

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

---

WKU Archives Records

WKU Archives

---

11-30-1969

## 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](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](#), [Organizational Communication 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](mailto:topscholar@wku.edu).

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

(September 1, 1969 - November 30, 1969)

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

College of Education  
Western Kentucky University  
Bowling Green, Kentucky

November 30, 1969

P R E F A C E

In accordance with the provision 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 September 1, 1969, through November 30, 1969.

Norman A. Deeb, Director  
Human Relations Center  
for Education

PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES AND INVOLVEMENTS OF  
THE HUMAN RELATIONS CENTER FOR EDUCATION  
(September 1, 1969 - November 30, 1969)

INTRODUCTION

As noted in the previous Technical Progress Report, the program of the Human Relations Center for Education for 1969 is based upon the following basic objectives:

- (1) To assist school districts with an analysis of those classroom problems which inhibit the establishment of an optimal developmental environment for learning.
- (2) To provide for teachers in-service educational experiences designed to give preparation in the solution of classroom problems which have been heightened by the process of desegregation.
- (3) To identify and describe examples of teacher behavior in desegregated situations which provide optimal learning opportunity.
- (4) To disseminate within the service area of Western Kentucky University those procedures which provide optimal learning conditions for desegregated classrooms.
- (5) To implement those learning models which provide for equal educational opportunities into the preparation of prospective teachers.

(6) To provide for social studies teachers in-service educational experiences designed to give preparation for introducing Negro and minority group history in the social studies curriculum.

(7) To provide resources for the leadership staff of the local school districts in order that they may identify, discuss, and develop necessary guidelines for reaching reasonable solutions to the problems before they become more magnified.

(8) To work in cooperation with the Division of Equal Educational Opportunitites of the Kentucky State Department of Education in providing services to local school districts.

(9) To assist local school districts in the planning of programs including the development of proposals designed to achieve equal educational opportunities.

#### SERVICE AREA ACTIVITIES

To meet the above objectives, particularly objectives one through five, a major focus of the Center's activities has been the conducting and evaluation of self-study in-service programs and assistance in the four service areas at Bowling Green, Hopkinsville, Elizabethtown, and Owensboro, Kentucky. The four-months seminars at these service areas were concluded by May 31, 1969. One objective for this

program was to obtain information relating to areas where teachers and other school personnel might need further training before effectively providing equal educational opportunities for all children. As reported in previous reports it was found that school personnel in general lack skills in group process, knowledge about individual differences and the process of learning.

As an ongoing part of this University's involvement with Kentucky school systems, extensive in-service and extension class programs are carried out in cooperation with schools. This is particularly true in the areas served by the Human Relations Center program of Self-Study. After extensive and intensive reflection upon the findings of the leaders who conducted the Self-Study programs, it was decided that the most general, effective, and continuous way of providing appropriate training for school personnel was to proceed through the University's well established programs of in-service and formal class offerings.

With the information concerning needs of school personnel obtained through the Human Relations Center activities as part of the data, plans were made for the 1969-70 in-service and extension class involvements. Throughout the history of Western Kentucky University requests for service

from the University have always exceeded our capacity to provide such services. This was again the case as plans were made for the 1969-70 academic year. It was decided that, whenever possible, in-service activities and extension classes would be organized around a study of group process, individual differences and the process of learning in the classroom. The rationale for proceeding in this direction was presented to school systems and as a result many school systems chose to center their school opening in-service programs around topics of "Understanding group process," "Understanding pupil differences," and more generally "Providing equal learning opportunities for all children."

Plans for extension classes offered in the Western Kentucky University service area could be more specific. The content of two Psychology Department courses, Psychology of Individual Differences and Psychology of Learning, was carefully examined by the Human Relations Center staff and Consultants and it was decided that these two courses most nearly fulfilled the needs of school personnel struggling with the problems of providing equal educational opportunities for all children. Further, the directors of all teacher education programs agreed that these courses would be acceptable as cognate area courses for students

in their programs. As a result of these activities and numerous discussions with superintendents and other leaders in cooperating school systems, at least one section of each of these courses was offered in each area served by the Human Relations Center Self-Study Programs carried out in the Spring of 1969. The only exception was the Hopkinsville, Kentucky area, and in this area the Center and the schools decided to continue the general in-service activities under the direction of Human Relations Center consultants for the fall semester before organizing specific extension classes.

Follow-up extension classes which were designed to meet the requests of local school district personnel are now being held at:

<u>Owensboro, Ky.</u> , Psy. 511, Learning Theory	42
<u>Elizabethtown, Ky.</u> , Psy. 511, Learning Theory	28
<u>Bowling Green, Ky.</u> , Psy. 511, Learning Theory	34
<u>Louisville, Ky.</u> , Psy. 511, Learning Theory	29
<u>Hodgenville, Ky.</u> , Psy. 511, Learning Theory	16
<u>Thompkinsville, Ky.</u> , Psy. 520, Developmental and Differential Psychology	<u>14</u>

TOTAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL ENROLLED 163

It should be noted that each of the 163 enrollees in the above mentioned graduate courses are paying their own expenses and they are not receiving any stipends from the Center.

### RELATED ACTIVITIES

Another development which relates to activities of the Human Relations Center was the approval of a large Title III Program for the Western Kentucky University service area. The focus activity of this Title III Program was the establishment of procedures which would allow each school system to determine its curricular needs for all children and design curricula with accompanying teacher training activities to implement the curricula. Since this University's involvements have moved from administrative provisions for all children, which seems to have been the focus of Human Relations Centers, toward the more complex problem of staff training and curriculum development, the resources of the University were aligned with the Title III Program to a great extent. As schools are aided by the University staff and the Title III staff, much of the information gained from Human Relations Center activities has been useful in focusing upon appropriate school problems. Many of the programs have centered around the same staff needs as were discovered through Self-Study programs such as individual differences, learning and group process. The advantage of deploying staff through this program has been the focus upon teacher training and curriculum development rather than more superficial administrative arrangements.

The activities of the Western Kentucky Human Relations Center program of Self-Study have been very helpful in developing appropriate follow-up activities both within the University and the schools served by this institution.

#### FOLLOW-UP TEACHER EDUCATION IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

As an outgrowth of the area meetings conducted over a twelve-week period last spring in Elizabethtown, Bowling Green, Hopkinsville, and Owensboro, six school systems, with professional personnel totaling 547, have conducted in-service programs dealing with problems of human relations.

For each program the Human Relations Center provided field consultants who helped in planning and carrying out the programs. A copy of the System Self-Study Program for Equal Educational Opportunities in Desegregated Schools was furnished each participant for use during the in-service program and/or in future individual school faculty meetings.

#### CAVERNA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Center Consultants: Dr. Claude Frady and Dr. W. B. Broach

On September 12, 1969, the Caverna School System conducted an in-service day on "Equal Educational Opportunities" for 53 staff members. Two local participants in the Bowling Green area meetings of last spring set up the schedule for the day.

One of the two University consultants gave a keynote talk on conditions of learning. He urged teachers to "practice what you know is best for the pupil, not what is easiest for you."

The other consultant discussed the System Self-Study, giving some background on its development. He emphasized that the school is essentially a human relations enterprise. Copies of the System Self-Study were distributed to all the participants for possible future use in their own schools in further human relations discussions.

The day's program called for four small group meetings for two hours in the morning, and one hour and fifteen minutes in the afternoon. Sixty questions had been selected from those prepared by the Human Relations Center. Fifteen of these were assigned to each group.

Group recorder reports at the end of the day indicated that some attention had been given to all the questions. There were indications that there was concern for covering the assigned questions, rather than dealing in depth with a few of them.

The consultants expressed the hope that the faculties of individual schools would make use of the System Self-Study materials in future faculty meetings.

CENTRAL CITY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Center Consultants: Dr. Claude Frady and Mr. J. Cangemi

The first all day in-service program of the year was held on September 26, 1969, in the Central City High School. Fifty teachers and two University consultants were involved.

One of the consultants began the program with a discussion of the "Responsibilities of Teachers, Students, and Parents for a Good School Program." The point was emphasized that education is "everybody's business," that better understanding among all facets of the school community is imperative, and that open and honest discussion of problems is a starting place in moving toward better understanding. This presentation was followed by a general discussion which helped to set the tone for the small group discussions which followed.

Six small groups of 8 to 10 persons, under the leadership of individuals who had participated in the Hopkinsville sessions, spent the remainder of the morning dealing with questions selected from the System Self-Study Program. The questions selected had particular relevance to local problems.

In the afternoon a panel of high school students presented their views of a youth conference they had attended at Western during the summer. They gave evidence of the

many forces applying pressures on the youth in this time of seething national unrest. They gave expression to their belief that if youth are exposed to different sides of an issue, and have an opportunity to be heard, the vast majority will not be swayed by those who preach disruption and anarchy.

In the afternoon small-group meetings, attention was given to a continuation of discussions begun in the morning. In addition, aroused by the comments of the student panel, some suggestions emerged as to how students and parents might become more involved with planning and with decision-making regarding school policies. Following are some examples: Have student representatives attend faculty meetings to discuss matters which the students think are important to them. Have students discuss matters of discipline, dress, speech, manners, and grading, and present ideas to the faculty. Bring in parents for discussions on what they want to be involved in and what they want the schools to accomplish.

During both the morning and afternoon small-group discussions, the consultants circulated among the groups. One of the consultants gave a summary of the impressions gained from the day's meeting.

On October 21, 1969, one of the consultants was invited to sit in on a two-hour school faculty meeting concerned

with examining discipline policies and the use of the demerit system employed in the school.

Another day-long in-service day is scheduled for January, 1970, with representatives from the Human Relations Center involved in planning and participating in the program.

#### HOPKINSVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL SYSTEM

Center Consultants: Dr. Claude Frady and Mr. J. Cangemi

Approximately 190 professional staff members participated in a two-day in-service meeting at Hopkinsville, Ky., on October 15-16, 1969.

The program was planned by four local staff members who had participated in the Hopkinsville area meetings of last Spring. Assistance in developing the program was provided by two consultants from the Human Relations Center.

The first general session, presided over by the superintendent, featured a keynote address by one of the consultants. His speech centered on attitudes which teachers should help students to acquire.

The other consultant introduced the System Self-Study materials to be used in group discussions, giving particular attention to "Expectations," "Responses," and "Involvement." These learning conditions occupied the discussion groups during the first day.

The second general session, held on the second day, was built around recorders' reports on the previous day's discussions. Again a consultant returned to the System Self-Study to introduce the topics of "Perceived Role " and "Modeling-Imitation" which were to be given attention in the group discussions for that day.

Three types of discussion groups were employed during the two days with the assistant superintendent and the school principals serving as group leaders. There were ten cross-section groups; there were nine subject area and special groups; and each of the nine school faculties comprised a group. The university consultants spent much of their time visiting in the various groups.

Recorders' reports on the group discussions indicated serious efforts to delve into problems which exist in the schools.

One of the consultants summarized the conference at the end of the second day. He emphasized the need for continuing to discuss in their faculty meetings the kinds of questions raised during the conference. Although a generally good attitude had been observed, he warned against the possibility of defensiveness and bitterness being injected into future discussions.

METCALFE COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Center Consultants: Dr. W. B. Broach and Dr. Claude Frady

Sixty-four members of the professional staff in Metcalfe County Schools held an in-service program on the morning of November 7, 1969.

After the superintendent of schools had addressed the meeting on the need for teachers to consider the individual abilities and needs of their pupils, two representatives of the Human Relations spoke briefly on similar themes. The first dealt primarily with the question of examining the curriculum to see if there are practices which are actually contrary to what is known about children and the way children learn. The second dealt primarily with teachers' attitudes toward children.

One of the consultants briefly discussed the System Self-Study which was to be used in group meetings. Since this was the teachers' first introduction to the materials, it was suggested that they limit their discussions to questions on "Expectations."

The groups were divided by grade levels; primary, intermediate, upper and high school. One of the consultants circulated among the groups while the other remained in the high school group. Some heated discussion was generated

over the question of excessive failure rates and their contribution to the schools' dropout rates.

Using the materials provided by the Human Relations Center, each of the five schools in the system is scheduled to have further discussions on questions of human relations.

LEITCHFIELD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Center Consultants: Mr. James McKee and Dr. James Koper

A one day in-service meeting was held in Leitchfield on the 24th of October, 1969. Forty educators, which included all of the teachers and administrators of the Leitchfield Independent School District, participated in the workshop type meeting with the leadership and assistance of two consultants from the University.

The program opened with a presentation by one consultant and participation by each educator on the theme, "How I See Myself as a Teacher." Emphasis was placed on a limited area of the Systems Self-Study Program involving High Student Contact Personnel and their looking at themselves in terms of their relationships with different kinds of students from varying backgrounds.

Following the initial presentation, the remainder of the day's program used the seminar technique with one

consultant working with 20 elementary persons and the other with 20 secondary teachers. The participants looked at and discussed their attitudes and beliefs with regard to student expectations, responses, involvement, perceived role, and modeling-imitation.

The participants were generally quite willing to share their insights with the groups in an open fashion. It seemed that they were stimulated to take a closer look at themselves and their relationships with their students.

#### HENDERSON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL SYSTEM

Center Consultants: Dr. William Floyd and Mr. D. Hayden

In an in-service day program held at Henderson, October 15, 1969, two University representatives of the Human Relations Center presented the System Self-Study Program for Equal Educational Opportunities in Desegregated Schools.

Each of the consultants addressed the 150 teachers and administrators who comprise the professional staff. One consultant spoke on "The Use of Psychological Models in Assessing the Effectiveness of Human Relations Programs in the Public Schools." He outlined the value of employing psychological models in attempting to examine the specific elements involved in learning. The program was presented as a visual method of differentiating components in the educational process.

The other consultant addressed the participants on "The Self-Concept of the Student." He reminded teachers that they are, indeed, behavioral manipulators and they should be conscious of their manipulative position. Specific suggestions were offered on how the teacher can positively affect the student's self-concept through reinforcement. Reference was made to applying reinforcement for minority group children.

Following the two formal presentations were two sessions of small group discussions. Seven groups of approximately 21 persons each were formed. Leaders assigned to the respective groups were individuals who had been previously trained in the System Self-Study Program presented at Owensboro last Spring. Discussion within the groups was structured around questions chosen by representatives of the Henderson Schools. Discussion was lively and views were expressed freely by teachers and administrators alike. The willingness of teachers to disagree with and make suggestions to authorities was noteworthy, as was the professional manner in which school authorities accepted this free expression. The University representatives served as consultants to two of the small groups.

In a final general session, with one of the consultants serving as moderator, a recorder from each group reported significant points touched upon in his group. This was followed by a summary from the moderator.

## LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

A follow-up Leadership Conference was organized and conducted on November 1, 1969, as a result of the wishes expressed on the evaluation forms of the May 1, 1969 conferees. In accordance with the seventh objective of the Western Kentucky University Human Relations Center for Education program for 1969 which was printed in both the first and second quarterly reports submitted by the Director, the major purpose of the fall conference was formulated:

"To provide additional opportunities for school officials who wish to devise or update school policy statements, guidelines, and/or handbooks which are preventive in nature and will help alleviate problems often brought about by desegregation."

### PRE-CONFERENCE PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Fortified with suggestions and recommendations from evaluation questionnaires completed at the close of the May 1, 1969 Leadership Conference, Dr. Norm Deeb, the Center director, and Dr. Vernon Lee Sheeley, the Conference director, moved to plan the follow-up conference. With the aid of Dr. Tate Page, Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Charles Clark, Assistant Dean and Director of Extension and Field Services, and Dr. Raytha Yokely, Department of Sociology at Western Kentucky University, the follow-up conference format and program for November 1, 1969 were determined.

Late in the Summer of 1969, school people in the Jefferson County Public Schools decided to prepare a booklet of emergency guidelines to help them confront a wide variety of expected disturbances that may occur in their schools in the future. Mr. James E. Farmer, Associate Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, agreed to supply the Center Director with a sufficient supply of the Emergency Handbook to distribute to each of the participants who were planning to attend the fall Leadership Conference.

Mr. James E. Farmer who spearheaded much of the planning behind preliminary work sessions and publication of the Handbook mentioned above, Mr. Ray Corns, Director of Legal Services, State Department of Education, and Mr. Newton Thomas, Office of Equal Educational Opportunities, State Department of Education, were invited and accepted the invitations to present a panel discussion at the Saturday morning Conference.

Letters and enclosures announcing the Conference were prepared and sent early in October to all the superintendents serviced by the Western Kentucky University Human Relations Center for Education. A follow-up letter, indicating final plans was sent on October 22, 1969.

To satisfy recommendations offered at the conclusion of the first conference of May 1, 1969, invitations were

extended to six participants from each school district. Superintendents were requested to represent their districts, if possible, with a school board member, the superintendent, a high school principal, a junior high school principal, a counselor, and a teacher.

A conclusion derived from the evaluation responses collected at the close of the May 1 Conference, indicated the extreme value of active participation by as many conferees as possible. Therefore, the conference planners utilized the services of as many volunteers as possible in the program.

#### THE CONFERENCE

A total of 132 participants (106 men and 26 women) from 37 different school districts registered at the November 1 Leadership Conference. In addition, a large number of graduate students were dismissed from their Saturday morning classes by professors to attend the general sessions and group meetings. Among the participants who attended the conference, the following work positions were represented:

Supt. or Assistant Supt.	17
Principal or Assistant Principal	43
Supervisors	9
Teachers	29
Board Members	5
Directors of Pupil Personnel	7
Guidance Counselors	14
Other Personnel	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	132

## The names of the participants were:

Allen, O. J.	Gilley, Wilbur
Alley, Judie	Gish, Delmas
Anthony, Joseph	Greenwell, Richard
Barlow, Irene J.	Gregory, Leland
Barriger, Denvil	Grimes, James
Bates, Clarence	Gumm, M. W.
Baulch, Ernest	Hampton, Darrell
Bell, Bud	Harvey, Earl D.
Bingham, Odell M.	Herndon, Robert V.
Borden, W. B.	Hightower, Claude
Branstetter, Wendell J.	Hightower, Virginia
Carroll, Dan	Hildreth, David
Carver, Lee Jean	Hina, Roy D.
Clark, Billie C.	Honeycutt, Charles B.
Coker, George, Jr.	Howton, Paul
Cook, Francis	Hunt, Tom
Coomer, Brooks	James, Roy
Coomer, J. T.	Johnson, Stanley
Coomer, Wallace J.	Johnson, Thomas W.
Corns, Ray	Keel, Howard B.
Cottrell, Garland C.	Keen, Mary Ann
Crouch, Dorothy	Kerrick, Paul E.
Crowdus, Hugh	King, Lera
Daniels, James	Lasley, Rev. A. R.
Davenport, Joe C.	Lee, Joseph
Davidson, Eldon E.	Link, Thomas
DeHaven, Huston	Long, Hoy R.
Dickerson, James	Mayhew, Stephen
Eblen, Wallace	McCubbin, Pat
Ehrlich, Dwain	Meredith, Gerald M.
Esters, George, Jr.	Meredith, Michael
Farmer, James E.	Moore, Jo Anne
Ferrell, Albert D.	Moorman, Marnel C.
Forsythe, Robert P.	Napier, Patrick
Forsythe, Shelby	Napper, Stan
France, Vonnie	Nash, Robert
Froggett, Joyce	Oaken, Arnold
Galyen, Kenneth	Oaken, Mary
Gamble, Clarence	Oldham, Herbert
Gammon, Terry	Park, J. W.
Gardner, Paul, Jr.	Parks, Charles E.
Gilbert, William T.	Peers, Lucille

Posey, W. B.	Tabor, Beulah
Potect, Joseph	Tabor, Elmer
Price, John	Taylor, Grace
Roece, Irene M.	Thomas, Newton
Renick, Andrew	Thompkins, Mary F.
Rigney, William	Thompson, W. A.
Robinson, Hubert	Tinsley, Susie
Royse, Emma	Traylor, Milton
Rubbarts, Minnie	Turner, Aaron
Rush, Clarence	Vincent, Johnny
Russell, Earl	Vinson, Tom
Scott, Kenneth	Wakefield, James L.
Shield, N. L.	Wallace, Jim
Simpson, John C.	Ward, James L.
Sisney, Ricardo	Wardlow, Mamie
Smith, Lewis E.	Weaver, B. H.
Steele, Bernadine	Wells, Lloyd
Stephens, Cornell	Wells, Lonnie A.
Stephenson, Bessie	White, Gerald H.
Stephenson, Don	White, J. C.
Stephenson, James	Wilson, Carol P.
Stevenson, R. E.	Wilson, Hulen
Stokes, James	Womack, William H.
Suitor, Mabel	Yokely, Raytha

The general format of the Leadership Conference conducted at Western Kentucky University consisted of the opening general session during which the three panelists made their presentations followed by questions from the audience. Following the coffee break, the participants assembled in 10 pre-arranged groups consisting of people with various school responsibilities. During those group sessions, the moderators and those in attendance were requested to base their discussion upon the content of the Emergency Handbook provided them at the time they registered.

Duplicate copies of reference lists of school districts throughout the country who offered samples of school guidelines were also included in the packet of each registrant and student visitor. Conference participants then returned for the second and final general session to hear the reports of the recorders of group sessions. General discussion and special announcements terminated the morning proceedings at the drive-in conference. Besides the panel discussants and representatives of the Center, a total of 20 moderators and recorders selected from among the participant volunteers provided leadership at the Conference.

#### THE PROGRAM OF CONFERENCE SPEAKERS

Dr. Tate C. Page, Dean, College of Education, Western Kentucky University, launched the opening general session chaired by Dr. Sheeley with a series of challenges to school leaders in his welcoming remarks. His realistic discussion of how school personnel must deal with student unrest and disruptions which are detrimental to school programs set the stage for the panel discussions which followed.

Next on the program was Dr. Norm Deeb, Director of the Human Relations Center. In his opening remarks, he reviewed the purposes of the Center to the schools and personnel in areas served by Western Kentucky University

this year and the aims of the two Leadership Conferences. Dr. Deeb expressed his views about shared responsibilities of the Center and school people this year, relating to common issues and problems resulting from desegregation. He focused upon the purposes of the November 1 Leadership Conference and then he introduced the three panelists.

Mr. James E. Farmer, who worked so closely with the Jefferson County group in formulating their bulletin of school policies, elaborated upon the procedures, gains, and shortcomings of those who met in the Louisville workshops to channel student unrest into constructive activities. He reviewed the content of the Emergency Handbook, then he discussed some of the definitions and types of disorders which are a part of the Handbook. He emphasized pages 10-11 which detailed preventive measures to help curb school disorders.

The second panelist, Mr. Newton Thomas, spoke initially about the purpose of the Office of Equal Educational Opportunities as a cooperative agency to the State's schools. He elaborated upon the need for school personnel to plan guidelines and he directed his remarks toward necessary ingredients to be included for consideration in policy guidelines. He called for participation opportunities by representatives of community groups to help prevent future

disorders in the Nation's schools. Among his remarks, Mr. Thomas suggested training students and people for leadership positions.

In the few minutes left during the opening session, the third panelist, Mr. Ray Corns, discussed briefly the importance for school personnel to consider legal implications in dealing with preventive measures such as school policy statements. Mr. Corns cited legal findings to the conferees at the first general session. As an example, he reviewed a recent court case in which a school district was upheld by the court relative to a boy who wore long hair. He commented about the recent New York case also, and he distributed extra copies of court findings on specific school matters following the question period. The panelists then answered several questions from the audience.

#### DISCUSSION IN SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

Following the coffee break, the conferees assembled among 10 small groups with designated moderators and recorders who had volunteered their services to the success of the Leadership Conference. The major task of the groups was to debate the issues, consider the emergency procedures, and react to the statements which formed the Emergency

Handbook. Group members were requested to study the guidelines and report their proceedings in terms of their own school districts at the final general session that morning.

#### SMALL GROUP RECORDERS' REPORTS

Dr. C. Charles Clark presided at the second and final general session of the Saturday morning Leadership Conference. The reports of the 10 recorders were heard. In the summaries of the reports, several patterns of subject matter were pieced together. Considerations by each of the 10 groups included at least three specific, but overlapping areas: (A) Students, (B) Community Members, and (C) School Personnel.

#### STUDENTS

General discussion about students included expressions:

- (1) about the taste of freedom which enables students at all education levels to raise their voices confidently and to want to be heard.
- (2) that students deserve to be heard and to participate responsibly in choosing from choices, identifying rights and privileges, being involved in policy-making decisions, and participating in well-organized school student government.
- (3) that leadership develops from opportunities to lead.

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Most groups voiced suggestions that the community leadership must accept a fair share of responsibility for social problems which may differ according to the rural or urban nature of a particular community. Suggestions about community members focused upon:

- (1) All community segments must work together to communicate, to plan, and to involve themselves in democratic living.
- (2) Problems within the community seem to be increasing in many ways. Four specific comments related to:
  - (a) Mass media informs and highlights sensationalism in reporting the news which draws excess attention to problems.
  - (b) People are becoming more conscious of race differences.
  - (c) Court policies are too liberal to help people remain responsible.
  - (d) Hatred begins in the home. Treat the cause rather than the symptom.

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

This area naturally received the greatest discussion. A number of recommendations for school personnel to consider are listed from the recorders' reports.

- (1) The prevailing attitude about prevention of school problems was that published rules and regulations must be formulated by representatives of groups involved with emphasis upon human needs.
- (2) Although there is a need to admit we have problems and we need to seek their solutions, no blanket policy will answer all problems.
- (3) The total school staff needs to share responsibilities in the work environment.
- (4) While searching for guidelines, seek out the causes for incidents. Then administrate by design with the community rather than by crisis.
- (5) The group members were desirous of something besides time alone to cure social ills. They believed that teachers and other school personnel must practice good human relations.

- (6) Besides suggesting that problems are attitudinal, group members thought that they should help others regardless of color or creed to have faith in themselves so they might find it in others.
- (7) In addition to conducting orientation programs to smooth transition problems of children, the participants noted the importance of self-involvement in well-defined and realistic activities for children.
- (8) Several comments related to upgrading the value of vocational education and guidance at all education levels. Not all children would go to college, because they did not need to do so.
- (9) Several groups discussed the value of selling education products through the successes of their school programs.

#### CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE CONFERENCE

A total of 110 of the 132 registered participants responded to evaluation questionnaires. A copy of the questionnaire results with all the written comments is enclosed at the conclusion of the report.

On the basis of the evaluations and recorders' reports, in addition to general comments, the following conclusions appear warranted:

- (1) All Emergency Handbooks distributed at registration were considered sufficiently useful to be taken home by the conferees for future use.
- (2) A sizable majority of the participants rated the Leadership Conference conducted by the Center as a great success.
- (3) The Leadership Conference program and activities demonstrated the value of active involvement, close association, and open communication channels to school leaders.
- (4) The Leadership Conference participants realize that future directions they take in their school districts relating to devising and updating school guidelines will be courses they chart.

TOTALS ON EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE--NOVEMBER 1, 1969

1. Check the one that pertains to your position:  
BOARD MEMBER 2 SUPERINTENDENT 10 PRINCIPAL 35  
COUNSELOR 14 TEACHER 27 OTHER 22
2. Check how well the leadership conference met the objectives:  
EXCELLENT 32 GOOD 52 ADEQUATE 21 POOR 4 UNSATISFACTORY 1
3. Check the overall rating of the leadership conference:  
EXCELLENT 30 GOOD 62 ADEQUATE 13 POOR 4 UNSATISFACTORY 0
4. If you answered "poor" or "unsatisfactory" on question  
No. 3, your major reason was: Comments on Page 31
5. Check the overall rating of the panel discussion:  
EXCELLENT 41 GOOD 50 ADEQUATE 14 POOR 5 UNSATISFACTORY 0
6. Check your overall rating of the group work sessions:  
EXCELLENT 28 GOOD 54 ADEQUATE 20 POOR 4 UNSATISFACTORY 0
7. Check the most rewarding aspect of the Leadership Conference:
 

PANEL DISCUSSION	45
GROUP WORK SESSIONS	67
GENERAL SESSIONS	13
PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS	19
SENSE OF IDENTITY WITH OTHERS WITH MUTUAL PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM DESEGREGATION	18
OTHER	2
8. General comments: Comments on Pages 32, 33, and 34.

IF YOU ANSWERED "POOR" OR "UNSATISFACTORY" TO QUESTION

NO. 3, YOUR MAJOR REASON WAS:

1. "No specific answers given."
2. "Poor group leadership - lack of understanding."
3. "Unequal opportunities should have been identified in order to work on solutions."
4. "More time for discussion."
5. "More black participants needed in order to make the workshop effective."
6. "All situations have their own uniqueness; to plan for trouble in many systems can only induce problems."
7. "Schools not in the metropolitan area do not realize what lies ahead in terms of disturbances."

## GENERAL COMMENTS

1. "Very good. Better than last. Mr. Farmer was good."
2. "Perhaps if material had been in hands of participants before session, groups would have been more rewarding."
3. "Excellent. Should have in-service in Independent Schools."
4. "Time for group session too short to really go into anything in depth."
5. "A very stimulating Conference. New questions, problems, and new and different suggestions offered."
6. "All of the problems are slanted toward areas with huge schools--urban areas--many of our schools have no such problems, nor do I think they will occur unless outside agitators or well meaning state or federal officials start looking for discrepancies where none exist; discussion avoided the major reason for the conference, problems concerning desegregation. We should never avoid the democratic process for the sake of a small minority. Every person is in the minority at least once a day."
7. "Most problems discussed have no ready answer. Vary from place to place; one situation to another. Not enough time for meeting."
8. "Well conducted; informative; it is good to get the opinion of others and to know we are not alone in our problems."

9. "A good feeling of togetherness."
10. "I feel that much more time is needed to discuss all problems."
11. "I have profited by all of the Conference."
12. "I feel we don't define the causes of our problems--we as white people are afraid to say how we feel for fear of hurting someone's feelings, therefore we don't get to know the Negroes and if we don't understand them, how in the world are we going to understand our students and their problems."
13. "This meeting was very good. I think it was better than the one in the Spring."
14. "This has been a very nice Conference. Nice small groups."
15. "Groups opened up and discussed problems that are practical to all counties in rural and urban Kentucky."
16. "Group discussions were down to our problem. It seems that we need more discussion and more time to get down to brass tacks."
17. "One main objective I received from the Conference was-- TOTAL INVOLVED--for all people concerned and putting into effect the golden rule."
18. "We appreciate most having the guidelines from Jefferson County and your calling to our attention the need for such guidelines in our system."

19. "A wonderful beginning to these problems. Each school district now needs a follow-up program."
20. "Panel discussion did not always stay on subject."
21. "It would be good to send each person a summary of what each discussed and some problems they dealt with."
22. "Very good. Might help if we had a meeting for more patrons."
23. "Would recommend a Conference similar to this during the Summer of 1970."
24. "New ideas and a different approach to same problems."
25. "Not enough group discussion."
26. "More time needed."
27. "I found the answer to my problem. I was so close to the situation. I could see it. The answer came from one of the participants in the group session."
28. "Not enough time except to barely touch on issues--however, it makes you think; therefore good."
29. "Helps us to deal better with our problems."
30. "This will help me to know what to expect in the future concerning disorders in school."
31. "This was a timely conference."
32. "Much accomplished in group sessions."
33. "Communications opportunities are always a welcome to our areas of discussion."