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Abstract

We have followed the planning process of the Home Base School (HBS), a public alternative secondary school in Watertown, Massachusetts. This school, with its 100 students and six staff members, is in its first year of operation.

The focus of this study has been in interaction between the planners of HBS during the planning effort (February through September, 1971). We have observed that despite the high level of personal attributes (talent, commitment, etc.) of the individual planners, the staff as a group was unable to act in concert as an effective, decisive team.

It is reasonable to assume that most planning efforts, as in the case of HBS, consist of participants with various values and personal styles of behavior. The HBS planning effort was not successful in that it was unable to pull together the various values and personal styles of its participants. This inability to cooperate, to be decisive, was caused by the staff's failure to establish the pre-conditions for decision making. These pre-conditions, based on compromise and trust, could have been reflected in decision-making mechanisms (voting, committee or special functionaries, etc.). This failure was due to the fact that no one worked within the staff to develop a team (community) that would trust one another enough to compromise on issues. We see this inability to decide as a failure of leadership.

We further observed that the staff's inability to be decisive was reflected at the Summer Workshop, where students had joined the planning effort, and in the actual operations of HBS.

In discussing the possible implications of the planning effort on the actual operation of the school, we envisioned three areas of concern. The first area was that of "adaptation to the environment." We are concerned that because of the failure of the planning process, HBS is more vulnerable to pressures from its outside constituencies. Secondly, we are concerned that in terms of the participants' own goals, achievement and success may be difficult. The type of pedagogy desired necessitates a social structure that puts a premium on caring and personal contact. We suspect that the school's social structure does not help in this goal. The third area of concern is in whether HBS can maintain its value patterns over time. We conclude that planning and preparation are important to the successful development of service institutions (schools) that hope to provide for groups of people an environment of spontaneous, self-motivated and self-regulated work.

The Planning Process of An Alternative Experimental High School in Watertown, Massachusetts
By: Sam Black
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Chronology of Events

1970

May, June
Charette

June 10
Charette Educational Sub-Committee presentation to School Committee

July 15
Superintendent appoints part-time administrative assistant to develop HBS proposal

November 24
HBS proposal presented to School Committee

December 8
School Committee approves HBS proposal

1971

February 7
Lead Teacher appointed

March 10
Five staff members appointed

March 28
First staff meeting

April 21
100 students randomly selected

May 13
First HBS meeting (students, parents, staff)

June 3
Title III proposal approved

June 24
First Community Advisory Committee meeting

July 26
Summer Workshop begins (staff week)

August 2-15
Summer Workshop (students join staff)

September 9
First day of classes
Pseudonyms for Actors

Richard:  The Assistant Superintendent of Schools (AS)
Kate:    The Lead Teacher (LT)
Isabel:  The Social Studies Teacher (SST)
Toby:    The Humanities Teacher (HT)
Zachary: The Industrial Arts Teacher (IAT)
Larry:   The Language Arts Teacher (LAT)
Edward:  The Science and Math Teacher (SMT)
Ralph:   The Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent (AA)
My purpose is to delineate that piece of humanity and love, of instinct and sublimity, that I know of from my own experience, and for whose truth, sincerity, and actuality I can vouch.

- Herman Hesse
Introduction

The Home Base School (HBS) is an experimental alternative high school in Watertown, Massachusetts. This school began operation in September 1971, with 100 student volunteers in grades 9 through 12 (25 in each grade). Assigned to HBS are six full-time staff members (one of whom is the "lead teacher," who coordinates HBS activities), four full-time interns (graduate students from a local college), a full-time secretary, and a part-time administrative assistant to the Superintendent of Schools.

The Watertown School Committee appropriated $100,000 for the academic year 1971-72 (1/3 of which was appropriated immediately, the remaining 2/3 having to be formally appropriated in March 1972, due to Watertown's fiscal calendar). Besides the School Committee appropriation, HBS was awarded a $30,000 staff and program development grant from Title III of the Secondary Education Act. It was also awarded a $40,000 grant from the New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE). This grant is concerned with the development of alternative staffing models (called Interface) at HBS and is providing the four interns.

The focus of this paper is concerned with the interaction between the planners during the planning process. We will study roles, value systems and personal styles, as well as the behavior, of the actors involved in the planning of the Home Base School.
The Home Base School received its major impetus from the Watertown Charette, a federally-funded planning program. The Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) made the Charette possible by awarding a grant of $11,000. This grant was awarded to the Watertown School Committee which provided contributions "in kind" (building space, release time for staff, etc.) to the Charette. The Watertown School Department administered the Charette.

The Charette is used by the Office of Education as a technique to bring citizens together in order to "brain storm" specific needs and goals (especially educational goals) of the community. In Watertown, it is generally agreed that the impetus for the Charette came from the impasse during the last few years of the School Department's building program. As one very active and influential participant of Charette recalled, "Since the Town had turned down a $14 million bond issue for a badly needed high school in 1968, it was thought that this Charette would generate interest anew in a high school and/or possible alternatives." Another Charette participant, who was a member of both the Charette Executive Committee and the Charette Education Sub-Committee, explained, "We (Charette) were formed to deal

* The term "charette" came from its use in architecture, where it is used to define an intense period of work time on a project. The Office of Education is using this term to denote an intense work time in a community by its residents on issues.
with the problem of no money. We had to find alternatives to not having permanent school buildings at the same time developing ways of getting our schools built in the future."

The Superintendent of Schools, who has since left Watertown, was the key figure in developing the Charette. For this man, the Charette meant "developing a political force in Watertown around progressive educational issues countering the old established guard. The Charette was designed, really, to get more democracy in education."

Most townspeople interviewed felt that the Charette was the liberal's attempt to reform the school system and more especially, an attempt by the Superintendent to get "his" new high school through the Town Meeting. The Headmaster of the town's only high school and both Principals of the two Junior High Schools felt that the School Department (teachers and administrators) were, by and large, either against or, at best, neutral to the Charette. It was, as they perceived it, the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent who really were in favor of the Charette. These administrators felt that the Superintendent wanted to develop the Charette into a political force in Watertown which would fight for his school building program at the next Town Meeting.

In fact, the Charette did become associated with the "liberals" in town. Originally developed to deal with educational issues only, the Charette wound up dealing with almost all aspects of town life, from ecology to taxes. A Charette participant close to the planners of Charette explained that they wanted community-wide support, "so
we decided to include many concerns of the town, hoping to attract as many people as possible." Another participant, who later became the Science and Math teacher at HBS, explained that the Superintendent's philosophy, in general, was to "put as many taxpayers as he could find on school committees. That way he could increase his chances of getting what he wanted (like the four-year high school)." A Town Meeting member, known for her conservative views, felt that Charette's close association with the "liberals" in town, especially the Superintendent, "would hurt any proposals coming out of it."

In December 1969, sub-committees were formed to deal with various town issues. One of these sub-committees, perhaps the most influential, was the Education Sub-Committee. These sub-committees worked from December 1969 until May 1970, researching their subjects. As one Education Sub-Committee member said: "We were charged with exploring the whole school situation, not to find answers."

During the week of May 11th, the whole Charette met, which involved anywhere from 200 to 1,000 participants. These daily meetings involved sub-committee meetings and general meetings. Presentations were made by the sub-committees to the larger body. The Education Sub-Committee tried during these daily meetings to hammer out recommendations dealing with school needs.

An educational consultant brought in to advise the Charette discussed and argued for a "school without walls" high school experiment modelled after the Parkway School in Philadelphia. He addressed the general Charette, who proved to be sympathetic to this idea. One
participant observed that "many people had the strong feeling that it would alleviate the inadequate high school facilities that existed."

Another Charette participant remarked that the "school without walls" idea was argued as a possible model for future construction needs of the high school.

The Superintendent, in explaining how he felt the idea of a "school without walls" came about, said: "I did everything I could not to be associated with Charette, knowing how the conservative forces in town would use that against it. Towards the end of the Charette meeting, nothing was being accomplished and, as a matter of fact, the Charette was coming up with ideas appropriate to the 18th century. I went over and broke up the meeting (Education Sub-Committee). I then got them to call a general meeting and I got the Educational consultant to come up with more progressive ideas. This consultant gave a speech in front of 400 or 500 Charette members. He spoke of Parkway's "school without walls." They liked it. I got this consultant to make that speech."

The Charette Package

The Charette produced a series of inter-related proposals and recommendations for action dealing with many and varied areas of town life. At the heart of these proposals (called "package") is the recommendation for a "multi-purpose facilities" (called "omnibuilding") in Watertown Square. As noted earlier, the need for a new high school was the underlying motivation of the Charette and the recom-
mendation for an omnibuilding seemed to provide a solution. The idea was to build a high-rise office building in Watertown Square. A high school would occupy the first few floors with the remaining part of the building being put to commercial use. The commercial part of the structure, the Charette reasoned, would pay a substantial part of the building costs, thus reducing significantly the expense to the town of building a new high school. The central point was that the town meeting would approve a building program that contained such savings as the "omnibuilding" would provide.

The recommendation for a "pilot program in home-base education" is also considered an "important part of the Charette package" and is linked to the omnibuilding proposal. In the Charette Official Report, three reasons are given for the Charette's recommendation of a "school without walls" experiment (now called "home base education"):

First, it is an imaginative concept, adding flexibility and choice to Secondary School Education. The basic idea is that students can receive a major part of the education outside the schools. Second, the program will have some impact on the overcrowding at our secondary schools. Third, if the program proves successful for a large number of students, it will have important implications for our building program. The likelihood of being able to save $10 million in the cost of a high school, while providing superior education should be rigorously investigated.

1) This report, dated August 1970, was edited by a Charette participant. Besides editing the Official Report, she helped write the Education Sub-Committee's proposals, including the "school without walls" recommendation.
The crucial aspect of "home base education" as far as the Charette was concerned was the possibility of extending the range of learning experiences outside the school and into the community. The possibility of alleviating the overcrowded schools and/or serving as a model for future school constructions (smaller, less costly schools) were frequent arguments on behalf of "home base education."

For instance, the Watertown Press of June 11, 1970, estimated the cost of the building program to be "$19.5 million if the high school is a comprehensive high school, offering conventional education to all its students, or $9 million if the new high school is built as a primarily home base school."

It is noteworthy that the argument that HBS would alleviate overcrowded schools never was taken seriously, despite its frequent public use. Also, the argument that HBS would allow the town to build a smaller high school at less cost (since it would need less classrooms) was also not very seriously considered by the School Committee or by the Charette, despite its frequent public use. As a matter of fact, one strategy, explained in an interview with an influential Charette participant, was to "build a smaller high school next to a vacant lot. Then just add wings quietly to the smaller building as time went by."

The Charette Official Report, in specifying further what "home base education" was to be, states that the "students receive basic education in communicative skills and computation within the school, but spend the bulk of their time out in the larger community."2 It

goes on to say that "the program will be open to both college-bound and non-college bound students, and the students themselves will be involved in the planning of the curriculum."\(^3\) The Charette called for 100 student volunteers with parental permission. "If more than 100 students volunteer, as is likely, selection will be on a random basis, with 25 students from each grades 9, 10, 11 and 12."\(^4\) There are to be 5 volunteer teachers and a coordinator who will be responsible directly to the Superintendent of Schools. These teachers should be chosen from the "present faculty or elsewhere;" be "certified or certifiable and have strong skills in either computation or communications, since mathematics, reading and writing will be heavily emphasized."\(^5\) A "network faculty" was to be established in the community and since such a program "would place undue strain on the normal schedule of the existing secondary schools, it should be located elsewhere in the community."\(^6\)

The Charette delineates the "coordinator's" role further by specifying that he "would act as a resource for the core faculty and as a liaison with the rest of the community, along with arranging for the proper evaluation of the program."\(^7\)

The Charette proposal for "home base education" was written mainly by one person. This participant explained that he "pieced

---


-15-
together what people were saying about 'home base education' and to that extent I am the originator of the whole thing." This man, later, was hired by the Superintendent of Schools as a part-time administrative assistant assigned to develop the home base concept.

For many Charette members, HBS was an alternative to the overcrowded and, perceived to be, inadequate high school and authoritarian headmaster, rather than an exciting experiment in community-oriented education. If there had been a different Headmaster or more reforms on the horizon at the high school, HBS would have been much less attractive to many Charette participants.

The School Committee Report

On June 10, 1970, the Charette Education Sub-Committee made a presentation explaining and arguing for a Home Base School experiment. This presentation was made to the Watertown School Committee. The presentation was made by a graduate student in education, named Ralph. He was assisted by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools, a number of high school students and a sympathetic businessman. As Ralph explains it, "We went into the meeting without lobbying for the idea."

The School Committee unanimously voted to direct the Superintendent of Schools to do a study of the feasibility of such an experiment. In explaining why the school committee passed the proposal, the superintendent said: "At the School Committee, I got 100 Charette members to demand a HBS experiment. I sat back when the School
The School Committee was faced with this confrontation. The School Committee directed me to proceed to develop a proposal for HBS. I agreed."

He further explained that publicly, he disassociated himself from the Charette Sub-Committee, while privately helping to plan their strategy.

A number of School Committee members, in subsequent interviews, remarked that the critical thing was the strong backing the proposal received from the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of Schools. A significant number of School Committee members noted that they viewed the HBS proposal as the Superintendent's work and voted for it on that basis. As one School Committee member remarked, "If it didn't have such strong support from him (the Superintendent) there is a very good chance it (the HBS) would not have gotten through the Committee." It is noteworthy that as of yet, few, if any, other Charette proposals have been implemented.

The Superintendent of Schools hired (on July 15) Ralph, the Charette member who wrote and made the HBS presentation, as a part-time administrative assistant. Ralph's sole task was to develop and write the formal school committee proposal for HBS. Ralph did, in fact, write a proposal and on November 22, 1970 made another presentation to the School Committee.

The proposal was accepted "in principle" and put on the agenda for the next School Committee meeting. The Superintendent felt that the then Chairman of the School Committee manipulated the School Committee to accept it only "in principle," in an effort to stall.
Others at the meeting felt that the Superintendent was trying to push this proposal through without giving the School Committee an opportunity to deal with it at all. For instance, the Superintendent had distributed the written proposal to the School Committee while the oral presentations were being made at the meeting. Even those sympathetic to the Superintendent and to the proposal felt he was too "paranoid" and "manipulative." At the next scheduled School Committee meeting, on December 8, the HBS proposal was unanimously accepted.

The proposal that was accepted, written by Ralph, is a 14-page document (see appendices). The first ten pages are devoted to four examples of student programs, illustrating the kinds of work they might be involved in at HBS. The Charette member who also edited the Official Report wrote these fictional case studies in collaboration with Ralph.

Of the four students, two were boys and two were girls, each in a different grade, from 9 through 12. All were taking some form of math, social studies, physical education, and three were involved with English in some way. Three of the four students received help and supervision from their guidance counselor. The courses were in specified time periods during the day, and the length of the courses were also clearly marked (8-week, 10-week periods). In reading these examples, one gets the sense of a well-directed and supervised curriculum which is diversified and relevant to the individual student's goals and needs.
The curriculum in these fictional case studies emphasized Mathematics, Social Studies and English, along with Physical Education. The work done outside the school was well integrated into the course work at the school. The scheduling, though varying with each individual, was clear and well thought out. In some examples, the guidance counselors were helping the students decide what would be most beneficial in the next sequence of courses. The work done outside the school was significant (roughly one-half the school day).

The last four pages of the School Committee proposal deals with the "details" of the proposal. The proposal calls for six teachers, one of whom should have "strength in the technical aspects of scheduling and the personal aspects of counseling at the secondary level." The proposal further specifies that of the five remaining staff positions, at least one staff member should have strength "in each of the following areas: Humanities/Arts, Language Arts, Mathematics/Science, Social Sciences, Technical/Vocational. One hundred student volunteers (25 in each grade, 9 through 12) with parental permission would be selected 'at random.'"

In detailing curriculum, the proposal noted that the Commonwealth has specified requirements for high school students. They are one year of U.S. History and "daily physical education." The Commonwealth also requires "instruction and training" in certain other areas. These areas include orthography, reading, writing, English language and grammar, geography, duties of citizenship, good behavior, etc. The proposal states that "many of the courses designed to meet these"
requirements would be conducted at the Home Base; others of them would be taken with outside resources or at Watertown High School. Individual students may wish to make additional requirements of themselves when they begin to plan their programs. The remainder of the student's program would be designed to permit an in-depth study of an area of interest, exposure to areas of potential interest, and/or sampling of career alternatives."8

Between the four case studies (which emphasized the basic subject areas) and the latter part of the proposal where it speaks about how the student can fulfill prescribed requirements, one gets a sense of a well-integrated and clearly defined curriculum.

The proposal states that a student's performance will be "evaluated by himself, by the staff and by any outside resource people involved. Individual progress reports will be made to the parents at regular intervals."9 It also proposed that "a formal Advisory Committee be created to provide the school and community with formal lines of communication." The proposal ends by calling for a separate administrative structure and "the need for all to be involved in the planning process as soon as possible. The proposal also mentions that there is no reason to believe that colleges won't accept HBS graduates. As a matter of fact, it may very will be helpful.

The School Committee proposal remained true to the Charette proposal. The curriculum was to emphasize communication and mathematics,

integrating outside work with course work in the school. The pro-
gamrs were to be developed individually under adequate guindance
and supervision. It is noteworthy that in both the Charette and
School Committee proposals, student participation is dealt with sole-
lly in the area of curriculum. The student should have a choice over
what he learns and it should be relevant to his needs. Ralph, the
Administrative Assistant, who wrote both these proposals, said his
chief aim was to write "something the School Committee would like to
fun and refund for a second year."

Ralph, in writing the proposal, said that he "rather arbitrarily
decided upon such things as the number of staff, the specified areas
they were to have expertise in, that the school should have 100 stu-
dents randomly selected and open to all types of students." He, more
than any other person, is responsible for the way in which the initial
idea became formulated and communicated to the town. He went to all
three secondary facilities, describing the program and seeking volun-
teers. He was also the person who spoke initially to the students,
telling them of the proposed HBS and seeking volunteers. Ralph told
me that he, the Superintendent, and Assistant Superintendent had been
talking about a Community Advisory Committee to insure a "legitimate"
link between the school and the community. This committee was writ-
ten into the proposal by Ralph when he learned that the Title III of-
fee was eager to have such a body in on the project. According to
Ralph, "I wrote it into School Committee proposal and Title III pro-
posal and quite arbitrarily chose the types of people who were to be
on it." The Charette proposal and the School Committee proposal were primarily the work of one man - Ralph, the Administrative Assistant. The Superintendent of Schools was responsible for the idea coming about and very instrumental in seeing to it that it got accepted by the Charette and School Committee. The majority of teachers and administrators in the School Department, by and large, disliked, feared or misunderstood the HBS proposal.
Mandate

One of the more important issues surrounding the Home Base School proposal was that of the possible change in the authority structure between the teachers and students. This issue, which permeated the planning process, seemed crucial to the planners. Following is a discussion of the views of the different constituencies concerning this issue.

Ralph, the Administrative Assistant (AA): In an interview in March, Ralph explained his view of the mandate of HBS. He felt that HBS was charged with developing an egalitarian, clearly-defined environment where "people who have to live with decisions should have a part in making them." The students, staff and community people must "trust each other enough to be able to participate as equals." But he was quick to add that "this is not a realistic expectation at this point, but rather a goal to work towards." The HBS is an experiment in reorienting schools towards the students, as far as Ralph was concerned.

The Superintendent of Schools: Interviewed in March, this man explained that he had "no idea what the school (HBS) would be like," but that the exciting part was "that the kids and the staff would

10 I am using Howard Becker's definition of authority, which is: "a set of shared understandings specifying the amount and kind of control each kind of person involved with the institution is to have over others: who is allowed to do what, and who may give order to whom."
create something unique to themselves and Watertown." He expressed misgivings over another school like HBS (Parkway) where the administrators had had preconceived ideas about what an "ideal high school was like, and had imposed it on the students." The Superintendent of Schools asserted that "HBS is going to be created by the people involved, democratically." He saw the chief opposition to HBS coming from the "teachers and administrators in the school system who fear that their police powers will be lessened if HBS succeeds." He explained that since he was leaving Watertown at the end of April, he didn't want to play a very active role in the planning of HBS.

Richard, the Assistant Superintendent of Schools (AS): Richard became Acting Superintendent of Schools when the Superintendent left Watertown. He was very active on behalf of "home base, education" and became associated with it as did the Superintendent. He explained (in an interview in July) that one of the mandates of HBS was to "get away from the institutional problems of the traditional secondary schools." His chief concern was that the HBS could become rigid and impersonal like the high school. The HBS "must distinguish among the kids. There are kids not prepared to handle freedom. We must be continually checking with them, developing ourselves to identify those kids who can't handle freedom." The potential was there for the students to "take heavier and heavier responsibilities from the staff." Richard said he would start with a "50-50 relationship, then go to a 60-40 relationship (in favor of the student), and then to a 75-25 ratio (student-staff). The students are "on the team," according to
Richard. There should be a genuine attempt, he felt, to have "the students as co-equal partners to some extent in the operation of the school."

Richard said that the school (HBS) "really consists of the teaching staff (five teachers), the Administrative staff (the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent and the Lead Teacher), the students and the parents. The School Committee will delegate some policy decision-making authority to the Community Advisory Committee. The Superintendent is responsible for administering HBS. He has delegated some (Richard stressed some) authority and responsibility to the Lead Teacher.

At another interview, in August, Richard stressed that a co-equal partnership between the teachers and students at HBS was in curriculum matters only. "I never envisioned students being responsible for policy or administration." When I asked what role Richard intended to play, he said, "You saw already. I vetoed the staff decision concerning the seven special students who they (the staff) wanted to let into HBS without a random selection. I am responsible, in the final analysis, for HBS."

For Richard (AS), Ralph (AA), and the Superintendent, freedom was a process to be worked toward. Richard (AS) explained that he and the Superintendent had had many long discussions about HBS. "Gradual freedom on an individual basis (in curriculum matters) was crucial to our plans for HBS." In no way was an all-school meeting, as
policy maker, acceptable to these men. "It (an all-school meeting) was unmanageable and unproduction and out-of-step with the hierarchy of authority set up by the School Committee." Ralph (AA) could accept the delegation of authority to students well beyond curriculum matters, though he was very concerned that it be appropriate to those involved. He also had major concerns about letting an all-school meeting run HBS. For Ralph, though, HBS was not to be staff oriented or run, and he expected the lead teacher to be an equal member of the staff.

The School Committee

The Watertown School Committee is made up of seven members (all elected to two year terms). The HBS received a unanimous vote of acceptance (with two members absent) from them. It is the School Committee which, in setting policy for the school system, determines whether or not projects like HBS can continue or not. If a majority of the School Committee (four or more) vote against refunding HBS for the next academic year, HBS must cease operations.

The following briefly describes the position of the School Committee toward HBS. This information was gathered through interviews with six of the seven members of the Committee. The seventh member was critically ill and could not be interviewed. The interviews ran from the middle of May to the middle of August.
The Issue of Hierarchy

Every member of the School Committee, without exception, expressed the belief that the Home Base School was part of the "normal hierarchy" of the School System. As one Committee member (who is very sympathetic to HBS) explained, "The School Committee is on top, making policy. The Superintendent is the executive officer of the Committee who administers the system. He is the boss. The 'Lead Teacher' at HBS is like a principal. She has been delegated certain authority by the Superintendent. She is the director of the staff. The staff, in turn, helps the Lead Teacher administer the program. Everyone else (Community Advisory Committee members, students, parents) is in an advisory position only" (he stressed only).

The Superintendent is, as another Committee member noted, "the key figure at HBS. He is the man the Committee will look to in deciding upon HBS." The staff's function, as far as the School Committee was concerned, was "to run the school," and, as one member noted, "They (the staff) should not abrogate their responsibilities." The students should participate and make inputs, but, as one member adamantly asserted, the students "should be kept the hell away from the decision making. The staff (under the Superintendent) and not those goddamned students, must be the ultimate decision-making body."

All of the members of the School Committee saw the Lead Teacher as principal or executive director. Some members did see this position as more participatory, but still within keeping of the hierarchical structure of the school system.
Every member of the School Committee was absolutely against the idea of having all-school meetings as the decision-making body of HBS. One member, when asked about his view concerning an all-school meeting, said, "The hell with that, nothing doing." Another explained that he thought an all-school meeting was "too large to get anything done." As long as the staff had clear control in terms of decision making, different forms of school government could be tolerated (majorities or representative committees, all-school meetings which advised the staff, and so on).

It is very clear that to all of the School Committee members, "student participation" (to varying degrees) meant inputs and consultations, and that these inputs should be in the area of their own personal curriculum and educational needs. It is noteworthy that every School Committee member could not understand why these questions about hierarchy were even being asked. They all accepted the hierarchy as a "given" for HBS. As one very sympathetic member remarked, "If HBS deviated from the organizational set up of the School Department, watch out! They're asking for trouble!"

As far as parental involvement in HBS was concerned, all of the members of the School Committee felt it was a side issue. One member went so far to say, "Keep the parents the hell away from the decision making. They are a royal pain." The consensus of the Committe was that a significant amount of parental involvement wouldn't hurt HBS, but that "schools are for kids, and that's what we (the Committee) will be looking at."
The Issue of Educational Philosophy

As soon as we leave the structural issues, we leave the land of unanimity and clarity for the School Committee. This, it must be emphasized, is true of almost every group interviewed.

Two School Committee members wanted the would-be HBS students to be hand picked, rather than randomly selected, although for very different reasons. One member wanted to select only the "deviants and malcontents" for HBS, while the other wanted to guard against "long hairs, truants, dope addicts and malcontents in general." The latter saw HBS as a school to help the "very bright and the stupid" (he changed "stupid" at our next interview to "vocationally gifted") who didn't respond to the traditional structure." The other Committee members all mentioned that they felt HBS was developed for those students who were having trouble. When pressed as to what they meant by "having trouble," they responded with examples. In all of their examples there was a 14-year-old genius who was ready for M.I.T., and a 16-year-old boy who wanted to be an electrician. They all mentioned that HBS was developed to serve all types of students, but somehow the explanations of just how HBS would do this were very unclear.

All of the School Committee members felt that the critical aspect of HBS was its community involvement. As one member said, "If the students are not out in the community learning, it is not the Home Base School the School Committee had in mind." Two members of the Committee were very concerned that HBS train saleable skills.
As one man remarked, "HBS is an extension of the High School's work-study program." Another man explained HBS as "an extension of the High School program out into the community."

All the Committee members remarked how students "need guidance and supervision more than anything else," and that they were expecting HBS to provide that. Two members went so far as to say that students can't handle freedom and "should not be given it."

The most interesting observation to be made about all of the School Committee interviews is their heavy emphasis on structural and behavioristic issues with little, if any, substantive or philosophical concerns. For example, all of the School Committee members were concerned about attendance, discipline, supervision, college acceptance, grade achievements, keeping the School Department's hierarchical structure intact, and so on. When asked why they were concerned about these issues, their responses usually varied from the conventional ("Students need discipline.") to no response at all.

**Charette Members**

Between April and August, seven Charette members were interviewed (some briefly, others more extensively). Of the seven interviewed, all felt that the Superintendent of Schools was the key figure. As one person put it, "He will either make or break HBS." Another member remarked that "Whether we like it or not, he is the boss." Five of the seven people interviewed felt that the Lead Teacher was just
another member of the staff, who was acting as coordinator. The
other two (who were least active and vocal in the Charette) felt that
the Lead Teacher was like a principal who administered HBS.

As far as decision making within HBS was concerned, four Char-
ette members felt that the staff would run the operation, with the
students making substantial inputs in "their own educational lives."
As one active member remarked, "The students need regulation. Few
students can cope with decisions on their own." The other three
Charette members saw the staff as equal partners with the students
in most aspects of HBS.

All seven placed great emphasis on guidance, supervision and
trust. They all envisioned a cohesive community developing, which
would be informal and fluid. Only one member interviewed could en-
vision an all-school meeting as the decision-making body. She felt
that if the students were left to their own resources, they would
respond affirmatively. The other six had misgivings about using an
all-school meeting for decision making.

For all of the seven Charette members interviewed, the main thing
was to get the students away from the dreaded high school and its
headmaster. Once away, they all expected the students to be out in
the greater Boston community doing educationally sound things. All
seven saw the HBS as serving all types of students.
Three Principals

The Headmaster of the high school and the two principals of the junior high schools all felt (as did the School Committee) that HBS was going to have to fit into the regular organizational scheme. The Superintendent was seen as the administrator of the school system, with the principals actually running each school. They envisioned the Superintendent as having a greater role at HBS than he normally played in other schools (since there was no principal at HBS). "The staff must make the decisions," the Headmaster felt. The students' inputs should be increased, but not on the decision-making level.

The Title III Administrator

Home Base School was awarded a planning grant of $30,000 for staff and program development. It was to provide funds for the academic year 1971-72. Part of this grant provided for a three-week summer workshop for staff and students.

The Title III Administrator of this grant was interviewed in June (after the grant was approved). He expressed the feeling that the strongest selling point HBS has is its community involvement. "We (Title III) were very impressed with the community grass roots aspect of HBS." He was referring to the fact that HBS was developed by the Charette and funded by the local School Committee. He was especially interested in the Community Advisory Committee (which, as Ralph (AA) said in his interview, had been written into HBS in order
to please Title III). This administrator expected the Community Advisor Committee to play a meaningful role at HBS. As he said, "It will be its (HBS's) eyes, ear, and super-ego."

The Title III Administrator felt that the Superintendent of Schools was a very important person to HBS, but that the students and community must be responsible for the school. He thought that the Lead Teacher should be "in charge" of the staff and that the staff should be responsible for the school. He envisioned the staff as guiding the school (students, parents, community) through the year. The final authority, though, lies with the students. He did not think an all-school meeting was workable and hoped for small groups where people could "interrelate and communicate more freely."
Staff Selection

After the School Committee approved the HBS proposal in December 1970, Ralph (AA) began the selection process for the six staff positions. He also intensified his investigation of other programs thought to be similar in concept to HBS. Five teachers and four students helped Ralph in this effort. They visited other schools (Copley Square School, Murray Rhodes, and so on), and helped Ralph make presentations to the faculties of all the secondary public schools in Watertown.

At these presentations, Ralph, with the assistance of the five teachers and four students, gave reports on what other schools were doing and what HBS might possibly do. He asked that teachers interested in having more contact with HBS submit their names. Between 40 and 50 teachers did so. Between December and March, Ralph and Richard (AS) interviewed many of these teachers and others from outside the system.

Three of the five teachers who helped Ralph between December and February were chosen for staff positions (one of which was for the Lead Teacher position). Two of the three teachers were active Charrette members.

It is noteworthy that a number of teachers who are sympathetic to HBS felt that the staff selection was "already made before the presentations, and it didn't pay to apply." They felt that the five active teachers helping Ralph were going to be the staff. One of the teachers, who was one of the original five and was selected for
the HBS staff, remarked that she was embarrassed because three of the other five "acted as though they really were the HBS staff" prior to formal selection.

The Lead Teacher Selection

The Lead Teacher position was open to a teacher in any area of expertise specified in the proposal. Ralph (AA) and Richard (AS) interviewed many applicants for this position. The choice came down to three teachers, two from the Watertown School System and one from the Newton School System. There were two men (both in the Science and Math area, with over ten years' experience each) and one woman, a guidance counselor with one year of experience at a junior high school. She was active in the Charette and was one of the five teachers who helped Ralph. Richard vetoed the teacher from the Newton School System. Ralph said that he felt Richard was "scared of this teacher. Richard recognized this teacher as a very intelligent and strong-minded character who was also articulate. Richard has problems with guys like that."

Ralph's first choice was Kate, the guidance counselor. His second choice was the teacher from Newton. Richard accepted Kate as the Lead Teacher. The Superintendent played a minor role in the selection, and accepted the choices, more or less, of Richard, and to a lesser degree, of Ralph, for staff positions. He felt that since he was leaving, and Richard would be Acting Superintendent,
The Lead Teacher

Kate (LT) is a 25-year-old woman with one year's experience in Watertown. Interviewed in April, she said that she felt that "Everything is up for grabs again, now that we're away from the high school."

Kate said, "The important thing is to get many more people involved in setting it (HBS) up and making it work."

Kate saw a "sense of community" as the most important feature HBS could achieve. Her idea was that academic proficiency, though very important, was a second step after, and coming out of, affective growth. In response to a written questionnaire, she listed five goals she had for students at HBS. They are:

1) To achieve personal educational objectives preparation...
2) To develop a sense of personal initiative and competence...
3) To develop a sense of personal worth, confidence - that an individual does make a difference - personal dignity.
4) To develop a sense of community, cooperation, and caring...
5) To enter into meaningful contact with people from other groups...

She would accomplish these goals by creating an environment where "everyone trusts one another, where open and honest communication and cooperation can take place. The staff should make the day-to-day administrative decisions (non-policy). The students should make the policy decisions (structure of school, etc.). Those decisions that affect everyone should be made by everyone." Kate's...
idea was to have small groups which could supply the decision-making and support vehicles of HBS. Town Meetings, as far as she was concerned, were a "royal pain, good for some things, but not for most things."

The critical element for the Lead Teacher was "treating kids as equals, with every teacher having a human relationship with the kids." She hoped to see the students taking on as much of a role in the on-going decisions of the school as possible. "As kids can take on more responsibility, they will." Most people, she felt, especially parents, were looking to the staff and not to the students as the decision makers. "As time goes on, these people will become increasingly more comfortable with kids being responsible decision makers."

Kate felt that "the worst thing that could happen is that the students aren't kept informed of what is happening and suddenly some decision (from the Superintendent or the School Committee) would be sprung on them that would destroy all the trust built up at HBS."

She hoped that the Superintendent would be too busy with other matters to "mess around with HBS."

As for her own role as Lead Teacher, Kate saw herself as part of the staff. She expected to be doing a lot of the coordinating and administrative work. She did not see herself as a principal or leader. "All decisions must be by consensus, within the staff at first, and then, everyone at HBS."

Kate imagined her role to be participatory rather than one of leadership. She saw herself as "an equal among equals." This role definition was written into the
Charette proposal. The School Committee proposal was less clear as to what role they thought the Lead Teacher should play. The main feeling was that the Lead Teacher wasn't going to play a "principal" role. The staff, by and large, did not want a leader or principal. They also hoped for a team of equals.

The Science and Math Teacher

Edward (SMT) has taught in the Watertown School System for over ten years. He was the third candidate for the position of Lead Teacher. He was Ralph's (AA) last choice. Richard (AS) wanted Edward on the staff, feeling that he would "add stability and creditability to a young staff."

Edward, in an interview in June, explained that he never wanted to be one the staff. He had attended the first meeting where Ralph made his presentation about HBS. A week or two later, he saw a memo at the high school (where he was Chairman of the Science Department) that invited applications for the staff positions at HBS. "I went over to the Superintendent's office just to find out if there was a salary differential between the Lead Teacher and the other staff positions. Before I knew it, I was being interviewed by Richard and Ralph."

The Superintendent of Schools, as Edward explained it, asked Edward to be the Lead Teacher. "I turned him down. First of all, I was disenchanted with the people surrounding this program. They are too far out. They are not my kind of professional educators." According to Edward, the Superintendent agreed with him, saying that
they were "30-year-old adolescents." Edward said that he also turned down the position of Lead Teacher because there was no salary differential. (Kate felt that this was a good thing, since it would help to keep the position on "an equal level with the staff.") It is noteworthy that Ralph (AA) remarked (in September) that he felt Edward (who had attended the Charette but had not been active) had trouble with the whole concept of HBS.

Kate (LT) and Ralph (AA), in trying to select a Math and Science teacher, found someone they both agreed upon. They were informed by Richard (AS) that Edward had already been chosen for this position. As it turns out, Richard had, on his own, recruited Edward for this position. Kate and Ralph were shocked and angered, especially since Edward was not their first choice by any means.

Richard explained, in an interview in June, that Edward "was an established teacher who was in the main stream of public education. He would not only balance, but add some creditability to the staff... He is close to the high school administration."

In private conversations with the staff during the planning process (March through August), remarks were made about Edward. One teacher said he thought Edward was a "plant for the Headmaster of the high school." Another teacher exclaimed excitedly, "He is a chauvinist who has a lot of growing, philosophically, to do." A third teacher thought Edward was "shallow and not in step with the staff."

Throughout his interview, Edward repeatedly emphasized that he was "one of the more stable people in the system, always pushing for
a highly organized, power-wielding situation. He said, "I like to have the authority to do things." As far as he was concerned (and he was adamant about this), the staff is the only decision-making body. "It is in the original mandate from the School Committee that Ralph wrote." Asked about an all-school meeting type of structure, he said, "I don't even think in terms of all-school meetings. It would be a great exercise in democracy, but it shouldn't be much. It won't really bear fruit without a lot of direction. You can't really use it effectively as a policy-making body." The only purpose Edward could see for an all-school meeting would be "to give the impression that the students are in on the decision-making process." He went on to say that "when the students begin to make decisions for themselves, either they don't know what decisions to make, or they don't know what is really in their best interests, or they focus their attention on issues that are perhaps juvenile." He saw the Student Council at the high school as a 'perfect example of kids having the constitutional rights to power and doing nothing with it. The only students who were vocal were the negative ones.'"

Edward's experience at the high school was that "Watertown kids are brought up in such a way so that they can't even make decisions for themselves. In a more permissive environment, the kids are anxious to get into the decision making." He felt that "if kids don't have the opportunity to make decisions in even a small way, they won't be able, or want, to make decisions at all...Kids will be making immediate decisions in their own interests, not decisions for the future."
Not very many kids are thinking about life as a whole and saying here are the kinds of things I need to be a person in society. They will say, 'Boy, I'm really into Karate, etc.'

The best way to run the school (as he felt he was running his classes at the high school for the past few years), was Informally. The students' "influence comes about in the day-to-day contact with us (the staff). The staff is at the crossroads of a lot of different inputs. They are the only ones who can look at HBS objectively. I work best through informally influencing people, saying the right thing at the right time. That's why I'm on so many committees." In fact, Edward is on many of the HBS committees. He is the representative to the Community Advisory Council, the School System's Instructional Council, liaison to the high school, and so on. He said he volunteered for the Community Advisory Council in order to get close to the Superintendent. He, the Superintendent, as far as Edward was concerned, was a key figure at HBS. He must be "co-opted."

Edward is dead set against an all-school meeting, with its rules, regulations, and "formal dialogues." He would be in favor of a Student Advisory Council, representing the student body at HBS. The ideal structure would be:

Staff ("Supreme and Ultimate Authority")

Student Advisory Council
(Rather than an all-school meeting, it would advise the staff.)

Community Advisory Committee
(Advises staff)
Edward would get the students' views and inputs, both informally and formally. Then, at intensive staff meetings, "once or twice a week, analyze and make some decisions. Issues could also originate at the staff level."

We concluded our five-hour interview (which Edward controlled, and for which he obviously had his own agenda, refusing to answer my questions) with the following remark: "I have serious reservations about anybody other than the staff making decisions. The real danger for HBS is that they (other staff members) push for more community and student control."

Edward firmly believed that the Lead Teacher must be an equal member of the staff. As a matter of fact, he felt the Lead Teacher, if anything, should serve the staff, "keeping us well informed, doing administrative work, etc." Ralph (AA), on the other hand, was not, according to Edward, an equal participant, "though he acts as if he runs this school." Ralph, as Edward remarked, "is only a part-time administrative assistant. Period!"

The Language Arts Teacher

Larry, the Language Arts Teacher (LAT) was active in the Charette and helped Ralph (AA) after the HBS proposal was accepted. He was Ralph's second choice for Language Arts teacher, and Kate's first. Ralph didn't have a major problem with Kate's choice, and agreed to make the recommendation to the Superintendent. Richard (AS) also
wanted Larry on the staff, saying "we need a way out guy like that on
the faculty." In private interviews, the Headmaster of the high school
described Larry as a "militant anarchist" and one School Committee
member noted that Larry was a "radical fire bomber."

Larry has taught in the Watertown public schools for four years.
He is widely known for the Junior High School's Experimental Theatre
(which he directs). In an interview (in April) he explained the basic
philosophy of HBS as being that of "parents and staff not being able
to tell the students they can do this or not do that." He assumes
the parents are aware of this kind of philosophy. To him, the staff's
role was a protective and supportive one toward the students. The
staff must guard against a "conservative and arbitrary world."

Besides the "teaching function," the staff's role was to choose
the membership of the Community Advisory Committee ("carefully," Larry
said, "so that the Superintendent and School Committee members could
not control it"), and to decide whether or not there should be small
groups (support groups) at HBS or not. "Everything else is up to the
students." The staff, "despite the expectations of the parents and
School Committee," will not be the ultimate decisions makers. "That
would destroy the basic concept of the school. Kids must be equal
and free to make mistakes for themselves."

Larry viewed any representative form of government as "a danger-
ous centralization of power against the students." He strongly fa-
vored an all-school meeting (town meeting) type of government, with
smaller groups feeding into it. The smaller groups would "ensure
that younger students who are less articulate and aggressive would have a real say in the decision-making."

He saw "everything and anything" being channeled back to the town meeting. The town meeting may be inefficient, but it was the only way to ensure "equal student participation." Anyone (students, staff, parents, Community Advisory Committee members) involved at HBS could come and participate. Issues would be discussed and debated openly in the small groups. These small groups would all come together, discuss the issues once more and vote. The voting would take place in front of everyone. To Larry, this structure was workable. He was very confident that "if we properly involve the students with the spirit of decision-making, they will be able to make decisions." Accountability and responsibility should be to themselves. They must be permitted to do what they want, "make mistakes, try all sorts of things and grow."

To Larry, the Lead Teacher was just another staff member who shouldn't have any special authority over decision making. He even remarked that he wanted to change the title of the position to Administrative Teacher or Coordinating Teacher. "Lead Teacher" a "Master Teacher" who really is in charge, he thought.

The Social Studies Teacher

Isabel, the Social Studies Teacher (SST), taught at a junior high in Watertown for three years. She left the school system to
live in Vermont, feeling that "schools were really prisons, with all their rules and regulations." She was, along with Larry (LAT) and Kate (LT), active in helping Ralph (AA) after HBS was approved. She left for Vermont and was surprised to hear that Ralph wanted her for the staff.

Isabel, in an interview (in May), said that HBS must give the students the "opportunity to do the kind of things kids do from 0-6 years old: experiment, try out lots of different things, fuck up lots of things, sample, open their minds." The HBS is not set up to "train kids for jobs or college entrance" per se (though that might be an outcome). It is a "whole growing-learning type of place." The critical thing is "to make better people." She felt that if the parents knew how she felt, they would be unhappy, since she perceived them to be more conservative and learning-oriented than she.

"The students couldn't grow, mature, make mistakes, become responsible" at the old high school. Students are applying to HBS to get away from it (especially its principal). If the principal wasn't so repressive and hated there wouldn't have been a push for an experimental school away from the high school. People just wanted to get away from him."

Isabel though that the students should be mostly responsible for HBS, and after a "period of fucking around and over-reacting, they will start doing positive things." Isabel did not envision giving students full freedom at the initial stages of the program. She expected the staff to have more responsibility at first, gradually
(hopefully) decreasing as time went on. "Anyway, everybody expects us (the staff) to run the school."

Her concern was that the staff would become conservative and that the Superintendent of Schools and the School Committee could (and might) over-react (making HBS more regimented). This possibility, she felt, would be caused by the students not being able to adjust fast enough and parents not being able to recognize the real purpose of HBS. She would "rather over-react toward the students as the focal point than remain conservative, because the staff will be under pressure anyway to check up on the students (know where they are and how well the students are doing)." She expects this pressure to come mainly from the parents and then from the School Committee.

To Isabel, a danger for HBS was that the "whole philosophy of the school will be changed because of over-reactions. If you start out saying kids are responsible for themselves (as we are going to do), that they can be and should be responsible for their own education, that if they are not responsible they must take the consequences (which may mean no credit for a particular activity), then, because somebody gets upset, you change what you say. Now you have to be checking up on the kids. This completely detracts from the whole philosophy of the kids being completely responsible for themselves and therefore suffering the consequences if they don't act responsible. You then end up with a school you didn't intend to end up with. The question is how to handle the School Committee and the Superintendent from over-reacting in the face of parent and community demands for
more regimentation." When asked what role the Superintendent and the School Committee had at HBS, Isabel replied, "to leave us alone and allow us to grow."

Isabel perceived the staff as a potential source of danger for HBS. They have come from positions of power in the regular school system. They may, "especially Larry (LAT) and Edward (SMT), find it very difficult giving up this power at HBS. They probably will want to keep it despite all the rhetoric. It sounds like they are turning the school over to the students. In reality, they may not be doing that at all. Perhaps the idea of having an all-school meeting run HBS is a way of really keeping the power within the staff, while making it appear as though the students have some power."

"The staff influence over students is very great. They (students, parents, community resource people) will all be looking to the staff to run HBS. We (the staff) will have all the power!!" To guard against this possibility, Isabel would have something like a representative form of government. This body could consist of a number of parents, students, general community people and perhaps staff. She preferred not having the staff in a decision-making role if there was a representative body.

"If HBS goes to an all-school meeting type of government, there will be chaos. This would be dangerous in that the staff and/or the Superintendent would and possibly could make arbitrary decisions. The students and parents will feel powerless, and they will be right!!" In the end, Isabel expects the staff to be the decision-making body
unless plans are made to ensure an effective, clear form of participatory decision-making.

Isabel complained that Kate (LT) was being relegated to a "secretarial position" by Larry (LAT) and Edward (SMT). She felt that Kate should be "more forceful" and take a leadership position rather than an administrative role only.

**The Industrial Arts Teacher**

Zachary, the man selected to be the Industrial Arts Teacher (IAT) at HBS, has taught in Watertown for over twenty years. Both Kate (LT) and Ralph (AA) wanted him on the staff, as did Richard (AS). Zachary refused, feeling compelled to stay with a new program he had developed at the junior high. After a number of weeks, Richard personally argued for this man to reconsider the appointment. His argument was that the HBS needed the "stability and maturity" he could provide. Zachary said that he felt "scared of the challenge," and on that basis accepted the appointment. Richard informed Kate and Ralph that this teacher was on the staff. Kate and Ralph were shocked at the unilateral decision Richard had made (as in the case of Edward (SMT)). In the case of Zachary, however, Kate and Ralph were very pleased that he accepted.

A principal of a school in Watertown has described Zachary as "humanistic but not a good disciplinarian." A community person who has known of him for many years felt he was a "nice guy, but his classes are chaos."
In an interview (in July) Zachary said that he hoped HBS would give him an opportunity to work individually with students. He felt he couldn't do it with 150 kids with a very strict schedule. "We must also utilize as much of the community as we can for the sake of education. The town's interest in HBS is in its community involvement, not, certainly, in its freedom aspects. For me, students being able to think for themselves is the most important factor."

As for running the school, Zachary felt "there must be control or else it's just a mob scene, but I've changed my mind a lot during the planning process. Larry (LAT) and Isabel (SST) have convinced me that the kids should have a chance at decision making. I personally think that they will throw it back in our laps because they will not be anywhere near ready to worry about all the little details of running HBS. The biggest problem will be to get them to participate in the decision-making. They will pass it by. The only interest they will have is in making decisions that will protect their rights (guard against restrictions of behavior). They will not be able to focus in on their responsibilities, which are the positive aspects of decision making.

At first, Zachary had hoped for a representative decision-making body. Larry's argument that many kids would be left out convinced him. Despite his feelings that an all-school meeting was "so inefficient that it won't function well at all," Zachary felt it would help to ensure equal participation. He emphasized how he was much less liberal when he joined the staff, but "now I'm more student-oriented;
the kids will have to make up their own minds!" He was quick to men-
tion that student decision making was a goal to be worked toward, not
a ready-made reality. "I don't expect we will ever get there."

A major problem that Zachary expected came from the fact that
"we (staff) never had been told our mandate (which way we are supposed
to go). These are not really our decisions, they are from above (the
Superintendent and the School Committee)." There are a number of ways,
he felt, that HBS could be set up. "One way is to pick the staff and
let them run it as they see fit. We have not been told that! Another
way is to have the staff set up HBS, keeping the ideal school of the Super-
intendent and the School Committee in mind. Suppose their assumption
is that the staff will set up HBS using a committee structure for de-
cision making, as I believe they do assume. The staff creates HBS,
with full freedom for the students. Suddenly the School Committee
or Superintendent realizes what is happening at HBS and can lay down
to the staff a new game plan. This new game plan overturns everything.
I have an idea this will happen. General policies can come from any-
where and will be dictated from above (the School Committee and Super-
intendent)."

Zachary hopes that everyone will have influence and that there
will be no veto power at HBS. Despite his fears of a representative
body, he feels that "somehow it will have to do. There are real prob-
with it though." He hoped the students would like the idea of a
"conversation period," where kids could get support and a sense of
community. The students should, according to Zachary, have complete
power over their courses. The staff and parents can try to convince the students, but should no be able to force him to change his mind. Zachary's fear is that the School Committee and the Superintendent will interfere with HBS and destroy the basic principles it is working on. "Whether we like it or not, the Superintendent is the boss and the School Committee runs the whole show. I don't like it but it is a fact of life."

Zachary felt (as did Larry (LAT) and Edward (SMT)) that the Lead Teacher's role should be participatory and not a leadership position.

The Humanities Teacher

Toby, the Humanities Teacher (HT), was the only teacher chosen from outside the Watertown School System. She has one year of teaching experience prior to HBS. Of all the staff members, she was least active throughout the planning process. Toby remained an "unknown quantity" to the staff for the most part.

In a brief interview (in August) Toby explained that she felt she was the most conservative of all the staff. "You see, I come from Kansas." She felt that HBS should be more staff-oriented, with less of a role going to the students as far as decision making was concerned. Toby thought an all-school meeting as the ultimate decision maker at HBS was a mistake. The staff should be the center of the decision-making process, not the students.

To Toby, the whole idea of HBS was "individualized learning." Students could make their inputs through personal contact with staff
The staff came to the planning process with different hopes, fears and expectations for the future. From their interviews, a picture of how these six teachers felt about different issues has emerged. Following is a summary of what I perceived these people to mean.

Generally speaking, when Kate (LT) said "everything is up for grabs," she captured the sense of many staff members. These teachers saw HBS in some vague and undetermined way outside of the regular organizational structure of the school system. The feeling that HBS occupied some new, though unclear, place in the school system permeated their remarks. They were uncertain as to what mandate they were given and what freedoms and authority they had in developing HBS.

The question of to whom HBS was responsible was unclear. Every one of the staff knew the regular organizational scheme (School Committee, Superintendent, principal, teachers, and so on). Clearly three teachers felt that for HBS to succeed, the Superintendent and the School Committee (though formally in charge) must stay out of HBS affairs. For these teachers more contact was desirable. One relief the staff kept hearing from Ralph (AA) was that Richard (AS) was so swamped with work that he wouldn't be able to really get involved with HBS. The other two* teachers (Edward (SMT) and Zachary (IAT)).

* Wherever the total of staff does not equal 6, it is due to lack of date on Toby (HT).
were more accepting of these outside pressures. To them, it was an obvious fact that the Superintendent and School Committee would eventually, in some undetermined way, interfere. They had a much clearer idea of where they were at, in terms of the organizational scheme. They were below the Superintendent, who was, in turn, under the School Committee. Ways should be found (manipulation, pressure, etc.) to short circuit or co-opt interferences from the Superintendent or the School Committee. The critical difference between these two teachers and the rest of the staff is that they saw themselves in just another school (or annex of the high school) in the school system. The other three teachers (Isabel (SST), Larry (LAT), and Kate (LT)) seemed to be more unclear as to what position HBS occupied.

Four teachers expected HBS to be student-oriented. This seemed to mean that the students, in some unspecified ways, would be in control of their own educations. For these four teachers, "being in control" meant having ultimate decisions. The staff was seen as mentors, advisors, consultants - not decision makers. Two teachers, Edward (SMT) and Toby (HT), were staff-oriented, Edward more so than Toby. They perceived HBS as being informal and fluid, a place where individual students could make inputs into the decision-making process through contact with the staff. To these two teachers, the staff was clearly responsible for and in charge of running HBS.

Only one teacher, Isabel (SST), hoped that the Lead Teacher would be more forceful and take a leadership position. She linked Kate's (LT) inability to lead in part to male chauvinism on the part of
Edward (SMT) and Larry (LAT). "After all," Isabel explained, "Kate is a young, very pretty teacher, who they (Edward and Larry) feel they can push around."

The other four teachers expected the Lead Teacher position to be "participatory and not like a principal's." Kate herself seemed to feel clearly that her role as Lead Teacher was not one of leadership. Kate saw herself doing administrative or "shit work" for the staff. At one point in the planning process, Ralph (AA) said that Richard (AS) was treating Kate as the director or principal of the staff, rather than as a liaison person.

Only Larry (LAT) was in favor of, and argued for, an all-school meeting. The other five teachers, though uncertain as to what was better, had reservations about an all-school meeting as final decision-maker for HBS. Edward (SMT) especially had a difficult time with the concept of an all-school meeting.

It is noteworthy that on this issue Edward (SMT) and Larry (LAT) were totally opposed to each other. Edward adamantly believed that only the staff should be the decision makers, while Larry trusted no one but "all the students together." An insight into why these two teachers held the views they did, and thus tried to build a school around these views, may be useful. In his interview Edward had said of himself that he "influenced adults much more easily and successfully than kids...That's why I volunteer for many committees." Larry, in contrast, seemed to have considerable influence with the students. Larry planned to open an experimental theatre at HBS, which would
involve (as it did when he was at the junior high) 40 to 50 students.

Larry said in his interview that he "had a number of old theatre workshop students coming to HBS" to do work with him. "My whole technical crew and many actors are coming." One possible explanation for Larry's heavy reliance on student decision making was his great influence with a significant number of students. Similarly, that Edward was so adamant about staff authority may be due, in part, to his influence over adults.

The other staff members were somewhere between Larry's and Edward's positions. They seemed to be leaning closer to Larry's position only because Edward's position was the model they were trying to escape.

**Group Views Contrasted**

At this point, it would be useful to contrast the views of the different groups surrounding the planning process.

All of the members of the School Committee, the Superintendent of Schools, Richard (AS), and the three principals felt that: 1) the Superintendent was the key figure at HBS and would play a large role; 2) the staff was responsible and must be the decision-making body of HBS; 3) the Lead Teacher was a position, like a principal's, of leadership and authority; and 4) an all-school meeting, which would serve as a final decision-making body, is "absolutely out of the question."

The seven Charette members interviewed felt that the Superintendent of Schools was the key figure at HBS. Four of the seven (the less active and vocal members) expected the staff and not the students...
to run HBS. Only two of the seven (the less active and vocal) expected the Lead Teacher to be like a principal. The other five hoped that the Lead Teacher would be an equal participant of the staff. As one active Charette member said, "We have one too many principals in the system already," (referring to the Headmaster at the high school).

Six of the seven members of the Charette felt that an all-school meeting was undesirable and unworkable. The one person who could envision an all-school meeting as the decision-making body for HBS felt that HBS was going to be an "informal, trusting place where large meetings could work."

Ralph (AA), who was active in the Charette, was hired by the Superintendent to develop HBS, and had played a major role in staff selection, hoped and expected that the Superintendent would not be involved in HBS. He also didn't expect HBS to be staff-oriented (run), and saw the Lead Teacher as an equal participant with the other members of the staff. He did not see an all-school meeting as a workable form of government.

The Title III Administrator felt that the Superintendent was the key figure at HBS, as far as the school's survival was concerned, but thought that the students and community (parents, community resource people, etc.) must be ultimately responsible, along with the staff, for HBS. The staff was to be in partnership with the students in the decision-making process. He further felt that large group meetings (all-school meetings) were not workable. Small groups were much better for most things, especially decision making.
Three members of the HBS staff did not expect the Superintendent to be involved at HBS. Four of the staff did not envision either the staff as decision-making body or the Lead Teacher as playing a leadership role. Five of the staff did not expect HBS to be successfully run by an all-school meeting.

The table on the following page summarizes the various expectations of the above groups.
Views of Various Groups, By Issues, Concerning the HBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>School Committee</th>
<th>Supt. of Schools</th>
<th>Richard (AS) (3)</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Title III Adm.</th>
<th>Charette Members (7)</th>
<th>Ralph (AA)</th>
<th>HBS Staff (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt. of Schools as key figure or boss</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/3*</td>
<td>1/3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff as decision making body</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/4*</td>
<td>1/4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher as Leader</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/4*</td>
<td>3/4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-school meeting as final decision-making body</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/6*</td>
<td>5/6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Toby's (HT) views unknown, thus total does not equal six.
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It is noteworthy that a significant number of teachers selected for staff positions at HBS had expectations, fears and hopes closer to Ralph's (AA) and the Charette members' than to those of the School Department or School Committee. One possible explanation for this is that Ralph, who wrote the Charette and School Committee Proposals, was also responsible to a large degree for staff selection. Ralph symbolized and represented HBS, in the school system as well as in the town. When he spoke to the faculties at public schools in a recruitment and orientation effort, he had accepted help from teacher volunteers (three of whom were Kate (LT), Larry (LAT), and Isabel (SST).

Ralph's first choice for Lead Teacher had been Kate, a first-year guidance counselor, who was a Charette member. The Superintendent's first choice, according to Edward (SMT), had been Edward. Kate became the Lead Teacher, with the approval of Richard (AS) and the Superintendent, after Edward expressed no interest in the position.

When Kate, a friend as well as a colleague of Ralph, was chosen to be the Lead Teacher, she joined the selection process. As a matter of fact, she (according to the Superintendent and Richard) was supposed to select her own staff, with the approval of the Superintendent and Richard (AS). Kate and Ralph chose Isabel (SST), a young woman with three years' experience who was not planning to return to Watertown partly because the teaching was so bad in "those prisons." Richard agreed to recommend Isabel to the Superintendent. Kate's first choice for the Language Arts position was Larry, a friend, co-worker and former Charette participant. Larry, known for his "radical"
and "unorthodox" views on education, was not Ralph's first choice, but was acceptable. Both Kate and Ralph recommended Larry to Richard, who accepted the recommendation and forwarded it to the Superintendent.

Kate had someone in mind for the Science and Math position when she and Ralph were informed of the successful recruitment of Edward by Richard (AS). They acquiesced to Richard's decision. Zachary (IAT) was the first choice of Kate, Ralph and Richard. He was successfully recruited, after a period of indecision, by Richard, who very much wanted him on the staff. Toby (HT) was the only teacher from outside the school system. She was one of the last teachers appointed. Kate and Ralph had trouble finding candidates for this position in the Watertown school system.

It is interesting that four of the appointees were under 30 years old (Ralph is 25 years old). Two of the four were in their first year of teaching, with the other two in their third and fourth years. The other two teachers were well established and older (35 and 49 years old), with one being closely associated with the high school administration (Edward).

The Superintendent was leaving the school system and allowed Richard (AS) to play a large role in staff selection. As the Superintendent explained, "He (Richard) will have to live with them after I'm gone." The Superintendent, considered a maverick and "too liberal" by a significant number of school and town people interviewed, might have felt more freedom appointing young, relatively new teachers, since he was leaving. His philosophy, as he explained in an interview, was
to "give the people of HBS freedom." Perhaps the staff selection was one reflection of this philosophical position. Certainly Ralph and Kate had great influence in determining the staff's pre-disposition.

This pre-disposition seemed very sensitive to the traditional school's restrictions and limitations, and concerned with being part of something different (better). The emphasis seems to have been on "different than what is" rather than on what could be. One indication of this disposition was the constant fear expressed during interviews of arbitrary, unfair and unexpected decisions from outside (above) which will destroy the school. This fear seemed to be a major impetus for trying to escape the hierarchical scheme and obligations traditionally associated with education. For example, one teacher said, "The parents will just have to understand that HBS is different...I hope they won't push the School Committee into over-reacting." Another staff member remarked that Richard (AS) was famous for arbitrary and "unilateral decisions which turn everything upside down." This perceived and distrusted fragmentation of power certainly shaped the pre-dispositions of some staff members.

It seems a reasonable observation, at this point, that the implementation of a proposal (staff selection, etc.) is as important, if not more so, than the creation and development of the proposal itself. In the HBS case, he who controls staff selection determines the pre-disposition of the planners and thus the planning process itself.
Mechanisms for Non-Decisions (March-July)

The staff began their planning effort for HBS late in March. Their main work revolved around weekly (sometimes bi-weekly) meetings. There were 19 staff meetings in this period, involving over 75 staff-hours (well over 450 man-hours). The staff, with the exception of Kate (LT), worked in this effort on their own time with only an occasional "release" from the school system. Kate received a significant amount of "release time" from her other duties in order to work on HBS. Ralph (AA), hired to develop the HBS proposal, worked two days a week for the school system on behalf of HBS. His contract was ending July 15.

A key issue that permeated the planning process (and shaped it) was that of the possible re-division of authority between teachers and students at HBS. The staff rarely dealt with this issue directly, as they debated, discussed and argued over structural issues. These structural issues, though reflecting their underlying assumptions and expectations about the division of authority, did not get to the heart of the matter. The structural issues themselves were not resolved during this planning period. The Summer Workshop, where the staff was joined by 80 students, began with the staff not having a clear idea of their position on this issue, neither in structural nor conceptual terms. Despite the significant amount of staff time and energy devoted to this very important issue, they were unable to reach a decision about it. The staff, feeling anxious about the fast-approaching Summer Workshop, and with the prodding of the Lead Teacher, did
manage to structure the workshop.

A conclusion of this paper is that the staff's inability to make decisions was caused by their failure to establish pre-conditions for decision making; furthermore, that his failure to establish these pre-conditions was a failure in leadership.

The staff was given the mandate by the School Committee to develop the HBS. In selecting a staff, Ralph (AA), Richard (AS), and then Kate (LT) seemed to have a team model in mind. The reasoning, perhaps, was that the staff through good faith, open communication and trust could decide as a cohesive community by consensus. This would serve as a model for the students at HBS.

The staff limped along throughout this planning period, working on short-term, concrete tasks. These tasks were fed to the staff (as well as done for the staff) by the Lead Teacher and Ralph (AA). No one could or would lead the staff through the agony or pre-decision making mechanism building. The staff's attention was focused outward (on their dangerous and dreaded enemies, the Superintendent, the School Committee, the Headmaster at the high school, etc., and on demands which had to be fulfilled via tasks), rather than inward.

Without decision-making mechanisms, the staff slumped into a two-way split with an indecisive and unclear center, which deadlocked throughout this period. Kate (LT) and Ralph (AA) seemed to be aware of the difficulty and tried from time to time to direct the staff's focus (as did other staff members from time to time) to resolving the
division of authority issue (which was seen as very important by the staff).

However, Kate (LT) could not take a leadership position, which was a prerequisite to decision making. Partly due to the rhetoric surrounding HBS ("egalitarian," "democratic," "individually-oriented"); partly to the sense of the staff that they were, in fact, a team of equals; and partly due to Kate's own definition of her role as equal participant rather than leader, Kate did not lead. Ralph (AA) was a lame duck; his contract was terminating July 15 (with no prospects for renewal), and he was not a full member of the team (staff). He was present at the staff meetings intermittently, and at least two staff members expressed resentment at his presumed power and influence at HBS. They were not about to take Ralph as a leader.

The two-way split within the staff can be seen in terms of the value systems and personal styles of two of the staff members. This split, with a very fuzzy and unclear center, helped deadlock the planning effort. It is noteworthy that we are discussing variables affecting the planning process, not particular actors. The staff members are used strictly as illustrative types of behavior, perceptions and dynamic interactions. They are all interchangeable.

What follows is a snapshot illustrative of a typical deadlock which the staff constantly found themselves in during this period. This brief excerpt if from a staff meeting (the 15th) held on June 14. Besides the staff and Ralph, a young organizational behavior consultant was present for this one meeting. (He was never seen nor
heard from again.) It seems that he had contacted Kate prior to this meeting, offering his services to the staff. He felt he could help them in organizational matters like decision making. Kate saw, as did other staff members, a possible need for this type of help. The staff, after a somewhat prolonged debate, decided to invite this man to a staff meeting. He observed most of the meeting, saying very little. At the point at which we are breaking into the meeting, Edward is addressing this man. The whole meeting lasted (as did most others) over three and a half hours. It is hoped that his shortened example will capture the flavor and essence of these meetings -- their frustrations, tedium, and all.

Edward: (To the Consultant): You might serve to swing the balance one way or another in terms of the philosophy. Can you do that kind of thing?

Ralph: Do you want to trust him to do that?

Edward: No! (He laughs.)

Isabel: Why would you want him to do that sort of thing?

Edward: Because I'm never going to agree with you. I will never agree with your kind of philosophy.

Ralph: You are looking for an ally. (Everyone laughs.)

Edward: (To Isabel): You and I, if we keep hassling, may never get to a point of decision. There are two points of view. Somebody's got to influence one of them to get an agreement. My personal way of doing things is to be adamant to the point where everybody agrees with me. I'm not much of a success doing that. I have to find a better way to influence people. (He is wearing dark tinted glasses and looks at Isabel or at the floor while speaking.)
Kate: I think we are all like that (adamant) ...

Edward: How can we come to a formal decision? We go through a lot of dialogue, we very seldom leave a meeting with a conclusion. Something...this (that the staff decides upon) is going to be it. The Law of the School.

Zachary: This is done on purpose.

Edward: I agree, because I can't face up to the decision. How can we come to a decision without taking a vote on it, let majority rule.

Isabel: We sort of made an agreement, unspoken perhaps, that we wanted to run things by consensus, which is one of the reasons why we don't always resolve everything. Also, we have been talking about an all-school town meeting so that kids could have a part in this. That, too, was going to be done by consensus. I have doubts about how that will work in the long run...we are not going to have that luxury of time in the decision-making process.

Kate: It might be sensible to come to the Summer Workshop with basically a good way we, the staff, feel of doing it (structuring HBS) and go through it again with the kids.

Ralph: Where does the formal responsibility reside, with the staff or students?

Kate: That is the question I'm begging.

Edward: I want to go overboard in letting the students make decisions. Let's identify those kinds of decisions that we should leave for ourselves and let the students have decision-making powers appropriate to them. But let's not overstep our bounds according to the hierarchy of education.

Ralph: Identify those decisions you want to keep for yourselves and make that fact known so the kids don't have to spend all year trying to figure out which decisions they can make.

Isabel: We haven't decided whether to decide or wait until the Summer Workshop with the kids.
Edward: There are lots of decision-makers on any issue - staff, Lead Teacher, Superintendent, School Committee, and so on. It's too democratic. (Edward turns to Isabel, mouths "I love you" and laughs. She in turn raises her middle finger upright in the air in his direction and laughs. This is a common type of interchange between them.)

Zachary: We have decided to wait until the summer.

Isabel: That's my impression also. But I'm hearing different things.

Larry: The only way to decide anything, all matters, at HBS is by calling a convocation of all the students. I want the staff to be advisory only and I distrust representative government.

Isabel: The problem is that convocations don't work and if it's ineffective, the staff will run the HBS anyway.

Kate: Maybe we should come to a decision ourselves, open it up at the Summer Workshop and then later in the year change it.

Isabel: I'm afraid that the kids are not ready for decision making. (They will be too conservative or liberal.) They have no practice. Let's make the decisions flexible.

Edward: We should allocate to the students what they can decide. Like they can decide the way in which they spend their day, their dress, time in travelling, etc.

Isabel: We're on different points on the students' role in decision making. Let's wait until the Summer Workshop.

Edward: All decisions have to be made by the staff.

Larry: We must have the students, all of them in on it.

Toby: We should start making decisions.

Kate: Let's build a flexible framework assigning rules...lay out the ball park.

Isabel: Let's present our view to the kids at the Summer Workshop and let them react to it and change it.
Edward: The staff must be at the top of the school, above Town Meeting or Community Advisory Council (CAC) or the Lead Teacher. Decision making starts here.

Kate: I follow up administrative decisions. I don't make decisions. I am not the decision-maker for the group despite the fact that the Superintendent is uncomfortable with group decisions. I'm a representative of the group.

Larry: I distrust representative government. (He then goes into a chorus of "Yes, Sir, That's My Baby," while tap dancing.)

Edward: (To Isabel): I accept that.

The indecision illustrated in this example is due not only to the two-way split and the unclear center, but also the role expectations and behavior of the Lead Teacher and the staff, who expected participation without leadership.

The Two-Way into Three-Way Split

The two- into three-way split was exemplified by the value systems and personal styles of Edward (SMT), Larry (LAT), and Isabel (SST). It must be stressed that these behavior profiles are used solely to demonstrate the split the staff found itself in. Only one dimension of multi-dimensional actors is exposed in these profiles for the sake of illustration.

Formalization and Centralization of Authority Position

Edward (SMT) exemplified the viewpoint that there should be centralization and formalization of authority within HBS. He saw the staff as
the focus and decision-making body. The students should make their input in the day-to-day operation of the school through their contact with the staff. By influencing staff members, he argued, the students could have a participatory role at HBS. Edward's view was hierarchical, in that as the students would make their input by "informally influencing the staff," so the staff in turn would make their input by "informally influencing and manipulating the Superintendent of Schools" at Community Advisory Committee meetings.

At the first staff meeting, Edward called for a change in the School Committee proposal. He wanted to hand pick rather than randomly select the students. His explanation was that he wanted the school to succeed and would only pick those students who in his judgment were sincere and motivated. He felt that he could and should be the judge. He stated that he was not going to be influenced by outside forces and that he would make decisions on his own judgment. Ralph (AA), who wrote the School Committee proposal, resisted the hand-picking idea, saying that there were no criteria on which to base a decision. Edward then asked Ralph how Parkway and Metro (two schools similar to HBS) had chosen their students. Upon learning that they randomly selected their students, Edward replied that they were not as "politically vulnerable as HBS."

Three days later (March 31), the staff visited John Bremer, who had helped develop the Parkway School. Edward asked the first question: "How did Parkway choose its students? Larry and I are against random selection." Bremer told Edward that Parkway randomly selected its students.
At the May 2nd staff meeting, Edward explained that he was approached by a student who had dropped out of school. He wanted her in HBS and wanted the staff to give special preference to her application. Except for Larry (LAT), the staff disagreed, and decided to leave her name in the random selection. Their reasoning was that she would probably get in anyway. Edward went along, as he said, "for now." As a matter of fact, the staff spent a significant amount of time discussing and debating whether to have a random selection or not, despite the fact that they had decided to allow seven special students into the program and randomly selected the rest. Edward initiated many of these debates over the selection process (at seven meetings). Each time he renewed his argument that the staff should screen out unmotivated and "dead-end" students. Edward felt that student selection was a staff function. "I want (the staff) to control who the students will be at HBS." He argued vigorously and often for staff control of HBS. Edward was adamant and aggressive (especially debating the women teachers).

The staff spent a considerable amount of time on the selection issue, only to be overturned by Richard (AA), who was now (in May) Acting Superintendent, one week before the formal random drawing. Richard's unilateral decision shocked the staff. There was some talk of going over his head to the School Committee, but this idea was quickly dropped in favor of reluctant compliance.

In an interview, Edward remarked that arbitrary and unilateral moves by Richard should be expected and must be manipulated by the
staff. He saw himself as a possible source of influence over Richard. Edward saw Richard as the man to be "gotten to," since Richard was very influential with the School Committee.

Edward's argument was for formal authority to reside in the staff. The Title III Proposal called for a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) which was to include the Superintendent, a School Committee member, the Lead Teacher of HBS, and a HBS staff member, among others. Edward aggressively volunteered for this position and got it (no one else seemingly wanted it so badly). On May 2, while working on the Title III Proposal, Edward stated that he thought the "function of the CAC should be to have the power to overrule things. Let's make them a Board of Trustees with policy-making authority." Ralph (AA) replied to this that the School Committee wouldn't go for it; Kate (LT) said that important decisions should not be subject to "a veto... there should be compromise;" and Isabel (SST) felt that "consensus had more spirit."

On a number of occasions Edward remarked that the decision-making process should be a group thing within the staff. The Lead Teacher was not to be "in charge." He felt that the Lead Teacher had the only access to the Superintendent, in addition to Ralph (who wasn't even on the staff). This put the staff (Edward) at a great disadvantage, as he saw it. Larry (LAT) was Edward's greatest ally in pressing for total equality of all staff. They both felt that the Lead Teacher should not be in charge nor have more access to information or to Richard (AS). On June 22, the staff was discussing the
upcoming first meeting of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Larry (LAT) wanted the whole staff to go to the first meeting to meet the CAC members. Edward, who had argued for 'staff' access to sources of information and power, refused, saying it would "confuse" the CAC and that they (himself included) must be left "free to determine their own role." The staff decided to attend the first meeting of the CAC.

It is interesting that Edward, prior to being on the CAC, had felt there shouldn't be such a committee. He explained that the "only reason for its existence was to please Title III," and that "Ralph just wrote it in." He went on to say, "I'm squeezing Ralph out of HBS. He influences Kate and Richard. They make up the golden triangle." By getting on the CAC, Edward said, "I can get to Richard."

At a coffee klatch on June 7 for parents, where Edward was the HBS representative (each staff member attended a number of parent meetings), a parent asked Edward how her son (who had applied but wasn't selected) could get into HBS. Edward told her that she should go to the CAC, and that they could admit her son. This power was never given to the CAC, although Edward implied to parents that it was. Edward explained at a staff meeting that the CAC wanted the program evaluated by professionals, not graduate students (a remark that was actually directed at the writer). Observing the CAC meeting, and briefly interviewing some of its members, it was verified that only one CAC member (besides Edward) had voiced concern over graduate students running the program evaluation.
The School Committee representative to the HBS CAC said in an interview (in June) that "Edward should take the leadership of HBS. Kate (LT) can't handle it. It's not work for a woman. She's nice but she will be overwhelmed. I'm just waiting for Edward to take over." Larry (LAT) said at a meeting, after it turned out that two invitations were sent to the HBS from the high school for a buffet (one to the Lead Teacher, the other to Edward), "Edward for Superintendent, 1984." Ralph's (AA) concern was "what will happen when Kate leaves next year (which she probably will). I shudder to think who may become Lead Teacher" (meaning Edward).

On April 15, Tish Havermill came to the staff meeting. She was on the staff of John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon. She urged the staff to break up into committees for "nitty gritty" issues. She said, "Kids need the option to be able to take alternatives already set up by you. They don't have to take your alternatives, but...kids need structure!" Kate responded by saying that she had the "need now to nail things down." Edward, on the other hand, saw no reason to assign tasks or nail things down. He wanted to do it the group way. He said to Tish, "Do I want to do everything with everyone all the time? Yes."

The staff did form two committees on June 3. Edward and Zachary (IAT) were to develop alternatives in structuring HBS. Isabel and Larry were to develop the philosophy of HBS. The committees were to report at the next meeting (June 9). Instead of presenting different models of decision making to the staff, Edward and Zachary
presented one model of scheduling. This modular schedule was not a schedule, in that there were no parameters (semesters, days, etc.). The other committee never reported to the staff. This was the only attempt by the staff to break into committees.

It is interesting to trace Edward's different positions concerning the division of authority at HBS. On May 19, he argued for staff control of the decision making. Then on May 26, he advocated that the CAC (of which he was a member) be given "decision-making power" like a Board of Trustees'. June 14 saw him advancing the position that an outside organizational consultant be used as a swing vote. (Edward hoped and possibly sensed he could influence this man.) On June 28 Edward took Ralph's (AA) long-held position that the staff should determine what it must decide at HBS and inform the students of their areas of decision making. A half-hour later, at the same meeting, Edward was arguing that the staff should decide who decides on all matters during the school year. By July 7, he was back to his first position that the staff must be the final and ultimate decision-making body at HBS.

The others on the staff were aware of Edward's changes in position and viewed them as manipulations to influence them toward Edward's position (they expressed this in interviews). To the staff, Edward represented the old or traditional authority structure. Edward did, in fact, advocate and recognize the regular organizational scheme common to schools. His main deviation was in strenuously arguing against the Lead Teacher having the authority of a principal.
One wonders what Edward would have advocated if he had been the Lead Teacher. The point is that Edward's philosophical and structural arguments were reflections of his own perspective and position in HBS.

The staff's posture throughout the planning process seems to have been, partly, a reaction to this very aggressive, adamant teacher. He and his viewpoints permeated and perhaps helped determine the outcome of this planning period. His style with the female teachers was, as one teacher remarked, "like being raped or assaulted." Edward (and Larry) were considered by the other staff members, especially by some of the women, to be male chauvinists. This chauvinism possibly made it more difficult for the women to actively participate in the planning.

**De-Centralizing of Authority and Centralization of Influence Position**

Larry (LAT) on one dimension was a balance for Edward's viewpoint that the staff should be central at HBS. Larry's position throughout was that the staff was not to be decision makers, but rather influential advisors to the students. The students, "all of them together," were to be the ultimate decision makers. Richard (AS) was pleased to recommend Larry for a staff position because of this seeming balance: Edward for the town and school administration, balanced by Larry for the students.

On another dimension, though, these two teachers seemed very similar. Each seemed to be acting from the standpoint of his own perspective.
Larry, as did Edward, seemed to act on his own behalf, trying to create an area of influence for himself. Edward, being "more influential with adults," saw the staff as final decision-maker. Larry, charismatic, popular and known to a significant number of HBS students (prior to their coming), advocated total student decision making. As Larry once remarked (in July), "the most influential advisors will have power at HBS. Advisors (teachers) who cannot honestly influence and communicate with the students should not have authority (power) at HBS. It's just opposite from the high school."

Larry did not "trust" government (whether in the real world or at schools). He argued against representative as well as against staff-run decision making. The only viable decision making Larry could conceive of, "with all its problems and drawbacks," was a convocation of the whole school (students and staff). He imagined that "smaller discussion groups feeding into the all-school meeting would be desirable." That would help develop a "sense of community and commitment," especially for the younger, less vocal students. All HBS activities would fall under the jurisdiction of this all-school meeting. He hoped decisions could be made by consensus.

Larry was a delightful, entertaining and talented participant. He was very funny and during the course of staff meetings would entertain the staff. It was not rare for Larry to break into "Yes, Sir, That's My Baby." He would not only sing (quite dramatically) the song, but would accompany himself by dancing. The staff always responded (laughing, applauding, singing along, etc.). This theatrical
facet of Larry's style was disruptive, many times, to the decision-making process of the staff. Larry's **divertissements** turned the staff away from the issue they were debating. It would take time (sometimes weeks) for the staff to return to the interrupted issue. Larry also interrupted discussions by exclaiming that the problem was that "we don't know or discuss our 'educational philosophy.'" He would pose abstract philosophical questions in the middle of discussion efforts to resolve concrete issues. This too was, at times, diverting to the planning process.

At the first meeting, Larry coalesced with Edward. They both argued against random selection of students in favor of staff selection. Edward felt it was a staff function (an investigation revealed that Edward had few, if any, special students coming to HBS). Larry explained to the staff that he was concerned for the success of HBS and wanted to keep "dope heads and uninterested kids" out. The rest of the staff, especially Ralph (AA), argued that there were no criteria for selection. Larry posed a compromise. Why not, at least, give the seven students who worked all along for HBS (at the Charette, with Ralph in the pre-proposal days) special privileges? The staff agreed. A subsequent investigation revealed that all seven of the "special-privilege" students were Larry's students. All seven were part of Larry's drama-play production team. As Larry remarked after the random selection, "What a relief! My whole technical crew got through!"
At the June 17 staff meeting Larry said that "the title 'Lead Teacher'" implies Master teacher, and Kate (LT) was really a "coordinator or administrator." He felt the title should be changed from Lead Teacher, despite the fact that Richard (AS) didn't want to "deal with a collective voice." Edward had been concerned that Kate should not be thought of as "in charge," for a long time. Kate once again told the staff that she saw her role as administrative, not as decision maker. For more than fifteen minutes, the staff discussed the possibility of formally changing the name of Lead Teacher to Administrative or Coordinating Teacher. Larry instigated this discussion, and Edward helped keep it going.

A typical interaction between Larry and Edward (SMT) is excerpted from this same meeting (June 17). The staff was discussing possible decision-making structures. Edward said, "I really can't understand what you (the staff) are talking about. We have a formal decision-making authority, the School Committee. They have delegated to us (the staff) some of their power."

Larry responded, "An all-school meeting should be the only and ultimate decision-making body." Edward remarked that Larry was not in line with "public education." Edward was slightly agitated, and looked intensely at the floor while he spoke. He wore dark tinted glasses.

Larry responded that HBS was to be an experiment. He then sang a chorus of "I Love a Parade," which broke the tension. Isabel (SST) quickly added that "no one (had) decided whether the staff or an
all-school meeting would be the decision-making body at HBS. Only the students can decide that." At this point, the meeting broke up. Kate, as always, said that they should put the topic "on the agenda" for next week.

Besides singing, dancing, and raising philosophical questions, Larry also playfully joked with Edward, which helped lessen the tension as well as to divert the staff's attention from a discussion. For example, knowing that Edward was a "hawk" on the Indo-China war, Larry asked him in the middle of the meeting where the draft counseling was going to be held. Edward replied, "In the urinals of the men's room." Everyone laughed and left the discussion. Another time Edward asked Larry to buy an American flag. Larry replied that there was one in the large room, to which Edward responded, "Jesus, you mean all this time I've been saluting the flag across the street at the Church!" Again, the meeting was distracted.

Neither Larry nor Edward was really able to seriously compromise or negotiate his position. Each seemed locked into arguing from his own perspective. It may be telling that at the PTA meeting and School Committee meeting (May 10 and 11) Larry chose to report on the upcoming Summer Workshop with the students, and Edward handled the report dealing with the Community Advisory Committee.
Isabel (SST) represented the inexplicit and off-balanced center of the staff. Her main role throughout the planning process was that of holding off Larry (LAT) and Edward (SMT). She felt that there should be an equal distribution of influence and authority at HBS, as she said many times. The best she could or would do was to postpone or put off Larry's and Edward's arguments by saying, "We must wait for the kids at the Summer Workshop. We shouldn't decide (without the students) on whether we should have an all-school meeting or staff-run school." On a number of occasions, she, along with Kate, called for decisions before "we (staff) go into the Summer Workshop." At that point, the staff would deadlock. Isabel was Edward's most determined resistance, but she was unable to develop a proposal of her own to counter his staff view. She also had doubts as to the merits of Larry's proposal. From her interview, it seemed she favored a representative form of decision making, though she never argued for it at staff meetings.

Isabel's posture was that of holding back rather than aggressively going forward. She did provide an anchor for the rest of the staff. Zachary (IAT) started the planning process "staff-oriented," as he explained in his interview. He was persuaded by Larry and Isabel that HBS should be student-oriented. Zachary also had concern about an all-school meeting, though he couldn't and never did suggest anything else.
A main characteristic of this off-balanced center was the confusion and uncertainty about how HBS was going to "motivate students... build a cohesive yet free community," and so on. Perhaps the strength and force of Edward and Larry tied up much of this center's energy so that a positive, aggressive proposal could not be developed. Toby (HT) missed a considerable number of staff meetings and remained for the staff a relatively unknown and inactive participant.

Isabel expressed (both at interviews and at staff meetings) discomfort with Edward's chauvinistic behavior. She also perceived (to a lesser degree) Larry as a chauvinist. In an interview, she remarked that one reason Kate could not be more effective as Lead Teacher was Edward's and Larry's attitudes and behavior toward her. "They treat us (women) staff as girls...They monopolize and dominate the meetings. Edward, especially, has his own agenda." This behavior, such as openly and playfully flirting with Isabel, making jokes and joking about Isabel and refusing to take her seriously, may have helped to off-balance the center.

The Lead Teacher as Non-Leader

The Lead Teacher position at HBS was thought of as a leadership or director position by the School Committee, Richard (AS), the three principals, the Title III Administrator, and two Charette members. Ralph (AA), five Charette members, and Kate (LT) herself saw this position as equal to the other staff roles. Only one staff member (Isabel) hoped the Lead Teacher would lead the staff.
Kate, feeling that "everyone should make the decisions as a group," devoted most of her time and energy to administrative work. She, along with Ralph (AA), fed the staff concrete, short-term tasks. The staff functions revolved around these tasks: recruitment and selection of students, meetings with parents and students, coffee klatches with small numbers of parents, dealing with the Headmaster and Richard on administrative work, and so on. Ralph, with Kate's assistance, had written final drafts of the Title III and New England Program in Teacher Education (NEPTE) proposals. A number of staff meetings were devoted to going over these drafts with the staff. The staff made some changes but mainly left these proposals as they stood.

Kate was more aggressive and ran the meetings more at the beginning of the planning process. As time went on, she concerned herself with administrative and sometimes secretarial roles for the staff.

Ralph had the greatest longevity of all of the staff at HBS. Active from the very beginning, he became less active at staff meetings during this planning period. Ralph felt that it was the staff's function to develop HBS. His role was as part-time administrative assistant to the Superintendent. He spent most of his time developing and writing proposals (Title III and NEPTE).

Ralph, from time to time, did take part in the staff discussion and tried, as did Kate, to direct the staff to decision making. Both Ralph and Kate were unsuccessful: she, because of lack of desire to lead and her role expectations as Lead Teacher; he, because his
attendance was not frequent and consistent enough, he was not a staff member, and his role definition was clearly in the administrative area (as Edward was quick to point out). Ralph's contract was terminating on July 15, which made him a lame duck. (Ralph subsequently became the Title III and NEPTE Administrator for HBS.)

The Superintendent of Schools left Watertown in April, and Richard became Acting Superintendent until the School Committee appointed a new Superintendent. Carrying a double load, Richard was "overwhelmed with work," and as Ralph noted to the staff, didn't have time to interfere with the HBS staff. This vacuum of power at the top of the administrative ladder helped create a pocket of freedom for the staff to operate in during this period.

The School Committee was also overwhelmed with work. One member was critically ill and another began as president of a local college (which limited his working time for the Committee). The School Committee was deeply involved in labor negotiations, school building programs, and so on. They looked to Richard for their information about HBS.

When questioned by Richard or the School Committee about HBS, Kate would respond that planning was coming along fine, but that things were still a little vague "since we are waiting for the students in the Summer Workshop." One got the feeling that, perhaps, the staff was developing a set of clear alternatives for the students to work with in the Summer Workshop.
Throughout the planning process, many of the actors seemed to use language as a camouflage from one another. When questioned, actors would speak of HBS in general and abstract terms, the operant meaning of which were never questioned. Words like "participation," "sense of community," "student-oriented," "cohesive," "supportive," "supervision," etc. were often used. Thus, for example, when the School Committee heard Kate say that the staff was waiting for the students at the Summer Workshop "because HBS is going to be student-oriented," no one questioned her as to what she meant. They may have assumed she was using their individual definitions of "student oriented." Kate meant "student decision-making" or "student-run," and no one on the School Committee expected HBS to be student-run (despite the fact that Kate did inform them in her own words). Similar failures of clarification or definition (operational or descriptive) of highly abstract terms, have already been seen in the communication (or miscommunication) process among the staff itself.

Another observation is that rarely did one actor listen, hear, and respond to another actor. It seems reasonable to assume that one reason conflict did not arise was misuse and inadequacy of language, plus the inability of most actors to listen to one another.

On several occasions Kate expressed her desire to "nail things down," meaning at one point to go to the Summer Workshop "with basically a good way (the staff feel) of running the school, and go through it with the kids," to "develop different alternatives and present them all to the kids." The staff never objected (except for Edward,
who wanted to keep things open so that things could "evolve"), but could never break through the split that they found themselves in.

The Summer Workshop was to begin on July 26 with a staff week. From August 2 to August 15, the students were to join in on the planning effort. The staff found themselves still deadlocked in early July. At the July 7th meeting (just two meetings away from the Summer Workshop), Kate explained that "we had better structure the Summer Workshop, especially since some of us are going away." (Zachary; Tobdy and Larry were leaving on vacation. Toby was not present, and Larry was leaving that same day for Europe.)

Isabel voiced concern that perhaps they were not "devoting enough time to the issues...one of the most important things is a design for decision making. Once we have it, they (the kids) can get plugged into it as we do."

Edward responded that Isabel was orienting the Summer Workshop toward specific topics in order to get to definite conclusions. "Aren't you pre-determining the school by choosing the issues, rather than letting it come out by natural evolution?" Edward advocated letting each day's discussion determine the next day's work. Zachary agreed, adding the students or staff could get together at the end of each day and re-define the issues. Edward proposed starting things off with "rights and responsibilities" at HBS. He added that as things arose the staff could determine the "best ideas" and make a "format for the following day."
Kate stated that she wanted to break down into five groups, with each staff member, in order to brainstorm ideas for courses.

Isabel said to Edward that his way was to have the staff pull things together. "I'm wondering if there is another way." To which Zachary replied that he thought it could be through the students. Larry said, "How about a large group meeting made up of the smaller groups?" Zachary was concerned that "you really have to run a big meeting or else it's Chaos," and Kate felt that "you really have to know what has to be decided upon" at large meetings.

Edward couldn't understand why things had to be decided at the Summer Workshop, why conclusions had to be reached. He felt that things would just evolve and that at the end of each day, it "must be the staff who decides on specific issues for the next day's meeting." He felt that HBS didn't need a time table for the year (Isabel's concern), and that it could just be "left open to individuals" (between students and staff). He wanted to leave most things open, to which Larry and Isabel responded that they thought students would be confused. He accused them of being "restrictive." After two hours, Edward reiterated his point that "all decisions should be channeled out from the staff. There is no better way." Larry responded, "Either we accept Edward's proposal or an all-school meeting."

Edward: I don't know how you can avoid having a controlling body that designates who will make decisions.

Isabel: Some of us are saying the control body should be all of us, and you are saying that the control body should be the staff.
Zachary: The students may very well say, and I won't be surprised at all, as a matter of fact, if they say, the staff should be the control body; but they have to say it. (He has mentioned this idea on several other occasions.)

Larry: As issues come up, let's bring them to the convocation of the student body, then vote on it. This body comes together once a week on all matters.

Edward: It can't be an all-school meeting decision because an all-school meeting is a peripheral body.

(A half hour later; the discussion centered around either staff-rule or all-school meeting.)

Larry: I'm very paranoid about a representative group.

Zachary & Isabel: So are we.

Edward: I'm not undemocratic to the students. I'm for centralizing authority but if that's the consensus (all-school meeting) I will work within it. Come December or January, the staff may have to have a rights and responsibilities meeting. Perhaps Larry's drama workshop will take away from me, my students and time. You know? Representative government may be a better way...

Isabel: The Charette process is probably a good one to employ for this. (She was referring to the fact that the Charette used large group meetings and smaller committee meetings that fed into the Charette as an organizational structure. The staff planned the Summer Workshop the same way.)

Edward: It seemed to work at the first meeting Ralph had for HBS.

The structure of the Summer Workshop was to a good extent in reaction to Edward's insistence on staff control. The only two alternatives posed were (as Larry explained to the staff) an all-school meeting or Edward's proposal. It is interesting that as the structure of the Summer Workshop was developing, the staff (Isabel and Edward especially) looked to other meetings they attended for guidance and
comfort. They were influenced and felt easier about choosing structures familiar to them rather than unknown and untried organizational schemes. There were no alternative models for structuring the Summer Workshop proposed.

The dynamic interaction within the staff (the chief planners) during the planning process can be shown graphically as:

- Staff decides/wait/ASM
- C.A.S./wait/ASM
- Staff decides who decides/wait/nail things down/ASM
- O.B. consultant/wait/nail things down/ASM
- Staff/students/wait/nail things down/ASM

COLOR KEY
1 - EDWARD (JMT)
2 - ISABEL (SST)
3 - LARRY (LAT)
4 - KATE (LT)

ASM - AN SCHOOL MEETING
It seems safe to assume that among any group of actors (planners) a variety of personal styles and value systems will emerge. It is a discovery of this paper, based on observations, that the dynamic interaction among the planners was not creative, in that it failed to bring the various value systems and styles into a cooperating, effective team. The focus of analysis is concerned with the interaction of the planners, not individuals. Each actor's role, value system or personal style, can be seen as interchangeable with each other's. For example, Edward could have been the lead teacher or he could be seen as the less aggressive, undecided actor. The outcome of the planning may very well have been different, but to what extent and in what ways, must remain an enigma.

Undoubtedly, any change in the actors or their respective roles or perspectives would have altered the planning process. Without knowing the dynamic interaction that would have occurred, had an actor been absent or different, makes any speculation, perhaps, frivolous and fruitless.

The critical factor is not the actors, but rather the interactions. Without creative leadership, any group of planners might find themselves in the maze of indecision and confusion the HBS staff were in.
Part of the Title III funding was specifically earmarked for a three-week summer workshop. The idea was to bring the students and others (parents, community resource people) all together to plan HBS. The first week was a staff week. The staff met Monday through Friday (July 26-30) from one until five p.m. The next two weeks (August 2-13) 81 students joined the staff (for the first time) in the planning process. Parents were told that they were welcome, and five or six parents did attend, though intermittently.

The staff spent the first week in the following activities. Ralph discussed the Title III budget; Professor M. Schwartz of Brandeis discussed his possible role as a consultant. Two days were spent discussing the possible issues that would arise with the students, and ways of dealing with and raising these issues. The staff participated in a cardboard construction demonstration (they were thinking of using cardboard for furniture). Kate discussed the possibilities of equipment and supplies procurement and needs. The last day was spent discussing the program evaluation and then a press conference was held.

Professor Schwartz, who had met previously with Kate and Isabel, was interested in helping HBS develop a sense of community and provide better communication within the school. Both Kate and Isabel liked Professor Schwartz and advocated hiring him at the staff meeting. Larry readily agreed; Zachary and Toby were somewhat more hesitant, but agreed also. Edward reluctantly acquiesced to the staff. He felt
no need for "expert" help. Edward said, We are all experts when it comes to dealing with kids, and besides, the one thing HBS has going for it, right off, is a sense of community the kids all feel."

Professor Schwartz, in speaking with the staff on July 26, suggested ways he might help HBS, and in so doing, suggested organizational schemes. He suggested as one possible way of organizing a division of the student body and staff into six groups. These groups would consist of one staff member and students, mixed by age and sex. A staff member and a student chosen by the group would act as discussion leaders, and these leadership pairs would meet weekly with Professor Schwartz in a group leadership training session. Although this idea was only an illustrative suggestion, it was endorsed by the staff (especially by Kate, Isabel and Larry). The students would have the final decision as to whether there would be discussion groups or not, and if the Schwartz organizational model should be used. The staff wanted to hire Professor Schwartz and to use this suggested plan. They said they were going to raise the issue at the Summer Workshop with the students. The sense of the staff was that they wanted Professor Schwartz and would argue on his behalf to the students.

During this week, the staff finalized the organizational scheme for the Summer Workshop (only roughly worked out before this). The structure worked out called for three group meetings almost every day. Small group meetings, called "Rights and Responsibilities," were to be made up of 12 or 13 students and a staff member, for discussion of issues surrounding the students' rights and responsibilities
To help build a sense of community and motivation, the students would decide for themselves what group (and leader) they wanted to be a member of. The idea was to have six roughly equal (in sex, age and size) groups. A second type of meeting students were to attend each day was called a "subject group." These randomly-selected groups were to meet with a different staff member each day to discuss and explore possible course offerings in that teacher's field. The third group was to be a large group meeting (all-school meeting), where everyone was to come together during the day. This large group meeting was to provide a sense of community for the whole Summer Workshop, to possibly make decisions, to receive information, and so on.

Mandate of the Summer Workshop

The Staff

Kate, at one point during the staff week, asked what the product of the Summer Workshop should be. Larry said, "to finalize community contacts for the students." Isabel answered by saying, "We should aim at some type of decision-making process and have a yearly, weekly time table, so that we can really plug the community into HBS." Kate added that the Workshop should make the final decision in the so-called Schwartz (discussion) groups. Larry said that besides those structural decisions, the Summer Workshop should build a "strong sense of community," so that kids could start trusting and communicating. Zachary
and Toby agreed. Edward viewed finalizing decisions at the Summer Workshop as restrictive and limiting. He advocated not finalizing any decisions at the Summer Workshop.

At the press conference called by the HBS staff, a press release was issued (which appeared in the Watertown Press). It said that the Summer Workshop was geared "to work out final details of programming and scheduling," and that these planning sessions with the students were "a vital step in organizing the new school." Kate was quoted as saying that, "There will not be a group of six teachers handing down all the decisions to everybody else." at HBS.

Parents

Between May and August, 13 parents were interviewed (some briefly, others more extensively). Clearly nine parents hoped that their children's program would be more or less organized by the end of the Summer Workshop. They were concerned about the "vague," "ambiguous," and "uncertain" answers they were receiving from the staff about the school in general and curriculum matters specifically. Four parents expressed concern about building a "sense of community," creating a "trusting and open school," and "involving the students fully," as important goals of these workshops. They seemed less apprehensive about curriculum matters, feeling that it would all "fall into place." Two of these four parents were very active in HBS.
Students

Interviews with 16 students (in August) revealed that a majority of these 16 (10) saw the Summer Workshop as a time to get their programs together. They did not seem to know (or care about) the Community Advisory Committee, the Schwartz groups, or decision making in general. Their interest seemed to be in: 1) taking interesting, relevant and exciting (sometimes exotic) courses; and 2) making sure no secret restrictions were placed on them. These ten students were the younger, less vocal, less aggressive (they participated less) students.

The other six students (the older, more active and vocal ones) saw the HBS as an opportunity to create a student-oriented school, with less restrictions than the high school had. They too, expected and hoped to have their programs in order by the end of the Summer Workshop. The difference between these two groups of students was that the former were much more concerned with what was going to happen to them and were trying to get as much as they personally could once they discovered the limitations, while the latter group seemed eager to create and develop a new place, different from the high school.

It is noteworthy that many of the members of the School Committee, Richard (AS), and the three principals, all hoped that by the time the Summer Workshop was over, "a clearly-defined school (curriculum especially) would emerge." At meetings and in mini-interviews, the staff expressed their knowledge of these expectations. They
seemed to experience it as pressure and anxiety (Kate was especially vocal about this). This was especially evident at "Coffee Klatches" with the parents, large parent meetings, and the School Committee report. For example, at the first meeting of parents and students of HBS (on May 13), one woman asked the staff, "We (the parents) are very apprehensive because you (the staff) can't say anything positive or concrete. We want some structure to get HBS going." This type of anxiety on the part of parents (especially) and the School Committee members was felt by the staff as pressure to really resolve issues at the Summer Workshop.

Interestingly enough, pressures, especially from the School Committee and even from Richard (AS), seemed like distant canons advancing ever so slowly. These anxieties, though recognized, were never translated into immediate pressure. They remained until about the end of the Summer Workshop, vague, distant rumblings, haphazardly and informally coming to the attention of the staff through individuals. The staff seemed quite buffered from many of their constituencies throughout the planning process.

Parents' Expectations for HBS

On August 10th, 91 parents, representing 75 families, were given a questionnaire to fill out. Consisting of 19 questions, this questionnaire seeks attitudinal as well as demographic information. Following are some pertinent data for our discussion, tabulated from these questionnaires. It must be cautioned that there may be errors.
in coding these questionnaires.

When asked, "What particularly do you hope that your child will get from the HBS experience?", a significant number (65) of parents answered, "a better education," "knowledge," "a wider and more relevant curriculum." The second most listed answer (59 parents) was "the gaining of 'direction,'" "motivation," which would help their children have a "rewarding career," or "line of work," or "to get into college." A significant number of parents (28) responded that "building responsibility" was important. Interestingly enough, only 17 parents listed "gaining experience in the 'outside world,'" or "community involvement" as important. Seven parents noted "building personality" as an important goal.

To the question, "In what way do you think the HBS will be different from Watertown High School?", 38 parents noted an "increased and meaningful 'parent participation'" as important. Thirty-three parents listed increased "student and parent participation" as the difference. Twenty-nine parents responded that students will have more responsibility in "what they learn in their courses," or "in their interests." Three parents felt that HBS would provide "lack of discipline" and "direction" for the students.

Asked "What is the proper role of students and parents in the areas of 'grades, discipline, attendance, course programs, school policy, etc?'", a significant number of parents (47) answered that the teachers are the decision makers, but not in the "traditional" or "standard" way. Another 15 parents felt that the students, together
with the teachers; should decide course programs and grades. Five
parents noted parent-teacher decision making as a goal at HBS.

Clearly, the profile that emerges from the parent questionnaire
is that the parents are concerned about their children's education
in the conventional way (courses, programs, achievement, etc.), and
are future-oriented (preparation for college, careers, jobs, etc.).
A significant number of parents look to the teachers at HBS as the
decision makers. The parents see their own role increased at HBS,
compared to the high school. As far as the students' role, it seems
to be confined, for most parents, to course programs and some curricu-

The parent profile that emerges from the questionnaire is consis-
tent with interview data. Thirteen parents were interviewed between
May and August. Ten of the thirteen saw HBS as a school that would
help their children educationally. One parent said, quite typically,
"Hopefully, students will be offered a measure of flexibility, trust
and encouragement to find and develop their own intellectual challenges
and capacities. I hope that will be encouraged to explore educational
experiences within and beyond the standard curriculum." Another par-
ent said that HBS would "open new subject areas for learning." Three
parents expressed a concern that their children should grow in an
"organic" way, as "whole" or "healthy" human beings. To these par-
ents, it seemed that the social (affective) aspects of HBS were pri-
mary, with the educational (cognitive attainment) coming second.
These parents talked more about a sense of community, communication,
trust, etc., than the other ten parents.

As for decision making, eight of the thirteen parents felt that the staff should "run" HBS. As one parent, who became very active at HBS, remarked, "The students should choose their courses, but the staff (teachers) are in charge." Another parent said that she thinks "the student should have a voice in the subjects, but not control, by any means." Of the six parents who saw a larger role for students in decision making, all spoke of staff guidance, supervision, cooperation, and so on, as being vital to the decision making process. One parent remarked that she felt that "a good deal of independence will not be an excuse for the absence of accountability. Students must accept the responsibility for their actions, academically and socially." These five parents, to varying degrees, saw a "cooperation" between staff and students beyond course program areas. They seemed to envision a close and constant guidance relationship between students and teachers. The staff, it seemed in their expectations, would help run HBS through their influence on the students.

Student Expectations for HBS

On August 10th, a questionnaire was administered to 87 students attending the Summer Workshop. Subsequently, the remaining 14 HBS students who did not attend the Summer Workshop have completed the same questionnaire.

The questionnaire had an open-ended format, and was used as a projective ("Why do you think kids applied to the HBS?") and as a self-
analytical device ("List your own reasons for coming to the HBS."). The largest single factor mentioned by students in suggesting both why they and their friends applied to HBS was to get away from "routine school," "traditional school," or from "Watertown High School."

Sixty-nine of the one hundred respondents noted this as a factor in the decision of "other kids," and forty-seven noted it as a factor in their own decision. Twenty-four respondents noted that they applied to HBS "to gain a wider curriculum," "to try something new/escape boredom," "to learn more/get a better education," and "to gain more freedom." All four of these factors imply a subtle desire to escape: a belief that a new "place" will offer more than the familiar one. Only one student responded that he wanted to "participate in governance," and six noted "gaining more responsibility" was an important factor in applying to HBS. There is a surprisingly low suggestion of distant future gratification, i.e., "to get a better job," "to get into college," or even "to learn a skill or trade."

Basically these responses show a disillusionment with traditional schools and a desire to try something new. Little sense beyond the desire to be away from the old school seems to appear. These findings are consistent with the interview data generated from sixteen student interviews. The main sense coming from these interviews is that a significant number of students imagined that the HBS would be student-oriented. Many of these students did not know how, or in what ways, the students would participate beyond their own programs. They seemed to be relying, in some vague way, on the staff for
delineation of what student participation meant at HBS.

The Summer Workshop (August 2 - August 13)

High hopes, great expectations and pressures surrounded the Summer Workshop with the students. Most actors hoped for concrete results from this two-week workshop. Based on our observations and interviews, we have concluded that the dynamic interaction within the staff during the prior planning period (March through July) recurred at the Summer Workshop. As in the staff planning effort, a two-into-three way split developed for lack of creative leadership. As before, Larry (LAT) represented one pole of the split, and Edward (SMIT) another. As before, Kate (LT) busied herself and was seemingly overwhelmed with procedural, administrative and paper work. She was an instrumental leader, focussing on specific tasks of these workshops. Isabel (SST), Zachary (IAT) and Toby (HT) represented the off-balanced and fluttery center. This time they were joined by the students of HBS. Without leadership to guide and direct these sessions (beyond the administrative tasks), decision making came to a standstill. The staff, as a group, had no alternative models (in decision making or in curriculum building) for the students to choose from. The staff was unclear as to where they stood on many issues, since nothing could be decided (especially on curriculum matters) until a timetable and a decision-making structure were formalized. For example, the staff did not approach community resources for courses during the planning
process, since they did not know if HBS was to operate on a monthly, semester, etc., calendar.

Larry, through informally influencing students, and Edward, by moderating (aggressively running) the meetings toward the end of the workshop, significant influenced the workshop. The basic influence, however, was the very structure of the workshop itself. Without leadership, as in the case of the staff planning, the students chose, at Larry's urging, very much the same structure for HBS as the Summer Workshop had. This, in the face of and despite, the apparent confusion and inefficiency of the workshop's organizational structure. Following is a brief description of the two-into-three way split at the Summer Workshop.

After seven days of workshop sessions, the staff realized that they still didn't have a decision-making process, which was holding up curriculum building also. The staff decided to change the on-going schedule of the workshop. On the 11th of August (the eighth day of this ten-day workshop), the staff called a "big organizational meeting." Kate left the workshop for the Central Office to do administrative work (as she did frequently). She remarked to me that she was "tired of running the whole show." She asked Zachary to run this big meeting. He in turn asked each R and R group to report to the entire group on what they thought about the decision-making structure.

Five proposals were presented to the entire group. Interestingly enough, two of the five were presented by Larry and Edward; a third alternative, presented by a student, was almost identical to Larry's
proposal. This student was not an HBS student. He was on the wait-
ing list and was attending the Summer Workshop expecting someone to
drop out whose place he could take. This student was on Larry's Tech
Crew at the junior high and was one of Larry's students. The other
two proposals were both student-presented. One young woman called
for "no decision-making body," explaining that "everyone should de-
cide for himself on the things affecting him." Another student (who
was also on Larry's Tech Crew) proposed a Research Council to run the
school. Zachary, who was still moderating the meeting, remarked that
"this council is like the Student Council at the high school." Many
students shouted "No!" The resemblance of this proposal to the high
school student council seemed to turn many students away.

The debate continued for an hour and a half. No more than eight
students participated actively, besides Larry and Edward. Edward had
taken over as moderator. At the end of an hour and a half the seat-
ing arrangement at this session was:

\[\text{Students leaving} \quad \text{Larry} \quad \text{Edward (now moderator)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Students playing cards} \\
\text{Active, pushup, bunny students}
\end{array}
\]
A student suggested that "we are getting nowhere...let's go back to R and R's and re-hash the decision-making issues again in smaller groups." Larry (quite dramatically) exclaimed, "No! I want closure!" (He stood up, pounded his fist on the table and gazed around the room.) At this point there were between 40 and 45 students left at the meeting (out of 81). Isabel remarked (privately) to me how Larry and Edward had "taken over, just as I feared they would." A tornado warning was received by the school at this point, and Zachary adjourned the meeting to the next day.

That evening, the staff held their own meeting. Edward began by saying, "Our (staff's) goal was to end the Summer Workshop with a decision-making process. We don't have it!" He then went on to delineate issues that "must" be resolved before a decision-making mechanism could become functional. At that meeting, Edward led the staff through thirteen issues that "had to be" resolved before the workshop ended (in the next two days). He went on to say that the "Schwartz groups" (which he didn't see a need for) was a student decision, not a staff decision.

The following day, August 12th, Edward moderated the "big organizational meeting," which lasted the whole workshop day (one to five p.m.). An aggressive student started to moderate, and did so (quite effectively and fairly), but was soon relegated to counting votes by Edward.

Proposals were again presented to the entire body (80 students were present). Following is a break-down of the proposals presented:
Advocate | Description | Votes Received
--- | --- | ---
1. Two students (one on Larry's Tech Crew) | Research Council. These 11 people, elected from entire would be the decision-making body. | 22
2. Waiting list student (Tech Crew member) | R and R's discuss issue, then bring it to all-school meeting. After discussion, group goes back to R and R for vote. Representatives for each R and R finally vote and group comes together again for vote tally. In front of everyone, vote is announced. This procedure is done for every issue. (This process was happening at the Workshop.) | 54
3. A young student | No structure. (She dropped her proposal.) | 0
4. Larry | He dropped out in favor of proposal #2. | -
5. Edward | Elected Council. This council would consist of 12 people all elected from the entire school. There would be 6 students and 6 staff. | 9

The first proposal, as some students said, seemed like the same old thing as the high school student council. The most popular, aggressive and oldest students, plus the staff, would run the school. A number of staff felt that this was the most sensible proposal in that it "might really work."

The second proposal was seen by students and staff alike as an upset victory. As one student remarked, "I didn't even understand how the proposal worked. I can't believe they voted for it."
fact, many people were unclear as to how the proposal worked. The factors that helped this proposal were: 1) It contained the R and R groups and large group meetings, which were familiar to the students; 2) Larry dropped his proposal in favor of the second proposal. When asked how many students Larry had before coming to HBS, he answered, "Forty to fifty per cent of the HBS student body." Randomly asking students how many kids had worked with Larry prior to coming to HBS, roughly the same percentage was ascertained (the range was from thirty to sixty per cent). It is interesting to note that Questa (an attitudinal questionnaire developed by ETS and administered to HBS and Watertown High School students) found a greater interest in HBS students than in WHS students in learning to appreciate and participate in the performing and fine arts, with a lesser interest in learning English, Science and Math, Social Studies, and Language.

It is also noteworthy that Larry's R and R group, which was supposed to have twelve to thirteen students, commonly had twenty-five students attending. Also, a significant number of the most active and vocal students during these large organizational meetings were members of Larry's Drama Workshop. His influence at these meetings was important to the decisions finally reached.

Kate and Isabel had also voted for this proposal, explaining that it would be a "good lesson in democracy, and besides, the whole thing will have to be changed within three months anyway."

When someone pointed out that Edward's proposal called for the election of six staff members as well as six students from the entire
school body, everyone laughed. There are only six staff members at HBS. Edward's proposal was not enthusiastically received by the students.

On August 13th, the last day of the workshop, Edward again moderated the large meeting. The aggressive student again tried to moderate also, but wound up counting votes again. From 2:45 p.m. until 4:30 p.m., Edward "pushed through" (as one student remarked) thirteen decisions at this large meeting. There were 56 students present, plus the six staff members. These issues covered such questions as: "Should there be six or ten R and R groups?" "What should the composition of these groups be?" "How should a moderator be chosen?" and so on. Edward, in speech and movement, had a proudness that comes over one with the realization of leadership. In fact, he did lead the workshop, though some students and staff felt he "rushed through" votes too quickly. He was also primarily responsible for determining the issues to be voted upon.

Without leadership, the Summer Workshop limped along, as did the staff planning effort, until the very end. Anxious to resolve the decision-making issue, the staff took over the workshop. Larry, using his considerable influence with the students, and Edward, using his aggressive, and at times, overwhelming personality, stole the workshop away from the kids in the name of decision making. The staff, still off-balanced, watched (sometimes resentfully and sometimes in awe) the process. Kate still busied herself with instrumental tasks, and Ralph (AA) came only intermittently.
Without any alternative modes suggested, any guidance or direction, the students were supposed to resolve issues in two weeks (40 workshop hours) that the staff had pondered for four of five months. The workshop ended without decisions on the "Schwartz groups," or curriculum matters such as timetable or schedule schemes. Without these decisions, supposedly, the staff felt it could not approach community resources.

Many of the staff went on vacations after the Summer Workshop. There were three weeks before school would begin on September 9th. Larry and Edward set up office hours at the guidance office of the high school. Since only roughly a third of the students had any semblance of course programs developed by August 13th, Larry and Edward felt they would call "everybody we know about getting kids into the community." Isabel and Toby assisted them in this effort, but to a lesser degree of involvement.

Between August 16 and September 9, Larry and Edward placed 35 to 45 students in courses. Some courses were with HBS staff, others with (and at) community resources. This intense effort, during these three summer weeks, shaped the curriculum of HBS more than anything else. Students came to HBS on September 9th (the first day of school) with an array of courses developed either at the Summer Workshop or with Larry and Edward after August 13th.

The problem was that there was no curriculum understanding, either by the staff or the students, as to what were the courses, how long they should last, how they should be evaluated and credited, etc.
Students just seemed to arrive with would-be courses on September 9.

The first day of school saw HBS in an all-day organizational meeting, moderated by Edward. Through this meeting, the school voted on a number of issues, one of which was to have the "Schwartz groups." Interestingly enough, many students didn't know what these groups were or what they were supposed to do at HBS. Roughly half the students seemed to have at least one or two courses lined up. The following questions were not resolved by the close of the second week of school (September 17):

How long should courses run?

Should there be required courses or course levels?

What about attendance, discipline?

How should the courses be evaluated (pass/fail, student evaluation, written, oral, etc.)?

What supervision and guidance responsibilities does the staff have to community resources?

This is a partial list of undecided and unanswered issues.

Towards the end of the second week of school, Isabel angrily remarked to me that Larry was putting all the community resource courses under his listing, "Language Arts," even if they were in the Social-Studies area. That meant that he was the staff liaison to these courses. This minor event confirmed Isabel's fears that Larry was taking over HBS.

As a "Parent's Night" at HBS, large sheets of paper used at the Summer Workshop were displayed. These sheets, divided into subject areas, contained course suggestions by staff and students. A School
Committee member remarked that HBS was more like an after-school club than a high school. He was referring to the obviously large number of students signed up for suggested Drama and Theater courses with Larry.
"The opposite to coercion is not freedom, but fellowship."

- Martin Buber, quoted by Herbert Read in Education Through Art, p. 282.

We have observed process and form unfold at the Home Base School. In this section we will draw together the themes of our study and will also follow possible implications for HBS, based on our perspective of the planning process.

The focus of this study has been the interaction among the planners during the planning process for Home Base School. We have observed that despite the high level of personal attributes (talent, commitment, etc.) of individual planners, the staff as a group was unable to act in concert as an effective, decisive team.

It is reasonable to assume that most planning efforts, as in the case of HBS, consist of participants with various values and personal styles of behavior. The HBS planning effort was not successful in that it was unable to pull together these various values and personal styles of its participants. Despite this failure, the school was put into operation through the tremendous efforts, in the informal system, of the individual teachers. This inability of the group to cooperate, to be decisive, was caused by the staff's failure to establish the pre-conditions for decision making. These pre-conditions, based on compromise and trust, could have been reflected in decision making mechanisms (voting, committee or special
functionaries, etc.). This failure to establish pre-conditions for decision making was due to the fact that no one worked within the staff to develop a team (community) that could trust one another enough to compromise on issues. We see this inability to decide as a failure of leadership.

The two-week Summer Workshop, when the students finally joined the planning process and the actual operation of HBS, reflects the staff's incapacity to be decisive during the planning process. Without leadership, the Summer Workshop was unable to resolve issues of importance to HBS, questions of grading and/or evaluation, length of courses, credit systems, Schwartz groups, curriculum requirements, and so on. The issue of coordination and integration of course work, especially community-related courses, was not dealt with at this workshop.

The students chose a decision-making structure which was almost identical to the Summer Workshop structure. Their decision to use this chaotic and ineffective structure for HBS was reached toward the very end of the workshop, under pressure from some staff members. The staff developed the Summer Workshop structure, and thus indirectly the structure of HBS, at the last minute. They did so more in reaction against the conventional authority structure (advocated by Edward), than with clear educational objectives and procedures in mind.

It is a striking aspect of the HBS planning process that no students were invited to join the effort prior to the two-week
Summer Workshop in August. Without students involved in the planning effort, the planners were forced to work on behalf of their image of the "ideal" students, and they used this fiction to advocate aspects of HBS (i.e., the students want decision-making power, etc.). The students were supposed to accomplish in 40 hours with 90 participants, what the staff found impossible to do in over 75 staff hours, with only 6 other actors: to trust, compromise, and decide.

As a result of such beginnings (if the description is true), the HBS is in a state of organizational chaos, a sort of "flopping around." As the "Watertown Home Base School Evaluation, Interim Report" notes: "On an informal basis, the HBS is working well socially for most students...Yet on an organizational level, the school has not developed a clear and efficient social form. A formal organization does exist, but it seems vacant and does not complement the actual, informal social functioning." 11

The question that arises, at this point, is whether a planning process is a worthwhile way to develop an innovative service institution like HBS, for it seems clear that despite the obvious lackings of the planning effort and the ensuing organizational chaos, the school is working (i.e., students express a greater happiness

and involvement, attendance is better than it was at the traditional school, at least one-fourth of the courses are in the greater Boston community, etc.). The question is, if the planning effort was a failure, why is the school working?

We firmly believe that planning and preparation are necessary and critical to the successful operation of an innovative institution such as HBS. It is our belief that Karl Mannheim was correct when he wrote: "The anarchist view holds that there is something in human nature, a kind of self-regulating power, which, if allowed complete freedom, will lead to spontaneous self-discipline. One of the basic convictions of this (ideological) school is that the more we use repressive devices for enforcing discipline, the more we foster what is called 'negativism' in the individual. We pay for repression by blocking human spontaneity and readiness to cooperate under good working self-restraint." Mannheim further wrote: "The anarchist idea contains a great deal of truth but lacks socialological qualification. Certainly, such self-regulating powers exist, but only in small groups. The larger an organization becomes, the less one can expect or wait for self-imposed discipline of the whole to emerge out of a lengthy process of minor adjustments." 12

Manheim was speaking directly to the HBS issue. Small groups can be spontaneous and self-regulating, where larger organizations

---

(possibly 100 students plus staff) must plan formally and consciously to achieve those same ends. It is the job of an administrative organization to provide the environment (the atmosphere) favorable to spontaneous, self-motivated and regulated work for large numbers of people.

Efforts involving large numbers of participants cannot be spontaneous without conscious preparation and direction. These preparations provide the background on which groups can develop and work spontaneously. Metaphorically, we see an organized effort, involving large numbers of participants, for the sake of spontaneous and self-initiated work as a heating system in a factory. Work goes on in the factory when there is appropriate heat. When there is inadequate or too much heat, more and more attention is paid to the heating system, rather than to the work itself. When an organization creates the appropriate environment for the desired work, little attention to or recognition of that environment is needed. The main focus can be the substance of the work itself. When the organization is not working properly (a structure that is inadequate or which hinders work), an increasing amount of attention and energy must be displaced from the work to deal with this problem. Without preparation, an organization cannot be developed that will work properly, i.e., as a background for the work as foreground. The peaks of exciting and spontaneous work cannot take place, for large groups of actors, without the background of a favorable and responsive organization.

In discussing how the planning process may have affected HBS, we will use three conceptual categories developed by Talcott Parsons.
These three areas of concern are: 1) adaptation to the environment; 2) goal achievement; and 3) maintenance of the value patterns over time.

**Adaptation to the Environment**

As we have seen like all service institutions, HBS is surrounded by constituencies (some more obvious than others). These constituencies represent forces which, to varying degrees, have potential influence over HBS. The outside constituents have hopes and fears for HBS -- if they believe that either their hopes and expectations are not being met, or that their fears are coming true, they may act (possibly with success) to alter HBS to fit their expectations. There is no way, short of outright clairvoyance, to responsibly predict what constituencies will feel and/or do in the future and what degree of success they will have in affecting HBS. What can be done, however, is to recognize their expectations and fears, determine whether HBS is vulnerable to pressure, and speculate the possible routes the vulnerability may take.

The main problem which the planning process created for the school, by not being decisive, was the staff's inability to recognize, evaluate, and then deal with outside expectations and fears. If the staff, as a group, identified these outside forces, they could then determine whether these forces: 1) were valid and must be incorporated; 2) invalid and not to be incorporated; or 3) invalid,
but need to be incorporated for political or social reasons. After an evaluation of the perceived outside expectations, ways might have been devised to: 1) incorporate the valid goals, and 2) incorporate the critical invalid goals in such a manner so as to not hinder the goals of HBS. Alternative models might have been developed which could have accommodated these outside goals. However, because the staff was unable to be decisive in this area, HBS is vulnerable to outside influences on a number of issues.

As we have seen, the School Committee, the Superintendent of Schools, the principals interviewed, a majority of Charette members, and parents felt that the staff should be the decision-making body, with the students making inputs and contributions. We also saw that all of the outside constituencies, except one Charette member and a number of parents, were against the idea of using an all-school meeting as a final decision-making body. We further observed that all the constituencies, except five Charette members and a number of parents, looked to the Lead Teacher as the executive officer, as the leader of the staff. Though their role definitions of what constituted leadership varied, they thought that she was responsible for HBS.

In fact, the staff does not have the formal authority to make decisions. The ultimate decision-making authority at HBS is an all-school meeting, which is chaotic, ineffective and becoming increasingly non-participatory. The Lead Teacher does not see herself, nor does the staff see her, as a leader. The problem is that the organizational aspects of HBS are not working. When, and if, these circumstances
reach "crisis" proportions (as the predictions forecast they will, in the immediate future), some of the outside constituencies may move to alter the situation at HBS. This may happen in any number of ways. The School Committee, under pressure, could unilaterally order specific changes (i.e., staff takeover of formal authority, etc.) or request the HBS to change its structure to a more effective model.* The point is that the possibility is there for arbitrary decisions, from above or outside, to adversely affect HBS.

This vulnerability might have been avoided if the staff, recognizing these expectations, had developed alternative models for the students to choose from, and, explaining the situation to the students, had tried to devise a structure which would have protected HBS from possible pressures. This structure could perhaps have been a modified all-school meeting, where the larger meeting advises a representative (or a number of representative) committees of its wishes. Participatory democracy does not necessarily have to mean that everyone votes on everything, all of the time; rather, it may mean accessibility, motivation, and trust in the decision-making mechanisms. As it is now, fewer and fewer students take part in the all-school meeting, so that twenty students have the power to vote an issue into being. The balance between participatory democracy and efficiency, as we have seen during the planning process, is a

* The School Committee is scheduled to discuss these organizational problems of HBS early in February.
subtle and delicate one indeed. Efficiency at the expense of democracy is undesirable, but the reverse is also true.

An explanation for the staff's indecisiveness is lack of leadership. Perhaps an innovative institution like HBS needs a new model of leadership. Two forms were observed during the planning process, both of which seemed inadequate and spurious. One mode was the conventional, authority-based behavior where the leadership resides at the top. This type of leadership is found in almost any organization where there is a premium on efficiency, divisions of labor and specialization of work, and a division of authority, such as in most secondary schools. Most of the planners reacted against this division of authority, which they had experienced at the traditional schools.

The second form of leadership we observed was that of the Lead Teacher, the role definition inherited and re-enforced by the Charrette. Ralph (AA), the other staff member, called for the Lead Teacher to be an "equal among equals." The idea was to have the group as a whole decide by consensus, without a formal leadership. This model, no doubt, was a reaction to the conventional authority structure in schools. The reason for the lack of leadership is partly due to the Lead Teacher's self-definition and partly due to the ambiguous, though insistent, feeling that the staff didn't want a leader; if her self-definition had been different, or her role clearer, another leadership model would have emerged. For example, if her definition of her role had been different, she might have moved into the situation, created trust, and developed a decision-making team. A role definition
with more authority and responsibility may have been enough positive reinforcement for the Lead Teacher to act.

Perhaps a third model of leadership needs to be developed at HBS. The Lead Teacher could be clearly charged with the authority and responsibility to get decisions made, but rather than as formal decision maker, she could be facilitator, aiding and prodding the staff into a posture of compromise and trust.

The proposal accepted by the School Committee states that a "student's performance will be evaluated by himself, by the staff, and by any outside resource people involved. Individual progress reports will be made to parents at regular intervals." (page 13)

Clearly this is not being met at HBS. Every outside constituent interviewed expressed an interest in on-going and constant evaluation of the students. A prime concern of the School Committee was supervision and guidance, as it was with parents, Charette members, and the Superintendent. The parents, anxious to know how their children were doing at HBS, kept asking for evaluation. The staff, from the planning process until the present, was unable to reach a consensus as to what constitutes an evaluation. Is it grades from the teacher? Is it a written evaluation from the teacher or community resource person, or both? Does it involve a self-evaluation by the student? Can different teachers use different forms of evaluation (i.e., grades, written evaluations, etc.)?
Weeks and then months went by during the planning process, continuing into the school year, without any evaluation system or even dates set aside for evaluations. Finally, in the face of mounting parental anxiety and pressure, the staff hurriedly decided to hold an evaluation just before Christmas recess, clearly to appease the parents' anxiety. All the staff could do was to try to have the students evaluate themselves in their courses; nothing more was done.

This pre-Christmas evaluation points out certain aspects germaine to our discussion. First, under pressure, the staff acted unilaterally and arbitrarily in deciding to hold an evaluation and in determining the form it would take. This was against the ideology, or at least the rhetoric, of participatory democracy at HBS. Second, a random investigation revealed that students, under pressure and fearing exposure, wrote evaluations for courses they were not attending. Third, the evaluation could not possibly placate the parents, since it only consisted of their own children's remarks as to how they perceived the course work.

What educative or social benefit could this evaluation, done in haste, provide HBS? Some students were forced, once again, to lie about their school work; the parents once again received a meaningless report from school; and the school's ideology of democracy was tainted somewhat by the unilateral decision of the staff. As P. Pi- gors, in his study Leadership or Domination, has shown, there is a shift from democratic leadership to despotism when autocratic measures are assumed by the leader or leading group in order "to save the
This shift, though subtle, might be a prelude to increasing power by the staff as they meet unanticipated "crises" with last-minute decisions. If the staff, aware of the importance of student evaluations, developed ways of evaluating that would be conducive to the philosophy and goals of HBS, this might not have occurred. What is true for evaluations is also true in the case of course credits, length of courses (weekly, monthly, semesters, etc.), and attendance.

A major concern of the School Committee as well as most other constituents is that of attendance. Interview after interview revealed how critical this issue was for so many people. School Committee members and parents told me that "HBS must (emphasis added) know where the student is at all times during the school day. If students are found at Watertown Square when they are supposed to be in class, 'all hell will break loose!'" Here again, the staff could not bring itself to develop a plan that would provide supervision, surveillance and/or contact with the students during the day. The students are required (the staff determined this) to check a sign-in sheet. These sheets are posted by the week, so that students can (and do) sign in for a week at a time. The issue is not one of trust, but rather a system that enables HBS to meet its community (and legal) responsibilities in such a way that is favorable to its philosophic ideal. For example, if there is a problem, an order from the School Committee might require the students' presence every day.

---

at a dreaded 'home room' period. This no doubt would change the whole atmosphere of HBS. One alternative the staff might have devised was assigning ten students to each staff member (with the four interns acting as staff members in this function). This might have provided the small group experience which spontaneously could have developed the self-regulation and discipline that the HBS as a whole cannot.

A concerned staff member keeping contact with a small number of students on a daily and weekly basis (with the time for field visits and consultation with the students' other teachers) might provide the necessary supervision, guidance and concern to develop conditions favorable to self-motivation and initiative.*

Having a staff which would recognize, evaluate, and then deal with constituencies' expectation and fears, by developing organizational models that would accommodate itself to their forces, would have been desirable. Now, a "crisis" or at least a breakdown may occur at HBS. The reaction of the staff to outside pressure, or presumed forthcoming pressures (anxiety attacks) may cause over-reactions, which may do more harm than good at HBS. Specifically, the staff may put HBS in a more advantageous position by pulling themselves together into a cooperating team that would become decisive on these issues prior to breakdowns, "crises," or anxiety-induced unilateral decisions. This effect, we feel, will take leadership that is willing and able

* It must be pointed out that a basic structural defect which may make this individualized attention impossible is the student-staff ratio. Perhaps there are too many students.
to work within the staff itself.

**Goal Achievement**

The next area of concern that we see the planning process affecting is goal achievement. Why did participants choose to come to HBS? If their goals are not met to some degree, they will be disappointed, and, in one respect, HBS will not have succeeded. We believe that the goal of individualized learning is specifically linked to the planning process.

The "Statement of Goals" developed by the staff states that an objective of HBS is to "provide a student-staff relationship which is a partnership of equals in discovery. Through innovative, broadened and creative interaction, the staff may facilitate the process by which students discover their own directions at their own unique pace." The Watertown Charette Official Report states that HBS is a school where "students and teachers work together in planning a program that is highly relevant to their needs."

It is very clear that a cornerstone of HBS is individualized learning. In private interviews during the planning process, the staff mentioned working individually with students as a prime reason for their coming to HBS; students also mentioned this as a reason for volunteering for HBS. Knowing that they wanted to work individually with students, the staff could have developed alternative models of social structure for HBS that would allow staff members the
time and energy to get personally involved with some students. They
could also have ensured that all 100 students would have a concerned
staff member working with them. This might have involved breaking
the school population down into small groups of students with a staff.
The staff member would then be responsible for a small number of stu-
dents throughout the school year (or a given period of time). This
small student-staff ratio would have allowed the staff members to
really get involved with each one of the students in his group. The
staff would have the time to have frequent talks with their students,
to speak with the students' teachers, and perhaps to go to some clas-
des with the students. Each staff member thus would really have an
opportunity to show his concern, in an in-depth and systematic man-
ner over the course of the school year. The staff member then might
be able to offer multi-services to the student, in that he could act
as facilitator, helping the student assess courses; he could coordi-
rate and supervise the student's work while at HBS. In other words,
he could serve as an important link to the student at HBS.

What is HBS like now, regarding individualized learning? First
of all, a significant number of students do not have an on-going re-
nationship with any staff members. There are students whose contact
with the school is quite slight. Second, there is little coordina-
tion or integration between courses either at HBS or in the community.
Students are more or less on their own to determine what they shall
take and they try to find a course that will be interesting. One
result of this is that a significant number of courses given at HBS
are at the school itself. The goal of using the community as a classroom is not working. This is due, in part, to the lack of sustained individualized attention which students need in order to go out into the community.

The staff offers many courses (much more than they would at the regular high school). The students can choose a staff-taught class at HBS, or may try to find his own class in the greater Boston area. The staff, being so busy, cannot give the great amounts of time needed to gain access to the community and to then follow it up by seeing that the course fulfills the student's needs. Thus the problem is two-fold. First, gaining access is difficult and time consuming, and must be matched with the student's needs and desires. Second, keeping in close touch with these courses to 1) ensure that the situation is meeting its potentials as an educative experience, and 2) to support the community resource people who by and large have never taught before, is difficult.

A result of not having the time to work in an on-going way with individual students has helped to develop this situation. Another problem that is emerging at HBS is irregular attendance and irresponsibility of the students. Teachers have complained that in a class of 15, only three students show up regularly. Community resource people have also complained that they set aside time for the students who then don't even show up for classes. This irresponsible behavior by the students is not unexpected. After all, HBS is the first school, for most students, that is not imposing rules and
regulations on students (backed up with disciplinary techniques). The staff is in the middle of all these happenings, trying to deal with everything. They go to the discussion groups (so-called "Schwartz groups"), decision-making meetings, staff meetings. They have their own heavy schedules of teaching, and they try to work with community resource people. They try to give guidance and supervision as they can, but their schedules permit only the briefest of on-going contact with students.

It is interesting that the Schwartz discussion groups are not working. As the Interim Report to the School Committee notes, "Their purpose is unclear to most students. They are poorly attended: in a recent survey, only fifty per cent of the students reported attending the discussion groups regularly, and only thirty-six per cent said they felt the groups served a useful purpose." These groups have been the source of criticism. The School Committee is scheduled to receive an in-depth report on these groups in February.

One reason these small discussion groups are not working is that the staff who advocated having them at HBS cannot have contact with the students except on the prescribed day of the group meeting. This is the case because of the staff's heavy commitments to course work and other duties. Perhaps changing the staff model, so that teachers teach less courses and have a more normal work load, would allow them to see certain students regularly. These Schwartz groups could become the core experience at HBS. A prerequisite, we would assert, would be a change in the staff model.
We believe, that without planning and preparation, the goal of individualized relationships in the learning process will not come about by itself. We feel that the staff should have developed a number of models allowing for this goal to be reached, and that without the staff's thinking through their goals and the various methods to reach them, the HBS will continue to limp along chaotically.

Maintaining Value Patterns Over Time

Much that happens at HBS does so through the extraordinary efforts of the staff. As we have discussed earlier, despite the seeming failure of the planning effort, the school was put into operation. It functions only through the informal system of contacts. The "fuel" that makes HBS "go" is a tremendous effort in terms of time and energy. Each member of the staff teaches a large number of courses, attends decision-making meetings and Schwartz discussion groups, acts as liaison to community resource courses, opens and closes the building, does his own administrative and paper work, and tries to provide guidance and supervision to all of the 100 HBS students.

The main problems that this extraordinary effort in the informal social system causes are: 1) a significant number of students are not getting adequate guidance and supervision; and 2) this effort will exhaust the staff before the academic year is finished. The exceptionally bright and motivated students are the ones who receive the attention of the staff. The students "in crisis" are also receiving the staff's attention (when the students are in crisis). A
significant number of students who are not outstanding or "in crisis" do not have adequate contact with the staff. The staff does not co-
ordinate or integrate their efforts so that a whole picture of a student emerges. Bits and pieces of a student's experience at HBS emerge. No one is responsible to personally watch over these stu-
dents.

The intensity of effort cannot endure throughout the school year. The problem is that the school cannot operate with a normal-
ized teaching effort. Resentments and bickering have surfaced among the staff. This is due partly to the pressure of the school situa-
tion. We are concerned that as the staff, finding itself exhausted, drops out of school activities, more and more students will be lost in the shuffle. This process is already under way at HBS. Without a replaced way of operating the school, HBS will become a less ex-
citing place and it will be increasingly more difficult to motivate students.

We believe that this seeming inability of the staff to maintain itself over time could have been avoided in the planning process. If the planners could have recognized, evaluated and then dealt with their obligations and restrictions from the outside environment. If they could have determined as a group what goals they wanted to achieve, they might have been able to develop alternative models of structur-
ing HBS. These models incorporating outside demands and HBS goals might have been structured so that a normal effort by the staff would have sufficed.
We believe that dividing the school into small groups with each staff member responsible for his group would have helped many problems. It would seem from our study that one important job of the planning process which was not done, is the developing of options for the students to choose from. The students were presented with the task of developing the school without any parameters or leadership from the staff.

A School Committee meeting is scheduled for February which will deal with the HBS. Among the issues that will be discussed is the organizational structure of HBS and its apparent ineffectiveness. I firmly believe that the staff must come forward very soon with positive options that would remedy this situation. If no action is taken, arbitrary and unilateral decisions will be imposed either by an outside force (School Committee, Superintendent) or an anxious and harried staff.

A conclusion I have drawn from my participation at HBS is that creating a new institution takes forethought and preparation. Participants came to HBS knowing mainly what they didn't want. Work has to be done defining and clarifying what goals are to be achieved and what processes or methods are available to meet these expectations. The results of the Summer Workshop would have been more fruitful if the planners had developed clear options defining the restrictions, requirements and expectations from the outside environment; their own goals for HBS; and various methods of achieving these goals. The students could have then chosen an option or combined a number
of options or developed a new one, if all these options were unacceptable to them. I would assert that everyone making all the decisions together is not workable when we're dealing with over 110 people. One lesson of the planning process is that without leadership, bright and talented people were unable to work as a team.

The Home Base School, with all of its problems, is certainly in the mainstream of innovative education, especially in regard to the problems it faces. For example, Ingrid Summerkorn, in an unpublished paper entitled "In Search of New Models for the Teaching-Learning Process in Higher Education" writes that: "A democratic seminar with a greater degree of 'student power,' i.e., of student participation and responsibility, requires a much greater investment of time and work by all participants, faculty included...In the final analysis, educational reform implies a redistribution of the teacher's time and value system; increased student participation does not mean less faculty involvement. The re-structuring of the teacher's role from an ex-officio authority figure to an egalitarian resource person necessitates careful preparation."

A Conference on Experimental Secondary Schools hosted by UNESCO found "decentralization of authority. Where should decision-making power lie?" are real and critical dilemmas for innovative secondary

---

14. For a detailed account, see the mimeographed report entitled, The UNESCO Conference on Experimental Secondary Schools," edited by Dr. Saul Yanofsky of the Pennsylvania Advancement School, Philadelphia. This conference was held on June 4-5, 1971.
The participants from the John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon, remarked that "participatory decision making - who decides who can make what decisions - to the point of paralysis" was a major concern of their school. The Cambridge Pilot School representatives noted "unsuccessful town-meetings" (all-school meetings) and the "huge lack of clarity regarding decision making" as a critical issue for them.

The representatives from the well known Parkway Program in Philadelphia as well as from the Metro High School Chicago and the Pennsylvania Advancement School of Philadelphia, all expressed concern over the ambiguity, tension and problem that decentralization of authority was for their respective schools.

In a personal communication, Mr. Tom Wilson of the Metro High School explained that de-centralized decision making was a "major problem" for his school. He further explained that in his visits and consultations with many other experimental and innovative secondary schools in the U.S., decentralized decision making was perceived as one of the most critical problems. 15

I tried throughout the planning process to remain detached. At times it was very difficult, I so sympathized and cared for what was happening. For example, when an organizational behavior consultant approached the staff, I advised them to "shop around" before committing themselves. I introduced M. Schwartz to the planners, and he subsequently became a consultant himself to HBS.

I found my role, at times, exceedingly difficult. There were times when I wanted very much to intervene in the process, thinking that I had a perspective that was not being recognized by the actors. I quickly learned that even if my view was correct, I did not have the vehicles to intervention. My participation was either ignored or taken as interference. Both reactions were very painful for me to face. I feel that one reason the staff did not hear, so to speak, my inputs (e.g., I told them of number of times that I perceived the School Committee to be against an all-school meeting), was that they were so embroiled in their own inability to work together they really couldn't afford another input.

Another problem I encountered is more on a personal note. I came to realize, rather quickly, that the very thing that helped me in my work (rapport and sympathy with the staff) was a major problem. Caring for all of them as I do and being in such sympathy with their goals, I found it hard to stand on the side lines, seeing and hearing what I felt were accurate perceptions.

I am still at HBS, now as the research coordinator for the Title III evaluation. A main aspect of my work, as I see it, is to
develop ways in which my perceptions (the research data and insights) can become a part of the on-going process of the school, rather than a post facto critique or analysis. I want my work to be a collaborative effort which will enhance and act as a self-correcting mechanism for HBS. Otherwise I feel like a deaf and mute participant to a rapidly approaching disaster which I'm not sure others see coming. I'm convinced that ways can be established that allow the researcher to intervene positively into the process, rather than to interfere unproductively or to report the outcome at the finish. Personally, this participant-observation study has shown me that I may really have a future in research, but that I will have to develop my own style - more active and collaborative - than other styles of research.

I think there are lessons that can be drawn from my experience at HBS. These insights might be helpful to a new Lead Teacher at HBS, especially since Kate (LT) is leaving next year. First of all, leadership does not necessarily have to be antithetical to participatory democracy. As a matter of fact, creating new institutions where democracy and freedom are emphasized needs leadership. A social structure must be developed that puts a premium on caring and on individual attention. The Lead Teacher, of course, must determine what kind of a leader she will be, according to her own value system and personal style. I would suggest though, that there are ways of leading that would not hinder participation by the other actors. I would also suggest that a role definition be developed that would clearly give the Lead Teacher authority and responsibility
to move for decisions on issues thought to be important.

Second, democratic planning does not necessarily mean that everyone must decide on all things together by consensus without leadership. As long as the participants feel that their concerns are being met and that they have easy access to the decision-making mechanisms and information, democratic planning can take place. A group of varied actors must merge into a cooperating team, which implies trust and compromise. Once these pre-conditions are met, decision making is possible. Various methods of decision making then can be used, such as voting, special functioning committees, etc. The leadership must, in my opinion, press for the resolutions regarding the pre-conditions. If she has the authority, she can say to the planners, we all agree that we need a decision, let's decide by a vote or else I must make the decision myself.

Third, I believe Mannheim was correct in feeling that large organizations cannot develop the spontaneity and self-regulation small groups are able to. I would suggest that dividing the total school population into small groups might be beneficial. Furthermore, I would let the small groups be spontaneous.

Fourth, more student involvement does not mean (as Summerkorn has pointed out) less teacher involvement. Perhaps meaningful student involvement means ever more staff involvement, at least in the early stages of the program. To work strictly on the staff's agenda was undesirable at the traditional high school. To work only on the students' is perhaps also undesirable. The teachers
are at HBS to achieve their own goals also. One starting point might be to establish what specifically do the teachers want for HBS. One thing was clear, no matter what the teachers wanted, they all planned to do it in 35 hours a week. Finding themselves at HBS 45 and 50 hours a week will be detrimental to HBS in that the pace cannot be sustained. The staff must decide for themselves what their own rights and responsibilities are at HBS.

M.C. Richards, in her brilliant book *Centering*, tells us that "Pedagogy is a formidable name for a simple act. It comes from two Greek words, meaning child and to lead. A pedagogue is one who leads a child, and pedagogy is his craft as a teacher. Education is an interesting word too, for it also comes from two other words - in Latin - meaning out and to draw or to lead. To educate is to draw out, to lead out. In some sense, then, we must be in!"16 She ends her section on pedagogy by stating, "Study in depth! To press in, extend upward, widen, contract, to develop a feel for the centered positive, and there to work out of a variety of impulses. Confirming each new form before we go on!"17 To achieve this, it will take forethought and preparation at HBS.

17. Ibid., page 129.