THE planning of research and other programs in isolation from a concerned community arouses the following concerns in the latter: research on what problems, under whose direction, for whose benefit, and toward what ultimate goal? New models for educational planning and research into which collaboration between the researcher and community at all stages is built must be elaborated. The community advisory committee is one strategy which involves community people in program planning in the role of consultants. The charrette strategy requires a majority representation on a committee of groups residing within the community who are the clients and community leadership direction of a multi-disciplinary group of academic and professional experts. Together they intensely study community problems in an open public forum to achieve creative solutions. A third type of strategy involves the coming together of researchers and community people at the initiative of the latter with the intent of working cooperatively using the resources of both groups to accomplish community oriented goals. Professional analytic and grass roots relational thinking are both needed to deal effectively with community problems. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JM)
NEW STRATEGIES IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH INVOLVING ETHNIC MINORITY COMMUNITIES

BY SYLVIA M. OHRADOVIC, PH. D.
FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

THROUGHOUT THE NATION IN RECENT YEARS DEMANDS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR EDUCATORS TO REFLECT GREATER SENSITIVITY TO COMMUNITY IDENTIFIED NEEDS BY FOSTERING RESPONSIVE CHANGE.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS WHO ARE INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS ARE IN A FAVORABLE POSITION TO SERVE AS IMPORTANT CHANGE AGENTS IN A COMMUNITY. YET, IN SELECTING, PLANNING AND DIRECTING RESEARCH PROJECTS AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THEY TEND TO PROCEED ALONG A TRADITIONAL ROUTE THAT EXCLUDES COMMUNITY PEOPLE AS PARTICIPANTS.

THIS PAPER ATTEMPTS TO DIRECT THE ATTENTION OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS TO SOME OF THE PROBLEMS THAT ARISE WHEN RESEARCH AND OTHER PROGRAMMATIC ACTIVITIES ARE PLANNED IN ISOLATION FROM A CONCERNED COMMUNITY AND TO SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES DESIGNED TO EFFECTIVELY DEAL WITH THE BASIC COMMUNITY CONCERNS THAT RELATE TO THESE PROBLEMS. THE OVERALL OBJECTIVE IS TO FACILITATE AND ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW MODELS FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH IN WHICH THE RESEARCHER AND COMMUNITY WORK IN CLOSE COLLABORATION OR PARTNERSHIP.

EVEN WHEN A STUDY IS BEING UNDERTAKEN IN REACTION TO EXPRESSED COMMUNITY CONCERNS IT IS TRADITIONALLY PLANNED WITH LITTLE PARTICIPATION OF COMMUNITY PEOPLE. TYPICALLY, THE COMMUNITY IS TAPPED ONLY FOR PURPOSES OF DATA COLLECTION. THUS, ALTHOUGH THE RESEARCHER MAY DESIGN THE STUDY AND HIS DATA-COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS WITH GREAT CARE, HIS ORIENTATION MAY BE FAR FROM THE COMMUNITY THAT THE PEOPLE FROM WHOM THE DATA ARE COLLECTED DO NOT READILY RELATE TO THE PROJECT. THIS IS ESPECIALLY LIKELY TO OCCUR WHEN THE PROJECT INVOLVES ETHNIC MINORITY PEOPLE. OFTEN, AS A RESULT, THE COMMUNITY NEITHER UNDERSTANDS NOR WELCOMES THE RESEARCH EFFORT. YET IF THE STUDY OR PROGRAM IS NOT UNDERSTOOD BY THE COMMUNITY, IT IS NOT LIKELY TO GAIN THE SUPPORT NEEDED TO CARRY IT OUT EFFECTIVELY. FURTHERMORE, WHERE THE COMMUNITY FEELS THE STUDY IS NOT THEIR CONCERN, OR THEY DO NOT WISH TO SUPPORT IT, THEY MAY INTERFERE WITH ITS SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT IN VARIOUS WAYS, RANGING FROM THE MOST SUBLIME TO THE MOST OBVIOUS. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY MAY GIVE INDIFFERENT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS, OR PASSIVELY RESIST GIVING HELPFUL RELEVANT INFORMATION, OR EVEN DELIBERATELY BLOCK PROGRESS OF THE STUDY OR PROGRAM. UNFORTUNATELY FOR THE RESEARCHER, THESE RESISTANCES ARE BEING ENCOUNTERED WITH INCREASING FREQUENCY AND INTENSITY.
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There has been a subtle shift in focus on the part of community people concerned about educational progress from the educational administrator to the educational researcher, and the latter is now coming under close scrutiny. Perhaps it is in reaction to mass media communications based upon reports on educational research which many ethnic minority people feel are, at least, biased and demeaning in their representation of them and, at most, damaging in their effects on social progress. Such reports have been embraced by authorities and officials who then use them as an excuse to divert public funds away from projects and programs which the community sees as fundamental to its successful struggle for community development. Thus, ethnic minority people especially are becoming increasingly concerned about the educational researcher and are carefully examining their relation to him. It would be advantageous for the researcher to join them in this examination toward developing a climate conducive to evolving a mutually beneficial relationship.

Among the concerns about educational research expressed by ethnic minority people are the following:

1. Research on what problems?
   Generally ethnic people are more concerned with actively dealing with the problems they encounter daily rather than spending much time and effort on surveying them. Thus, whereas a survey-type portion of a study may be of great value to a researcher, a community eager for progress long overdue may see this as low on their list of priorities of activities useful to the community. Often they interpret focus on surveying as deliberate stalling on the part of the establishment and consider it a waste of money that could be better spent in action-oriented research.

   The real question to be dealt with is this: Who should determine research priorities? When the educational researcher exercises the prerogative of making this determination and selects for study a problem that is of low priority to the community, the researcher is likely to be charged with insensitivity in dealing with the community and his research effort is likely to be labeled as "irrelevant".

2. Research under whose direction?
   A related community charge is that much money allocated for research is spent on finding out what the community already knows but what the researcher does not know because of his different cultural orientation. Thus, research money is spent to educate the researcher to the problems instead of to help the community solve them. This raises the question as to the capability of a researcher of widely different cultural orientation to conduct valid research in an ethnic community.
AND ESPECIALLY TO RENDER A VALID INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA HE COLLECTS WITH REFERENCE TO THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH THE DATA ORIGINATES RATHER THAN WITH REFERENCE TO HIS OWN COMMUNITY. FURTHERMORE, THE VALIDITY OF RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN THE FIELD BY AN ACADEMIC-ORIENTED RESEARCHER IS ALSO BEING QUESTIONED.

3. RESEARCH FOR WHOSE BENEFIT?

OFTEN DATA IS COLLECTED FROM A COMMUNITY FOR A DISSERTATION TOWARD A GRADUATE DEGREE, FOR A REPORT TOWARD PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT, OR OTHERWISE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE RESEARCHER WITH LITTLE REGARD TO THE NEEDS OR DESIRES OF THE COMMUNITY. ETHNIC MINORITY PEOPLE HAVE BEEN TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF FOR SO LONG THAT THEY HAVE BECOME SUSPICIOUS OF THOSE WHO CLAIM TO BE INTENDING TO HELP THEM BUT WHO SEEM TO GAIN THE BENEFITS OF THEIR ENDEAVORS THEMSELVES. AMONG INDIANS, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE IS GROWING RESENTMENT BECAUSE OF THE VAST AMOUNT OF RESEARCH DONE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES WHICH, IN THEIR OPINION, HAS NEITHER BEEN COMMUNICATED TO THEM NOR ORGANIZED IN SUCH A WAY AS TO BE BENEFICIAL TO THEM. IN BLACK COMMUNITIES, YOUNG COLLEGE STUDENTS FREQUENTLY ARE ATTEMPTING TO CLOSE COMMUNITY DISCUSSIONS AND CONFERENCES TO CAUCASIAN RESEARCHERS WHOM, THEY CHARGE, SEEK THEIR IDEAS AND INFORMATION TO WRITE CONVINCING PROPOSALS ABOUT PROBLEMS THEY LITTLE UNDERSTAND AND IN SO DOING COMPETE FOR SCARE FUNDS AGAINST THOSE WHOM THEY KNOW TO BE WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY IN DEVELOPING PROPOSALS FOR RELEVANT STUDY.
4. RESEARCH TOWARD WHAT ULTIMATE GOAL?

The conduct of community-oriented projects has often led community people to suspect that a project was programmed for failure. In such a case they suspect that the research evaluation efforts are designed to provide the "proof" of failure. Such suspicions are reinforced when, after cooperating in a research study they find that the results are later used against community development. As an example, widely publicized reports of studies by a researcher of a different cultural orientation from the community have been used by public opinion makers in arguing for a decrease in food programs and outbacks in compensatory education programs where blacks are recipients.

Regardless of the degree of validity of these charges they clearly illustrate the nature of community attitudes toward the researcher.

In order to attempt to resolve the problem of the relationship between the researcher and the community, one must realize that basic to the expressed community concerns is a history of exploitation and a basic distrust for the intentions and capabilities of the professional researcher who has largely ignored community expressed needs and desires. Therefore ultimate solution will depend upon establishing a more humanistic and trusting relationship. This paper presents examples of three approaches being used to bring about such a relationship between the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and its community in the conduct of mutually beneficial research and development efforts.

Three types of planning strategies are described on the following pages:
A. Community Advisory Committee
B. Charrette
C. Cooperative Research and Development Activities

Community Advisory Committee

At first glance bringing community people into the research arena to serve as consultants in planning and conducting research appears to be a rather simple strategy. Whereas it is the simplest and least innovative of these being discussed here its apparent simplicity is deceptive. In order to establish a truly representative advisory committee whose members can and will work productively toward community relevant goals serious consideration must be given to several critical issues such as representation on the committee, power delegated to the committee and the framework within which the committee functions. These issues will be
DISCUSSED WITH REFERENCE TO A COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP NOW SERVING THE FAR WEST LABORATORY.

EARLY CONSIDERATIONS OF A POSSIBLE PROGRAM IN MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION REVEALED THE COMPLEXITY OF THE PROBLEMS OF MINORITY PEOPLE AND THE INADEQUACY OF TRADITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR PLANNING AN INTEGRATED CROSS-CULTURAL PROGRAM. IT BECAME EVIDENT THAT, IN ORDER TO PLAN A PROGRAM THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED RELEVANT AND GAIN THE SUPPORT OF THE MANY COMMUNITIES FOR WHICH IT WAS TO BE DESIGNED, THE LABORATORY WOULD NEED TO PROVIDE FOR COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN EARLY PLANNING STAGES. THE DECISION WAS MADE TO FORM A COMMUNITY BASED COMMITTEE TO ASSIST STAFF IN PLANNING A SOCIALLY RELEVANT AND EXPERIMENTALLY SOUND LONG-TERM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN THE AREA OF MULTI-ETHNIC EDUCATION BASED UPON DEEP INSIGHT INTO MINORITY EDUCATION PROBLEMS AND REFLECTING SENSITIVITY TO THE THINKING OF MEMBERS OF DIVERSE ETHNIC COMMUNITIES.

SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REQUIRED CONSIDERABLE CARE AND EFFORT IN ORDER THAT ALL SEGMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY BE REPRESENTED IN SO FAR AS POSSIBLE. IT WAS REALIZED THAT ALTHOUGH RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LEADERS PLAY IMPORTANT DECISION-MAKING ROLES IN THEIR COMMUNITIES THEY CANNOT BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WHOLE COMMUNITY. THE COMMUNITY MUST BE CONSIDERED AS A COMPOSITE OF SUBGROUPS INTERACTING IN VARIOUS WAYS, AT DIFFERENT LEVELS, SO THAT BROAD REPRESENTATION EVEN OF NON-REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS IS IMPORTANT. THEREFORE, PARTICIPANT ROLES WERE PROVIDED FOR STUDENTS, HOUSEWIVES, COMMUNITY ORGANIZERS AND PROFESSIONALS OF DIVERSE SOCIOECONOMIC LEVELS, ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS AND AGES RESIDING IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.

THE SELECTION PROCESS INVOLVED ELICITING NOMINATIONS FROM PEOPLE ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AMONG AFRO-AMERICAN, ASIAN AMERICAN, LATIN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITIES IN THE GEOGRAPHICAL REGION SERVED BY THE LABORATORY. WHERE THE SAME NOMINEE WAS SUGGESTED BY VARIOUS COMMUNITY GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS THE PERSON WAS IDENTIFIED AS A COMMUNITY-DESIGNATED LEADER. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WAS COLLECTED RELATING TO THE NOMINEE'S INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY ORIENTED ACTIVITIES FOR CONFIRMATION OF HIS REPRESENTATIVENESS. USING THIS PROCEDURE RESULTED IN A BODY MOST MEMBERS OF WHICH WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN RECOGNIZED AS LEADERS BY THE TRADITIONAL PROCEDURES. SUCH A COMMITTEE CAN CLAIM TO BE LEGITIMATE AND CAPABLE OF BRINGING THE LABORATORY AND THESE COMMUNITIES CLOSER TOGETHER BY ESTABLISHING LINES OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THEM.
INASMUCH AS TOTAL REPRESENTATION IS IMPOSSIBLE IN ANY GROUP SMALL ENOUGH TO BE AN EFFECTIVE WORKING BODY, A SYSTEM WAS DEVISED FOR PERMITTING AND UTILIZING INPUTS FROM ADDITIONAL GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS THROUGHOUT THE ACTIVITY. IT WAS DECIDED THAT BY CONSULTING WITH INDIVIDUALS FROM OUTSIDE THE COMMITTEE OR INVITING THEM TO THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND THROUGH THE INTERACTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WITH PEOPLE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES ADDITIONAL VALUABLE INPUT COULD BE PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE. IN ADDITION, THE COMMITTEE HAS EXERCISED ITS PEROGATIVE TO EXPAND ITSELF IN ORDER TO BROADEN ITS REPRESENTATION.

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS CHARGED WITH ASSISTING MULTI-ETHNIC PROGRAM STAFF IN DESIGNING, FORMULATING, AND CONDUCTING A PROGRAM PLAN THAT MEETS BOTH THE LABORATORY AND COMMUNITY CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATION AS A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WORTHY OF EXTENSIVE LABORATORY EFFORT AND FULL COMMUNITY SUPPORT. THIS INVOLVES ESTABLISHING BASIC GUIDELINES AND PRIORITIES, PROVIDING MATERIAL INPUT AND DIRECTION TO THE PLANNING EFFORT, AND REACTING TO PLANNING DOCUMENTS AS THEY ARE DEVELOPED. ONLY WHEN BASIC PROGRAM PLANS MEET THE APPROVAL OF THIS BODY WILL THEY BE SUBMITTED FOR LABORATORY REVIEW AND APPROVAL IN A SESSION TO BE ATTENDED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMITTEE. MEANWHILE, THE COMMITTEE HAS AUTHORIZED A FEASIBILITY STUDY TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE PLANNING ACTIVITY.

IN CONDUCTING ITS ACTIVITIES, THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE USUALLY MEETS FOR A TWO-DAY SESSION BIMONTHLY. IN THE FIRST MEETINGS IT WAS PROVIDED WITH ORIENTATION TO LABORATORY POLICIES, CAPABILITIES AND PROCEDURES THROUGH INTERACTION WITH THE GOVERNING BODIES AND SENIOR STAFF OF ALL PROGRAMS. AS A RESULT, COMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE ABLE TO FUNCTION ON A LABORATORY-WIDE BASIS RATHER THAN BEING LIMITED TO A SINGLE PROGRAM. KNOWING THE RESOURCES OF THE SUPPORT AND MANAGEMENT STAFF PERMITS THEM TO CALL UPON THEM AS NEEDED IN THE CONDUCT OF THE PLANNING TASK.

THESE INTERACTIONS RESULT IN THE OPENING UP OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES WHICH OTHERWISE MIGHT NOT BE READILY AVAILABLE TO THE RESEARCHER. THUS, VALUABLE MATERIALS AND PERSONAL CONTACTS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED THE LABORATORY STAFF FROM WITHIN ETHNIC COMMUNITIES.

CHARRETTE

A CHARRETTE IS AN EXCITING NEW TECHNIQUE FOR STUDYING AND RESOLVING PROBLEMS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF TOTAL COMMUNITY PLANNING NEEDS. THE TECHNIQUE REQUIRES A MAJORITY REPRESENTATION OF GROUPS RESIDING WITHIN THE COMMUNITY WHO ARE THE CLIENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP DIRECTION OF A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY GROUP WHICH MAY INCLUDE EDUCATORS, PLANNERS, ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, ECONOMISTS, PSYCHOLOGISTS AND STUDENTS. TOGETHER THE CLIENTS AND PROFESSIONALS INTENSELY STUDY COMMUNITY PROBLEMS IN AN OPEN PUBLIC FORUM TO ACHIEVE CREATIVE SOLUTIONS. THE PRINCIPAL PURPOSE IS TO ARRIVE AT IMPLEMENTABLE PLANS AND SOLUTIONS TO COMMUNITY PROBLEMS IN A COMPRESSED TIME PERIOD.

PARTICIPANTS OF A CHARRETTE ASSEMBLE IN SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS TO CREATE NEW "WORKING PARTNERSHIPS" AND TO BRIDGE OLD PRE-EXISTING GAPS IN COMMUNICATION. THE CHARRETTE PROVIDES AN ATMOSPHERE OF CREATIVITY AND COOPERATIVE INTERACTION BETWEEN ALL PARTIES SUCH THAT IDEAS, CONCEPTS, AND VALUE JUDGEMENTS CAN BE CONFRONTED, TESTED AND RESOLVED. THUS, THE CHARRETTE APPROACH LIES IN SHARP CONTRAST TO THE TRADITIONAL APPROACH WHERE THERE FREQUENTLY OCCURS A POLARIZATION OF FACTIONS RESULTING FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS AND DECISIONS IN SECRECY.

IN THE CHARRETTE THE AVERAGE LAY CITIZEN PLAYS AN ACTIVE AND CERTAINLY IMPORTANT ROLE IN EXPRESSING THE NEEDS OF HIS COMMUNITY AS WELL AS IN ADDRESSING HIMSELF TO RESOLUTIONS OF COMMUNITY PROBLEMS. THROUGH THEIR ENTHUSIASM AND IMAGINATION ORDINARY CITIZENS CAN SUCCEED IN OPENING UP POSSIBILITIES THE PROFESSIONALS HAD NOT THOUGHT OF OR HAD THOUGHT NOT FEASIBLE OR IN UNCOVERING WAYS OF OVERCOMING BUDGETARY AND POLITICAL CONSTRAINTS THAT HAD SIMPLY BEEN TAKEN FOR GRANTED. THUS, "ESTABLISHMENT" AND COMMUNITY ALIKE THROUGH AN EXTRAORDINARY EDUCATIONAL PROCESS—COME TO KNOW AND UNDERSTAND MUCH MORE ABOUT EACH OTHER THAN EITHER MIGHT OTHERWISE HAVE IMAGINED POSSIBLE.

TYPICALLY, A CHARRETTE PROVIDES THREE PARTICIPANT ROLES:

COMMUNITY PEOPLE: COMMUNITY RESIDENTS INTERACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS TO DEVELOP PROPOSALS, MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS, REVISE PROPOSALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION FROM PROFESSIONALS AND OFFICIALS AND REACH DECISIONS.
Educati...serve as resource people in an advisory capacity as, for example, with regard to technical feasibility of portions of community proposals and the design of the physical plant.

Public Officials: These participants also serve as resource people who react to proposals as, for example, with regard to their fiscal and political feasibility.

An example of the operation of a charrette can be given by a brief description of the recent planning and conduct of an "educational facilities charrette" involving the far west laboratory for educational research and development and community people of the region which it serves. In this case, the charrette was conducted for the purpose of making decisions about the use of non-laboratory space within an educational facility to be operated and managed by and for the community...

As a preliminary step to conducting a charrette there must first exist a body to decide upon and organize activities and recruit participants. The formation of this body or steering committee is an essential precursor to the development of a successful charrette. The approach to the formation of a steering committee was to deliberately promote an environment whereby community leadership would be encouraged to surface to form its own steering committee. Communities were exposed to the charrette process through the use of descriptive audio-visual presentations and exemplification of other communities which have held charrettes in the past in an effort to produce an atmosphere conducive to community involvement through commitment and belief in the process itself. This in turn served to motivate the community residents to select their own leadership for a steering committee.

The major purpose of the steering committee was to obtain broadly based participation of community leaders and decision makers in the planning and implementation of the educational facilities charrette. Toward this, the committee promoted public relations in the community, conducted pre-charrette meetings and workshops to define "givens" of problems, and selected charrette participants and leadership core.

Key private and public officials were invited to participate at the invitation of the community. Typically, participation of individuals at the state or federal level would be in a non-voting, ex-officio capacity. Thus, the steering committee emerged from the depths of the community and sought to include a majority of community residents and leaders as well as representation from public and private organizations directly involved with the community. This approach to creating a steering committee avoids the inbred bias of the traditional
METHOD OF SELECTING STEERING COMMITTEES WHEREIN AN ORGANIZATION IN POWER APPOINTS AND CONVENES A STEERING COMMITTEE AND PERMITS THE COMMUNITY TO ESTABLISH INNER CONFIDENCE AND STRONG LEADERSHIP IN THE PLANNING PROCESS.

Ideally, the steering committee should be multidisciplinary group representative of the total community and, although the educational facility is located in San Francisco, community representation was elicited from the entire Bay Area and, to a lesser degree, from the three-state region which is served by the laboratory.

Problems with which the steering committee found itself confronted were numerous and varied. An important concern arose regarding the problem of identifying truly representative community leaders. Another concern was that community leaders were not being given enough opportunity and time to become identified with the problem and to become a functionally effective group. In addition, adequate time should be allowed to sensitively recruit community representatives. It was expressed that these representatives should have the opportunity to become thoroughly familiar with the responsibility of the committee. Failure to take this additional time could result in the inability of community representatives to make effective contributions. Further discussions were made as to voting rights on the steering committee. Resolving these problems was an important factor in achieving the essential requirement that representation of the community be as fair and equal as could possibly be reached by the group. In well-organized neighborhoods (for example, where there is a functioning Model Cities agency) representatives were named promptly, and they functioned efficiently. In less-well organized neighborhoods (e.g., where a coalition of varied community organizations was not yet attained or it was disputed) representation was not named promptly and functioned less effectively. Discussions developed compromise situations which were necessary in some of these cases. Questions arose with respect to the responsibility a representative would need to assume where he felt he could adequately communicate and represent the interests of those organizations which did not belong to the coalition he represented but were included in the same general area. The steering committee as a whole found it needed to discuss its role. Questions arose such as "What are we supposed to do?" and "Why am I here?" Steering committee members questioned whether they would truly be decision makers or whether decisions would have been made prior to the holding of the charrette.

A second set of problems which confronted the steering committee centered around decision-making authority. A charrette could become a decision-making body only through effective interaction among representatives of the power structure, representatives of the community, and technical consultants. The steering committee was responsible for
DESIGNING A PLAN FOR SUCH INTERACTION WHICH INVOLVED FOUR PHASES OF ACTIVITY:

**Phase I** - Testing the feasibility of holding a Charrette
**Phase II** - Planning the Charrette
**Phase III** - Conducting the Charrette
**Phase IV** - Implementing the decisions of the Charrette

**Feasibility of the Charrette** was dependent upon clarification of the role of the community participants. Steering committee members had to be assured that they would not be "window dressing" for a planning effort in which all of the decisions had already been made. The real decision makers were revealed to be the Board of Directors of the Laboratory. Members of the committee suggested that the Laboratory demonstrate its willingness to involve the community by taking steps to include community representatives as members of the Board of Directors so that it would be community relevant.

The Charrette was held over a ten day period including two weekends. A schedule was designed concentrating major large group activities on the weekends and some small group sessions in the late afternoon and evenings. In this way people with heavy weekday commitments were enabled to actively participate.

Among the outcomes of the Charrette was a lengthy document describing the decisions reached with regard to the management and design of the educational facility which was to include a demonstration school, multi-ethnic resource center, multi-lingual diagnostic and remedial center and facilities for agency coordination, communication and counseling.

The Charrette defined the rules for election of members to the Interim Board of Directors and conducted the election. Thus, the Charrette process concentrated in a ten-day period the basic planning and decision making about the use and management of the educational facility and has set into operation what promises to be a viable community-controlled institution.
COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

A THIRD TYPE OF STRATEGY INVOLVES AN ARRANGEMENT WHEREBY RESEARCHERS AND COMMUNITY PEOPLE COME TOGETHER AT THE INITIATION OF THE COMMUNITY WITH THE INTENT OF WORKING COOPERATIVELY IN A HUMANISTIC WAY UTILIZING THE RESOURCES OF BOTH TOWARD THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED GOALS. THE TWO PARTIES SHARE IN PLANNING, DEVELOPING AND CONDUCTING GOALS. THE TWO PARTIES SHARE IN PLANNING, DEVELOPING AND CONDUCTING THE PROGRAM WITH EACH CONTRIBUTING MOST HEAVILY IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS EXPERTISE.

TYPICALLY THE ROLES IN A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACTIVITY OF THIS KIND ARE AS FOLLOWS:


FIELD REPRESENTATIVES: A RESIDENT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVES AS A LIASION BETWEEN THE RESEARCHER AND THE COMMUNITY. THE PERSON SELECTED FOR THIS ROLE MUST BE CAPABLE OF MAINTAINING THE RESPECT OF COMMUNITY PEOPLE AS ONE WHO CAN TRULY REPRESENT THEIR NEEDS TO THE RESEARCHER WITH FULL REGARD TO THEIR PRIORITIES AND SENSITIVITIES.

OFFICIALS OF THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: WHERE THERE IS A RECOGNIZABLE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PROVIDING DIRECTION TO COMMUNITY EFFORTS, ONE OR MORE OFFICIALS MAY BE CLOSELY INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH THROUGH INITIAL DISCUSSIONS WITH THE RESEARCHER AND SUPERVISING THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE.

COMMUNITY PEOPLE: COMMUNITY RESIDENTS PROVIDE INPUT TO THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE AND RESEARCHERS WITH RESPECT OF COMMUNITY GOALS, PRIORITIES AND ACCEPTABLE PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES. IN ADDITION, THEY ACTIVELY WORK IN THE PROJECT, MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT THE DIRECTION WHERE ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS ARE AVAILABLE.
AN EXAMPLE OF THIS KIND OF MUTUAL COOPERATIVE EFFORT IS PROVIDED BY THE INDIAN EDUCATION PROJECT FUNDED BY THE CARNEGIE INSTITUTE AND DIRECTED BY THE LABORATORY. THIS PROJECT WAS INITIATED BY A COMMUNITY WHICH FIRST HAD IDENTIFIED SOME OF THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THEIR CHILDREN AND DECIDED TO SEEK THE ASSISTANCE OF RESEARCHERS SENSITIVE TO INDIAN LIFE STYLES IN HELPING THEM WORK TOWARD MEETING THESE NEEDS. THUS, AT THE REQUEST OF OFFICIALS OF THE TRIBAL COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION LABORATORY STAFF VISITED THE INDIAN RESERVATION TO DISCUSS THE POSSIBILITIES OF A COOPERATIVE PROJECT INVOLVING PARENTS IN THE EDUCATION OF THEIR CHILDREN. IDEAS AND CONCEPTS THAT EMERGED FROM THIS DISCUSSION WERE INTRODUCED TO THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE FOR THEIR UNHURRIED CONSIDERATION OVER A PERIOD OF A MONTH. UPON THEIR RETURN TO THE INDIAN COMMUNITY THE RESEARCHERS MET WITH A LARGE GROUP OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN TO EXPLAIN THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF A PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROJECT AND THE COMMUNITY DECIDED TO ENTER INTO A COOPERATIVE EFFORT.

EARLIER EXPERIENCE HAD DEMONSTRATED TO THE LABORATORY STAFF THE IMPORTANCE OF HAVING A FIELD REPRESENTATIVE RESIDING AT THE PROJECT TO SERVE AS A COORDINATOR. SUCH AN ASSOCIATE WHO IS SENSITIVELY AWARE OF THE INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN THE PARENT, CHILD, AND SCHOOL PERSONNEL IS REQUIRED TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN DEEP COMMUNITY SUPPORT THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT. A TRIBAL MEMBER WAS SELECTED FROM COMMUNITY MEMBERS ALREADY INVOLVED IN THE SCHOOLS AND AN AGREEMENT WAS ENTERED INTO WITH THE TRIBE FOR HER SERVICES.

ARRANGEMENTS WERE MADE FOR THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE TO VISIT THE LABORATORY FOR ORIENTATION, TO HELP DEVELOP PLANS FOR THE PROJECT AND TO OBSERVE VARIOUS LABORATORY PROGRAMS RELEVANT TO THESE PLANS. AFTER THAT SHE CONVINCED PARENTS TO ELICIT THEIR IDEAS AND SUGGESTIONS AND FEELINGS ABOUT THEIR CHILDREN’S EDUCATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS THE PROJECT MIGHT TAKE. AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE PROJECT PARENTS ARE BEING AIDED IN EXPRESSING THEIR IDEAS FURTHER THROUGH THE PREPARATION AND HOME USE OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

AS THESE MATERIALS ARE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND TRIED OUT, THEIR USE WILL BE DISCUSSED AND ANALYZED IN RELATION TO CHILD MATUREATIONAL PROCESSES BY ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT. THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT IS SO COMPLETELY DETERMINED BY THE PARENTS THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO PREDICT THE CONTENT OR OUTCOMES OF IT. HOWEVER, IT CAN BE EXPECTED THAT WITH RESULTING FULLER PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE OF COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION PROCESSES THE PARENTS WILL DEVELOP NEW WAYS OF REINFORCING FORMAL EDUCATION IN THE HOME AND NEW WAYS OF RELATING TO THE FORMAL EDUCATION IN THE INSTITUTION. ONE THING IS CERTAIN: THAT THE PROJECT IS UNIQUE IN ITS PLANNING AND DESIGN AND THAT IT IS UNIQUELY RELEVANT TO THE COMMUNITY.
THE PROBLEMS IN CONDUCTING A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT WITH A COMMUNITY ARE ASSOCIATED LARGELY WITH THE DESIRE ON THE PART OF THE RESEARCHER TO "GET ON WITH THE TASK". HIS EAGERNESS MAY RESULT IN HIS TRYING TO MOVE THE COMMUNITY INTO ACTIVITIES BEFORE IT IS READY OR IN EXERTING INFLUENCE ON THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF THE COMMUNITY. THIS ERROR MUST BE AVOIDED AND THE RESEARCHER MUST BE ABLE TO ACCEPT THE ROLE OF RESOURCE PERSON, NOT DIRECTOR, IN ORDER FOR THE PROJECT TO REMAIN A TRULY COMMUNITY-DIRECTED EFFORT. WHEN THIS IS DONE, HOWEVER, THE RESEARCHER MAY FIND HIMSELF IN YET ANOTHER ROLE. BECAUSE OF HIS DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMUNITY HE MAY BE CALLED UPON BY THEIR MEMBERS TO SERVE AS A SPOKESMAN WHO CAN ARTICULATE TO POWER SOURCES IN THE MAJORITY CULTURE AND TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC THE NATURE AND NEEDS OF A SOCIALLY DISTANT OR LARGELY NON-VISIBLE OR NON-VOCAL COMMUNITY.

IN SUMMARY, IT MIGHT BE WELL TO POINT OUT THAT BOTH PROFESSIONAL ANALYTIC AND GRASS ROOTS RELATIONAL THINKING ARE NEEDED TO DEAL EFFECTIVELY WITH COMMUNITY PROBLEMS. WHEN THINKING FROM THESE TWO VERY DIFFERENT ORIENTATIONS IS CONSOLIDATED, IT CAN BE EXPECTED TO RESULT IN A MORE WHOLESOME APPROACH TO RESEARCH AND PROGRAMMATIC ACTIVITY.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS CAN BE EXPECTED OF THESE COOPERATIVE EFFORTS. A COMMUNITY THAT KNOWS IT IS INTIMATELY INVOLVED IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROJECT IS MORE LIKELY TO COMMIT ITSELF TO THE SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT. AND WHEN THE PROJECT IS LARGELY COMMUNITY-DESIGNED IT CANNOT FAIL TO REFLECT THE CONCERNS AND BE RESPONSIVE TO THE IDEAS OF THE COMMUNITY. Thus, these or similar strategies PROVIDING FOR IN-DEPTH COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM EARLY PLANNING STAGES THROUGHOUT THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT SHOULD SERVE TO BRING THE RESEARCHER AND HIS CLIENTS CLOSER TOGETHER IN A HARMONIOUS WORKING RELATIONSHIP.

IT SHOULD BE KEPT IN MIND THAT THE STRATEGIES DESCRIBED HERE REPRESENT EARLY STAGES TOWARD THE EVENTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF MODELS FOR PLANNING AND RESEARCH IN WHICH COMMUNITY PEOPLE AND RESEARCHERS EACH SERVE IN THE ROLES OF CONSULTANT AND RESOURCE PERSON, COMPLEMENTING EACH OTHER. CONSIDERABLE ADDITIONAL EFFORT WILL BE REQUIRED TO DETERMINE THE BEST WAYS FOR THE TWO TO POOL THEIR RESOURCES IN ORDER TO INCREASE THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN DEALING WITH EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS. HOWEVER, WITH CONSCIENTIOUS EFFORT AND DETERMINATION, THE COMMUNITY AND THE RESEARCHER CAN DEVELOP A WORKING RELATIONSHIP WHICH VALUES AND RESPECTS THE INTEGRITY OF EACH AND PERMITS COLLABORATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE TOTAL SOCIETY.