

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

WKU Archives Records

WKU Archives

12-31-1968

UA64/4 Technical Progress Report of the Western Kentucky Human Relations Center for Education

WKU Human Relations Center

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/dlsc_ua_records



Part of the [African American Studies Commons](#), [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#), [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in WKU Archives Records by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT OF THE
WESTERN KENTUCKY HUMAN RELATIONS
CENTER FOR EDUCATION

(October 1, 1968 - December 31, 1968)

Submitted to the Division of Equal
Educational Opportunities, BESE
U. S. Office of Education

College of Education
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

December 31, 1968

P R E F A C E

In accordance with the provisions of contract #OEC-2-6-000107-1083, the Human Relations Center for Education, Western Kentucky University, hereby submits a report of its activities covering the period of October 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968.

Norman A. Deeb, Director
Human Relations Center
for Education

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES AND INVOLVEMENTS OF
THE HUMAN RELATIONS CENTER FOR EDUCATION
DURING THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 1968

Introduction

The activities of the Human Relations Center during the fourth quarter of 1968 were principally to field test the Self-Assessment Procedure. The major purposes of the field test were:

- (1) to determine whether local schools could utilize the Self-Assessment Procedure without further revision,
- (2) to determine whether local school districts could utilize the Self-Assessment Procedure without the help of consultants,
- (3) to discover the types of problems which may be uncovered by local school district personnel, and,
- (4) to determine the various kinds of technical assistance the Center will be requested to provide.

THE FIELD TEST OF THE
SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

On October 3, 1968, Dr. Norm Deeb, Director of the Human Relations Center for Education and Dr. H. Robe, Head of Psychology Department and Chief Consultant for the Self-Assessment Instrument, met in an orientation conference with the Superintendent of the Hopkinsville City Schools and his administrative staff who were to be involved in the field test of the Self-Assessment Instrument. The administrative staff had previously received copies of the Leader's Manual and Participant's Manual.

Those in attendance were:

1. Dr. Gene Farley, Superintendent
Hopkinsville City Schools
2. Mr. Charles Dewesse, Assistant Superintendent
Hopkinsville City Schools
3. Mr. Frank Simpson, Assistant Superintendent
Hopkinsville City Schools
4. Mr. Claude Hightower, Principal
Belmont School
5. Mrs. Virginia Hightower, Elementary Supervisor
Hopkinsville City Schools
6. Mr. Cletus L. Hubbs, Principal
Hopkinsville High School
7. Mrs. Dorothy Crouch, Secondary Supervisor
Hopkinsville City Schools

8. Mr. Amos R. Lashley, Principal
Booker T. Washington Elementary School
9. Mr. David Hildreth, Principal
Attucks Seventh Grade Center
10. Mr. John J. Mathis, Jr., Principal
Morningside School
11. Mr. William McConnell, Principal
Virginia Street Elementary School
12. Mr. G. Lloyd Seay, Principal
West Side School
13. Mrs. Larcenia Johnson, Director of
Pupil Personnel, Hopkinsville City Schools
14. Mrs. Cornelia Combs, Library Coordinator

The orientation of the Self-Assessment Instrument was well received and it was unanimously agreed by all members of the administrative staff that the faculties of the Virginia Street Elementary School and the Attucks Seventh Grade Center could well benefit from the field test.

On October 10, 1968, the Center Staff and Technical Assistants met at the Virginia Street Elementary School with the above mentioned administrative staff and with the faculties of both the Virginia Street Elementary School and the Attucks Seventh Grade Center. The faculty members who participated were:

1. Jennie K. Baker
2. Margaret Baker
3. Helen Banks
4. Diane Beck
5. Myra Blane
6. Ruthie Bradley
7. Jacob Bronaugh
8. Constance Coatney
9. Lillie H. Deason
10. Louise Fentress
11. George Fortune
12. Judith Fortune
13. Rose Garrett
14. Edward Glass
15. Joseph E. Gregory
16. Shirley Hubbs
17. Lucile Lile
18. Margaret Litchfield
19. Alice Macrae
20. Theresa Markham
21. Sue Ann Mays
22. Gene Reigel
23. Betty Sisk
24. Vernell Sowell
25. Arthur Thompson
26. Sherrie Turner
27. Fred Verderosa

Mrs. Virginia Hightower, Elementary Supervisor of the Hopkinsville City Schools, served as the Center coordinator for the project. Communication with Mrs. Hightower revealed that the teachers expressed a great deal of interest in the idea and seemed anxious to get started.

On October 15, 1968, the faculty was divided into three groups with an equal number of Negro teachers in each group. The administrative staff comprised group number four, which was to consist solely of Low Student Contact Personnel. The Center Technical Assistants who led the Self-Assessment in each of the groups were:

- Group # 1 - Dr. Harry Robe
Dr. James Koper
- Group # 2 - Dr. Harlan Stuckwisch
Dr. Robert Melville
- Group # 3 - Dr. William Floyd
Dr. B. W. Broach
- Group # 4 - Mr. Robert Sleamaker
Dr. Claude Frady

Discussions started after opening statements were made concerning the importance of Consistent Responses as a Condition of Learning (Participant's Manual, pages 16-18). Questions for discussion came from page 52 and 53 of the Leader's Manual. The most directly stated questions were numbers 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.

At the end of the meetings each participant filled out the Individual Inventory: Responses. Classroom teachers marked the scale for High Contact Personnel. Administrative

faculty marked the scale for Low Student Contact Personnel.

On October 22, 1968, group meetings continued with discussions revolving around the importance of Involvements and Relationships as necessary conditions of learning. At the end of the meetings each participant filled out the Individual Inventory for Involvements and Relationships.

On October 29, 1968, group meetings continued with discussions concerning the importance of Modeling-Imitations and Expectations as necessary conditions of learning. At the end of these meetings each participant filled out the Individual Inventory for Modeling-Imitations and Expectations.

On November 7, 1968, a general meeting was held with all participants in order to share the findings of the field test.

SUMMARY OF FIELD TEST

There were two kinds of remarks most frequently noted from the inventory sheets:

- (1) When responding about themselves the teachers stated that they were adequate and consistent, with teachers rating themselves as being more consistent and the administrators rating the teachers slightly less consistent. The

tendency throughout the study was for all participants to interpret the ratings as the "rating of someone else's teaching" with teachers rating teachers in general rather than themselves, and administrative faculty rating teachers rather than themselves.

- (2) When asked to indicate the areas in which further training or discussion were needed, both teachers and administrators indicated a need for further training in all areas related to the conditions of learning.

EVALUATION

In light of the stated objectives of the field test, it was determined that:

1. The Self-Assessment Procedure needed revisions. The primary revision needed was to include more specific examples of classroom behavior as teachers were unable to provide examples of analysis and discussion. A revision of several descriptive terms is needed to make the instrument more meaningful.

2. It would be very difficult for local school districts to implement the Self-Assessment Procedure without technical assistance. A great deal of preparation is needed on the part of technical assistants or group discussion leaders. A minimum of 12 to 16 meetings are needed in order to adequately assess the variable of race in its relationship to the School Components and the Necessary Conditions of Learning.
3. The teachers had no objective means for analyzing their own classroom behavior. Many more examples of classroom behavior are needed before the Conditions of Learning as set forth in the Model would be meaningful.

(These examples of behavior could consist of tapes, films, or other means of graphic description).
4. Technical Assistance in group discussion leadership and training in the techniques of classroom interaction analysis are necessary

activities which are needed to accompany the discussion of the Necessary Conditions for Learning. The Center may need to provide these activities.

OTHER CENTER ACTIVITIES

Inter-Action Analysis Classes:

In an effort to aid teachers in understanding and describing their relationships with their pupils, it was proposed that a class in interaction analysis be conducted under the direction of the Human Relations Center for Education. Such a class was organized in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, under the direction of Dr. Harry Robe, Head of the Psychology Department at Western Kentucky University.

Membership in the class was limited to 25 classroom teachers. Care was taken to select teachers at all grade levels and all schools in the system. Nine members of the group were Negro and the remainder white. The class was organized in October and ran through December with 10 group sessions and 6 taping and analysis sessions.

Throughout the class period, enthusiasm was high and attendance good. Most of the members of the class

conducted informal sessions in their schools which paralleled the formal group sessions and at the end of the class, most of the class members said they intended to continue their informal groups in their schools.

The specific technique for the study of classroom interaction was that developed by Flanders and Anderson, and training materials developed by the Association for Productive Teaching, Ind., were used by the class. After this specific technique was mastered, supplementary techniques and categories were developed by members of the class. These supplementary techniques were developed along the lines of the Model for Self-Study which was developed by the Human Relations Center for Education.

Evaluation and Conclusions:

As a result of this class, most of the teachers became acutely aware of their own particular style and manner of teaching and became aware of gross differences in their interaction styles as they moved from one instructional group to another. There was not sufficient time to develop the techniques to the point where they could be used to analyze patterns of interaction with individual

pupils in an effort to discover patterns of interaction as they relate specifically to race. At least 10 additional sessions would be necessary before the average teacher in this group would be ready to analyze individual interactions and focus upon the specific variable of race.

Although this series of sessions falls short of the objective of analyzing interaction as related to races, it did create an awareness of classroom interaction which would make it possible to meaningfully apply the Human Relations Center Self-Study Model. It would be recommended that a technique such as the interaction analysis technique be employed by all faculties prior to undertaking a self-study program which focuses upon the variable of race.

Faculty personnel in attendance in the interaction analysis classes were as follows:

1. Mr. Pat Adams, Belmont School, 6th Grade
2. Mrs. H. B. Baker, Morningside, 1st Grade
3. Mrs. Sadie Clark, Booker T. Washington, 3rd Grade
4. Mrs. A. Easterly, West Side, 2nd Grade
5. Mrs. George Fortune, Attucks Seventh Grade Center, 7th Grade

6. Miss Laselda Hamby, Social Studies, Hopkinsville High School
7. Mrs. C. Hudson, Belmont, 6th Grade
8. Mrs. Thomas V. Jones, English and Speech, Hopkinsville High School
9. Mrs. Walter Joslin, West Side, 2nd Grade
10. Mrs. Edward Kennedy, Belmont, 3rd Grade
11. Mrs. Ken Litchfield, Special Education, Virginia Street School
12. Mrs. Nathaniel Moore, West Side, 5th Grade
13. Mrs. James Morgan, Science, Koffman Jr. High
14. Mrs. Matthew Quarles, English, Hopkinsville High School
15. Mr. Gene Reigel, Social Studies, Attucks Seventh Grade Center
16. Mr. John Roark, Social Studies, Koffman Jr. High
17. Mrs. B. Roberts, Morningside, 4th Grade
18. Mrs. Fred Sandefer, Indian Hills, 1st Grade
19. Mrs. Robert Thomas, Indian Hills, 6th Grade
20. Mrs. Mary Thompkins, Booker T. Washington, 4th Grade
21. Miss Elizabeth Vaughan, English, Hopkinsville High School
22. Mrs. M. Warren, Morningside, 1st Grade
23. Mrs. Charles Webb, English, Koffman Jr. High
24. Mrs. T. Withrow, Booker T. Washington, 6th Grade

Conferences and Visitations

Dr. Norm Deeb and Dr. Harry Robe, Hopkinsville, Kentucky,
10-3-68

Purpose: Orientation conference with Superintendent of
Hopkinsville School District and Administrative
faculty concerning the Self-Assessment Procedure.

Dr. Norm Deeb, Dr. Harry Robe, and Center Consultants,
Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 10-10-68

Purpose: Implementation of Self-Assessment Procedure
with Virginia Elementary School and Attucks
Seventh Grade Center

Dr. Norm Deeb, Washington, D. C., 10-15-68 to 10-17-68

Purpose: Attend meeting of Center Directors.

Dr. Norm Deeb and Center Consultants, Hopkinsville, Kentucky,
10-22-68

Purpose: Implementation of Self-Assessment Procedure.

Dr. Norm Deeb, Dr. C. Charles Clark, Henderson, Kentucky,
10-24-68

Purpose: To meet in conference with Superintendent of
Henderson City Schools and Evaluate the Henderson
Project.

Dr. Norm Deeb and Center Consultants, Hopkinsville, Kentucky,
10-29-68

Purpose: Implementation of Self-Assessment Procedure.

Dr. Norm Deeb and Dr. C. Charles Clark, Louisville, Kentucky,
11-6-68

Purpose: To meet in conference with Program Officers of
EEOP to work on Proposal for Center for 1969.

Dr. Norm Deeb and Center Consultants, Hopkinsville, Kentucky,
11-7-68

Purpose: Report findings of field test of Self-Assessment
Procedure

Dr. Norm Deeb, Coral Gables, Florida, 12-9-68 to 12-11-68

Purpose: Attend National Meeting of Center Directors.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH SPECIAL TITLE IV PROJECTS

During the fourth quarter, the special projects which were funded under a supplemental and are being administered concurrently by the Human Relations Center for Education with its regular 1968 program, continued to reflect interesting activities and developments. A summary of these activities follows:

Hopkinsville Independent School DistrictJunior and Senior High School Curriculum Study Groups:

The fall quarter has been spent mainly in helping new teachers to understand and implement the following:

1. Time has been spent in study groups helping the new teachers to understand and implement the Curriculum Guide for Disadvantaged Students.
(This guide was prepared last year under a Civil Rights Grant).
2. Two new courses were implemented at the suggestion of the curriculum committees.
 - (a) Driver Training at Junior High School level.

It was felt some boys and girls were terminating

their education without this service, as we do have some dropouts at the ninth grade level.

(b) Business English at Senior High level.

Students are allowed to take this in lieu of one year of regular English. We felt this would be better preparation for some disadvantaged students who will not have means for college, but who need to be prepared for the work-a-day world.

(c) Family Life. A course in Family Life has been added to the high school curriculum. It is felt this will be very meaningful to students at high school age level.

3. Guidance committees have been established in both the junior and senior high schools. A planned guidance program (which we outlined fully in an early paper for you) has been implemented and we feel that this has helped some to ease tense race relations.
4. The curriculum committee at the high school secured the services of the Rotary Club in planning a day

when prominent businessmen would come out and talk with students about the various vocations.

5. An additional guidance counselor, as suggested, has been added at the high school level.

Elementary Curriculum Study Groups:

Members of the study group were:

Dr. Gene C. Farley, Superintendent of Schools
 Mrs. Virginia Hightower, Elementary Supervisor
 Mrs. Dorothy Crouch, Secondary Supervisor

Elementary Group

Claude Hightower, Principal, Belmont School
 Mrs. Lucille Van Wyk, First Grade, Belmont School
 William McConnell, Principal, Virginia Street School
 Miss Genobia Bryant, First Grade, Belmont School
 Mrs. Constance Coatney, Fourth Grade, Virginia Street
 Miss Sue Mays, Third Grade, Virginia Street
 Mrs. Shirley Hubbs, Second Grade, Virginia Street

The recommendations of the elementary committee were as follows:

1. Grade Centers

2. Primary block and intermediate block in different building.
3. Primary block (four years for completing three grades).
4. A better report card for first grade.

Two of the four recommendations are working nicely as we have completed our report card study and they are now being used by all first grades.

The intermediate block of time is being used in part of the elementary schools in grades five and six. Booker T. Washington Elementary School has departmentalized grades 4, 5, and 6. Teachers are able to teach the subject they specialized in or feel they can do a better job teaching.

Our study on the primary block is continuing. We hope some definite plans will be complete by September, 1969.

Due to the lack of funds for transporting pupils, the idea of grade centers has been shelved for the time being.

Henderson City School District

Elementary Curriculum Development Team:

Since September, 1968, the ECDT has made the following contacts with the Central Elementary School Project at Henderson, Kentucky.

1. Ten visits to the Central School. These were for the purpose of becoming familiar with the school and its program and to become acquainted with the teaching staff.
2. Three or four on-campus meetings of the ECDT for the purpose of putting together report findings and recommended program changes.
3. Two on-campus meetings with the principal of Central Elementary School. One for the purpose of data gathering and the other for the purpose of searching for possible financing proposals.

The following outcomes have been realized:

1. The Central School Staff listed what they thought were existing problems that hindered program effectiveness.
2. The ECDT concluded that certain weaknesses exist in physical plant, staff, and material utilization.

In general, the ECDT has tried to set the stage for an adjustment of program so that the children of Central School would have the possibility of receiving more adequate educational experiences. The team will be recommending some changes in the following areas:

1. Staff utilization.
2. A revision in the approach to teaching reading and a different organization of the reading program.
3. Certain physical space utilizations.
4. Certain experiences for the teachers of Central Elementary School.
5. An art program for grades 1 - 6.
6. A variation in the scheduling and a more flexible time-grouping structure in the upper two grades.
7. Promotion, grading, reporting progress, etc.

In general, the ECDT has kept on schedule in its work with the Central School Project. This phase has been slow but worthwhile. There now exists good rapport with the Central School Staff, a good insight into existing conditions (space, staff, and materials) and the foundation for proceeding with sound recommendations.

Louisville Independent School District

Louisville Project, Beacon I:

The fourth quarter of 1968 was used to plan and prepare for the final general five-hour workshop of the Beacon I Project. Because of budget limitations no two-hour meetings were held in the various participating schools in order to make possible the general workshop.

Several planning sessions were held with teachers and administrators of participating schools. It was decided that the final meeting would include several local professionals rather than one person from out of state. Thus, money ordinarily spent for travel expenses could be used for obtaining more consultant services.

In early December, one principal, Mr. Paschal DeSanctis, visited schools in St. Louis, Missouri. He chose schools with locales, patrons and problems similar to those in the Louisville Project.

During his visit to the Enright School District, Mr. DeSanctis talked with students, teachers, and administrators. He found that most school staff members taught in inner-city schools because of a "feeling inside" rather than just because it was an assignment.

On Thursday, December 19, 1968, the final Beacon I five-hour workshop was held for staff members of all participating schools. Judging from comments made by individuals in their evaluations, this was the best and most helpful of the four large workshop programs.

The general theme for the program was "Understanding and Motivating the Inner-City Child." The consultants, all from Louisville, were:

1. Dr. Robert Munson, Clinical Psychologist and Associate Professor of Psychology
Bellarmine-Ursuline College
2. Dr. Carroll Harpenau, Acting Chief Psychologist
Child Guidance Clinic
3. Dr. Edward Hampe, Research Psychologist
University of Louisville Medical School

The format of the meeting included a keynote address by Dr. Munson, followed by three group meetings, each headed by one of the consultants. The final one hour of the program was a question and answer session with all three consultants appearing as a reaction panel before the assembled participants. This meeting seemed to be the highlight of the entire Beacon I Project.

Paducah Independent School District

Title IV activities for the past quarter have been concentrated in the three areas discussed in the last report. They are:

1. Administrative and Supervisory Human Relations Seminars.
2. Individual School-Faculty Seminars.
3. Professional Staff Confrontation Meetings dealing with racial issues.

In addition to the work to develop skills of interpersonal relationships and interracial understandings, the members of the elementary staff have become very active in a study of ways to improve self-image. Staff meetings are being conducted on the methods employed by Norma Randolph and William Howe to develop Self-Enhancing Education. These meetings are conducted by members of the school staff and are pertinent to the problems in the school community.

All staff members have been introduced to Methods in Human Development or Human Development Training which was developed by Harold Bessell and Uvaldo Palomares. Two staff members attended a training session with Bessell and

Palomares in San Diego, California, during this quarter. They are conducting in-service with the staff.

In addition to the in-service activities, more concrete reading and language development programs have been made available to children with the special learning problems associated with cultural and economic deprivation. These include programmed materials, language development kits, paper back literature books and high-interest low-vocabulary materials.