

ROUND TRIP TO HARTFORD

Will The University of Connecticut Realize Its Mission
At the Arsenal School?

Prepared by the External Evaluation Team

March 15, 1970

Burton Blatt, Evaluation
Chairman
Frank Garfunkel
Albert Murphy
Dan Richardson
Alex Rodrigues
Leo Sperling

Revised and Amended
June 11, 1970

ROUND TRIP TO HARTFORD

Will the University of Connecticut Realize Its Mission

At the Arsenal School?

I. Introduction

Any experimental program that expends approximately \$600,000 a year for a relatively small group of students requires justification. We were engaged to evaluate the nature and content of the UCONN/E.P.D.A.¹ cost-product assessment. We were engaged to "take distance" and describe the relationship between the training proposal and project activities. In a sense, we are responsible for providing the project staff with a meaningful bridge that negotiates the perennial chasm between expectation and data, between planning and happening. In another sense, we are responsible for studying the question, "Were the trips from Storrs to Hartford worthwhile?" Although this report will focus on that question, in the ultimate sense, the UCONN staff and student group are the only ones who can--and must-- answer it.

During the months of June and July, 1969, the principal consultant met and corresponded with the project co-directors, Professors Cawley and Pappanikou. From these discussions, he submitted a proposal (dated July 11) describing projected external evaluation team activities for the ensuing academic year. On October 6, the external evaluation team (then composed of Professors Blatt, Garfunkel, Murphy and Sperling) met with the project staff and student group.

¹Hereafter, the University of Connecticut will be designated as UCONN, and the Education Professions Development Act as E.P.D.A.

From that meeting, two important decisions were made. First, although the evaluation team reemphasized our plans to test hypotheses, i.e. to evaluate the effects of project activities and the degree to which project objectives were being fulfilled, we further realized that an important responsibility we must accept would place us in the role of more than visitors and evaluators. We agreed that, possibly, our most important functions would be as participant-observers and--as our relationships evolved and clarified themselves--as interactors with staff and student groups. Obviously, that role would place the evaluation team on a kind of tightrope, making them a part of the total project team but, at the same time, requiring that they remain apart from the project group--i.e. requiring that they continue to maintain some "distance" and relative objectivity. Therefore, to summarize this first decision, we agreed that we were to serve as both hypotheses generators as well as testers.

Our second important decision concerned the absolute necessity to add two additional evaluation team members, one to more or less represent the black community and the other to represent the Puerto Rican community. Mr. Alexander Rodrigues joined the evaluation team on November 6, and Mr. Dan Richardson was appointed soon after the new year.

This report is based on: a careful review of the UCONN project proposal; all of the relevant material produced during the first six months of this project year; summer meetings (1969) between the principal evaluator and the project co-directors; external evaluations on October 10 and 17 and November 13, 14, and 15; and visits of the full evaluation team on October 6, November 3, December 1, and February 16 and 17. The evaluation team assumes that the

readers of this confidential report will be UCONN staff members, specially selected University students, and relevant advisory and University people. We assume, further, that readers are well acquainted with the focus and objectives of the National E.P.D.A. program and prior materials that have been developed both by the UCONN staff and in our own correspondence with the project co-directors and staff. Lastly, we look forward to the April 6 meeting with UCONN staff and selected other individuals (Appendix A summarizes the April 6 meeting). Subsequent to that meeting on April 6, we are prepared to modify or append this report and, representing the total evaluation team, the principal consultant will be available at your pleasure to return for visits to the University for purposes of clarifying recommendations and aiding in planning for their implementation.¹

II. Classroom Life

John and Eric are good friends. They live on the same block and have been in the same classroom since the first grade. They are classmates in Mrs. Jackson's² third grade at the Arsenal School.

¹As a consequence of the April 6 meeting, two conferences were scheduled for May 14; one with faculty representatives of the School of Education, and the second with University students who participated in the Arsenal School student teaching program. Appendix A summarizes those meetings.

²For obvious reasons, all names have been changed. Secondly, all descriptions of children, teachers, and groups reflect our observations of numerous settings and individuals. While John and Eric and Mrs. Jackson are fictitious characters, all of the events and places described are as accurate and truthful as the powers of our observations permit. It is the purpose of these observational reports to, through summarizations and the combining of several events, portray a "feeling" for life at the Arsenal School.

John and Eric have a great deal in common--their color, black, is but one similar characteristic. Both were considered immature during the kindergarten year, exhibiting poor work habits, very slow progress, and distracted behavior. Of the two, John's progress in the first grade was slower, although Eric continued to upset and puzzle his teacher. By the second grade, both were considered serious behavior problems and both were recommended for special class placement. They are now in the third grade, believed to be slow and reluctant learners, John now a stutterer, and Eric considered to be one of the most difficult behavior problems in the school. Both were recommended by their teacher and selected by the E.P.D.A. staff for assignment to interns.

The class, itself, appears to be crowded, in mild disarray, with a background of chatter and noises. To the observer, there appears to be a lot of sitting around, waiting for the next activity. The teacher is pleasant, but formal. She asks a question and the child, or children, respond. The teacher reads a story on "rabbits", utilizing a film strip to reinforce her teaching of facts or concepts. During the story, there are several interruptions. Another teacher comes in, chats with Mrs. Jackson for a minute or two, they chuckle, and the visitor leaves. A message comes from the office, delivered by a child from another

class. An intern comes in, then another person, then a third person--possibly a parent. The period ends and the children prepare for lunch.

In another class, José is busy drawing a picture when his intern arrives for his individual session. He'll have to miss the 10 o'clock showing of Sesame Street that the rest of the third grade children will be viewing, as they do every day. Miss Brown, the intern, and José retire to a narrow hallway between two classrooms. The hall traffic is heavy and it is often difficult to hear the questions which José is being asked. Miss Brown asks José to project louder and not to cover his mouth when he speaks. Miss Brown later informs us that José's major problem is that he refuses to speak loudly. Back in José's class we discover that his drawing was of a cowboy and Indian scene with lots of cartoon type dialogue written on the page. The spelling is correct and the drawing shows a lot of imagination. William, sitting next to José, speaks loudly when responding to the teacher's questions, but with further investigation it is discovered that William cannot read or write. He was not chosen to participate in the E.P.D.A. program.

It is difficult to discuss classroom life without speaking about teachers, their relationships with interns, and their mutual concerns, strategies, and perceptions--matters we will continually come back to in this report. Teachers at the Arsenal School each apparently conceptualized the E.P.D.A. project in his own special way. When a request came for teachers to identify children who might need some form of additional educational ser-

vice they had little trouble in selecting one or two children from each class. Then, each of these children was assigned to an intern, removed from the class for an hour a day, 3 days a week, and individual remedial tutoring began. This process seems to be aimed at a kind of remedial reading, with some variations. There does not appear to be any great diversification of strategies from child to child--the model of "tutoring" being the one generally accepted both by the teachers and the interns and not modified by the project staff or by subsequent discussions between Arsenal staff and the E.P.D.A. staff and interns. Furthermore, although there are a great variety of relationships that have been established between interns and teachers, this does not appear to be reflected in either diverse strategies with individual children or, especially with groups of children. In a few cases we have observed interns with two or three children but this is clearly the exception. We have not found any clarity with regards to either the teachers' or the interns' perceptions of how the selected children fit into the total school population, or the communality that exists over all of the children that were selected (see Appendix B).

Lastly, we mention for consideration our observations vis a vis innovative and relevant classroom materials. Because of the involvement of the University team in the public school, we should expect an unusual input regarding innovative materials which have, at least, a surface relevance. The most obvious example of this is the use of materials that describe and picture blacks and Puerto Ricans in urban situations and that underline the contributions

of various minority groups such as artists, athletes, politicians, and civil rights leaders. Although, occasionally, such curricula materials were evident, for the most part there was a conspicuous absence which, apparently, many of the interns are aware of. On one occasion, there was an important election in Hartford and, although the pictures and programs of one of the black candidates were visible in a classroom, they were noticeably absent in the other classrooms visited that day. Observations in these classrooms did not reveal any discussions of the issues involved or the increasing activity of Puerto Rican and black candidates in local elections. Interns have raised many questions about what is going on in the school, the kinds of controls that are used, and the relationship of the classroom scene to the community. Perhaps, the limited time involvements of interns and staff are such that these kinds of issues must remain unattended. However, some may feel that these concerns are intimately connected with the overall problems of disability and human welfare and protection and, consequently, must be more openly discussed.

III. Inner City

The Arsenal School is, by any definition, an inner city school. Many of the homes are in disrepair; more often than in other sections of Hartford one sees boarded up stores; the snow plows haven't done their work well; too many people are on the streets with, apparently, little to do; one observes the frequent sounds of fire trucks, ambulances, and police cars; it doesn't appear to be a pleasant part of town in which to live or to work.

There are many community and social and neighborhood agencies and clubs. We were impressed with the obvious fact that there were personnel in each of these agencies that knew something about the E.P.D.A. project and that there were E.P.D.A. interns and staff who--collectively--knew something about each of these agencies. In our experience, even in so-called inner city schools, such mutual knowledge is rarely found. Obviously, the E.P.D.A. team has made deliberate efforts to involve interns in the various community activities that relate to welfare and education. However, one of the frustrating outcomes of these involvements obtains from the restricted time schedule each intern has, causing among many great anxiety and the feeling of powerlessness. Each intern is assigned to a community agency for one morning a week. During our interviews with interns, as well as agency personnel, we learned that very little can be accomplished--if anything--in the two or three hours allocated for this experience. One student expressed this dilemma most aptly when he concluded that, if anything is accomplished during these agency involvements, it is probably the students who benefit and, it is certain, the agency receives little "payoff". There are other students, less optimistic, who feel that this experience as it is presently organized, is a waste of time for all concerned. There are two viewpoints. Either it should be greatly expanded in scope and commitment or removed from the overall program. Or, on the other hand, as the E.P.D.A. proposal was written and approved, contacts with agencies are meant to perform a teaching function for the interns and may be of value if viewed in that

context. Extended and deep involvement, some may claim, would distract from other activities, drawing away from more essential priorities. One suggested possibility is to set up a small cluster of intense experiences for a sub-group of interns who would develop with selected agencies relationships of longer duration and richer involvement. This group could feedback to the larger intern group. Other intern sub-groups could serve similar resource and feedback functions in other special assignments.

In any event, it appears to us that the E.P.D.A. project has to take a stand regarding the relationship between community agencies and the school. At the present time, they remain splendidly isolated from each other. In spite of the involvements of interns, most of the agency people we have spoken to knew very little about what was going on in the school, and similarly, teachers appear to know little about the agencies. If a good principle is being expressed in having interns work in the agencies, as we believe is the case, then there should be an active attempt to make this experience more than a cursory learning one; it should, in some way, involve agencies and schools in common pursuits. Some of the agency people might be directly involved in curricular projects with children and there might be more lively connections developed among parents, agencies and the school. Because of our own limited knowledge, we are not sure exactly what from this could take; but it seems quite certain to us that these agencies play an important role in the community and there should be stronger bridges between them and the school. It would appear that the E.P.D.A. project is in a position to generate these connections.

IV. Interns

Interns' perceptions of the Hartford experience are as diverse as their prior activities and interests. First, a sample of their views and, then, our discussion of the issues and problems relating to them:

1. "I have worked in an inner-city for years; and with blacks. I did not come here to do what I have done for so long. I want new ideas, new procedures. They are hard to come by."

2. "As an administrator, I am getting a better feel of what it means for a teacher to work on an individual basis with a child. I can identify better with all the problems."

3. "We are cut off from the top dogs. The program is organized to keep people apart. It is over-organized. Plus you have got interns supervising interns, where are the top dogs in this project?"

4. "I do not want to bite the hand that feeds me. This is a new program, new staff, new people. We are the experimental group for ironing out the bugs. I would recommend the program to others."

(Additional "field notes" concerning interviews with interns are found in Appendix B).

The E.P.D.A. interns, literally, come from as wide backgrounds and interests as one can find anywhere on a university campus. Possibly, their singular common characteristic is that each intern is more or less untrained for work with the handicapped and, prior to this experience, was employed in some educational role with so-called typical children. Some of the interns

are on leave of absence from colleges and universities where their responsibilities focused on teacher preparation. Other interns are on leave of absence from school systems where they served as supervisors and administrators. A third group of interns are classroom teachers on leave. From time to time, the evaluation team has raised questions about the degree to which interns will, indeed, return to home/school communities in which the lessons of this project can be applied. Although not fully resolved, that question has become less of a concern; some of the interns have been working in and will return to city-school situations not unlike Hartford; others, though inschool systems considered more middle-class, believe that the numbers of variously impoverished children in their communities will be increasing; as for those interns who will be teaching few poor school children, one cannot deny that the experiences of an inner-city year may have profoundly positive effects on those individuals' professional lives, regardless of the character of the communities to which they will return.

At the University, these interns are enrolled in a variety of programs. Some are in administration and supervision graduate programs leading toward the doctorate degree. Others are in teacher-preparation programs leading to masters or doctorate degrees. Others are in counseling. Irrespective of their academic programs or their interest in this E.P.D.A. program, each intern is--first--a student matriculated in a University program other than special education. Each intern is required to spend approximately half of his academic time at the University and involved in other than the

study of handicapped children. Each intern must abide by the rules and regulations and advice of his academic department and major advisor, who is always someone other than a special educator or a faculty member in the Department of Special Education. Further, the correlation in programming between Hartford activities and Storrs activities usually is by chance, and only if the interns intrude their inner-city experiences into the in-campus courses in which they are enrolled. Some professors have stated that they simply are not interested in the interns' inner-city involvements. The possibility of holding coursework in Hartford, itself, deserves consideration. Many interns feel an uncomfortable juxtaposition between the practical realities and relationships typical of Hartford and the academic, grade-oriented atmosphere of the campus at Storrs. It is this dual allegiance, and what some students view as a kind of manufactured institutional "schizophrenia", that has caused the most concern---both to the interns and in the minds of this evaluation team. This problem is one of the more important and pressing ones that the University staff must confront and deal with.

The typical intern lives in the Storrs area, drives in each morning to the Arsenal School--or during one morning to an agency in town--and returns, sometimes in haste and under time pressure, to the campus each afternoon for classes, library work, or course-related activities. It is a very rushed and hurried existence, one that may not be most efficacious for personal and professional development.

During his mornings at the Arsenal School, the typical in-

tern is responsible for clinical activity with a child. Some interns are "team leaders" and have supervisory responsibility in addition to their own clinical activity. The singular impression concerning intern activities is that a great deal of time is spent on what appears to be either pre-language and reading activities or remedial reading. In a few incidences, we observed individual work in mathematics concepts and language development.

In the form of observations, the evaluation team offers the following for consideration:

1. The interns as a group bring a variety of skills and knowledges to the project. These abilities have not been fully surveyed and evaluated for purposes of being shared with fellow interns and staff. Such a survey should be conducted at, or prior to, the beginning of the project year, and utilized as another resource reservoir.

2. The relationship of interns to the families of the children with whom they work has been inadequate. Visits to homes have had a "staged" feeling about them; interns need a more natural relationship over a longer period of time. As we suggested, a sub-group of interns focussing in depth on school-home relationships, and serving as a special resource and feedback group, should be considered.

3. Perhaps not to be omitted is the suggestion made by certain community agency staff members: "If interns or others want to know what it is like, they have got to live here in this community--hear the rats at night, feel the cockroaches, listen to the fights, hope for some heat in the pipes."

V. Externs

The purpose of this program is to "provide public school administrators and teacher preparation personnel in education with a greater awareness of the problems specific to handicapping conditions prevalent among disadvantaged children." Approximately 25 school administrators and trainers of teachers met for a total of two days, November 13-15, at the University of Connecticut at Storrs, Connecticut. Taking the stated purpose of the program as the framework, the participants appeared to be well balanced in terms of their professional background and responsibilities. To the extent that it can be assumed that a black professional may be able to contribute an additional dimension to understanding the problems of the disadvantaged because of his chances for closer and more affective contacts with the black community, the relatively larger number of black participants should be mentioned as a positive aspect of the first Extern Program meeting. Unfortunately, this rare opportunity for meaningful inter-racial dialogue on a professional and education-oriented basis was not fully explored, primarily due to lack of leadership in overcoming a natural reluctance to enter this sensitive area. The discussion groups were too large (approximately 25); there was no agenda which is essential when time is so very limited as was the case; and the discussion leadership was rather passive.

Presentations by the interns provided a good picture of the UCONN E.P.D.A. activities; however, in terms of "providing a better awareness of the problem" the material offered was too elementary and limited for the type of audience present. For many in-

terns the program and the exposure to the Arsenal School has brought about new insights and a sharpened awareness of the problems. Many in the audience would have preferred to hear more about these various affective (phenomological) experiences rather than listen to reports on minor organizational matters. Both during these presentations and the group discussions, the participation by the audience was less than could be expected from a professionally sophisticated group. Possibly, one of several reasons for this situation may have been a limited relevancy of content. If so, it may have been worthwhile to solicit requests in writing for topics prior to the start of each Extern Program meeting, make last minute adjustments in the agenda and/or use the requests as bases for the discussion groups.

Many of the above shortcomings may very well have been due to the newness of the program. Most of the participants felt that the basic concept and purpose of the Extern Program was sound and valid. Suggestions were made that concise and well-organized printed material be made available which could be taken back for references and future information. In some cases the first Extern Program meeting showed immediate results in one important area of its purpose, that is, to act as a catalyst. There were requests for follow-up workshops in several school systems. As of this time, information on the second Extern meeting is not available.

VI. Staff

The staff are not quite as heterogeneous a group as the interns, all having had some degree of training and experience in

fields associated with the education of the handicapped. As with the student group, the staff more or less live in the Storrs area and commute each day to Hartford. To the degree that students appear conflicted in terms of both time allocations and deep program involvement, the staff have similar problems. Probably the combination of problems attendant to the mounting of a major new program with all of its uncertainties added to the dual "masters" that staff members must serve, reduce neither ambiguities in relationships nor the avoidance of precipitous decision making. The staff has had more or less formal training in work with the handicapped and, certainly, they are devoted to this project and appear to be working very hard. Thought should be given to the recruitment of additional clinical-type professors, those who are specialists with the handicapped as well as experienced supervisors of clinicians and pedagogical demonstrators.

VII. Facilities

The most positive aspects of the E.P.D.A. program are this extraordinarily interesting community and school, a dedicated staff, and some very fine students. However, the school building, itself, and its facilities are most inappropriate for the proper conduct of this study. This very old school house, crowded and probably no less appropriate now for an educational environment than it was on the day of its dedication, must be renovated if the E.P.D.A. program is to complete its mission. Literally, there are no adequate facilities for intern meetings. Literally, there is no space for individual work with children. Literally there

are no possibilities for observing children and interns without interfering with ongoing classroom activities. What must be added, before the second year of this program commences, are sufficient conference rooms, small therapy rooms, and--at least--some classrooms with capability for one-way vision and monitoring sound observation. Without facility modification, the consultants have grave concerns about the future of this project, concerns that appear to be shared by every intern, staff, and administrator connected with this project.

VIII. Recommendations

1. It is recommended that summarization data be collected by the project staff that describe each intern's : educational experience, prior background, his commitment to the education of handicapped children, his future plans, his academic progress at the University of Connecticut, and his autobiographical sketch of his activities this year. The consulting team views the problem of intern selection as the number one priority for evaluation and modification. During this first year, certain decisions had to be made in intern selection that--in the best of all possible worlds--may not have been to the interest of the project goals. These decisions are completely understandable in light of the lead time given for intern recruitment during this first year. However, the evaluation team believes that, in the future, there will be little justification in selecting students who may have no more than peripheral interest in handicapped children and have severely conflicting loyalties and commitments. To help the pro-

ject staff survey intern and staff accomplishments and feelings during this past year, the evaluation team has prepared a draft of a questionnaire that should be edited and then given to each intern and staff member, then returned to us at your earliest convenience (see Appendix C for analysis of Questionnaire). Recognizing the restraints imposed by the federally supported E.P.D.A. program, the evaluation team suggests that the following be considered toward the development of more viable recruitment criteria:

- a. Recruitment of inner-city candidates.
- b. Recruitment of blacks and Hispanic-Americans.
- c. Recruitment of people committed to the inner-city experience.
- d. Recruitment of people in high-density poverty areas.

Lastly, if agreement can be made with Washington officials, the project staff should consider a recruitment and training program for non-degree people.

2. The project staff should collect, in some tabular form, data on children that interns and staff are now working with. Such data should include: test information, presenting problems, labels that have been affixed, and summaries of classroom behavior. Further, the staff should indicate the extent to which these children are now involved with the project staff. Lastly, the staff should indicate the number of children they are not presently working with--who are eligible for inclusion in this group--and their intentions concerning that population. These data may lend some clearer set of answers and focus to the question, "What is a handicapped child in the Arsenal School?" Further, it may

provide some greater insight than heretofore in better understanding the relationship between the project group and the regular Arsenal School staff.

3. As suggested above, evidence indicates that the singular criterion for the selection of children presently in the program may be no more than a teacher who was willing to make the referral. Again, as suggested above, we would like to know to what extent children selected represent the total school population. This leads, further, to the much larger question concerning clinical backup for screening, diagnosis, and intervention. Presently, the extent of clinical backup is more or less informal and does not converge on the multi-problem child and family. There is a fair amount of disagreement among project staff and school personnel concerning what children need special attention and who should deliver the service. Because it cannot be expected that all interns (or staff) of the E.P.D.A. project will have highly specialized skills for dealing with the various aspects of disability and family disorganization, special effort should be made to recruit interns next year who possess either special training or extensive experience with families in the inner-city or in psycho-diagnostics, community psychology, and other related areas of specialization.

4. The evaluation team requests summary data on each agency that now collaborates on this project. These will be very helpful in better understanding the nature and content of the field work program. Such data should include the following questions: (a) How are agencies selected, (b) In addition to interns, are agen-

cies offered other "inducements"?, (c) What is the role of the advisory council?, (d) What value do interns find in agency work?, (e) What should be the minimum and maximum time commitments that interns devote to agency service?

5. The evaluation team requests summary data on family involvements. The following questions should clarify our understanding of the nature of this program element: (a) What is the frequency of home visits?, (b) What occurs during these visits?, (c) How is the information obtained during home visits used and transmitted to classroom teachers and other clinicians in the school?

6. As has been noted before in other memoranda, the evaluation team considers it a serious project deficiency not to have included on the senior staff an appropriately trained black or Puerto Rican colleague. This deficiency should be remedied in the coming months.

7. The evaluation team would appreciate, and find very useful, summaries of special projects that graduate students are engaged in, relating to either the Arsenal School program or activities in the inner city.

8. The evaluation team recommends consideration for developing a program to train auxilliary or so-called quasi-professional personnel for work in inner city schools and community agencies. This program may require either support supplementary to the current program budget or a reallocation of E.P.D.A. program resources.

9. The evaluation team recommends that the faculty in Special Education critically review the program and participation of undergraduates in the E.P.D.A. Project. Serious questions were raised that require deliberate, possibly radical, program modification (See Appendix A, 2a).

10. The evaluation team recommends that the D.P.D.A. staff reevaluate, and modify, strategies for developing more positive and viable relationship with campus faculty (See Appendix A, 2b).

IX. Concluding Remarks

The University of Connecticut E.P.D.A. program is an innovative attempt to bring meaning to teacher preparation as it relates to work with the handicapped and disadvantaged. At this time, it is too early to estimate the probability that this program will fulfill its mandate. At this time, the evaluation team concludes that the evidence available is mixed. If the aforementioned deficiencies are dealt with adequately, this program may make a substantial contribution to the field of education. If program inadequacies are not vigorously remedied, our concerns will continue to remain and deepen.

Finally, this report represents serious divided impressions of the evaluation team. Frankly, some among us believe there is less than a reasonable possibility that, without major staff change and new orientations, this project will accomplish its mission. Others are, albeit very much concerned, somewhat more optimistic about the possibilities that this first year will lead to a greatly improved program and the eventual realization of project objectives.

Respectfully submitted,

Burton Blatt, Evaluation Chairman
Frank Garfunkel
Albert Murphy
Dan Richardson
Alex Rodrigues
Leo Sperling

APPENDIX A

Meeting Subsequent to March 15 Initial Report

1. Summary of April 6 Meeting

The evaluation team (Blatt, Garfunkel, Murphy, Richardson, Rogriguez and Sperling) met with the following University of Connecticut staff: Ann Feir, Jean Wallen, Anita Kwasniewski, A. Pappanikou, Lou Shea, Herb Sheton, Clarence Cisen, Ron Hatch and John Cawley. The full day agenda included, in additon to private discussions with Dean Roe, the following items:

1. Recruitment of students
2. Relationship between campus and Hartford
3. Arsenal achool program and community
4. Staff relationship between students
5. Spin off effect on School of Education
6. Impact on School of Education and relation of program to students participating in program
7. Staff
8. Reading (remedial)
9. Extern program

Several problems received serious and lengthy attention. First, the question concerning the involvement of School of Education faculty into the E.P.D.A. program continued to be brought up as a major problem. Although the Dean, and many members of the faculty, want this project to be a School of Education program rather than one of a particular department, there remains a segment of faculty that appear not at all interested in this project and,

consequently, do not wish involvement for themselves or their students. It was agreed that the evaluation team would meet with faculty representatives on May 14 to discuss with them the general interest that faculty have in this project and how those currently not interested or involved may learn more about the project and, hopefully, develop some involvement with it.

Scheduled on May 14, after the aforementioned meeting with faculty representatives, will be a meeting with University students who have participated in the student teaching program at the Arsenal School as part of the E.P.D.A. project. It is hoped that this meeting will reveal the nature and extent of their participation at the Arsenal School, these students' perceptions of the program, their recommendations for program enlargement and modification, and student interest in the possibility that this project might serve the needs of special educators in training as well as those university students for whom it is primarily designed.

A discussion, begun in Hartford several weeks earlier, concerning facilities and physical environment for this project at the Arsenal School, was continued during this meeting. Later that day, in private discussions with Dean Roe, it was emphasized that the University of Connecticut should assume more responsibility for modifying the physical facilities at the Arsenal School and, consequently, enhancing the probabilities for better student-staff-child interactions. Also, during the meeting with Dean Roe, it was again brought out that the University should forcefully seek to recruit senior level black and other minority staff for this project and, secondly, many more members of the School of Education faculty should be more actively involved in the E.P.D.A. program.

There was considerable discussion concerning more viable relationships with community agencies and groups. Plans are underway to increase E.P.D.A. student participation in community programs next year.

To summarize, and as a result of this meeting, Professors Blatt and Murphy will meet on May 14 (12-3 PM) with representatives of the faculty of the School of Education, to discuss faculty perceptions and possibilities for increasing faculty and other student involvement in this project. Secondly, Professor Gasfunkel and Mr. Rodriguez will meet with University students (also on May 14, 4-6 PM) to discuss the student-teaching participation at the Arsenal School. Thirdly, Mr. Richardson will develop a schedule to evaluate the Summer Leadership Program sponsored by the E.P.D.A. project. It will be Mr. Richardson's responsibility to make periodic visits to that program and submit a report to Professor Cawley soon after its conclusion.

Respectfully submitted,

Burton Blatt, Evaluation Chairman
(with a grateful assist from Alex
Rodriguez who provided the team
extensive notes of the above meeting)

2. Summary of May 14 Meetings

a. Interview with Undergraduates

Professor Garfunkel and Mr. Rodriguez interviewed all of the undergraduate students of the University of Connecticut who participated in the six-week Arsenal School experience during the spring of 1970. Attached to this summary are some verbatim statements of the students participating in that meeting. It is the interviewers' impression that the students were, as a group, unhappy with what they termed an insensitive program that appears to suffer from lack of leadership, creativity, and insensitivity. The interviewers were confronted with a challenge by the students who thought they were representing the government and would be, therefore, able to do something about the program. Specifically, they asked what they (the interviewers) were going to do to change or get rid of the program. The interviewers reported to the evaluation team that there was very little in the way of positive feeling expressed about this program or those who are responsible for it. The meeting raised a number of compelling questions, all leading to the inescapable conclusion that - at least for these students - the E.P.D.A. project is inappropriately managed and, possibly, globally conceived.

STUDENT COMMENTS¹

X Let's start from the beginning, we were all supposed to be assigned to an intern who had done his homework. The intern had not done his homework. There was a conflict between interns and interns, bosses and interns, etc. To me it was not a rewarding experience. We saw things that were absolutely wrong, like physical abuse, and we couldn't do anything about it.

¹ Each X specifies a new speaker.

- X A lot of us thought that we didn't need the E.P.D.A. experience. We already had one-to-one tutoring.
- X Student-Teachers were babying and spoiling children on individual bases. The one-to-one relationship was unrealistic.
- X There was a basic contradiction in the program. We were supposed to be in the inner city to learn how to teach ghetto kids - but ghetto kids are going to have to be in regular classrooms - and that's a fact. They don't get an opportunity to learn on a one-to-one basis.
- X I think that's putting it lightly - the child went back to class worse than he was before he came to me on an individual basis. It was really cruel.
- X The tension between the staff was bad. _____ must have been putting pressure on _____, he on the interns, the interns on the undergraduates, etc.
- X We are all seniors who had some experience with camps, retarded children, etc. We didn't do our practice teaching until the end of the E.P.D.A. program. We came to the program with skills and materials in special education. The interns, our supervisor, didn't know much about special education - they were in that "elementary education" bag -
- X I had a good intern and we shared. I gave my special education knowledge, I had test results on my kid, we spent a lot of time on my kid's needs. I know other people have had bad experiences with their interns. The next time they should be more selective about the interns.
- X The kids did not matter. Interns didn't show up. They would get involved in the community programs and the kids would suffer.
- X One of the major problems was this community base thing - it was a bust. They had nothing for us to do until one hour before the program began. The assignments were not planned.
- X I was assigned to a headstart for pre-nursery school kids. I didn't see any reason for my participating in the class.
- X The interns didn't show up except to get their checks. It was a mess. The whole thing was a lot of wasted time.
- X I also feel that the interns alienated a lot of teachers who were favorable to the program. No one talked to this wonderful teacher who really wanted to help the program. I come on the scene and the teacher said that if she had been told you were coming she would have said NO.

- X It was a bunch of bull shit. No one cared. My kid was hit and I saw it. I went through channels, I saw Dr. _____. I thought something was going to happen. Finally nothing happened. I was told that we could not do anything. I couldn't see _____ (Principal) and tell him because we were guests at the school.
- X It really messed up our class at U. Conn. When we got back, we were so bitter, we couldn't learn because we spent all afternoon in class complaining and griping about the frustrating experience that we had in Hartford.
- X We would have to wait on "Community Day" for _____ and _____ to show up. About 10:30 they would show up. We would go to an agency and they didn't know that we were to be there.
- X Let's face it. The program is a big wast of the taxpayer's money.

What did you do with the Kids?

- X Did you perceive that you would only have fifteen hours with the kid?
- X NO. We were led to believe that we would spend lots of time with this kid. We were lucky to have fifteen hours if he attended school all the time.
- X My kid has problems with visual, motor, basic learning skills. I was willing to create the whole program necessary for the kid. Nobody cared. I broke my ass and nobody cared about this kid. Do you think that you could prepare something valuable in the time allocated?
- X I realized that nothing could happen in six or seven weeks, so I changed my program, minimized my behavioral objectives.
- X That's what we all did. We changed our behavioral objectives - if we didn't have to go through all the bull shit, it would be possible to do some small things.
- X If the program was well structured we would not hurt the children, but it wouldn't help. This way we were hurting the kids.

Questions directed to quiet members

- X I had a kid but at first he didn't show up. When he did show up he said he didn't want to be tutored that he was sick of being tutored.
- X I am quiet because I get frustrated talking about the program. I spent my time arguing with the intern. I would bring in materials in special education and the interns were not familiar with the materials and didn't want me to use them. I couldn't stand the program. It hurt the children.

- X I didn't say anything before because I felt it would jeopardize my future.
- X They wouldn't supply the rides to the Arsenal for the students.
- X The teachers at the Arsenal are not going to listen to E.P.D.A. people because they are outsiders. They don't listen to the good teachers.
- X Maybe they should have taken six classes and dealt with them -

b. Interview with Campus Faculty

Professor Albert Murphy met with the following campus faculty on May 14: Richard Wylie, Christine La Conte, Martin S. Wolfe, John Leach and Richard Whinfield.

This meeting took place in the office of the Dean, School of Education, and lasted several hours. The entire meeting was held in group. No other individuals were present except those named above and the interviewers.

Evidently, this group of faculty was selected and invited because they represented the group with highest potential of interest in the Arsenal Project. Only one has been to Arsenal more than once; one visited once (last week to see if the Project might assist him in one of his own projects beginning next year): the others had not visited. One, however, (J. Leach) is in the Hartford Public School System Administration Structure (on leave this year) and knew Arsenal well. He was black, intelligent, deeply interested, and articulate (the kind of person the Project, itself, need).

Clearly, the group was not familiar with the Project's goals; although the Project Director had explained the program to the total SED faculty at the beginning of the year, the imprint was light. Some had read the brochure, but within the past week or two, evidently in preparation for this meeting. But

they were cooperative and became increasingly interested as a lively discussion developed.

There was concern about whether the amount of money involved was realistically placed, compared to the needs of other projects and concerns, it was a moot point.

Visitors to Arsenal thought that it would be impossible to do a good job there, given its abominable physical plant, regardless of the staff of the Project or the Arsenal Teachers. (One reactor suggested the possibility of using the E.P.D.A. money to help rebuild Arsenal).

The group* seriously questioned the wisdom of the trainee selection; they have heard numerous comments from trainees and Arsenal staff about the inadequacy of background of many trainees for the practicum work with Arsenal children (are the children being sacrificed? was asked). Arsenal teachers have complained they* heard, about the lack of background of trainees.

They questioned, also, whether the afternoon field placements were really appropriate (trainees driving parents and waiting an hour at the supermarket, etc.). More seriously, it was stated that the clinical teaching of individual students was not appropriate for administrator trainees; certainly not to the extent practiced; those trainees ought to be placed in practicum placements dealing with school and agency superstructures, legislative bodies of the community, etc.

Group members stated that the Program made it very difficult to obtain an advanced degree - it requires too much time, what with mornings at Arsenal, afternoons at agencies, evening classes were common.

They questioned whether the Puerto Rico trip really was educationally meaningful, but saw how it could be, following group discussion. At this

point, a number of findings of the trainee questionnaire were shared with them, a kind of informative sharing and thank you.

The major criticism, and it was loud and clear, related to numerous comments given them by students concerning friction at the E.P.D.A. Project top-staff level; lack of clarity of responsibility; not giving the on-scene director any real authority, and other criticisms detailed in the report of the trainee questionnaires. This bothered the group, and constitutes a serious concern on their part for the future.

Finally, only one of them has recommended an individual to apply for a traineeship for the 1970-71 year. All expressed again, an interest in the project, but it is unlikely that most or all of them will be able to become more involved next year than this, which was very little, indeed.

APPENDIX B

FIELD NOTES

(1) Interviews with teacher-educator interns

Question: Why did you feel a need to participate in a program like this?

Answer: I worked with students at _____ and I found that it lacked material directly relevant to the teaching experience in _____.
(However) Working with one student this past semester is not satisfying that I need.

Answer: I wanted to gain experience in special education. I had lots of experience in inner-city schools. I wanted to come back to the kids, to become more sensitive to the inner-city situation.

Answer: I could have done it around the corner but I came here.

Question: What do you think of the supervision you get in the program?

Answer: The top level of the administration is competent. When _____ left the group there was no real supervision. The program was reorganized at the Annex. I could have led the group as well as anybody else.

Answer: The group has been cut off from communication, other interns have been put in charge of the group and this does not allow any connection between our needs and the answers to these needs.

Answer: The weakness in this program is administration.

Answer: The organization keeps you away from the fountainhead of knowledge. Its (the program) organized on a piece of paper. We are too far removed from the Core Staff.

Question: What about the relationship between the work you do at the University in class and your field work?

Answer: There is no correlation between the course work and what happens at the Arsenal School. What we need is some work in psychological testing, behavioral objectives and related courses.

Answer: Friday morning seminars are used for each person's emotional crisis. There seems to be few opportunities to release emotional conflict.

We find the Thursday evening seminar to be more rewarding because of the presence of more competent people.

Answer: There isn't any time for the trainers of teachers to sit down and develop programs for teacher training. There is very little time for philosophy. We need specific meetings to deal with our common problems. The administrators, teacher trainers and teachers should have a chance to meet with each other. The entire program should be much more flexible.

Question: Why do you think your children were selected? Are they any different from other children in the school?

Answer: There isn't any real definition of the handicapped child. We do not have statistics that tell us anything about differences between our children and the ones who remain in the classroom.

Our notion is that the children selected are the ones who were giving the teachers a hard time.

Question: Would you recommend this program to others who you know?

Answer: One person answered "yes".

(2) Interview with Administrator Interns

Question: What do you think is the value of the E.P.D.A. program?

Answer: The program helps me understand the teachers' problem on a day to day basis. It also enables me to see some of the problems involved in bringing about change on any level. Some of us have been trying to get classes ungraded. We are now working with the Arsenal Principal on the beginning of committees that would lead to ungrading the school.

Answer: I think it makes sense to include administrators. We can bring something very valuable to the school experience.

Question: Are there any real differences between the handicapped children you've been given to work with and the children who remain in the classroom?

Answer: Very little difference. At least one-third of the children in this school have the same learning problems. The handicapped child is simply the child chosen.

Answer: There are as many as 75% handicapped children in some classes if the children I am dealing with qualify as handicapped.

Question: What has the program given you that you can bring back to your situation at home?

Answer: I wanted a one-to-one situation where I could really work with a child.

Answer: The Arsenal School is the major party to benefit from our program. There is a lot of good that has come from this program, but most of it happens here at the Arsenal School, not at Storrs.

Answer: I don't think we have had enough time with the children. Three to five hours a week just can't change much.

I enjoyed my time with the agencies, but I was split between the Arsenal School, Storrs, and the community. We should really get in there and help the teachers.

It might be better to work with disadvantaged kids elsewhere than in the Arsenal School. The children are not disadvantaged; the faculty just has to learn to listen.

Answer: Most of the administrative staff has been withdrawn from the interns. The contact has been minimal. You

have to go after the staff to get answers to simple problems. They are not available.

We came here to learn not only to contribute. We want to learn but the structure of the program does not allow you to help the child.

Answer: Good things can happen in this school if mothers and other people were in the school. Let the parents get together with the interns and let's help these kids now. We should be more involved with these kids now.

(3) Interviews With Teacher Interns

Question: What do you think are benefits of this program?

Answer: Benefit of the program for me is that the things learned here are applicable at _____ where I teach. This would hold true for others in the program who have to work with white migrants and other poor Americans. These people have the same problems that the children in the Arsenal have.

Answer: I don't know why you people don't see that the Arsenal children represent the same range of problems as the suburban kids with problems.

Answer: This work could have been done without the direction of the project.

Answer: One thing I've seen here is that these children who end up in Special Classes are behavior problems. When I go back to an inner-city school I am going to try to fit myself into their pattern of learning rather than my pattern of teaching.

Answer: The agencies contribute a greater amount to our learning than we as interns contribute to the agencies. While I believe that the agency activities are very important, we don't have enough time to really get into anything with the agencies. Such a program should be an entity in itself.

Question: What about the relationship between the work you do at the University of Connecticut and Hartford? Do your classes make sense?

Answer: The classes some of us take make sense and are useful. Generally speaking, there is no real relationship between Storrs and Hartford. We learn somethings at the Arsenal School and try to relate this back on campus, and we get told by the professors to keep our ideas to ourselves.

Answer: We haven't had an adequate chance to learn from each other. This is a problem of the classroom teacher in the regular school. We are separated and there is little encouragement to get together. No one cares what we have to contribute to the program. No one cares.

Answer: The communication with the leadership is "lacking" and sporadic. They hear us but they don't understand.

APPENDIX C

Twenty Questions

TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT EPDA PROJECT

May 1, 1970

The purpose of this survey questionnaire was to provide an opportunity for trainees to relay some impressions to the staff concerning their year's experience in the University of Connecticut Program. Based on such responses, in addition to what has been learned in daily program interaction by all concerned, the staff hopes to enhance its own understandings of all phases of the program in order to develop an improved program for the 1971-72 year. The cooperation of trainees in providing the data to be discussed below is gratefully appreciated.

A few explanatory notes. The responses are reported on, question by question. Every effort to retain the language used by the trainees has been made. Where the term "local situation" occurs, it refers to the trainees regular job setting. Twenty-six of the thirty trainees (87%) returned the questionnaires (4 teacher trainers, 9 administrators, and 13 teachers). Finally, the individual questionnaires themselves are in the files of the Project staff.

ITEM #1: "WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY PURPOSES OR GOALS OF THIS PROGRAM, ON UNDERSTANDING HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS AMONG DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN?"

Responses to this item were in large part consistent with statements in the Project Proposal. The increases of understanding of handicapped or disadvantaged children in order to enhance one's educational efficiency upon returning to the local work situation was cited most importantly. The desire to initiate and effect changes on the local level as a consequence of the Project involvement was clear. The goal of acquiring knowledge of prescriptive models or teaching techniques, of learning to diagnose and prescribe, of responding to specific individual problems rather than merely to broad categories of impairment was cited frequently. The goal of community involvement and of comprehending what goes on in inner city schools was specifically mentioned four times, as were the opportunities to work with handicapped children on a 1 to 1 basis in order to bring insights back to the total local situation, and the goal of bringing under-achieving children up to grade level.

Among goals mentioned just once or twice are these: to identify children with problems; to become skilled in special education techniques; to find out the causes of handicapping conditions.

One individual stated that "the Arsenal children are incidental to what the participant (trainee) gets out of the program." While the great majority of responses were positively toned, several responses were negative: one trainee stated that there were no defined goals; another, that the "publicity was often false" leading to "personal fame for the leaders;" another: "it is still unclear to me; if the power structure knows they have still not communicated it to me." However, the great majority of responses contained no negative or derogatory element.

ITEM #2: HOW DO YOU DEFINE THE TERM "HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS"?

Near unanimity occurred on this item. Any conditions, especially environmental deprivations and specifically home or school, which limited or impaired learning or reaching fullest potential, or which caused deviations from accepted school achievement levels or practice, especially from the middle class viewpoint, were cited as handicapping.

ITEM #3: ESTIMATE THE PERCENTAGE OF ARSENAL SCHOOL CHILDREN YOUR DEFINITION INCLUDES.

Six respondents estimated that 100% of the children at Arsenal School fit their own definition of handicapped. The lowest estimate was 30% given by two respondents. The mean estimate by the group respondents was 83%.

ITEM #4: HOW DID YOU FIRST BECOME AWARE OF THIS PROGRAM?

The majority of trainees became aware of this program through their faculty advisors or other professors, most of whom were at the University of Connecticut, and all of whom had been notified by the Project Staff. Several read Bulletin Board announcements, and individuals were notified by their school president or principal; one read a newspaper article.

ITEM #5: WHY DID YOU ACCEPT A TRAINEESHIP IN THIS PROGRAM?

The majority of trainees stated the following reasons, in decreasing order of frequency: (1) to learn of inner-city problems or minority groups in relation to handicapping conditions, (2) to continue work toward a degree and to fulfill residency requirements, and (3) to learn so as to improve overall perspective of education and the society so as to be a better educator and the society so as to be a better educator and citizen.

Individual responses included those citing a desire simply to study unhampered by daily work trivia and a sense that disadvantaged children were not being helped. One student gave financial motivation as the major motivant and one other named the financial security possible while continuing studies.

Two individuals spoke disappointedly of their unfulfilled hopes that the program would help them become more efficient workers with a new knowledge of special techniques under expert guidance, of their interest in the projects stated problems which did not come to be studied sufficiently.

ITEM #6: WHAT PROFESSIONAL GOALS DID YOU HOPE TO APPROACH OR REACH AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THIS PROGRAM?

The group's responses to this item are consistent with those to item #5. The goals of improving ones knowledge concerning handicapping conditions in inner-city settings in order to improve specialty proficiency. Six individuals cited Academic Degrees as primary goals.

ITEM #7: PLEASE NAME THE COURSES IN WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN ENROLLED THIS YEAR.

Courses beyond the DPDA - specific work occurred primarily in the following areas, in order of frequency (a) Courses in Administration and Counseling; (b) Courses in Curriculum, Tests and Measurements, and Reading; (c) Courses in Sociology, educational methods and educational psychology, and finally, (d) a large number of different courses, primarily in the area of psychology.

ITEM #8: WHAT IS THE PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY FIELD OF YOUR GRADUATE PROGRAM FACULTY ADVISOR?

About half of the respondents did not indicate their advisor's main area of competency: those indicated represented a great variety of specialties. The members indicate the number of respondents for a particular category; the percentage figure that number represents of the total response is directly below the number.

_____ HIS KNOWLEDGE OF YOUR FIELD WORK? 6/27% EXCELLENT 9/40% GOOD 4/19% FAIR
3/13% POOR

_____ HIS INTEREST IN YOUR FIELD WORK? 6/27% EXCELLENT 9/40% GOOD 4/19% FAIR
3/13% POOR

_____ HAS HE EVER VISITED YOU AT THE ARSENAL SCHOOL?: Yes: 5 (21%)
No: 16 (76%)

_____ NOTES:

One trainee indicated that he had no advisor, another that he was not in the graduate program, a third that his advisor was on half-year leave. Several trainees indicated that they had been negligent in inviting or had never invited their advisor. Three trainees reported unusually interested advisors.

ITEM #9: WHAT ARE THE MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THIS PROGRAM?

There was no one common factor or process mentioned by a majority of the trainees. However, a quarter of the group cited the Project staff in a variety of clearly complimentary ways; the following phrases were used, in decreasing order of frequency: superior staff, flexibility, freedom to observe and try out all possibilities; continuing growth in leadership and commitment to the inner city and disadvantaged children; the excellent goals, intent and design of the program; respect for individuality; the good nature and cooperation of staff and their desire to be a good program.

The second major area cited was the opportunity to work with individual children. Third, as a group, were the sharing of experiences by interns, the experiences at the community centers, and Puerto Rico, each mentioned by two or three trainees. Mentioned once were such factors as a) money, b) camaraderie,

c) work with student teachers, and d) "that they have another chance next year." Two respondents said that there were no strengths.

ITEM #10: WHAT ARE THE MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF THIS PROGRAM?

Major weaknesses cited relate to 1) program administration; 2) staff; 3) faculty staff-trainee communication; and 4) trainee and staff morale.

The Project administration was regarded as confused, especially during the initial months. Top administration was seen as participating in power struggles. Authoritarianism or a lack of democratic resolutions, with inadequate involvement of trainees in decision making were cited.

Staff was seen to be in a state of friction much of the time, especially at higher levels. Complaints ranged from those claiming the staff had insufficient expertise for the Project's requirements, to an unusual sensitivity to criticism or disagreement, therefore, stifling staff-trainee interactions and work through. An unwillingness by the Project C-Directors to delegate authority was cited repeatedly as a problem.

All such factors affected trainee morale, which many regarded as very low. The failure to utilize trainee expertise was mentioned often also. Several complained of preferential treatment by staff if certain trainees, especially minority group members, who several others described as "not being accountable" (they "dictated to the staff") didn't follow the rules as others did - attendance and punctuality, for example.

These constituted areas cited as major weaknesses of the program. Also mentioned were: (a) a need for a Black History course, (b) more correlation between Hartford and Storrs experiences; (c) more time for experimentation; (d) more efficient screening trainees; and (e) more emphasis on attitudinal changes re: black individuals and Puerto Ricans.

ITEM #11: HOW WOULD YOU EVALUATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUR ACTIVITIES ON CAMPUS AND YOUR FIELDWORK?

Response to this item was brief and sufficiently categorical to present the data in the following fashion.

Excellent:	14%
Good to Very Good:	27%
Fair:	36%
Poor:	23%

Two individuals stated, "As close as I made it."

ITEM #12: WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THE TRIP TO PUERTO RICO?

On the basis of this questionnaire, there was little doubt that the group thought that the trip was a worthwhile experience. Only four individuals judged the experience to be of little or no value. The majority thought it was extremely valuable, perhaps the highlight of the year.

There was some queasiness about the amount of money the trip cost and some suggestion to see more of the homes and schools rather than hearing lectures from the establishment.

ITEM #13: SINCE YOU BEGAN THIS PROGRAM, HOW MUCH HAVE YOU CHANGED IN TERMS OF:

- A.) ADDED KNOWLEDGE OF HANDICAPPING CHILDREN 42% GREATLY 35% MODERATELY 23% SOME 0% NONE
- B.) ADDED KNOWLEDGE OF INNER CITY SCHOOL LIFE 50% GREATLY 23% MODERATELY 08% SOME 15% NONE
- C.) INCREASED INTEREST IN WORKING WITH/FOR HANDICAPPED 50% GREATLY 27% MODERATELY 08% SOME 15% NONE

ITEM #14: ALL IN ALL, THE TOTAL PROGRAM HAS BEEN:

- 08% 100% successful
59% moderately successful
33% mildly or not at all successful

ITEM #15: DO YOU REGARD THE PROGRAM AS ONE YOU WOULD HIGHLY RECOMMEND TO OTHERS?

- 46% YES
31% NO
23% UNDECIDED

ITEM #16: WAS YOUR COURSE WORK GENERALLY VALUABLE IN TERMS OF THE PROBLEMS YOU FOUND AT ARSENAL SCHOOL?

- 26% YES
16% NO
58% UNDECIDED

ITEM #17: PLEASE LIST THREE COURSES (IF ANY) THAT YOU FOUND HELPFUL IN YOUR WORK AT ARSENAL:

Responses here ranged from a lack of any courses to a greatly heterogeneous collection. Most individuals filled the three spaces listed for courses judged helpful.

ITEM #18: WERE YOU ABLE TO BRING UP IN YOUR COURSES FOR DISCUSSION SOME OF THE PROBLEMS YOU FOUND AT ARSENAL?

62% YES
0% NO
38% SOMETIMES

ITEM #19: WAS YOUR INSTRUCTOR ABLE TO INCLUDE IN THE CLASSROOM PROCEDURES YOUR QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS RELATING TO ARSENAL SCHOOL?

26% YES
0% NO
70% SOMETIMES

ITEM #20: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR INPUT (FROM THE ARSENAL SCHOOL) INTO THE COLLEGE CLASSROOM WAS NEEDED IN ORDER TO MAKE THE MATERIAL MORE RELEVANT FOR YOUR WORK IN THE INNER-CITY SCHOOL?

37% YES
13% NO
50% IN SOME COURSES