

Within the broad framework of common objectives and similar approaches, there was wide variety of programmatic design in the matrix of demonstration programs. The needs and composition of potential auxiliaries in various communities, the diverse policies of local school systems with respect to the utilization of auxiliaries, the available facilities and resources for training, and the nature and extent of cooperation in the institutional life of the area all had an impact upon the training program.

Variations were in such matters as: sponsorship, pre-planning, recruitment, selection, the composition of the participant group, the specific skills for which auxiliaries were trained, instructional content and process, and methods of process observation and feedback. These various elements of program structure are described below, indicating both the common features and those which were idiosyncratic.

Sponsoring

The sponsorship of these institutes was by institutions of higher learning with the exception of three projects: Detroit, Puerto Rico, and Berkeley. In these three, the local school system was the sponsoring agency. Wayne State University was involved in the Detroit program on a consultative basis; in Puerto Rico some members of the University of Puerto Rico held important positions on the project staff; in Berkeley, the University of California School of Criminology conducted the research component of the project; in the Ball State University program, involving four school systems, the planning and implementation were in the hands of the individual systems, with the University acting as catalyst. In the Howard University program, the Model School Division of the District of Columbia public school system was deeply involved in the planning and operation.

Pre-Planning

Pre-planning for the training programs was initiated by the sponsoring institution with school administrators, local Community Action Agencies, and occasionally with representatives of other appropriate agencies, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Northern Arizona. The components of pre-planning, including number of meetings, hierarchical level of involvement on the part of cooperating institutions or agencies, areas of concern explored, and degree of agreement reached, varied greatly from program to program. This coordination of training and employment was most thorough and most easily accomplished when it could be achieved intramurally, as in Detroit, Puerto Rico, and Berkeley, where the school system was the sponsor. In the other cases, coordination was facilitated when a sponsoring institution of higher learning had previously formed extensive contacts with school systems, either through working relationships involving placement of student teachers or through other services rendered by the college or university to the system. In only one instance—University of South Florida—the university sponsor was not able to gain cooperation from the local school system. In this case, the University then arranged with the local Catholic diocese to utilize parochial schools in the practicum.

In all cases, the purpose of the pre-planning was to work out appropriate methods of recruitment and selection of trainees, to explore the roles of teachers and auxiliaries in the local school systems so that an appropriate and realistic training program could be developed, to secure commitment for employment, and to agree on areas of responsibility.

At Ball State University the project staff worked closely with the superintendent and principals of four Indiana school systems. In other situations initial overtures to school systems or Community Action Agencies had to be made. Such was the case in Ohio University where the program was involved with Head Start Programs in ten different localities in two states. Still another approach was used in Maine where liaison was established with local school systems, with the State Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the Maine Teachers Association, and where a week-long conference was held with school administrators.

Some local situations precluded the sponsoring institution's working with the school system because the latter had a policy of not employing auxiliary personnel in the classroom. In Boston such a situation existed at the time of the Institute (later modified), so Garland Junior College developed a Leadership Institute prior to the program for preparation of auxiliaries. The purpose of the