educator.

New programs in teacher education are an excellent place for trying-out some opportunities for the unusual teacher-to-be and to give him enough space to claim his own awareness and dignity. Everyone would have to make an effort at change, not to serve any institutional master but to serve each other. In 399 B.C. a teacher was accused of corrupting the morals of the youth and was put to death by a tribunal of justices. Even today we honor the teachings of Socrates; but the names of the justices we do not know. There must be a better fate for us and our creative youth than to follow Dylan Thomas' words, "go gentle into the night."¹

¹An effort was made to attract some so-called "hippy-types" into the Project, both as staff and as students. One man who might fit that description did stay with the staff for the duration of the Project and made an excellent contribution, too. He gave us insights about working with certain students. Beyond anything he did for the students directly, he represented a freedom that each staff member envied in his own way. His beard, his unconventional dress, his creative sense of humor and his problem-solving capability; each had its appeal.

Now he is living happily in Chicago doing odd jobs with his camera and hands. He told us that teacher educating required too much confinement.
3. Somehow teacher education must become more modern and less traditional. Some conventionality is spinoff from the public school, but much of it is internally produced.

Many of the points discussed under number two fit here as well. Teacher education has atrophied partially because the teacher educator is not challenged by aggressive learners who force him to examine himself. As a result, what was acceptable a decade ago in content and technique is still being used.

Further, the institutional bonds are quite strong and do, to some extent, inhibit the growth of the teacher educator. Although one really wonders if these bonds are not easily broken by individual effort, it would be wrong to underestimate the power of the institution at controlling some behavior and rewarding other.

It would seem, however, that if teacher educators met their students more directly and on grounds that were not owned by either, there would be mutual change and updating. One thing the Project taught was how much security the classroom and the campus offers as a medium of its own. Outside that arena the educator must generate some newness to help him succeed, and that newness must necessarily contain more humanness and vitality than any typical institution.

Also, the Project did show that with some openness, students, public school people and professors could co-exist meaningfully off campus. Being responsible for a person beyond his professional preparation is not comfortable, but it is enlightening. During the Project's off-campus phase it becomes somewhat confused as to who is teaching whom! It appeared that everyone was learning.
4. Public school teachers and administrators need to give careful consideration to whether or not they wish to work with college people in co-institutional ventures.

Because of the historic status variation between public school professionals and college professors there is a natural problem coming into a co-institutional relationship from a personal point of view. Teachers who become cooperating teachers face several difficulties which are hard to describe in professional terms.

Not only are they expected to "turn over" a rather large share of their operation to a beginner, but they must assume the responsibility for the classroom even though they are not fully in control of what occurs there. Frustrations are numerous and the possibility of becoming a success or failure on the strength of a set of circumstances is quite good. For this reason teachers ought to look carefully at their performance and how the college will support them during the experience.

Off-hand collaborative statements are not sufficient. Cooperating teachers should have an opportunity to meet the student's supervisor and compare philosophical and operational foundations before the experience begins. It might even be well to arrange a means by which the student and cooperating teacher could interview each other before a relationship decision was made.

Some personality matching of students and cooperating teachers was attempted within the Project, but the results were not very clear. One thing is clear, however; some teachers do not want student teachers
and under no circumstances should they be forced to assume the responsibility for institutional reward. The final loser is the child, and that is not fair.

5. Professional people from the university who are asked to assume the responsibility for a number of student teachers, in a co-institutional arrangement, should be willing to give their full attention to that responsibility.

For all the difficulties we experienced, probably the most valuable segment, from a learning position, was the interrelationship of student and staff. Cutting through the artificial, assumed problems of some students to the reality of their confusion is at times unrewarding and discouraging; but the experience is, in the end, worth the effort. That assumes that the professional sincerely wants to work with teachers-to-be and to become insightful about the task.

As was pointed out in Chapter Two the energy requirements are substantial and the traumas one must confront are often quite confusing, but the coming-together produces a much clearer view of the position from which the student operates. Beyond that understanding the close viewing of a student undergoing rather dramatic exposure of himself can provide a person with a more sensitive way of seeing others and himself.

Where I failed

The role I was to play in the Project, as it was originally conceived, was to be a sort of liaison between the university and the community of the urban poor. It was through that relationship that the Project was to gain accurate information about poor people and
and their attitudes about education and their hopes and disillusionments that were related to the school.

During the planning phase and through the pilot segment of the Project I felt that I served that function well. Several people were hired by the university who had first-hand insights into the black community and others were invited to serve in advisory capacities and some did. I was able to move easily in the subcultures that the Project wished to understand and to deliver a reasonably accurate picture of some of the symptoms of poverty-ridden people and the communities in which they are forced to live.

Yet, even during the planning period of the Project I tried to convey that the urban situation was changing and that the informal leadership was shifting from the moderates (whom I felt I knew and with whom I could relate) to the militant who, because of the color of my skin and the segment of society with which I was identified, would not relate to me. It became increasingly clear, at least to me, that my value was to become insignificant in terms of my liaison role.

During the summer of 1968 sufficient shifts had taken place in the ghetto that nearly all of my previous sources of contact were closed down. My resentment, frustration and, no doubt, fear caused my behavior to change and forced me to assume new roles with which I was not happy and for which I was not suited.

My behavioral change confirmed the suspicion some had had about me all along and my frustration, which appeared as hostility much of the time, alienated others. One of the unspoken agreements or arrange-
ments poor people make among themselves is "to use and to be used."
When it became impossible for me to use, I resented being used and
that resentment forced me into a retreat from people I once had
enjoyed very much.

The social loneliness which followed caused me to reassess my
own personal life-style in relation to people and places that com­
prised a "home" for me only months before. I realized I did not (or
perhaps could not) live there anymore. Nor, could I ever really
belong to the academic community I had chosen to work within. For
me, a new search must be undertaken.

The eleven students - Summary

From the experience we had with eleven students whom we kept
in close proximity the following statements could be made:

1. Most teachers-to-be do not expect to teach very long, if
   at all.
2. Teachers-to-be faced with the cultural gap tend to ignore
   it or do declare it impossible to bridge.
3. Most student teachers at first resist standard institutional
   values and attitudes but come to accept them if not in word,
   surely, in deed.
4. With few exceptions there was very little creativity within
   the group. Getting past tomorrow was a prime objective.
5. No appreciable shift in life-style was evident to an observer. Many students talked about how they had changed, but if they had, they had not yet found ways to demonstrate it.

6. Most of the students deemed the experience successful even though they could never report how they arrived at that conclusion.

Many more issues of less importance could be discussed, but the ones listed are the ones that are most visible and most generalizable. A lot happened that went on below the surface of consciousness. For example, it is not possible to truly assess the dilemmas that the students experienced with their parents. The significance of that relationship probably affected the students' performance, but hardly any of that interaction took place on the Project stage.

Other relationships were vital, too. Boyfriends, husbands-to-be and peer group associates not affiliated with the Project doubtless played some role in the overall operation. This, not to mention the intergroup relationships which never fully developed so that they were visible. Staff people rarely attended discussions in which the students shared themselves with each other. Unquestionably such discussions occurred, and there were reports of the occurrence, but it was always second-hand information.

It goes without saying that some very vital happenings escaped the view of the staff and have been lost. There was so much going on so rapidly that even an observer in a staff position could not cope with the amount and complexity of the events. Surely, it would be
wise if staff members could be given some help in learning how to observe the unfolding human condition. If their skills were more acute, they certainly would see a lot of what is generally missed.

Finally

The real test of the value of the Urban Teacher Education Project resides inside each of us. Each, in his own way, has asked himself questions, serious questions, during the term of the Project. The answers we got are not public. Each of us has probably become more open to experience and more sensitive to our own feelings. That is probably enough for any project, at least, in human terms.
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INTRODUCTION TO APPENDICES

The following inclusions have been inserted in the hope that they will add dimension to the reader's background knowledge of 1) the Urban Teacher Education Project, 2) the everyday flavor and occasional irony in working with students and staff, 3) the writer's philosophical approach to interaction in the name of education, and 4) the several media used to facilitate such interactions.

Appendix A is a formal mission statement written by the directors at the end of the pilot study in the spring of 1968. It includes 1) background philosophy for such an effort by Ohio State University and the Ohio Board of Regents, 2) some generalizations realized through the pilot study, and 3) goals for the Project in 1968-69. The pages included are part of an overall proposal which was sent to the U. S. Office of Education in an effort to obtain financial support under the Educational Professions Development Act. Dr. Virgil E. Blanke was the main author of this work, but he collaborated closely with his staff and colleagues. Though the proposal was unsuccessful in obtaining funds, the part included as Appendix A remained the springboard for planning the 1968-69 Project program.

Appendix B is a series of vignettes written by the author at various times during the year in reaction to or description of events in the Project. It is included to give the reader a feeling of the
plight of the urban poor and the reaction to that plight by would-be inner city teachers. Though the first vignette is a dramatization of many observations, the remaining selections were based on actual observations and were recorded by the author, or are reflections on such observations.

Appendix C is a dialogue entitled "Board Meeting." It was written by the author before the Project began. He was then involved in the Able Student Program, a series of loosely-structured courses taught to select students for the purposes of educational change. This program was a precarious, though long-lived arm, of the Ohio State University College of Education; and when the originators of the pilot Project evidenced an inability to identify students who were willing to try the new idea, the author was able to find fifteen of the original twenty students in his own class of juniors! The "Board Meeting" dialogue is included to give the reader an indication of the author's state of mind when he entered the Urban Teacher Education Project. It was a position of strength, though not an applauded one.

Appendix D is a series of pictures and captions that will also give an idea of the author's thinking and life-styles. They are included because the author still doubts the authenticity of words to represent the feelings of poverty. Those who would look further can find that a set of over 300 slides plus a video tape and a tape recording have also been submitted with this paper. The author suggests that they represent another dimension of the Project which words could not convey.
Appendix A

THE PROJECT FORMAL DOCUMENT

URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

(CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY)

Problem

Differences between the existence of the urban poor and life styles of the rest of Americans comprise the most urgent and crucial issue of our time. The improvement of formal education for inner city inhabitants is a strategy for strengthening urban life which has almost complete political and social consensus in the United States. The federal government has allocated millions of dollars to cities, their school systems, and institutions of higher education to work on problems of urban education. Despite the utilization of these new resources, the problem remains unsolved.

A very important key to solving inner city learning problems is the inner city teacher. The teacher is the most important individual in relating and mutually modifying for the inner city student the norms of his culture and the expectations of the rest of society through the school and its curriculum. At the present time most beginning teachers and many experienced teachers are inadequately prepared for this task. Consequently, the money expended on curriculum reform, organizational change, and poverty eradication is ine-
feciently used. Public schools and colleges for teacher education as we know them may well be replaced by other educational institutions if they continue to fail in this arena.

The environment, values, and living patterns of poor people are grossly different from other Americans. If poor people are to receive quality instruction, teachers must understand such differences and build teaching styles and strategies accordingly. The present teacher education program at Ohio State University does not articulate and deal with such differences. It assumes that good teaching is good teaching with little adjustment to context. Where the inner city is concerned, such preparation programs lead to professional behavior resembling apathy and/or flight.

In addition, the complexity of the urban situation tends to make quick payoff of new program and curriculum ideas unlikely. Consequently, few innovative teacher education programs designed especially for the urban poor exist. Those that do exist have not been evaluated adequately and many of them never will be assessed because the designers do not stay with the program long enough to accomplish such assessment.

**Historical background**

For the past few years the Cleveland Public School system has needed greater numbers of adequately trained teachers to teach in inner city schools. Ohio State University, which is one of the largest teacher educational institutions in the nation, did little to prepare such teachers for Cleveland's urban areas or inner cities elsewhere. During those years, most teacher graduates from Ohio State did not
elect to begin their teaching careers in inner city schools. What was urgently needed was a concerted effort by school systems and universities to ameliorate this condition. Therefore, a joint effort by the Cleveland Public Schools and Ohio State University was initiated to develop a relevant teacher education program and to determine if the responsibility for preparing teachers could be met on a collaborative base.

Preliminary plans and discussions took place between the two institutions during the 1966-67 academic year. While it was easy to reach agreements at a conceptual level, initial difficulties arose over the practicalities of creating a collaborative teacher education program at the institutional level. Both formal and informal exchanges between administrative staffs and other personnel set into motion a removal of obstacles that under ordinary conditions prevail to prevent change. Financial support, personnel, and material resources were made available to the Pilot Project of 1967-68 by both Cleveland and Ohio State in order that a more relevant teacher education program for the inner city might be met. Part of the financial resources came as a direct grant from the Ohio Board of Regents.

Study teams

Two study teams composed of O.S.U. and Cleveland personnel were organized and charged to develop programs for teacher education that were appropriate to inner city life and its residents. Each team was directed to arrive at its own conception and implementation of what should constitute this new program to prepare teachers. The teams had representation from both institutions (O.S.U.-Cleveland)
in each study group. Based on a clinical team concept these roles were a teacher educator, psychologist, environmentalist, ghetto liaison, master teacher of an inner city school, appraisal specialist, and graduate student.

A decision by both teams to field test ideas with a group of undergraduate teacher candidates, rather than "to armchair" an innovative program, was made early. Twenty-two students were identified for this purpose, and the activities of conceptualizing, doing, and evaluating were undertaken in January of 1968. The students were enthusiastic and receptive to the notion of a pilot program of innovative activities which would prepare them to teach in inner city schools. In fact, they were chosen on these bases: their willingness to engage in such a program; their disenchantment with existing programs; their commitment to becoming an inner city teacher; and their receptivity to change and revolutionary mindedness. A few students had little experience in the accepted teacher education sequence, while some students had taken extensive work in the regular program. They were at all stages of university work in the College of Education (Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors, and Graduate).

During the course of the first quarter (January 3 to March 12, 1968), the two teams engaged in four primary activities: (1) attempted to conceptualize and to design a teacher education program vis-a-vis inner city, (2) tried to become a study group that could think, work, and achieve its task together, (3) recommended viable activities for student experience in preparation for a teaching practicum in Cleveland inner city schools, and (4) developed closer O.S.U.-
Cleveland relationships relative to suggested and actual student experience in Cleveland. In the main, these four activities were achieved with some success. Since these activities were intensely human undertakings that involved different institutional values, personal feelings, and programmatic aspirations, it is extremely difficult to capture the essence of that progress through a recourse to words or through a recollection of events. Suffice it to say, that the activities were productive and laid the foundation for a promising future of collaborative activity.

Not all of the student experience resulted from the recommendations and suggestions by the teams, but the teams had the liberty and freedom to work with students to field-test ideas which they believed were appropriate. To give some description of our involvement with the students is to refer to our participation as clinical team behavior. The team exercised its expertise by planning and arranging for student experience in selected inner city schools, with community agencies, on-going school programs, and community resource persons; by making oral presentations on inner city life, community structure and culture, teacher behavior, school realities; etc.; by providing support and encouragement to students during their teaching practicum vis-a-vis counseling, observations, and group meetings; by using diagnostic techniques and remedial measures for students who needed assistance and help; and by being available when the need arose from student difficulty.
During the second quarter, when the students were housed in Cleveland for their teaching practicum, the clinical team worked closely with the students under actual teaching situations. Several group meetings and seminars were held at both the student residence house and the schools for facilitating the value of the student teaching practicum. Observations of teaching behavior and feedback sessions were held in order to facilitate student teaching performance. The cooperating teachers of the inner city schools, who were expressly chosen to co-teach with the students, were especially helpful in their willingness to work closely with the students and to evaluate teaching performance with the students and with the clinical team. A recent evaluation session with the cooperating teachers revealed two specific behavioral characteristics which corroborated the assessments that the clinical teams had made of students: 1) a commitment to teaching the inner city child and an ability to relate effectively to these children, and 2) an idealistic enthusiasm for teaching in an inner city school that had been converted into a realistic enthusiasm, but persistent and self-sustained enthusiasm nevertheless.

Program and Objectives

During the 1968-69 academic year forty-four undergraduate students and five graduate students will be involved full-time in the Urban Teacher Education Program. Half of their time will be spent on the campus at Ohio State University and the other half of their time will be spent in Cleveland. The clinical team approach, program organization, content, and schedule are sketched briefly in the appendix of
this proposal. This brief sketch is a portrait of intent which was painted after last year's experience. The curriculum experiences which will form meat for the bones of this skeleton are being created daily, and they will be described in full at the end of this academic year.

Two kinds of goals provide direction for this experimental curriculum development in teacher education. The first set has to do with broad changes in institutions. The second has to do with individual behavioral change in students and staff working in the program.

Broad Goals

1. The program is designed to produce more and better teachers for large city school systems. Since Cleveland and the Cleveland School System will provide the major field experience for teacher candidates in the Urban Teacher Education Development, Cleveland will have the best access to teachers graduating from the program. Three of the six seniors in last year's program are now teaching in Cleveland. The past percentage of O.S.U. graduates taking their first teaching position in Cleveland is much smaller than that.

2. The program is also an attempt to improve the lot of many dwelling in Cleveland's inner city by producing teachers who care about people and want to improve their conditions.

3. If the concepts being tried work effectively, these ideas will be incorporated in the regular teacher education program at Ohio State University. Furthermore, these ideas
might be used by other colleges and city school systems who are attempting to improve their own teacher education programs.

Expected change in individual behavior

1. Each teacher candidate was expected to demonstrate particular skills which are related to teaching competence. Teaching here means the ability to help students learn certain things prescribed by society and to help students develop certain things prescribed by themselves.

2. Teacher candidates were expected to understand the norms and values of the culture or cultures in which their students live. Teacher candidates were also expected to understand the norms and values of the culture from which they came. When there is individual conflict because of cultural difference, teacher candidates were expected to articulate this conflict and deal with it. Furthermore, teacher candidates were expected to help students learn and develop themselves rather than just imposing their own cultural biases on students who do not understand or want such values. This set of objectives might result in some of the following behaviors: a willingness to risk oneself, a willingness to be uncertain, the acceptance of personal discomfort and emotional imbalance, a constant concern about institutional fit, and the willingness to be both protagonist and antagonist.
Each teacher candidate was expected to articulate clearly what he is as a person and what the role of teacher means to him. He was expected to articulate these matters so that he can deal openly with his own conflict and alienation.
Appendix B
ENTER STUDENT TEACHER

Here I am in the sixth grade after having spent seven years on my way here. I've been studied, tested, isolated, paddled, retained, returned, insulted, kept, sent, discouraged, displaced, treated, examined, shook and tutored. The results have all been the same--teachers don't like me; some have said I don't want to learn, some have said I can't learn, some have ignored me, some haven't even done that--some have said I don't care--I don't care?

On the streets I dance, steal, run, hide, skip, play, laugh, sing, whistle, cry, fight, yell, swear, masturbate, eat, screw, work. My life is the radio, comic books, sweat, cold, stomachaches, sore throats, records, big girls, watching cars and looking for policemen.

This year the teacher cares less because I have to go to junior high anyway--lowest reading group--last seat in last row, messenger for the principal--water the plants every fourth week and a new shirt from the bookroom and new shoes from the shoe fund.

Pop gone, Mom works, one sister in second grade who is smarter than me, two sisters out of school, one with a new baby, one already had one last year. Older brother in the Army in Florida.

A student teacher--someone who is learning to be a teacher--she is learning too, only to teach. Her teacher will come to see her teach--chair beside the door and her plans on the desk. She
likes children and she's young and pretty and wants us to like her. She wants to help me especially, asks questions, brings a special book, pictures of cars, knows some of my songs, comes out to the playground, eats lunch with me, helps me with tests and spelling words.

Now she teaches my reading group, spends less time with me, doesn't read my papers, can't come outside anymore, says I should try harder, teaches the whole class--tells her teacher I'm her friend, whispers that I can't read--tells me to be quiet, to be quiet--to be quiet--says I just don't try, don't read, don't behave, can't spell, out in the hall, down to the principal, paddle, yell, cry, desk beside hers, can't learn, junior high anyway. Goodby, 25¢ for party; Goodby TEACHER--I'm her friend--last seat--last row--messenger for principal--water plants--shirt from bookroom--shoes from shoe fund.

One student said in her application that she felt more able to help underprivileged children because she had been a cabin leader at a Girl Scout camp for two summers. No one asked her, "more able than what?"

On one application for the Project the girl wrote that she felt that the future of America depended upon the effort that each person was willing to put forth in order to assist the development of our blighted cities and their people. Later she quit the Project because she said I insulted her sorority.
"This Project requires full commitment," one of the STAFF announced at the first Project meeting. Everyone nodded as though they understood. One girl got up to sneak out after glancing at her watch. I said, "Is full commitment too much to ask?" "No," she said, "not at all but I have a coffee date at 10:00."

Our students were housed in a hotel in Cleveland that served as a residence for many aged people who appeared to have come from varied and interesting backgrounds. There was very little conversation between the kids and the golden agers. One day in the elevator several students told me that they didn't like history in school either.

Before we went to Cleveland one white student told me that she wouldn't accept a student teaching assignment in an all-white school. She said she felt black kids needed her more than white kids did. Especially, she said, since middle class black people would not help "their own" people!

Some black students at Ohio State "took over" the Administration Building to protest mistreatment of blacks on our campus. After that confrontation our college held a meeting to address itself to finding ways of helping improve the lot of the black student. Our faculty philosopher delivered a moving appeal to inspire change and progress. I read the paper he presented and it was beautiful and sensitive. He said he wasn't surprised at the reaction--his proposal was sent to committee--it is still there--but then so is the Administration Building.
At one of the early planning sessions of the Project staff some wanted to use our time to plan very carefully the processes of the Project. I wanted the whole thing to be a "happening." One of the younger staff members suggested that we compromise and have a planned-happening. We did compromise, but we didn't talk much after that.

Housing in Cleveland was a major concern for many of the students and for some parents. One mother called to request, very politely, that her daughter be placed in supervised living quarters. She suggested the Western Reserve Campus. When I told her that we had tried to obtain space there but could not, she seemed relieved. She was probably happy just to know that the University still cared about her daughter.

Another mistake we made was trying to select students for a Project we already had started. It was like selecting Clark Gable to play a role better suited to Peter Sellers. In many ways we spent the remainder of our year asking Gable to shave off his mustache.

There was a great effort to attract black students into the Project. The reasons for that probably weren't very closely related to teacher education or elementary education or public education in general. When the students behaved as though they didn't need us we lost sight of how much we needed them.
The great questions of the day or the great questions of our age need full discussion and new creative answers. This statement is being made more frequently now than perhaps at any time in history. We (mankind) face nuclear annihilation, localized war, racial turmoil, civil disobedience, fiscal confusion, and economic tragedy—all in the same hour, every hour of every day. But man's emotional senses have been dulled much as the physical handicap becomes common to the bearer.

The thesis that the writer shall propose here is not meant to be scholarly, nor will it purport a newness. It is a view, in fact, which will doubtless lead from here to there without much sensation of motion.

The state of public education is said to be sound. The institution, in theory, presents the youth of our age with the fundamentals of vocational endeavor, the heritage of our culture, the skills of socialization, and the power of research and development. The complexity of the system staggers the imagination not only in terms of the administrative matrix, but even more fascinating, the implied role of the school in our modern sociological development.

The first and, of course, the most often articulated assignment of the school is education.
In the philosophy of nearly every school one finds the words "to educate." This phrase usually is neither proceeded nor followed by a definition of education. How would the philosophy read, or more important, how would the system operate if Plato's definition of education were superimposed and were utilized:

The harmony of the soul, taken as a whole, is virtue; but that particular training in respect to pleasure and pain, which leads you always to hate what you ought to hate, and love what you ought to love from the beginning of life to the end, may be separated off; and in my view, will be rightly called education. (Plato, Laws, paragraph 653)

The setting is an informal meeting of a Board of Education in a city of 35,000. The informal topic is educational policy, and the superintendent is a disciple of the late Plato. His reputation is that of being a master educator, but an unusual theorist. "Well liked," it goes, "but misunderstood."

Board President: Now, Super., would you restate that first objective again. (Looks fiery-eyed at Board Member #1)

Superintendent: (Reluctantly) Yes, the first and most critical objective of education is to come to grips with love, hate, joy, and sorrow.

Board Member #1: Okay. We all agree that love is important, but what does that have to do with the kindergarten? Everybody loves a kindergartener.

Board President: I think I understand. You mean teaching kids to love animals and nature and mothers and...
Board Member #2: We have been doing that for years! I want to know what we are going to teach that's new, modern.

Board Member #5: Books and materials and the costs and where do we hire teachers and that stuff, that's what I want to know.

Superintendent: In my view, we can't talk about the "stuff" of education until we decide what we are educating for, what we need to do; the task, will follow.

Board President: Here, I'll read what the curriculum guide says: "The purpose is to educate the whole child and make him a useful, productive citizen." That seems clear to me, by gosh!

Board Member #2: It surely does, and we have been doing it for years.

Board Member #5: Right! What we need to know from you is what books we need to do the job.

Board President: Well, let's start with the teachers. Where will we hire the number we need?

Superintendent: The question should be what kind of teacher should we hire to help us accomplish our task?

Board Member #5: Do you ever answer a question? What is this kind of teacher bit? A teacher is a teacher, just as a rose is a rose.
Superintendent: I don't agree! Haven't you any standards for the quality of person you have instruct your children?

Board Member #5: Here we go again!

Board President: I resent that. Of course we care about quality. We have always had fine teachers in our schools, sir.

Superintendent: Doubtless you have, but I am asking you what you see as a fine teacher.

Board President: One who can teach, of course. One who likes her job and likes children and is an asset to the community and to the school.

Superintendent: That's what I mean. Tell me what you consider an asset both to the community and to the school. Are there not qualities which can be described?

Board Member #2: Well, I think I can list some for you. We want teachers who believe in God and who aren't afraid to say what they think. Ones who are part of the community and who will settle down here.

Superintendent: Let's start with a belief in God.

Board President: That's awfully general. Everyone believes in God, or they should. We better be more specific.

Board Member #2: We have never had any teachers who didn't believe in God!
Superintendent: Fine. I'll put that down, then.

Board Member #5: Wait, there must be a trick here. Oh! I see! You have a Jew you want to hire.

Superintendent: So far, Jews fit our criteria, don't they?

Board Member #2: Well, I suppose, but they certainly wouldn't want to settle in our community, I don't know of another Jewish family here. Do you, #4?

Board Member #4: I've never thought of it, I guess. Can we get on with the list?

Board President: Well, Superintendent, you know what we mean about God, don't you? I mean, there are limits, of course.

Superintendent: I know what you mean! What else do you want on the list?

Board Member #2: Next would be someone who knows his subject matter. Yes, and was able to get it across, too. Why are you laughing, #4?

Board Member #4: I was thinking of what the superintendent said about love and then what you said about getting it across.

Superintendent: I agree completely, but I need to know what you mean by subject matter.

Board Member #2: Haven't we already laid it out for you? We've implied high morals, religious belief, and intelligence. Now, that seems adequate to me.
Superintendent: It may be adequate for some, but you need to tell me more.

Board President: Maybe you should tell us. We can't seem to give you a satisfying answer.

Board Member #5: That's right: you tell us what you want and then maybe we can decide.

Superintendent: Of course, I too want intelligence, but intelligence in more ways than in subject matter. I want a person who feels deeply his obligation, not only to today, but to tomorrow, also. One who can see a child as more than a miniature adult; a human spirit itself which learns not only from books, but who mirrors events in his own life. I want a person who can speak of love as a lover, not as an admirer of love; who can stand up to evil not as a cynic, but as a fighter for justice. Yes, even one who can himself rise above the cheap, selfish instincts of human nature and dare to deal with authentic reality not as an illusion, but as a fact.

Board President: How can we expect a teacher to have all of that? Isn't that unrealistic?

Superintendent: Perhaps, but then isn't it unrealistic to expect to educate at all? To teach the skills of problem solving may appear easy enough, but the test comes in the solution, not the skill.
Board President: You said something about "fighter for justice."
What's that again?

Superintendent: I said someone who can contact and defeat evil
not just criticize it; not just a journalist
of life, but a soldier of life.

Board Member #4: You mean immorality, don't you?

Superintendent: Call it what you will, but...

Board Member #4: But there is very little of that in this town.
I mean very little.

Superintendent: Perhaps so, but we should ask if our society
is good to all men and...

Board Member #4: Our town is a friendly, warm little community
and while it has its faults, they can be lived
with.

Superintendent: That's my point. If generation after generation
lives with its faults, they become the society.

Board Member #4: We have no serious faults. That's my point.

Superintendent: Is it an accident, #4, that not one Negro family
lives in this city? Yet in all the neighboring
towns Negro people have lived for years.

Board President: I'd never thought of that, but I know any family
would be free to live here. Apparently they
don't choose to move in.
What a topic to bring up! We have never been bothered by the Negro problem. Anyway, I've heard that a family is moving in and they are welcome as far as I'm concerned.

My God! Where?

Don't worry. The story is that he is a lawyer.

Do they have kids? That could really cause us trouble.

Trouble, that would be a minor disaster. Where are they moving?

I've heard that they are moving in, but that some of the Citizens for Better Government still have a chance to solve the problem.

What problem?

Well, I mean keep...I mean, you know, they couldn't be happy in an all-white community.

Perhaps we better add that to our list. White teachers only.

I don't like the sarcasm.

Can we get on with the meeting? We have a lot to discuss.

I agree, but you must give me direction.

Could we stay away from controversial topics?

We cannot avoid the real issues.
Board Member #3: It seems to me we are getting away from the real issues in education and talking about the Jews and Negroes and love. How about talking about learning and teaching?

Board Member #4: Right!

Board President: Could we all agree that we want our children to believe in and support democracy?

Board Member #5: I would surely think so. Our last superintendent was a strong believer in democracy, and he really taught it to our children.

Superintendent: How did he teach it?

Board President: For one thing, he treated teachers democratically. They had open meetings and really discussed the controversial issues.

Superintendent: Could you give me an example?

Board President: Well...there was the time the teachers insisted there be a ticket booth from which to sell tickets at football games. He mastered that one. Remember, #4?

Board Member #4: I don't remember the details, I guess.

Board President: He just told them they could have the ticket booth or the $2.00 per game. They had to decide.

Superintendent: And?

Board President: And they took the $2.00, of course.

Superintendent: And that's democratic?
They voted and expressed their desire, didn't they? (laughter) Well...?

I suppose, but isn't that a misuse of either the principle or the example?

It is a simplification, of course, but it shows how he used democratic methods to his advantage.

Is democracy a tool to use to control or a means of setting free?

What do you think?

Should democracy not be a set of freedoms and responsibilities in which men assist each other in becoming perfect? To release the soul so that man can achieve a harmony with truth and goodness and therefore become nearly perfect, and also causing his society to become perfect.

But democracy as an operation is a way of controlling people.

No, it is a way of people controlling themselves, but there must be a purpose for control.

There is. If we didn't control ourselves there would be chaos. Man must regulate himself, and yet he must permit himself freedom to think and develop.
Superintendent: Now we are getting some place. What you have said is true, but there is even more. Democracy implies that man can free himself and that in the process he can free other men. Education, then, gives men not only the pattern for freedom, but the inspiration to be free. The problem is that our freedom is being taken for granted.

Board Member #4: That is exactly why I favor patriotism being taught in the schools. We need to remind these kids what freedom means. That might stop some of these silly protests.

Superintendent: How about the freedom to protest?

Board Member #4: Remember what the president said about regulation? People have to regulate themselves.

Superintendent: But democracy functions on criticism.

Board Member #4: Constructive criticism.

Superintendent: Constructive criticism has its place, but to insist that criticism be constructive is to restrict debate.

Board President: I don't see that. I say if you don't have a better way, don't criticize. That's the tradition of our form of government.

Superintendent: Do you agree that if you need to present an alternative every time you criticize, it limits criticism?
Of course, as well it should.

But couldn't creative alternatives be derived after the criticism, as well as before it?

Can you not protest for spirit as well as for system? Must criticism always be measured in terms of its vehicle, rather than in terms of its intentions?

Exactly what I said. What do you intend to do when you criticize? If it makes sense, then criticize, if not, keep quiet.

Makes sense to whom?

To everybody.

Does this not limit the freedom to criticize?

Yes, but the way you earn the right to criticize is by coming up with a better way.

Better in whose opinion?

Everyone's involved.

Then it is not criticism, it is suggestion.

Perhaps it is at that.

Then there is no place for criticism and no room for dissent.

Sure there is room for dissent, but it's how you go about it that counts.

More than the quality of the dissenting?

Dissenting will do no good if it just makes people angry. Agree?
Of course, as well it should.

But couldn't creative alternatives be derived after the criticism, as well as before it?

Can you not protest for spirit as well as for system? Must criticism always be measured in terms of its vehicle, rather than in terms of its intentions?

Exactly what I said. What do you intend to do when you criticize? If it makes sense, then criticize, if not, keep quiet.

Makes sense to whom?

To everybody.

Does this not limit the freedom to criticize?

Yes, but the way you earn the right to criticize is by coming up with a better way.

Better in whose opinion?

Everyone's involved.

Then it is not criticism, it is suggestion.

Perhaps it is at that.

Then there is no place for criticism and no room for dissent.

Sure there is room for dissent, but it's how you go about it that counts.

More than the quality of the dissenting?

Dissenting will do no good if it just makes people angry. Agree?
How about the American Revolution? And...
That's an extreme example, isn't it?

Jesus?

I mean everyday dissenting, not revolution or religion.

But sometimes everyday dissenting turns into revolution. Revolution need not have nationalistic implications. In fact, it can be quite limited.

You're right there. Maybe I mean dramatic revolution.

Out of dissenting can come progress and freedom for the individual, and so it would seem to be consistent with democratic ideals.

I can see that and I agree. You mean like Martin Luther King.

But he has ulterior motives.

Such as...

He wants people to have rights which they have never earned, which they don't deserve.

Well...

That is a dangerous line of reasoning, #2. There are some real pitfalls in the argument. Inevitably you will be asked how you earned your freedom.

That is a ridiculous question, and you know
it. Just plain ridiculous. Compared to...

Comparisons are dangerous, too. The point of this discussion is for us to assess our attitudes toward what we believe, not to discover whether we believe. The fact is that democracy offers us opportunities of being ourselves and expressing our reactions to life as we see it. Education is not a part of democracy, but it is democracy. For to educate is to awaken man to his destiny, to his hope, his fear, his joy, his sorrow, and his ultimate worth. If he is only indoctrinated, he is the captive of someone else's restrictions. If he is educated, he is restricted only by his sensitivity, his obligation, and his vision. He will serve justice, he will represent virtue, he will strive to harmonize with the mystery of the ultimate, and to turn away from the evil of man.

Much of what you say makes sense to me, but it sounds strange in this day and age. Somehow I've had the idea that education was to prepare man to be productive. Productivity meant having an income and supporting one's obligations. Then, too, education, in my view, is to teach man to fulfill his social responsibilities,
but I'd never thought of the meaning of education to the man himself, as well. Interesting thought, indeed.

Thank you for your encouragement. Perhaps if I could explain just a bit further.

Yes, go ahead.

For man to have meaning for himself requires that he have a concept of himself as having true worth. Thus, he must risk himself in the struggle for meaning. Education has come to be institutionalized to the place that the routines of education, the histrionics of education, have been taken for education itself. It has become a paradox. The motions and systems of education have, in many cases, snuffed out the lamp of learning.

And teachers?

In my judgment these must be the originals, the ones who have not joined the frantic search for commonality. The emphasis on objectifying teaching is causing a trend toward depersonalizing education to the place that the teacher fears to be real, the excitement of teaching and the exhilaration of learning are being replaced by method and procedure and practicality. The teacher I see is the one who puzzles, disturbs,
confuses, inspires, and wrestles with the vital questions of his environment. One who himself has acquired the zest for the undefinable something that intrigued Einstein enough that he began the search for the infinite, that engulfed man until he produced a vision of education, taunted Carver to see the complexity of the simple peanut, that harmonized canvas, paint, and Van Gogh. That can't be taught to students, it must be felt by them, translated by them.

It brings to mind the story of the bright young music student who, after hearing Fritz Kreisler play the violin, rushed up to him and said, "Mr. Kreisler, I'd give my life to play as you do!" "Son," Kreisler replied, "I did."

You have given us much to think about, and we will. However, we still have a school system to run and a great deal of equipment to purchase.

It seems too bad, Superintendent, that you ended up in education. You ought to be in the newspaper business or something where your thinking could be appreciated.

Thank you for a very interesting and revealing evening, gentlemen. Perhaps, #2, I'll take your suggestion, but tomorrow, or the next tomorrow, or the tomorrow after that. I feel something
Superintendent: like the woman and the magical porridge pot; I shout "Boil, boil," but just as she discovered it takes more magic than just a command. Wands and magic dust do not enchant our age. I'll keep searching.
Appendix D

Photographs
I took my camera and went to the beach one stormy Monday morning.
Somehow it made me sad to see the toys that were forgotten by the Sunday crowd.
There was a young girl by herself there too.
I smiled when I saw her over top a Cracker-Jack box. What a trade--Cracker-Jack for I.B.M.
The lake looked frightened and imposing.
I wonder if kids are scared of the Pepsi generation--could be...
In a matter of an hour it was dark as if the world would end. Then all of a sudden it changed and looked like the beginning all over again.
I saw a whole flock of gulls and a lone lighthouse.
I was glad I was alone.