

who were themselves of migrant background, but before viewing the film they were reluctant to admit this background. The showing of the film made such an impact on them that they began to reveal more of their identification with migrants in order to discuss the film. Other frequently used instructional processes included buzz sessions, role playing, and panel discussions among participants.

Individual conferences as well as group meetings were a feature of the Garland program. Jackson State College set up a number of committees on which all participants were encouraged to serve. The residential nature of the program facilitated individual and small group counseling, on an informal basis, at Southern Illinois University.

Field trips were used in a number of ways. Sometimes they were arranged for children in the practicum and participants. The purposes varied. Some field trips to local institutions and social agencies locally were designed to enhance participants' understanding of the problems of the disadvantaged and to inform them of community resources for coping with these problems. Other field trips were specifically designed to supplement the participants' cultural or historical backgrounds.

It was soon discovered in all the programs that strategies were necessary to assure frank and thoughtful feedback relevant to the changing needs of the trainees. In almost every project the relationships which the staff established with the participants provided an atmosphere in which both auxiliaries and professionals felt free to discuss their experiences and their needs. Some programs provided formal structures for communicating this information to the staff. Conferences, group discussions among staff and participants were set up to this end. Some programs relied on the use of logs written by participants. Northern Arizona University instituted a suggestion box, while the University of Maine and Jackson State College had a newspaper prepared by trainees. The record on film of the video-taped sessions provided a unique form of feedback in Maine and Riverside. At Ohio University the use of college students as sponsors of the high school auxiliaries provided a link between the staff and the trainees. The college students discussed their observations in seminars with the staff. At Howard University, the group counseling sessions were open-ended, and suggestions on programmatic changes were welcomed.

Every project had some form of process observation which contributed to the feedback. In most cases one or two persons were employed as process observers for the whole project. This was the case in Northern Arizona University, Puerto Rico, San Fernando Valley State College, Ball State University, Detroit, New York University, Southern Illinois University and Berkeley. In other programs staff instructors served as process observers for other classes and meetings. Staff in Garland Junior College, the University of Maine, and Jackson State College reported that observation of others' classes was particularly useful in achieving integrated instruction since the entire staff was aware of what was being presented by other instructors and of the reactions of the participants to this material.

Riverside's unusual and more complex approach involved junior high school students as process observers. Midway through the program, those pupils found to be most effective as observers were retained in the role, while those less effective were assigned other functions.

Only one program arranged for a daily staff meeting: Northern Arizona University. The project staff reported these meetings were most useful in "putting out fires before they became conflagrations." Other programs, however, had frequent informal meetings of part or all of the staff for consultation and discussion of current issues, or weekly meetings. At Howard University, monthly staff meetings for project staff with appropriate faculty of the high school in which the project was operating proved valuable.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE PROGRAM FROM VARIOUS POINTS OF VIEW

The programs were analyzed from within and by outside observers. The self-evaluation was conducted by process observers drawn from instructional staff and research staff. Participants also recorded their reactions. For outside evaluation, each program was visited by a team of three consultants for two days.

The chairman of each visitation team posed a series of searching questions in group interviews with each group of participants, and with instructional