DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 077 SP 004 726

AUTHOR	Otto, Henry J.; Bessent, Wailand
TITLE	Evaluation of an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	60p.; Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 22
AVAILABLE FROM	Univ. of Texas Press, 120 West 20th Street, Austin, Texas 78712 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary Schools, Elementary School Teachers, *Graduate Study, *Internship Programs, *Principals, School Administration, *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This book describes and evaluates a 12-month postgraduate program to develop better leadership in urban elementary schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Chapter 1 on the program describes 1) procedures for recruiting the 15 fellows (who already had a master's degree and at least 3 years of teaching experience); 2) goals and components of the program in terms of informational and performance objectives; and 3) program details for each section of the program: the fall semester on campus (which included 12 hours of course work and practicum), the spring semester administrative internship with an elementary school principal in a disadvantaged area in the community from which the intern had been nominated, and the summer session back on campus. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 assess student development (cognitive, affective, and performance) as revealed through a variety of tests and evaluation instruments used throughout the program. The final chapter on student appraisal of the program includes assessment done throughout the program and the followup evaluation conducted one year after each fellow had returned to a leadership position in his respective school system. Included is a listing of the most valuable components and procedures: these included the internship semester, the use of block scheduling for campus courses, and the mixture of ethnic groups (Negro, Mexican American, and Anglo) among the fellows themselves. (JS)

BUREAU OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS MONOGRAPH NO. 22

Evaluation of an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

by

HENRY J. OTTO

WAILAND BESSENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN : 1970

CONTENTS

PREFACE

As far as the writers know this is the first time that a comprehensive description and evaluation has been attempted of a federally funded program. It is true that Larry W. Hughes and C. Kenneth Tanner published an account of their Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program conducted at the same time that ours was but theirs is not a complete description.[1]

[1] Larry W. Hughes and C. Kenneth Tanner, "An Evaluation Procedure for a New Program to Prepare Administrator Change Agents," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 4:46–55, Spring 1970.

They took Bachelor's degree people and gave them 15 months preparation to make change agents out of them. Their article describes primarily the evaluation process.

This is also the first time that a federally funded group of students has been followed up after a year back on the job. We had a little money left over from the fellowship program and used that to finance the follow-up and the publication of this report. It is hoped that it will be helpful to others as they plan innovative programs.

HENRY J. OTTO
WAILAND BESSENT

CHAPTER I

THE PROGRAM

In January, 1968, The University of Texas at Austin was notified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, that its application for an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program for 1968–1969 had been approved. At once the University received a $5,000 advance so that publicity, recruitment, and program development could begin. On January 31, 1968, the U.S. Office of Education staff sponsored a meeting in New Orleans for the directors of programs which had been approved for 1968–1969. The award to The University of Texas at Austin provided for fifteen fellows to participate in a twelve-months program from September 1968 through August 1969.

The target of our program was leadership in urban elementary schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods. More specifically our objective was the preparation of unusually capable experienced elementary school teachers for leadership roles in urban elementary schools in disadvantaged areas in major metropolitan centers in Texas. Those familiar with Texas will know that cities like Houston, Corpus Christi, the towns in the Rio Grande Valley, San Antonio, El Paso, Austin, Dallas, and Fort Worth contain about 15 percent or more Negroes and from 15 to 51 percent Mexican-Americans in their respective populations. Large portions of these ethnic groups live in areas heavily populated with educationally and economically disadvantaged families, many of which represent broken homes.

Our target, therefore, was the development of more and better leadership in elementary schools in these population centers. Our objective necessitated the selection of genuinely capable individuals who subsequently could provide new ideas and leadership skills. Hence we specified that each applicant must possess a Master's degree, at least three years of teaching experience, and meet the requirements for admission to the Graduate School of The University of Texas.

Our rationale recognized that the problems of urban schools had become increasingly complex, diffuse, and difficult to resolve. The diverse approaches to desegregation, the education of the disadvantaged, the emphasis upon individualization, and the need for home-school-and-interagency cooperation were particularly acute at the elementary school level and more particularly in rapidly changing metropolitan areas. New horizons were needed in organizational arrangements, staff and facilities uti-

lization, interagency cooperation, curriculum programs for pupils with diverse needs, intergroup relations, the emerging character of life in a magapolis, and the role of the elementary school in this changing environment.

Recruitment Procedures

Since our goal was to strengthen leadership and programs in the school districts from which the fellowship holders were to be chosen it seemed important to obtain applicants who had already been identified by local school administrators and supervisors as individuals with much leadership potential, individuals whom they would most likely select when principal or supervisor vacancies occurred. These considerations indicated personalized recruiting. Hence the program director made personal visits to the target centers: Austin, Houston, Corpus Christi, Brownsville, Pharr-San Juan-Alamo, McAllen, Edinburg, San Antonio, El Paso, Ysleta, Dallas, and Fort Worth.

Prior to each visit a program prospectus was mailed to each superintendent along with a personal letter suggesting a date for the director's visit. As soon as a mutually agreeable date in February or early March had been agreed upon, the program director again wrote each superintendent, confirming the date and requesting that his personnel director and elementary supervisors be invited to join him at the time of the director's visit. Each conference lasted about an hour. The proposed program was discussed in detail and local officials were urged to identify the individuals they would like to nominate, discuss the fellowship program with each one, and send us the name and address of each one who had expressed a desire to be considered. Thirty-two teachers with Master's degrees were nominated by this procedure. Thereafter, the communication was between the director and the individual nominee.

During the visits to the school districts two unforseen circumstances came to light. Due to the establishment of 20 regional service centers the preceding fall by the Texas Education Agency, the prior development of federally funded regional laboratories and research and development centers, and intensive recruitment by colleges to staff increasing enrollments, the smaller school systems had been literally drained of their best talent. Hence they found it difficult to suggest nominees. In the largest school systems, such as Dallas and Houston in which new administrative or supervisory appointments had been restricted almost exclusively to persons already in the system, the approved lists were already so long that new individuals felt the waiting list was too extensive to hold much promise for an

assignment within the foreseeable future. Hence there was no great enthusiasm for further preparation associated with the goal of our program.

Correspondence with each nominee began as soon as name and address were available. Each one was asked to complete the application form provided by the U.S. Office of Education, submit a complete transcript of previous college work, and to take certain tests required by the Department of Educational Administration or the Graduate School, including the aptitude section of the Graduate Record Examination. After all data were available on all candidates, the final selection was made. Only one of the fifteen original selectees found it necessary to drop out during the summer, to be replaced by one of the alternates. The final group consisted of five men and ten women representing Negro, Mexican-American, and Anglo ethnic groups.

Program Goals—Major Components

The broad goals of the program were cast into the following two categories.

I. Informational objectives:
  1. A meaningful operational understanding of *basic concepts* in:
    a. Metropolitanism
    b. Culturally disadvantaged
    c. Strategies of change
    d. Preschool education
    e. Nongraded programs
    f. Grouping of pupils
    g. Programmed learning
    h. Team teaching
    i. The school as a social institution
  2. Essential differences between:
    a. Noticeably different Head Start programs.
    b. Hierarchical and collegial patterns of team teaching.
    c. Ability vs. achievement grouping.
    d. A-B-C-D-F marking system and the absence of a comparative marking system.
    e. Ethnic groups in Texas.
    f. Different approaches to language assessment of preschool children.

II. Performance goals:
  1. Communication skills:
    a. Ability to give a public lecture.
    b. Ability to interview an individual adult.
    c. Ability to write a clear, concise memo or article for a newspaper.
    d. Ability to interview a disadvantaged pupil.

2. Group process skills:
   a. Ability to serve as chairman of a large group meeting.
   b. Ability to serve as chairman of a small discussion group.
   c. Ability to serve as a resource person.
   d. Ability to initiate enthusiasm for making a change in school operation.
3. Professional content skills:
   a. Ability to assess the language development of preschool children.
   b. Ability to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of remedial programs (especially in reading).
   c. Ability to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of preschool programs.
   d. Ability to evaluate and restructure programs for non-English speaking pupils.
   e. Ability to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of school programs for different ethnic groups.
   f. Ability to evaluate and to suggest improvements in the school's grouping practices.
   g. Ability to evaluate and suggest improvements in the school's library services.
   h. Ability to evaluate and restructure the school's use of community resources.
   i. Ability to evaluate and recommend improvements in the school's organization for instruction.
   j. Ability to evaluate and recommend changes in the school's provisions for adapting instruction to individual differences, including the adequacy of resources for so doing.
   k. Ability to harness available community health and welfare resources needed by pupils.

During the fall semester the students were on campus full time and were registered for twelve semester hours of course work. These twelve hours consisted of a 6-hour block-of-time in which the class met for three hours each afternoon on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. This 6-hour block provided the vehicle for field visits and a great variety of lectures, exercises, films, and reading assignments pertinent to the objectives of the program. Students were expected to read and make a brief written report on at least three books per week chosen from an extensive bibliography provided by the faculty. In addition, the students were registered as a special group in a 3-hour Practicum in Supervision taught by Dr. Ben M. Harris and in Management 382—Organizational Behavior and Human Relations taught by Dr. E. J. Hall of the Management Department in the College of Business Administration.

During the spring semester each student was assigned as an administrative intern in elementary school administration with an elementary school

principal in a school in a disadvantaged area in the community from which he or she had been nominated. The assignment of schools and supervising principals was made by local school officials. Each intern was visited in his school three times during the semester by one of the program staff members. The students were registered for nine semester hours, six for the internship per se and three hours in a conference course in Elementary School Organization and Administration. On December 11, 1968 all supervising principals attended a one-day orientation meeting in Austin. This was a joint meeting of program staff, the interns-to-be, and the supervising principals.

The 1969 summer session was again spent in full-time residence on campus. The first six weeks the students were enrolled in a block-of-time program directed by Dr. Wailand Bessent. During the second six weeks the Department of Sociology made Dr. Norval Glenn available for a special course in The City and Urbanization. During the spring semester Dr. Glenn had visited several of the communities and the schools to which the interns had been assigned.

Program Details—Fall Semester

Details for the fall semester fall logically into the three registration categories mentioned earlier. Although students were registered in three different courses, the courses were designed to support and supplement each other. This interrelationship can be observed as one examines the synopses given below. Each of the three courses provided numerous opportunities for writing and speaking and for different roles in small and large group discussions.

The six-hour block directed by the authors of this monograph. In this course the students met for three hours on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. It was the vehicle through which the story of the disadvantaged and various programs for them as well as ways of dealing with their problems were treated. It provided the avenue for field trips and guest speakers, and various content items and performance skills were covered. The outline below provides an overview of the scope of activities.

A. Lectures:
   1. Dr. C. Richard King—Writing for various audiences.
   2. Dr. Robert Jeffrey—Speaking to lay and professional groups.
   3. Mr. Howard—Texas Title I Programs.
   4. Dr. W. Harmer—Remedial Reading.
   5. Mr. Devine—Language development of young children.

6. Dr. Thomas—Community organization.
7. Mr. Coffee—Human Opportunities Corporation in Austin.
8. Dr. Bunderson—Computer Assisted Instruction.
9. Dr. Otto—Programmed learning.
10. Dr. Otto—Team Teaching.
11. Regional Lab staff—Orientation to SEDC programs for disadvantaged.
12. Dr. Richard Arnold—Bilingual programs for non-English Speaking beginners.
13. Dr. Bessent—"The Conference" (and "Wattsie" case films).
14. Dr. Bessent—Change Processes in Organizations.
15. Dr. Bessent—Strategies of Change.
16. Dr. Otto—Grouping of Pupils.
17. Dr. Otto—Guidance in Elementary Schools.
18. Dr. Sanchez—Interviewing Parents.
19. Dr. Otto—Perceptions in Human Relations.
20. Dr. Otto—Decision-making.
21. Don Partridge—Texas Special Education Program.
22. Dr. Bessent—In-basket items.

B. Field visits and observations:
1. Remedial reading cases.
2. Title I Classes in Austin.
3. Head Start and Day Care Centers in Austin.
4. Television instruction demonstration.
5. Dr. Harris and library project at Casis School.
6. Desegregation exercise—Extension Building.
7. Nongraded and cooperative teaching at Casis School.
8. Visit to San Antonio schools offering bilingual programs.

C. Other program components:
1. Reading of library books—three per week.
2. Bulletins distributed in class.
3. Preparation of guidelines for Head Start programs.
4. Preparation of guidelines for Title I programs.
5. Interview with the president of the Lions Club (Dr. Bessent).
6. Working as a special group (the 15 of you).
7. The films shown at the Federated Women's Club.
8. Tape recorded presentations.
9. Conference with supervising principals.
10. Social affairs for group.
11. Testing sessions.
12. Papers on "What I have learned."

The course in Organization Behavior and Human Relations was taught by Dr. Ernest G. Hall of the Department of Management. Students participated in weekly laboratory sessions in the human relations laboratory.

Through lectures and term papers the following topics were also covered.

1. The organization: its goals as applied to its role and self-concept.
2. The power and role concepts in the formal organization.
3. Three dimensions of human personality within the concept of norms of large organizations.
4. Interpersonal power motivation and cognition.
5. Motivation and cognition as they relate to goals in a small group.
6. The relationship of self-concept and role to social perception in establishing norms for interpersonal behavior.
7. The significance of power, role, and self-concept in interpersonal relations.
8. The interaction of role and self-concept in the small group.
9. Motivating workers toward organization objectives.
10. How norms in the unstructured group affect interpersonal motivation and cognition.
11. Cohesion, role, and self-esteem as viewed in a structured small group setting.

The Practicum in Supervision was taught by Dr. Ben M. Harris. The course contained several laboratory exercises in connection with the topics listed below.

1. Basic concepts of classroom observation for the improvement of instruction.
2. Skills and techniques for comprehensive observation of instruction.
3. Use of focused instruments for observing and analyzing instruction.
4. Design characteristics of in-service programs.
5. Use of laboratory approaches in in-service programs.
6. Supervisory interview techniques.
7. Formulating instructional objectives.
8. Curriculum decisions interrelating ideals, goals, objectives, and activities.
9. Helping teachers with diagnostic analysis of individual needs.
10. Analyzing effects of homogeneous grouping systems.
11. Problems in evaluating pupil performance.
12. Evaluating supervisor leadership and programs.

Program Details—Spring Semester

The spring semester consisted of two interrelated parts, the internship per se and the course in Elementary School Organization and Administration. Each of these is described below.

The internship. In December of 1968 an all-day meeting was held of students (prospective interns), the supervising principals designated by local school officials, and project directors. The purpose of the meeting was to orient everyone present with the suggested internship activities and the

anticipated roles of each intern and each supervising principal. This meeting made it possible for everyone to get acquainted with everyone else and for each principal to have lunch with his prospective intern. The outline below summarizes the anticipated activities of the interns. This outline, distributed and discussed at the December meeting, was to be a guide and not a prescription.

A. Orientation activities.
   1. Establish familiarity with the school as a social institution, its teachers, its pupils, PTA organization and activities, use of resource persons in the instructional program, the program as a whole (what is offered, who offers what, how is the offering organized and scheduled), the general nature of daily operations, the major problems as viewed by principal and by teachers.
   2. Spend at least one day during the semester with a secondary school principal to familiarize yourself with the offering, the schedule, the guidance program, provisions for individual differences, and problems seen by the principal, especially problems arising with students from disadvantaged backgrounds.
   3. Spend at least two days during the semester in the central administrative offices to become familiar with the various central staff assistants, their duties, and problems as they see them. Spend at least one day making field visits with a supervisor or curriculum director.
   4. Spend at least one day with the local welfare department, including some field visits with a member of the staff if such is permissible.
   5. Spend at least one day with the local health department, including some field visits with a member of the staff if such is permissible.

B. Activities to enhance communication skills.
   1. Request your principal to give you several opportunities during the semester to make a formal presentation to the faculty.
   2. As early in the semester as possible, initiate a parent study group and lead that group on vital educational topics for a series of 3 to 6 meetings.
   3. Make home visits to several disadvantaged pupils' homes.
   4. Prepare at least two articles for the local paper and send Dr. Otto a copy of each of your articles and the resulting newspaper clippings.

C. Activities to enhance group process skills.
   1. Item B-2 also applies here.
   2. Request your principal to let you chair, or serve as a consultant to, several faculty committees and a PTA committee or some other lay committee.

D. Activities to enhance administrative performance.
   1. As a continuing activity during the whole semester, participate in or observe all of the usual duties befalling an elementary school principal. Increase level of responsibility during the semester to assume full responsibility for a variety of duties by the end of the semester.

REV/12-68

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
INTERN'S LOG

Date: _____

Time	Activity	Respon-sibility Level	Profes-sional Level	Analytical Comments	Learnings and Outcomes	Value
CODE:	Col. 3 1-Full Responsibility 2-Assisting Role 3-Observer		Col. 4 1-High Professional Level 2-Low Professional Level 3-Non-Professional Level		Col. 7 1-Great Value 2-Some Value 3-No Value	

2. Establish a close working relationship with one or more teachers and assist them in improving their program (supervisory role, instructional improvement). Make at least 6 classroom observations using a classroom observation guide, followed up by conferences with teachers observed.

E. Activities to enhance professional content skills.

1. Evaluate the Title I program in your school using the guidelines developed

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF FIFTEEN INTERNS

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating								
		Level of Responsibility			Professional Level			Learning Value		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
I. Office routines:										
a. Answering the telephone	14	73	30	14	29	36	53	25	44	47
b. Answering questions of office callers (teachers, pupils, parents, others)	11	72	57	5	34	81	17	37	62	32
c. Securing substitutes	1	2	1	1	1	0	3	0	4	0
d. Securing exemption from jury duty for a staff member	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
e. Sorting and opening mail	8	17	6	0	2	7	14	5	9	9
f. Disposing of newly received supplies	11	20	20	4	6	8	26	6	25	12
g. Other _____	14	67	25	8	23	18	67	39	30	27
Sub-total		251	139	33	95	150	181	112	175	127
II. Management routines:										
a. Making attendance report	12	23	13	4	10	10	20	19	15	6
b. Making textbook inventory	14	55	29	2	24	42	20	25	51	9
c. Handling activity funds	7	12	6	4	5	13	4	5	13	4
d. Planning for or entertaining visitors	9	48	22	13	37	35	11	30	47	6
e. Reshuffle lunchroom schedule	5	3	2	0	3	2	0	0	4	1
f. Supervise lunch period	8	71	23	6	14	39	47	13	50	37
g. Supervise pupils before or after school	8	51	121	7	16	40	122	18	40	119
h. Deliver messages or packages to central office or local agency	11	47	19	3	11	20	35	11	34	23

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating: Level of Responsibility 1	2	3	Professional Level 1	2	3	Learning Value 1	2	3
i. Supervision of custodial service and custodians' schedule	8	31	9	0	6	19	15	12	27	2
j. Study policy manuals or other directives	13	60	6	3	28	20	21	36	33	0
k. Study or revise office organization	5	3	2	28	2	28	31	4	31	0
l. Prepare requests for renovation, remodeling, or other needs	10	12	12	1	15	4	6	17	8	0
m. Handle Federal Project requests, forms, reports, etc.	13	23	23	0	22	13	12	26	16	3
n. Project next year's enrollment and staff or facility needs	11	14	28	1	21	20	5	23	19	1
o. Arrange for unscheduled events, interruptions, etc.	11	55	31	6	34	38	23	39	47	9
p. Enrolling new pupils or checking out those moving away	11	21	13	4	15	18	5	17	15	6
q. Keeping record of teacher absences	3	4	0	2	0	3	3	2	3	1
r. Making report on substitutes used	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
s. Schedule or supervise fire or defense drill	8	2	13	3	3	6	9	6	10	2
t. Requisitioning supplies	11	28	14	2	11	19	14	14	23	7
u. Prepare payroll roster	8	4	5	3	4	7	1	6	5	1
v. Other _____	12	69	20	3	35	35	22	60	29	3
Sub-total		636	413	93	316	413	426	383	522	240

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating: Level of Responsibility 1	2	3	Professional Level 1	2	3	Learning Value 1	2	3
III. Pupil services:										
a. Testing individual pupil	7	20	1	2	9	8	4	9	10	2
b. Analyzing pupil achievement and ability profile	11	28	9	0	25	6	6	23	14	0
c. Giving first aid to pupil	13	64	14	2	2	19	58	10	33	34
d. Home visit in pupil interest	15	38	66	12	85	22	9	72	42	2
e. Arranging for medical or dental care for pupil	8	7	10	1	12	5	1	11	7	0
f. Arranging for welfare aid for pupil or parents	12	19	13	4	17	9	10	18	16	2
g. Assigning pupil to special education class or special program	10	18	11	2	11	12	6	14	15	0
h. Obtaining a complete inventory of pupil services available from local agencies (school and non-school	9	16	10	7	19	13	1	21	12	0
i. Other (miscellaneous)	10	46	24	3	21	41	11	23	48	2
Sub-total		256	158	33	201	135	106	201	197	42
IV. Oral communication:										
a. Conference with principal	15	147	214	54	254	148	36	210	184	15
b. Conference with individual teacher	15	171	83	13	159	118	7	123	126	35
c. Conference with parent	15	65	47	20	78	41	3	71	48	3
d. Conference with pupil (non-discipline)	13	146	11	11	74	79	13	66	53	49
e. Conference with discipline case	14	348	41	12	122	226	57	114	170	121

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating: Level of Responsibility 1	2	3	Professional Level 1	2	3	Learning Value 1	2	3
f. Conference with a committee of teachers	14	42	30	28	49	30	1	38	39	3
g. A presentation to the faculty	15	41	18	2	43	17	1	48	17	0
h. A presentation to a lay group	15	35	16	4	38	17	0	28	26	0
i. A presentation to a group of visitors	8	12	8	0	20	0	0	17	3	0
j. Conference staff from central office other than supervisors or curriculum director	12	34	26	21	63	12	4	60	18	1
k. Other (miscellaneous)	15	36	26	87	89	43	19	76	68	7
Sub-total		1077	520	252	989	731	141	851	752	234
V. Written communication:										
a. Letter to individual parents	7	12	1	1	7	3	4	8	5	1
b. Group letters or memos to parents	12	25	11	1	17	16	4	14	21	2
c. Preparing news items for local paper	15	33	4	0	30	6	1	29	8	0
d. Preparing memos to faculty	12	37	5	0	15	17	10	12	27	2
e. Other (miscellaneous)	14	110	12	5	40	31	57	39	60	24
Sub-total		217	33	7	109	73	76	102	121	29
VI. Curricular activities:										
a. Help teacher plan a field trip	7	3	8	2	4	7	2	6	7	0
b. Make arrangements for a field trip	12	5	11	1	4	9	4	10	7	0
c. Join a class on a field trip	12	8	16	5	10	12	7	8	19	2

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating								
		Level of Responsibility			Professional Level			Learning Value		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
d. Observe in a classroom	15	145	39	151	211	103	18	184	125	23
e. Discuss instructional plans with a teacher or a group of teachers	13	92	24	8	86	34	2	71	50	2
f. Teach a class	14	236	25	0	145	107	5	58	168	36
g. Analyze appropriateness of school's program in relation to ' ientele served	10	27	18	10	23	19	13	24	23	2
h. Suggest and help implement improvements in the program	13	68	36	12	64	34	18	49	55	12
i. Evaluate testing program and results	11	38	11	2	26	8	18	15	30	7
j. Conference with curriculum director or supervisor regarding program elements in this school	14	29	49	12	58	27	5	52	32	6
k. Preview films	8	8	7	8	7	14	2	6	17	0
l. Assist in evaluation of teacher performance	9	14	22	5	33	8	0	30	11	0
m. Visit a junior or senior high school to learn about program available to pupils who complete the program in this school	13	13	10	10	17	15	1	21	12	0
n. Evaluate and/or suggest improvements in lunchroom program	7	12	6	1	8	5	6	12	5	2
o. Other (miscellaneous)	12	135	32	14	55	76	49	51	98	33
Sub-total		833	314	241	751	478	150	597	659	125

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating								
		Level of Responsibility			Professional Level			Learning Value		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
VII. Professional growth activities:										
a. Read professional books or journals	13	103	7	2	59	40	10	40	69	1
b. Attend inservice meeting	15	31	14	42	67	19	2	55	32	1
c. Interview division or department directors in central office	14	47	15	7	59	10	0	57	12	0
d. Attend system-wide principals or supervisors or directors meeting	15	21	11	47	56	23	1	55	24	0
e. View exhibits of books or other teaching aids	12	18	12	15	24	15	6	24	20	1
f. Conference with university supervisor	15	18	26	2	40	6	0	38	8	0
g. Attend building faculty meeting	15	13	38	49	46	47	6	56	42	5
h. Visit local health department	14	11	5	5	16	5	0	19	2	0
i. Visit local child guidance clinic	10	8	5	3	15	1	0	15	1	0
j. Visit local welfare department	14	16	7	4	21	4	1	21	5	0
k. Evaluate a Title I program	12	36	1	1	27	4	6	24	12	1
l. Evaluate a Head Start program	11	18	3	4	22	3	0	20	5	0
m. Evaluate the library program	15	66	5	1	48	16	11	30	44	1
n. Visit a juvenile court	10	4	2	8	10	3	1	12	1	1
o. Observing a principal-teacher conference	11	3	11	25	31	9	2	28	14	0

Activity	Number of interns reporting each activity	Frequency of Participation and Rating								
		Level of Responsibility			Professional Level			Learning Value		
		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
p. Conference with special teacher	14	38	31	10	45	28	4	40	33	5
q. Conference with counselor or psychologist	13	25	39	14	41	33	5	49	26	3
r. Other (miscellaneous)	9	44	35	48	59	55	8	68	48	8
Sub-total		520	267	287	686	321	63	651	398	27
Grand total		3790	1844	946	3147	2301	1143	2897	2824	824

in class. Have your evaluation ready for discussion with the supervising professor.

2. Evaluate the Head Start program in your school (if there is one); otherwise evaluate one somewhere else in the district using guidelines you have developed from your reading. Have your evaluation ready for discussion with the supervising professor.
3. Evaluate the library program in your school as you deal with Chapter 6 in the Otto and Sanders text, using the guidelines provided by Dr. Harris.
4. Identify one example of a successful program change in the school and write an analysis of events and circumstances that led to success. Do the same thing for one *attempted* program change and analyze reasons why it did not succeed. Contrast factors relating to successful and unsuccessful change.
5. Prepare an analysis of staff relationships, staff organization, and cooperative efforts in the elementary school to which you are assigned.
6. Other professional content skills will receive attention in Section II of this outline.

Each intern was asked to prepare a daily log using the form shown on the preceding page. Broad categories of activities were to be entered in the log; such details as "having lunch" or "walking to the annex" or "chatting informally with another teacher or a pupil" were to be omitted. The tabulation which follows is a summary of the activities of all fifteen interns.

The tabular summation of intern activities shows that the students engaged in 87 different activities (counting the miscellaneous category only once in each sub-section). Of course not every intern engaged in all 87 activities. If the "grand total" figures at the end of the summation are used the reader will find that the interns rated themselves as having full responsibility for 50.8 percent and an assisting role in 28 percent of the activities in which they engaged. Their self-rating also shows that 47.7 percent of their activities were of a high professional level while an additional 34.9 percent were at a low professional level but not in the non-professional or clerical level. The same type of analysis shows that 43.6 percent of their activities were of great learning value while another 43.5 percent had some learning value. Only 12.4 percent of their activities were rated as having no learning value.

If the sub-section totals are studied, using the "level of responsibility" column, one finds that the most frequent group of activities was in Category IV—Oral Communication, in which conferences with discipline cases received the highest frequency. In rank order of frequency of participation the remaining categories fall into the following pattern: curricular activities, management routines, professional growth activities, pupil services, office routines, and finally, written communications. On the whole it would

seem that these interns spent most of their time in activities relating most closely to the objectives of the internship.

The conference course. For several years the staff of the Department of Educational Administration has felt that the course in elementary or secondary school organization and administration could be pursued most profitably when the student was assigned as a full-time administrative intern in an elementary or a secondary school. The staff believed that theory and practice could be integrated more effectively by such an arrangement. For this group of interns the instructions read as follows:

This part of the internship involves a systematic study of elementary school organization and administration. To assume systematic coverage you are asked to take the Otto and Sanders text chapter by chapter and prepare an analysis of practices in the school to which you are assigned with recommendations or "best practices" as found in the text. You should do one chapter per week and prepare a report on each chapter, using the procedure outlined below.

1. Study the chapter carefully and make a list of the 5 to 8 most important ideas, recommendations, or "best practices" found in the chapter. Then make a careful analysis of practices in your school and compare these with the good ideas you have gleaned from the text. Arrange your report in brief columnar form as follows:

1. Good idea no. 1	1. Description and evaluation of the school's practices.
2. Good idea no. 2	2. Description and evaluation of the school's practices.

No doubt you will want to review your analysis with your principal before you mail your report to Dr. Otto. Try to keep your report brief and to the point; avoid the temptation to write many pages. The report on each chapter should not exceed three pages. Here is a chance for you to practice your communication skills—to say much in a few concise statements.

Program Details—1969 Summer Session

The first six weeks. Students devoted full time to a block program directed by Dr. Bessent, assisted half-time by Mr. Kelly Hamby, a graduate student, and nine guest speakers from the Austin Public Schools. The latter represented two principals from elementary schools in disadvantaged areas, an assistant senior high school principal, the assistant director of teacher personnel, the director and assistant director of pupil personnel, the chief

psychometrist, a supervisor, and the real estate buyer for the school system.

The class met for a 3-hour period five days per week unless field trips or other special events were scheduled. The first class day (June 5) was devoted to a group review of internship experiences. Then followed three days during which various tests were taken, including a re-take of the Whitman In-basket Exercises. On June 11th the students participated with their supervising principals in an all-day review and appraisal of the internship semester. One day (June 19) was spent in attendance at the summer workshop sponsored jointly by the Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association, the Texas Education Agency, and The University of Texas. The topic for the day was "Managing Behavioral Problems."

During the first week of the term the students were invited to participate in the planning of the content and activities of the 6-weeks session. Students were thus able to have included in the program the topics which they felt they needed most in the light of deficiencies recognized during the internship. The list below summarizes the major areas covered during the remainder of the six weeks.

1. Decision-making through in-basket exercises.
2. Legal aspects of teacher responsibility and liability.
3. Managing classroom behavioral problems; crisis prevention.
4. Programs for atypical children.
5. Organization of staff for optimum utilization.
6. Building staff morale.
7. Administrative functions in counseling.
8. Community relations with minority groups.
9. School lunchroom management and transportation services.
10. Field trips for school plant study.
11. Field trip to personnel and planning divisions of a school district.

The course in urban sociology. During the second term of the 1969 summer session the students were enrolled as a special proup in the course taught by Dr. Norval D. Glenn, Associate Professor of Sociology. The major topics covered in this course were:

1. Definitions of urban and rural; the rural-urban continuum.
2. The ecology of cities.
3. The impact of urbanization upon family structure.
4. The impact of urbanization upon religion and religious institutions.
5. The impact of urbanization upon political institutions.
6. The social and cultural characteristics of slums.
7. Racial and ethnic relations in American cities.
8. Urbanization and fertility.

A Final Word

Since few if any reports of a fellowship program have provided a detailed account of what actually transpired, the authors have endeavored to describe rather fully the content and the sequence of the content of our program. Staffing problems in other departments of the university made it necessary to accept some compromises. One of the compromises was the offering of the sociology course in the 1969 summer session instead of in the 1968 fall semester, but even that had some compensating features in that Dr. Glenn was able during the spring semester to visit several of the communities and the schools in which the students were engaged in internships.

The authors tried hard to provide a program tailor-made in terms of the goals sought. We had a fine group of students. How well we succeeded will be revealed, at least in part, in the chapters which follow.

CHAPTER II

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT—COGNATIVE ELEMENTS

During the fellowship year the students in this program were given a variety of tests, some of which were administered two or three times. The tests which dealt with cognative elements are discussed in this chapter.

A Vocabulary Test of Important Concepts in Education

During the summer of 1968 the authors developed a 100-item True-False test containing definitions or applications of terms in education whose clear understanding seemed essential to student attainment of the objectives of the program. A copy of this test is reproduced in the appendix.

The students took this test during the first week in the fall semester, again in mid-January, and again during the first week of the 1969 summer session. The results are summarized below. N = 15 at each testing session.

	Percent Correct Answers	
Mean — Sept. 1968	62.7	F ratio — 46.24
Mean — Jan. 1969	77.7	P = .00
Mean — Jan. 1969	77.7	F ratio — 2.52
Mean — June 1969	78.8	P = .13
Mean — Sept. 1968	62.7	F ratio — 51.29
Mean — June 1969	78.8	P = .00

The tabulation shows several things. Students revealed a rather high mean score in September, 1968—62.7. The increase in correct answers from September to January was significant below the one percent level. The reader will recall that each student was urged to read at least three books a week. This was also the semester during which the authors and guest consultants gave lectures. The internship semester did not contribute much to score improvement on this test but there was no retrogression in mean score. The net increase in correct answers was 16.1 percent, a difference which was significant below the one percent level.

Student Concepts of Disadvantaged Children's Characteristics

Three times during the year the students were asked to complete the Free Response Inventory shown on the next page. The terms used to characterize disadvantaged children were summarized under the 18 categories shown in Table 1. A total of 324 different words and phrases were

Table 1

SUMMARY OF STUDENT ANSWERS - FREE RESPONSE INVENTORY

Descriptive categories	Fall 1968		Jan. 1969		June 1969	
	A[a]	B[b]	A[a]	B[b]	A[a]	B[b]
1. Behavior traits (positive)	3	7	4	4	6	6
2. Behavior traits (negative)	10	12	8	16	14	20
3. Behavior traits (factual)	4	6	2	2	2	2
4. Physical traits (positive)	3	4	5	7	7	15
5. Physical traits (negative)	6	31	7	25	8	20
6. Physical traits (factual)	4	4	4	16	2	14
7. Environmental factors (factual)	12	19	6	12	6	9
8. Environmental factors (negative)	21	46	14	31	18	25
9. Academic (positive)	1	1	2	3	3	4
10. Academic (negative)	8	18	13	27	9	20
11. Academic (factual)	0	0	3	11	6	8
12. Sociability (positive)	3	3	4	5	5	11
13. Sociability (negative)	5	12	2	4	4	5
14. Communication (positive)	1	1	4	9	4	5
15. Communication (negative)	2	12	2	15	3	15
16. Communication (factual)	3	3	1	2	0	0
17. Personal traits (positive)	15	22	42	64	56	84
18. Personal traits (negative)	43	60	40	68	47	63

[a]Number of different terms listed.

[b]Total frequency of terms listed.

listed by these 15 students. In September the range in the number of descriptive terms listed was from 0 to 32 with a mean of 17.5; in January the range was from 15 to 54 with a mean of 41.0; in June the range was from 17 to 69 with a mean of 44.3.

Name_____

Date_____

FREE RESPONSE INVENTORY

What are disadvantaged children like: What words come to your mind when you think of the disadvantaged children you have known or with whom you expect to work? You are asked to describe the characteristics or behavior of disadvantaged children in the following manner:

Step 1. On the lines below, please list all the words that you think are most descriptive of disadvantaged children. You may list as many or as few as you like. If it helps, think of all the different words you would use to finish the sentence: "Disadvantaged children are _____."

Step 2. When you have finished listing words, go back over the list and circle the words that you think are desirable or favorable characteristics or behaviors.

Disadvantaged children are:

1. _____	16. _____
2. _____	17. _____
3. _____	18. _____
4. _____	19. _____
5. _____	20. _____
6. _____	21. _____
7. _____	22. _____
8. _____	23. _____
9. _____	24. _____
10. _____	25. _____
11. _____	26. _____
12. _____	27. _____
13. _____	28. _____
14. _____	29. _____
15. _____	30. _____

The analysis of variance calculation of fall vs. January revealed the difference in number of terms listed to be significant at the .00 level. Between

January and June the difference was not significant but from September to June the difference was again significant at the .00 level. The semester in residence on campus rather than the internship was responsible for student's breath of information about disadvantaged children.

A different type of analysis consisted of the total number of responses and the percent which connoted a negative concept. The details are as follows:

September:	total — 273	—	82%	negative
January	: total — 362	—	59%	negative
June	: total — 369	—	54%	negative

The two sets of data taken together indicate that the number of characteristics listed by these students increased from fall to January to June, with the largest increase during the fall semester. The percent of negative terms decreased from one testing date to the next with the major decrease in negative terms taking place during the fall semester. In spite of the large drop in the percentage of negative terms listed, the students still recorded more than half of their responses as negative characteristics in June.

Pupil Control Idealogy

In 1967 Willover, Eidell, and Hoy published the results of their work in which they developed and ascertained the validity and reliability of an instrument which they called Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form).[1]

The conceptual framework for the development of this instrument assumed that pupil control plays a central part in the organizational life of public schools. Previous research had shown that pupil control problems play a major part in teacher-teacher and teacher-principal relationships and that pupil control was important in both the structural and normative aspects of the school culture. Teachers who were viewed as weak on control had marginal status among colleagues and others. Teachers are expected to maintain adequate social distance between themselves and pupils yet at the same time they are expected to be kind, friendly, and helpful to pupils. A disorderly classroom is not a good environment for pupil attainment of the school's purposes.

The research of these authors conceptualized a continuum of control ideology ranging from "custodialism" at one extreme to "humanism" at the

[1] Donald J. Willover, Terry L. Eidel, and Wayne K. Hoy, *The School and Pupil Control Ideology*. The Pennsylvania State University Studies No. 24. The Pennsylvania State University: University Park, Pennsylvania, 1967.

other. The rigidly traditional school serves as a model for the custodial orientation. It is highly teacher-controlled and concerned intensely with the maintenance of order. The model of the humanistic orientation is the school conceived of as an educational community in which members learn through interaction and experience. There is much use of cooperative teacher-pupil planning and socially approved self-directed conduct is sought. Schools vary from one of these extremes to the other, with the majority probably falling somewhere in between the extremes.

The PCI Form contained 20 statements to each of which the respondent was to check "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." These response categories were scored 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, respectively, with scoring reversed for the nine items positive to the humanistic viewpoint. The item scores are summed to provide a single test score. The range of test scores is from 20 to 100; the higher the score, the more custodial is the pupil control ideology.

Our 15 students took the PCI Form in September and in June. In September the scores ranged from 41 to 65, with a mean of 50.9 and standard deviation of 6.8. In June the scores ranged from 32 to 57, with a mean of 44.9 and a standard deviation of 7.4. The analysis of variance calculation, September vs. June, proved to be significant at the .0001 level. The conclusion is that student control ideology changed significantly in the direction of the humanistic orientation.

Semantic Differential Data on External Concepts

A twelve-item Semantic Differential was administered at three different times—at the beginning of the program, at the end of the first semester, and at the beginning of the summer session. The instrument employed had four scales for each of the three factors of meaning defined by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum in their original conception.[1] The factors were: (1) evaluation, connoting the good-bad dimension of the concept; (2) potency, connoting the strength of the concept; and (3) activity, connoting the static-dynamic dimension of the concept. In addition, a distance score was computed according to the formula derived by Osgood, *et al.*

Five concepts employed were judged to deal with the subjects' cognative structures in the sense that they were external to the person's self-concept.

[1] Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, Ill.: The University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Other concepts relating to the affective domain will be discussed in Chapter 3. The five concepts were:

1. Disadvantaged children.
2. Education as a means of fighting poverty.
3. Getting teacher to change.
4. Continuous progress plans such as the non-graded school.
5. Individualized instructional methods such as programmed learning.

During the semester spent on campus, the only significant change ($p < .05$) observed was in the concept of Disadvantaged Children, which increased in the potency score from a mean of 13.6 to 16.5, and the activity score which changed from a mean of 14.3 to 17.9. No significant changes were discovered in the spring semester during the internship.

Over the entire year Education as a means of Fighting Poverty decreased in the activity score from a mean of 21.1 to a mean of 18.3.

The only significant change in the distance score was for the concept "Getting Teachers to Change," in which the following results were obtained:

MEAN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES ($N = 15$)

	Fall	Summer
Evaluation	22.1	22.5
Potency	19.7	18.9
Activityy	18.4	18.0
Distance	6.58	4.03

In summary, the residential semester accounted for greater change than the internship in the meaning of the external concepts employed; the direction of change was mixed.

In good-bad connotation, none of the concepts changed significantly and there appeared to be a decrease in both strength and activity of concepts. The only exception noted was in the concept of Disadvantaged Children which became both more active and stronger in meaning.

CHAPTER III

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT-AFFECTIVE ELEMENTS

The program was designed with an emphasis on both cognitive and affective elements. The latter might be expressed in terms of three statements of expectations for which some measurable change would be observed: (1) the student would become more positive in his attitude toward disadvantaged children, (2) he would become more open-minded, and (3) his concept of himself as an administrator would become more salient. Evidence concerning each of these will be presented in this chapter.

Attitude Toward Disadvantaged Children

As was noted in chapter 2, the Free Response Inventory results reflected a sizeable increase in positive attitudes seen in disadvantaged children. There was still a net negative view toward disadvantaged children at the conclusion of the program, however.

In traits mentioned that could be classified as behavioral, negative attributes connotations outnumbered positive ones more than two to one. Academic characteristics were negative by a ratio of three to one. Negative environmental factors outnumbered positive ones by a three-to-one ratio. An equal number of positive and negative traits were mentioned on physical traits, and communication skills. The only characteristics on which more different positive attributes than negative ones were named was for sociability and personal traits in general.

The Semantic Differential (discussed in chapter 2) was used to obtain responses to the concept "Disadvantaged Children." The following results were obtained at three different time intervals:

Semantic Differential Results at Three Intervals for the Concept "Disadvantaged Children"

Time	Evaluation	Potency	Activity
Fall	20.0	13.6	14.3
Spring	20.6	16.5*	17.9*
Summer	20.8	16.6*	17.3*

* Significant at .05 level.

The Semantic Differential employed has a range from 4 to 28 on each factor with the higher score representing "better" on evaluation, "stronger" on potency, and "more active" on the activity factor.

As may be seen in the above table, disadvantaged children were seen in a positive way, but no increase was noted. The strength and activity of the concept increased significantly during the residential semester, but remained constant during the internship.

Open-Mindedness

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was used as a pre- and post-measure to determine if students became less dogmatic (more open minded) in terms of belief systems differing from their own.

Scores on the 40-item instrument have a range from 40 to 160. Subjects scored overall at the mid-ranges of the instrument with no change from the beginning to the end of the program. The pretest scores had a mean of 104.6 and a standard deviation of 9.3. Post-test scores had a mean of 102.3 with a standard deviation of 9.1. The difference was not significant.

Self-Concept

In the concepts measured by the Semantic Differential, three were judged to provide a measure of the students' concept of themselves in an administrative role. They were (1) myself as a leader, (2) being principal of an urban disadvantaged school, and (3) communicating with others.

Results on these three concepts at three different time intervals during the program were as follows:

Evaluation Scores on Leadership Concepts from Semantic Differential

	Testing Period		
Concept	Fall	Spring	Summer
Myself as a Leader	23.9	23.5	23.8
Being Principal	23.3	22.9	22.9
Communicating	26.5	25.9	25.5

As one may see in the above tabulation, the students' evaluation of themselves in an administrative role remained relatively stable throughout the program. Activity and Potency factors showed a similar result.

The magnitude of the self-concept on the evaluation factor is of interest. "Myself as a Leader" and "Being Principal" were both ranked lower in the

evaluation factor than other "non-personal" concepts. The factor ranked highest on the good-bad continuum at all three intervals was that of "Communicating with Others." As may be seen in tabulation, this concept was near the top of the available range on the evaluation factor.

Summary

The greatest affective change was observed in the attitude toward Disadvantaged Children. Students became more positive in their orientation toward such children.

Self-concept scores did not change appreciably, nor did students become more open-minded.

These results may reflect the program over-emphasis on cognitive outcomes. In general, affective objectives were not directly sought through program activities designed with that end in view. It was hoped, however, that attitudinal changes would accompany increases in learning about the educational problems of disadvantaged children and becoming more familiar with the principal's role. Some evidence from the free response inventory indicated a favorable change in the former, but little evidence exists to support changes in the latter.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT—PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

Two methods were used to obtain an index of student performance. One was a rating on internship performance by the supervising principals. The other device was repeated administration of the Whitman School in-baskets and a locally developed one called The Shady Acres In-baskets.

Appraisal by Supervising Principals

Although the faculty supervisor receives the student's daily logs and project reports and holds conferences during each visit, the real on-the-job evaluation of the intern can be made only by the resident supervisor (principal or other designated person). This is why we requested the resident supervisor to give us his (or her) appraisal of the intern's capabilities and performance.

The supervisor responded to the items below by placing an X in the appropriate column and mailed it to the University.

Activity	*Ratings*[a] Excellent or Oustanding	Ade-quate	Needs to Improve
A. *Communication Skills:*			
1. Ability to give a public lecture	7	1	
2. Ability to work constructively with patron groups	12	2	
3. Ability to deal constructively with pupils	10	4	1
4. Ability to write a clear, concise memo or article for newspaper	9	5	
5. Ability to relate constructively to members of the faculty	13	1	1
6. Ability to deal constructively with administrators	9	5	1
7. Ability to serve as chairman of large group meetings	9	4	
8. Ability to function constructively in small group discussions	13	2	

9. Ability to serve as a resource person	13	1	1
10. Ability to initiate enthusiasm for making a change in the school's program	9	5	1
B. *Professional Content Skills*:			
11. Ability to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of remedial programs	8	4	1
12. Ability to evaluate pre-school programs	6	6	1
13. Ability to evaluate the adequacy of programs for pupils with language deficiencies	8	4	1
14. Ability to evaluate and to suggest improvements in the school's library services	9	5	1
15. Ability to evaluate and to suggest improvements in the school's pupil grouping practices	10	4	1
16. Ability to make the best constructive uses of community resources in the instructional program	8	5	1
17. Ability to assess the school's overall organization for instruction	10	4	1
18. Ability to assess the school's provisions for individual differences among pupils	13	3	1
19. Ability to assess the socio-economic-cultural climate of the school's service area and to draw implications therefrom for the school program	11	3	1
20. Ability to use supporting personnel effectively, such as school nurse, social worker, attendance officer, etc.	12	2	
21. Ability to secure health and/or welfare services for children who need help	8	6	
C. *School Management Tasks*:			
22. Ability to organize the office staff for most effective service	8	5	1
23. Ability to handle activity funds properly	8	4	
24. Ability to handle textbook management and records properly	11	3	
25. Ability to handle all child accounting records and procedures properly	11	3	
26. Ability to use the telephone in ways which enhance public relations	13	1	
27. Ability to use central staff resource persons effectively	11	3	1
28. Knowledge of the legal rights and limits in dealing with pupil problems	9	5	1

29. Knowledge of the principal's responsibilities and zones of freedom	12	2	1
D. *Readiness for Job Assignment:*			
30. In your judgment, how ready is this intern for a job assignment as:			
a. A Principal	10	3	1
b. A Supervisor	10	3	1
c. A central office position other than supervisor	7	3	3
Totals	315	117	24

[a] Some rows total less than 15 because some items were not checked by some supervising principals.

The supervising principals were asked to complete the above check-list during the second week in May after the interns had been there nearly a whole semester. Out of 456 ratings, 315 were "excellent or outstanding" and 117 were adequate. Only 24 were in the category of "needs to improve." Apparently the internship was a huge success for all of them. This may be why the internship was mentioned so frequently in the student evaluation a year later, as will be shown in chapter 5.

In-Basket Data

In order to evaluate the administrative style changes in students in the program, an in-basket performance test was administered three times during the program. The design of the in-basket evaluation was as follows:

Beginning	End of First Semester	End of Second Semester
Group 1: Shady Acres In-basket (T_1) ($N = 8$)	Shady Acres In-basket (T_3) ($N = 8$)	(no in-basket)
Group 2: Shady Acres In-basket (T_4) ($N = 7$)	(no in-basket)	Shady Acres In-basket (T_5) ($N = 7$)
All students:	Whitman School In-basket (T_2) ($N = 15$)	Whitman School In-basket (T_6) ($N = 15$)

In-basket responses are probably highly reactive on a test-retest basis, and since two different, non-equivalent, in-basket forms were employed it was necessary to randomly split the students into two groups: Group 1 took the second in-basket test at the end of the residential semester and Group 2

completed the same test after the additional experience in an internship. In addition the Shady Acres test was given to both groups at the end of the year.[1]

The following comparisons were used to measure learning:

1) If $T_1 - T_3$ change is different from $T_4 - T_5$ change, the addition of the internship in group 2 may account for the difference.
2) $T_2 - T_6$ change was used as a measure of internship effect.
3) Overall program effect was measured by Shady acres results for both groups combined. Since nearly a year elapsed from the first to second administration of the test, it was hoped this would minimize the reactive effect of the pre-test.

Scoring

The in-basket responses were hand-written messages such as letters, memos, and notes produced by the students to indicate their disposition of the problems appearing in their in-baskets.[2]

An assistant was employed and trained in scoring the responses, using scoring procedures developed by Hemphill, *et al.* She scored the items without knowing which group the subject belonged to. In addition, she rescored items at intervals to check on reliability of her judgments. The scoring categories employed were the following:

1. Estimated number of words
2. Number of subordinates involved
3. Delays or postpones decision
4. Communicates by telephone
5. Future action indicated but not scheduled
6. Gives directions and suggestions
7. Setting up new procedure
8. Takes action short of terminal action
9. Gives recognition to subordinates
10. Communicates by writing
11. Refers to background material
12. Sets up procedure for deciding
13. Complies with suggestion from subordinate
14. Number of outsiders involved

[1] The Whitman In-basket is published by UCEA, Columbus, Ohio, and the Shady Acres In-basket was developed at The University of Texas.

[2] A comprehensive treatment of the in-basket method is found in Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, *Administrative Performance and Personality.* New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

15. Planned activity (2 to 14 days)
16. Asks information or advice from subordinate
17. Gives courtesy to subordinates
18. Communicates face-to-face
19. Complies with suggestion from superiors
20. Plans fut[illegible] action
21. Shows in[illegible]nality to subordinates
22. Takes terminal action
23. Schedules activity same or following day.
24. Takes final action
25. Discusses with su ordinates
26. Asks opinion or advice from subordinates
27. Asks opirion or advice from outsiders.

Results

The changes in Group 1 from the beginning of the semester to the end of the first semester as compared to the changes in Group 2 from the beginning to the end of the second semester were taken to be a measure of the effect of the internship on the administrative performance of the student. On only three of the twenty-seven scoring categories was a differential change ($p < .05$) noted. The students in Group 2 tended to comply more with suggestions from subordinates, discuss more with subordinates, and to take fewer terminal actions after the internship. These changes were not observed, however, in a comparison of Group 1 prior to the internship and Group 2 following the internship when the same in-basket form was used (T_2–T_6 comparison). In the latter analysis, no significant F-ratios were discovered.

An overall change was noted by a comparison of pre- and post-test results on the two Shady Acres in-baskets a year apart. Changes noted ($p < .05$) were:

- An increase in delay or postponed decisions,
- An increase in giving directions or suggestions,
- An increase in planning a future action,
- A decrease in reference to background material,
- A decrease in setting up procedures for deciding,
- A decrease in taking final actions.

Summary

The in-basket performance test indicated a number of changes in administrative style. An overall tendancy was noted to become more deliberate in problem handling with a change toward including others in decision-making. This change was consistent with the instructional emphasis in the program.

CHAPTER V

STUDENT APPRAISAL OF PROGRAM

Twice during the fall semester we asked students to prepare a paper on "What I Have Learned." One was done at mid-term and one at the end of the first semester. Unfortunately these papers were returned to the students so we cannot summarize them. In the tabulation below you will see that these papers ranked fifth, with a rating of 4.4, out of a total of 44 fall semester activities.

Student Evaluation of Fall Semester Activities

U. S. Office of Education requires us to include an evaluation by students in our final report. Hence we must ask you to rate the items below. The ratings are as foliows: 1 = Of little or no value; 2 = Of some value; 3 = Of average value; 4 = Of considerable value; 5 = Of great value. Opposite each item place an X in the column which best represents your appraisal of *value to you.* (The original rating form had 5 columns.)

Rank	Rating	Activity
1.	4.9	Dr. Bessent—In-Basket items
2.	4.8	The course with Dr. Hall
2.	4.8	The practicum in supervision—Dr. Harris—Ed.A. 385
2.	4.8	Reading of library books
3.	4.6	Working as a special group (the 15 of you)
4.	4.5	Conference with supervising principals
5.	4.4	Dr. Bessent—"The Conference" (case film)
5.	4.4	The visit to San Antonio
5.	4.4	Paper on "What I Have Learned"
6.	4.3	Dr. Otto—Team Teaching
6.	4.3	Interview with the president of the Lions Club
7.	4.2	Dr. Otto—Perceptions in Human Relations
7.	4.2	Dr. Otto—Decision-making
8.	4.1	Dr. Otto—Grouping of pupils
8.	4.1	Bulletins distributed in class
8.	4.1	Preparation of guidelines for Head Start programs
9.	4.0	Dr. W. Harmer—Remedial Reading
9.	4.0	Dr. Bessent—Strategies of Change
9.	4.0	Dr. Otto—Guidance in Elementary Schools
9.	4.0	Don Partridge—Texas Special Education Program
9.	4.0	Dr. Harris and library projects at Casis
10.	3.9	Dr. Bessent—Change Processes in Organization
10.	3.9	Preparation of guidelines for Title I programs

10.	3.9	Social affairs for group
11.	3.8	Dr. C. Richard King—Writing
11.	3.8	Regional Lab staff—Orientation to SEDC programs for disadvantaged
11.	3.8	Remedial reading cases
11.	3.8	Testing sessions
12.	3.7	Dr. Robert Jeffrey—Speaking
12.	3.7	Dr. Otto—Programmed learning
12.	3.7	Head Start and Day Care Centers in Austin
12.	3.7	Nongraded and cooperative teaching at Casis
13.	3.6	Tape recorded presentation
13.	3.6	Dr. Thomas—Community organization
13.	3.6	Mr. Coffee—Human Opportunities Corporation in Austin
14.	3.4	"Wattsie"—Case film
14.	3.4	Title I Classes in Austin
15.	3.3	Dr. Sanchez—Interviewing Parents
16.	3.2	Television instruction demonstration
16.	3.2	Desegregation exercise—Extension Bldg.
17.	3.0	Mr. Devine—Language development
17.	3.0	Dr. Bunderson—Computer Assisted Instruction
18.	2.8	Mr. Howard—Texas Title I Programs
19.	2.6	Dr. Richard Arnold—Non-English Speaking beginners
20.	2.5	The films shown at the Federated Women's Club

Internship Descriptive Profile

To evaluate the internship experience, the students responded to an instrument containing twenty-nine items which were descriptive of various expectations the intern may have had for the internship experiences. The items dealt with such things as the relationship between the intern and his supervising administrator, the assistance to be provided by the University supervisor, and the quality of the intern's on-the-job experience.

The instrument was administered prior to the internship when the student responded in terms of his *expectations*, and again at the end of the internship when he responded in terms of what *actually* had transpired.

Pre- to post-test comparisons were made by a single classification analysis of variance. Out of twenty-nine items, only six showed a significant ($p < .05$) change and all of them were in the direction of the internship not being up to expectations.

Students' responses on items for which they differed significantly are shown in the following table. Means are on a scale from 1 (high) to 5 (low).

	Group Mean	
	Expected	Actual
The University has provided the intern with an understanding of what to expect in his internship	1.87	2.53
The intern will know the purposes of the internship before he leaves the campus	1.27	1.93
The cooperating administrator will plan in advance the work that the intern will do	2.20	3.00
The cooperating institution will use the intern's work in the normal flow of its operation	1.53	2.13
The intern will find that continued contacts with the university supervisor will prove helpful	1.20	1.67
The intern will feel that reports required by the university will not be a petty demand on his time	3.47	4.33

The results indicate that the group, while somewhat favorable on all the items shown (except the last) believed that their experience did not live up to expectations. This may be partly explainable in terms of the high expectations expressed on most of the items. It is an inescapable conclusion, however, that both the university and the school district supervisors did not quite measure up to the high expectations held for them by the interns. On the other hand, on 23 items the interns' expectations were met. The six that were not met are probably due to the same factors of lack of communication and coordination between the university and the school systems.

June 1969 Evaluation of Internship

On June 11, 1969, a meeting in Austin of students and their supervising principals was held to evaluate the internship semester. The students and supervising principals met separately for a two-hour period and then the two groups met together. Below are the comments of the supervising principals to a series of questions.

1. What changes should be made in the student's preparation prior to the internship?
   a. Cover the topic of administrative liability before assignment.
   b. Give more attention to communication with low-income parents and pupils.
2. Should the conference course in elementary school organization and administration be taken concurrently with the internship?
   a. Do not require Ed.A 382T.1 concurrently with the internship; it should be taken before or after the internship.
   b. Interns need a clearer understanding of their relations to the principal.

3. How can the role of the supervising professor be made more valuable?
   a. Make more frequent visits, at least at first, and spend a whole day in school.
4. How can the role of the supervising principal be made more effective?
   a. More thorough orientation.
   b. Have the intern visit the school prior to the onset of the internship.
   c. Have another meeting of supervising principals after the first six weeks.
5. What post-internship activities should be planned?
   a. Have students take the National Teachers Examination.
   b. Have former interns evaluate their internship.

The students gave many of the same suggestions that had been made by their supervising principals. Below are listed additional comments made by the students.

1. What changes should be made in the student's preparation prior to the internship?
   a. Have former interns visit the class.
   b. Begin with the summer session.
   c. Clear intern's status with the central office more thoroughly.
   d. Advise students on what understanding he should have with sending district: leave status, insurance, etc.
   e. Clear up legal status while on the internship.
2. No additional comments.
3. How can the role of the supervising professor be made more valuable?
   a. Schedule an extra visit in May.
   b. Let intern help set dates for visits.
   c. Have more contact and more correspondence.
   d. Read logs more thoroughly.
   e. Clear up grading standards earlier.
   f. Clarify how much deviation from "suggested" activities will be allowed.
   g. Clarify whether supervising principal should review the intern's logs.
   h. Begin log with hourly reports and later shift to critical incidents.
4. How can the role of the supervising principal be made more effective?
   a. Require him to make periodic reports on progress.
   b. More frequent (daily) planning sessions are needed.
   c. Introduce intern to faculty earlier.
   d. Allow teachers to help plan intern's activities.
   e. Supervising professor should approve school for internship.
5. What post-internship activities should be planned?
   a. Use anecdotal records of intern-principal problems to help in future intern-principal relations.

It was clear from the discussion that not all interns nor all supervising principals experienced all of the problems in the foregoing lists. It was

thought that all the comments of individuals should be listed so as to get a comprehensive view of those actually encountered by at least some individuals in the group.

Follow-Up Evaluation

In the fall of 1969 each of the students went back to a position in his respective school system. Two became elementary school principals, one became a head teacher in a small elementary school, two became curriculum writers in a Central Cities project, one became an elementary supervisor, three became assistant principals at mid-term (one in a junior high school), one became an assistant principal in a junior high school but will be a principal in an elementary school next year, one became director of a bi-lingual program, one became a second grade teacher in a "follow-through" program for children who had been in Title I programs, and two were placed in former teaching positions. There is hope that one of these will have a principalship next year. One returned to his former position as director of a Spanish program. Each school system had to effect placement in terms of its own changing organization so that not very many obtained principalships for which their program was specifically designed, but then the program was somewhat general and aimed at leadership roles in whatever capacity the individual served.

In April, 1970, a check-list was mailed to each of the 15 former students. After the check-lists were returned each student was visited in his job situation and interviewed regarding his responses to the check-list. The check-list is reproduced in full here to make the discussion easier.

FORM A

TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

September 1, 1968 through August 9, 1969

Below you will find a condensed list of topics and activities included in last year's program. Each item has a code number. You are requested to use these code numbers as you respond to Form B.

Code No.	*Topic or Activity*
1.	In-basket exercises (Dr. Bessent).
2.	Reading of library books.

3. Field trips (San Antonio, Title I and Head Start Classes, Casis library).
4. Preparation of guidelines for Title I and Head Start programs.
5. Fall semester lectures by guest speakers.
6. Fall semester lectures by Drs. Otto and Bessent.
7. The internship.
8. Elementary School Organization and Administration (The conference course with weekly papers).
9. The 1969 summer session course with Dr. Bessent.
10. The practicum in supervision (Dr. Harris).
11. The course in urban sociology (Dr. Glenn).
12. Working as a special group (the fifteen of you).
13. The various films shown in class.
14. Television instruction demonstration (Bunderson).
15. Redemial reading demonstration (Harmer).
16. Papers on "What I Have Learned."
17. The course with Dr. Hall—Organizational Behavior and Human Relations.

FORM B

YOUR CURRENT YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

Directions: The list given below is sufficiently extensive to include activities in which all fifteen of you in six different types of positions may have engaged this year. No one of you will have engaged in all of them. Hence proceed as follows:

1. Familiarize yourself thoroughly with the items in Form A.
2. Go down the list of activities in Form B. Select the ones in which you have engaged this year (skip the others). For each one in which you have engaged (a) circle the number in front of it and then (b) in the columns opposite the activity insert the code number of the topic in Form A which was very helpful or somewhat helpful to you this year in dealing with that activity. In some cases you may wish to enter several code numbers. If no topics were helpful, make no entries in the columns. In the example below Mr. X has prepared several memoranda for parents. He feels that the lecture by Dr. King was somewhat helpful but that the writing involved in class exercises, internship writing assignments, and the preparation of the Guidelines for Title I programs were particularly helpful in enabling him to write better for a lay audience. Hence he circled item Ex. in Form B and put Code Nos. 4 and 6 in the first column and Code No. 5 in the second column.

Activity	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful
Example:	4, 6	5
I. Communication areas:		
1. Giving a talk to a lay group		
2. Giving a talk to the faculty		
3. Relating to the principal		
4. Relating to central official staff		
5. Speaking more satisfactorily with individual pupils		
6. Communicating with a class of pupils		
7. Conferencing with individual teachers		
8. Writing memos to the faculty		
9. Writing articles for the newspaper		
10. Writing curriculum guides		
II. School management tasks:		
11. Organizing the clerical staff		
12. Handling activity funds		
13. Handling child accounting records		
14. Using central office supervisors		
15. Supervising the lunch program		
16. Supervising custodial services		
17. Inspecting building and grounds		
18. Requisitioning plant repairs or additions		
19. Handling transfers-in or transfers-out		
20. Developing or revising the all-school schedule		
III. Leadership roles:		
21. Serving as chairman of faculty groups		
22. Serving as chairman of lay groups		
23. Serving as a resource person		
24. Serving as a group process facilitator		
25. Serving as a consultant		
26. Serving as a sympathetic listener		
27. Serving as a change agent in the affairs of your school		
IV. Classroom related activities:		
28. Improving teaching method in various subjects		
29. Making more adequate provision for individual differences		
30. Working more effectively with disadvantaged pupils		

31. Assessing the language development of pupils .....
32. Diagnosing individual pupil learning problems .....
33. Helping pupils who manifest maladjustment problems .....
34. Planning remedial work for individuals .....
35. Using library recources more effectively .....
36. Obtaining health or welfare services for pupils .....
37. Other (please add items) .....

SOME GENERAL ITEMS

1. What problems have you encountered this year which could have been included in last year's program if we had known about them at that time?

2. What is the difference between your annual salary this year and your annual salary in 1967–68? .....

3. As seen from your present position and duties, list the three most valuable fellowship year activities.
   a.
   b.
   c.

4. Did the fellowship year give you a widening perception of:
   a. Your personal capacity? Yes..... No.....
   b. Your aspirations in the profession? Yes..... No.....
   c. Your commitment to professional service? Yes..... No.....
   d. Your concept of generalized expectations in a leadership role? Yes..... No.....
   e. Your insight into self-other relations? Yes..... No.....
   f. Your concept of rights and obligations of a professional? Yes..... No.....
   g. Your concept of authority and autonomy? Yes..... No.....
   h. Your understanding of the "ins and outs" of organizational arrangements? Yes..... No.....

5. From a broad perspective, what are the three most cherished values which you derived from the fellowship year?
   a.
   b.
   c.

6. List below your three most important criticisms of the fellowship year.
   a.
   b.
   c.

7. What would like to be doing 5 or 6 years from now? .....

Since the students had different kinds of assignment in 1969–1970, it was anticipated that different students would check different ones of the 17 program elements which had been lumped into groups representing major types of program component. The difference between program details and the check-list may be ascertained by comparing student evaluation of fall semester activities with the check-list. As was expected, students checked a different number of items as well as different items. The number of program components checked ranged from four to 39 with a median of 16. Five students checked more than 23 items. The reason the numbers are greater than 17 is the fact that an item might be checked as helpful in more than one activity.

The tabulation which follows shows the total number of times each program component was rated as "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" in their present position. Adding the "very helpful" and "somewhat helpful" does not change the rank order of the items. Note that the internship outranks all the others almost 2 to 1. Six of the program components received 34 or more choices as being very helpful. It was somewhat surprising that the internship should outrank the others by such a large margin. Since reading in the library comes second, one wonders what all the other more or less organized activities contribute to the program.

Helpful Very	Program Components	Helpful Somewhat
135	Internship	50
79	Reading in the Library	41
62	Practicum in Supervision	40
52	Fall Semester Lectures by Drs. Otto and Bessent	44
45	Summer Course	19
34	In-Basket Exercises	21
34	Working as a Special Group	22
26	Preparation of Guidelines	20
25	Course in Organizational Behavior and Human Relations	13
20	Fall Semester Lectures by Guest Speakers	19
19	The Course in Elementary School	

	Organization and Administration	31
17	The Field Trips	22
11	Remedial Reading Demonstration	17
9	The Course in the City and Urbanization	13
2	The Various Films Shown	4
1	Television Instruction Demonstration and Papers on "What I Have Learned"	3

Follow-Up Interviews

When the check-lists had been returned a follow-up interview was held with each student to clarify some responses which were not self-evident. Here are some of the replies; they are not from the same student but represent various answers given by different students to the same question. It shows how different students pick out different elements from the program components and find them helpful in subsequent work.

To question No. 3, Relating to the principal, various students had this to say. "It made you think of the responsibilities of the principal" (8); "Discussion of the in-basket items was the key to it" (1); "Material dealing with supervising principals was very helpful" (8); "You get other people's perceptions, their viewpoints" (1); "The course gave insight into different kinds of people and how to work with them" (17); and "It makes one more tolerant of women principals; it is the first time I have worked under a woman principal" (9). The numbers in parenthesis refer to program components.

To question No. 27, Serving as an agent of change in your school, the answers were even more diverse. "In stressing the concept of change; everything in my school has been 'changed' this year" (6 and 9); "The course in sociology helped one to think of understanding ethnic groups" (11); "Dr. Bessent had a design on the blackboard on agents of change" (6); "Discussion of in-basket items—what change would do in a school" (9); "Supervision is a change agent" (10); "The group work in Dr. Hall's course; have group members think" (17); "The insight into people that it gave—every person has something to offer" (17); and "All this program is new and internship helped in preparing for change" (7).

Question No. 28, Improving teaching method in various subjects, brought this array of answers. "Activity method is good in any field" (6); "Classroom observation has been used very often" (10); "A principal needs to know about teaching—Dr. Harris discussed supervision of method" (10); "You need to change teacher attitude before you can change method" (6); "Dr. Otto's lecture on curriculum design helped"

(6); "Dr. Harris' lecture on behavioral objectives was very helpful" (10); "Visiting lecturer told of teachers who have discipline problems" (9); "Supervision is a change agent" (9); "Dr. Harris talked about goals, behavioral objectives, and outcomes" (10); and "Discussion of behavioral objectives was very helpful" (10).

It is clear from the three examples that have been given that no two students are likely to take away the same things. What one thinks is important, finds interesting, remembers, and later finds useful is highly individual. It merely confirms what has been known for a long time.

What Should Have Been Included?

When asked for problems encountered this year which could have been included in last year's program if we had known about them at the time no two students gave the same response. A long list of separate items were listed. Here is the list. "Communicating effectively with patrons and community leaders concerning (1) redistricting school attendance zones to meet H.E.W. guidelines, (2) sex education in the schools, and (3) effect of integration on a previously all white neighborhood and school." "How to combat high teacher turnover in a Title I school." "Methods of scheduling principal's time to keep up with the great amount of paper work for the central office." "Sessions devoted to developing a strong PTA organization." "Developing and implementing evaluation models for analyzing instructional methods." "More specific human relations with ethnic groups in crossover integration situations." "More remedial work in a classroom setting rather than in a laboratory set-up we observed." "A lecture about drugs used by pupils." "Need more information on curriculum design." "More attention should have been paid to the middle school concept."

It is clear that each of the above points was made by the individual in terms of his new assignment. If the directors of the program could have envisioned the diverse problems which would confront these people we probably could have included all of them.

Better Salaries

Each student was asked to give the difference between his salary for 1966–1967 and his salary for 1969–70. The answers we received are interesting. One person stated that he received only the 4 percent raise as a teacher (no figure was given). The others gave dollar amounts. They were $200, $300, $800, $1,000, $1,371, $1,400, $1,531, $2,000, $2,500, $2,735, $3,335, $3,500, and $5,800. The three lower figures were from individuals

who were re-assigned to classroom teaching. The top figure was for the individual who moved from a classroom teaching position to become a director of a bilingual program in a Regional Service Center. The median is $1,531.

The Most Valuable Components

The students were asked to list the three most valuable fellowship year activities as seen from their present positions. The answers fell into 12 categories. The numbers following each item represent the number of students naming each.

1. Reading in the library—9
2. The internship—9
3. The practicum in supervision—6
4. Dr. Hall's course in human relations—5
5. The in-basket exercises—4
6. The summer course with Dr. Bessent—3
7. Working as a special group—2
8. Visiting different schools and seeing many classroom situations—2
9. Overviews of education by Drs. Otto and Bessent—1
10. Activities and assignments geared to developing more meaningful concepts about the disadvantaged—1
11. Preparing guidelines and measuring instruments—1
12. All courses—1

Widening Perceptions

All of our students were mature people and, with the exception of one, had completed Master's degrees several years ago. It is no wonder, then, that a whole year of advanced study enhanced their perceptions of themselves. All 15 said "yes" to the eight questions we asked them. If the reader will refer to the check-list, these answers were in response to the query "Did the fellowship year give you a widening perception of:"

Most Cherished Values

The fact that each student takes from an activity in terms of his own experience background is further demonstrated by the answers the students gave to the question, "From a broad perspective, what are the three most cherished values you derived from the fellowship year?" Only five of the 23 rubrics were given by more than one student.

1. The group experience with different ethnic representatives from all over the state—9

2. An opportunity to study at The University of Texas with top quality professors and resource persons—2
3. Reading in the library to keep up with current change—2
4. The development of self-confidence—2
5. The broadening of my capabilities—2
6. I have a much greater understanding of research and a better understanding of why professors don't always have pat answers.
7. The year gave me a much better understanding of state government and the role of the University.
8. Personal encouragement to pursue further graduate work.
9. A year of study with compensation which eliminated the necessity to work.
10. Educators need to work together for the purpose of helping children.
11. It gave me the opportunity for self-examination.
12. Ideas gleaned from reading and lectures concerning the need for compensatory education.
13. Familiarity with the growth of Federal programs.
14. The newer concepts of management.
15. The internship gave practical application to theories.
16. A broader view of administrative problems.
17. A better understanding of people.
18. A broader, more sympathetic understanding of the problems of children from deprived areas.
19. An appreciation of the dedicated efforts most teachers expend with these children.
20. A greater sensitivity to other people's feelings.
21. A greater insight into the needs of disadvantaged children and ways to fulfill these needs.
22. I feel that I am now prepared to be a principal.
23. One's values cannot be thrust upon another; other's values are not good, bad, or non-existent—just different.

Complaints

The students were asked to list the three most important criticisms they had of the fellowship year. Five students did not list any and five criticisms were given by more than one. The criticisms are in terms of individual needs as were the most cherished values.

1. Individual needs for certification requirements were not considered early enough in the program—4
2. Needed more communication between the University of the cooperating school system—4
3. The red tape aspects of gaining admission to the graduate school—3
4. The non-commitment of job placement by local school systems upon completion of the program—3

5. The fellowship stipends were too low for the summer session—2
6. Lack of selectivity in choosing the cooperating schools and principals.
7. Lack of clear understanding whether the "suggested internship activities" or the wishes of supervising principals were to be the major tasks of the interns.
8. No joint conferences between intern, supervising principal, and University supervisor.
9. Preparation of guidelines for Head Start and Title I have been of little value.
10. During the internship no provision was made to visit other elementary schools.
11. Inadequate information about the program beforehand.
12. Needed more contact with program instructor.
13. Too much like a crash program.
14. Some parts of the program were too superficial.
15. Not enough resource persons were used who actually dealt with these problems.
16. If the fellowship year is designed to qualify as supervisors, then more credit hours should be earned in supervision.
17. Needed more informal group activities.

Perhaps it is permissible to come to the defense of the University regarding some of the complaints. The University had to commit itself to the Office of Education far in advance to a program which would "prepare leaders for urban schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods" and this meant that the program had to be planned in advance of any student enrollment and had to be sufficiently structured so the office of Education could see what was proposed. Hence our program was predetermined in broad outline and permitted flexibility only within the mandated portions. It is only in the latter category that individual needs could be recognized.

Three members of the Department of Educational Administration supervised the interns, the two authors and one other. In nearly every internship supervisory visit we contacted someone in the central office to keep the central office informed. We did not always see the superintendent. We did everything we could to keep the channels of communication open. Since these were large school systems we felt that we could not visit all schools to select the one most appropriate for the internship. Perhaps we should have made the effort. The students were selected by local school officials from among those whom they had already identified as persons with leadership potential and as individuals who would be appointed to leadership positions as soon as vacancies occurred. The fact that twelve now have such appointments attests to the fact that school systems did live up to their

agreement. The University cannot dictate appointments in local school districts.

Dreams for the Future

What would you like to be doing five or six years from now? This question caused each one to dream of the future and what his plans were for the years to come. Seven of them said they would like to be a principal or supervisor helping children in disadvantaged areas. Five hoped to continue their graduate work toward a doctorate and be teaching teachers. One wanted to continue as a teacher. One said she would like to start a private school serving the "culturally different." One voiced the ambition to write texts for the Mexican-American and other disadvantaged pupils.

Summary

The internship appeared repeatedly as very helpful; it outranked all the other program components and in the three most valuable fellowship activities. Does this mean that the internship is of great value as a supplement to other activities? Would the internship have been so valuable if not preceded by a semester on campus? Would it have been as valuable if it had preceded a semester on campus? We do not know.

A number of suggestions were made for improving the internship. Most of them were within the realm of possibility. The University has other programs which involve an internship and these suggestions can be incorporated in the regular program.

It is worthy to note that 21 out of 44 fellowships activities were rated 4.0 and above, with many of them getting a rating above 4.5. A 5.0 is the maximum any activity could get. This was a rating at the end of the semester in which they appeared. They did not rank as high when the appraisal was made a year later. Does this mean that the individual items in the fall on campus sort of merge into a total picture and the individuality of them is lost?

The block scheduling undoubtedly paid greater dividends than was anticipated. Nearly everybody commented at one point or another about the benefits derived from having three ethnic groups have the opportunity to work together as a group. We had Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos in the group. Many had not worked intimately with members from a different ethnic group. The group work gave them an opportunity to put aside old prejudices and to build a new respect for the other fellow regardless of ethnic background. Every one of them said they would join a fellow-

ship year again if the opportunity arose. This is perhaps the best testimony we could expect.

A word should be said about Federal program. In the first place we had to do all our recruiting between February 1 and May 1. This meant that publicity materials had to be prepared, the school system had to be notified, the field visits had to be scheduled and made, the school system had to have time to solicit applicants, and then those selected had to be processed. No wonder the applicants had problems of inadequate information!

We learned many things that would be helpful if we could have had at least one more year, i.e., another similar program another year; but that was not to be. It seems to us that Federal programs could be much more effective if the same institution could be assured of a grant for two or three continuous years to take advantage of what is learned one year to improve the program in subsequent years.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROGRAM IN RETROSPECT

Since the chapters are short and each one was summarized, there appears to be no need for another summary. We can use the available space to take a broad look at the enterprise.

We all felt good about the program, the students as well as the instructors. Everyone of the students said a year later that he or she would join up again if another opportunity should present itself. This seemed to us to be the best testimony we could get as to the value of the program to them. A year later (by May, 1970) all but one had received some type of leadership position. Some had become principals, some assistant principals in large schools, one had become a supervisor, some had become curriculum writers, and some had been given important jobs as directors of programs for the disadvantaged in Regional Service Centers.

We did not change affective development except for attitudes and concepts relating to disadvantaged children. Does this mean that if you want to change feelings and concepts you must take a more direct approach than was done in our program or were our students too mature and thus had their attitudes well established? The reader will recall that their scores were well above average at the start.

Cognative learning seems to be attained while engaged in full-time study on campus and not during the internship. Is this because the internship stressed "on the job tasks"? The conference course in Elementary School Organization and Administration was taken concurrently with the internship on the assumption that it offered excellent avenue for bridging theory and practice. There was plenty of opportunity for cognative learning in this course but we have no evidence that it took place. Maybe our instruments for assessing cognative development were too inadequate to measure that which took place.

The internship remains as the most puzzling part of the whole. From Chapter 1 the reader will recall that the interns rated 78.8 percent of their activities for which they had "full" responsibility or an "assisting" role. They also reported that 87.1 percent of their activities had "great" or "some" learning value. In the follow-up evaluation a year later the internship was rated three times as frequently as any other program component as being very helpful. In January the students gave a rating of 4.0 or better (5 was the maximum) to 21 out of 45 program components yet in the

evaluation a year later no one of the program components received more than 79 "very helpful" mentions whereas the internship received 135 such ratings. In spite of all of this we have no cognative development taking place during the internship. Also it should be remembered that in 23 of 29 categories the internship met their expectations.

Perhaps the time has come when we should develop a whole new set of evaluation instruments for appraising innovations in administrator preparation. We used mostly those that were available from other projects. These may not measure what is being attempted in the newer programs in administration.

APPENDIX

A Vocabulary Test of Important Concepts in Education

These are true-false items. If you think the statement is true, circle the (T); if you think the statement is false, circle the (F).

T F 1. In the educational literature the phrase "disadvantaged children" refers to children who have been reared in homes which provided inadequate food, clothing or shelter.

T F 2. The "whole child" point of view as it exists among educators calls for a broad, unfocused educational program that recognizes no priorities and tolerates no omissions.

T F 3. The typical nursery school program provides pupils about the same experiences and learning opportunities as the typical disadvantaged home.

T F 4. All children from disadvantaged homes have "cultural deprivation."

T F 5. Academic aptitude is a combination of native and acquired abilities that is needed for school work.

T F 6. Scores from the typical general intelligence test are commonly viewed as some kind of an "index of brightness."

T F 7. An intelligence quotient is obtained by dividing mental age by chronological age (multiplied by 100).

T F 8. A "grade equivalent" is the grade level for which a given score is the real or estimated average.

T F 9. The child development theorists place much importance upon the "natural unfolding" of each child's growth pattern and believing that "forcing growth" is unprofitable.

T F 10. The Bereiter and Englemann program for disadvantaged preschoolers is a "pressure cooker" approach in which "culturally disadvantaged" pupils must learn more in less time in order to catch up.

T F 11. A "talking typewriter" has been used to teach three and four year old children to read, write and compare poetry.

T F 12. A genuine Montessori program for preschool pupils provides relaxed, diversified activities similar to most nursery school and kindergarten programs with which most of us are familiar.

T F 13. Overachievement is a technically nonexistent phenomenon.

T F 14. An individual's self-concept is a syndrome of attitudes and feelings that accompany his awareness of himself as a person together with what he believes himself to be.

T F 15. The "ecology of slum areas" refers to the ethnic groups which live in the area.

T F 16. The term "social classes" refers to the classification of people into categories according to social-economic-educational factors without reference to ethnic factors.

T F 17. "Social classes" exist within Negro, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican groups as well as among Anglos.

T F 18. There is much evidence that a caste system prevails in the United States.

T F 19. The term "compensatory education" is used to identify programs of special or extra services intended to compensate for a complex of social, economic and educational handicaps suffered by children.

T F 20. A special summertime enrichment program for children with I.Q.'s above 130 could be classified as "compensatory education."

T F 21. The standard Metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Census Bureau) is a city of 50,000 or more in population.

T F 22. Metropolitanism refers to the tendency of more and more people moving to, living in, and engaging in occupational pursuits in large population centers.

T F 23. Metropolitanism is characterized by an increasing deterioration of *per capita* income, school support, school programs and other governmental services in the "inner city."

T F 24. In northern and western states 90 percent of Negroes live in cities and make up the core of the "inner city" population.

T F 25. The typical standard metropolitan statistical area contains more than twenty school districts.

T F 26. The Economic Opportunity Act passed by Congress in 1965 provided for the strengthening of public school libraries.

T F 27. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by Congress in 1965 provided for matching funds to build needed classrooms.

T F 28. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided special program funds earmarked for strengthening certain subject offerings in public schools.

T F 29. The concept of "social class" is a statistical one.

T F 30. A method frequently used to measure social status is to use an index of socio-economic characteristics.

T F 31. "Culture shock" is a term used to describe the experience some middle class teachers have when they get assigned to a school attended largely by lower class pupils but does not apply in other teacher re-assignments.

T F 32. Negroes and whites in the U.S. are castes or at least caste-like groups.

T F 33. The test of intermarriage is the best way to determine whether a caste difference exists between two groups.

T F 34. Social mobility means movement from one caste to another.

T F 35. Poverty stricken people move to the big cities because they are better off there.

T F 36. "Subsistence farmers" try to produce all the food and other material they need for a bare subsistence without selling or buying much.
T F 37. Urban renewal had its official start with the Federal Housing Act of 1949.
T F 38. Megalopolis is a synonym for Metropolitanism.
T F 39. "Effective schools" is the name used in New York City for a group of inner-city schools that have been given special services not available to other schools.
T F 40. One's "ability" is inherited and is not influenced by environmental factors.
T F 41. The term "educational park" refers to a school located in a park to permit vast natural resources readily available to enrich the curriculum.
T F 42. The term "organization" refers to an organized structure, a systematic arrangement of parts for a specific purpose.
T F 43. It is absurd to talk about the internal organization of a school.
T F 44. Internal consistency is a desirable goal in the organization of a school.
T F 45. Diagramatically a subjects-taught-in-isolation curriculum looks much like a correlated curriculum.
T F 46. The term "organization for instruction" refers to the way teachers organize the instructional activities in each subject.
T F 47. A so-called "platoon school" may also be called a semi-departmentalized school.
T F 48. Specialization in teaching is antithetical to the self-contained classroom.
T F 49. Decision-making is usually defined as the point in time at which a choice is made from among several alternative courses of action.
T F 50. Technically a nongraded school is a school in which pupils with wide ranges in achievement are placed in the same grade.
T F 51. The Dual Progress Plan is a combination of a graded and a nongraded organization.
T F 52. Multiple-age grouping has many of the earmarks of vertical grouping.
T F 53. The term "ability grouping" means that children are sectionized on the basis of ability, that is, ability to learn.
T F 54. The objective of achievement grouping is the formation of classes whose pupils have past records of comparable attainment.
T F 55. The term "sociometry" means companion measurement.
T F 56. Neglectees are children who receive no choice in a sociometric test.
T F 57. Class size and pupil-teacher ratio are terms which can be used interchangeably without confusion of meaning.
T F 58. The vertical-bureaucratic pattern of team teaching provides differential salaries for members at different ranks in the hierarchy.

T F 59. The autonomy-equality pattern of teacher relationships is now the prevailing arrangement in elementary schools.

T F 60. The horizontal-collegial organization of teaching teams provides extra pay for teachers who agree to join a team.

T F 61. "Numerical staffing adequacy" is a better predictor of school quality than average class size.

T F 62. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 reversed the previous U.S. Supreme Court decision supporting the "separate but equal" doctrine for schools for Negro and white pupils.

T F 63. The "grade standards" theory of pupil progress is still accepted in most school systems but is violated in practice in those same school systems.

T F 64. In practice it is difficult to discern any difference between libraries organized as "teaching centers" and those organized as a "service center."

T F 65. School enrollment is the best basis for assigning work loads to visiting teachers or school social workers.

T F 66. Everyone who occupies a position in a school has certain "role expectations" attached to that position.

T F 67. The "theory of social reference," sometimes called "the looking glass theory," implies that we see ourselves as we perceive that others want us to be.

T F 68. The faculty of a school represents an "alter group" for the principal.

T F 69. A community "power figure" or "power holder" does not have the authority to put his desires into action.

T F 70. A school board has authority but no power.

T F 71. Most decisions made by principals and teachers are "organizational decisions."

T F 72. Most decisions made by principals are "intermediary decisions."

T F 73. If the school is viewed as a social system perfect congruence between the ideographic and nomothetic dimensions is a desirable goal.

T F 74. A job description in a handbook is one way of defining role expectations.

T F 75. The "organizational climate" of a school may be thought of as the psychological climate or the personality of a school.

T F 76. In the professional literature the phrase "chain of command" refers to the number of subordinates who report directly to the top executive.

T F 77. The phrase "span of control" refers to the number of hierarchial levels through which a person must go to reach the top executive.

T F 78. Few formal organizations, like schools, can succeed unless accompanied by informal organization procedures.

T F 79. The terms "principal" and "principalship" identify significantly different concepts.

T F 80. The term "status" connotes the idea of differential ranking among persons holding various positions in an organization.
H F 81. The ghettos of the inner city are a direct result of inter-city population migration.
T F 82. The proportion of contemporary change that is planned or that issues from deliberate innovation is about the same as in former times.
T F 83. Organizational lag is a discrepancy in the rate of implementing administrative changes and technical changes. The latter usually lag behind the former.
T F 84. The Moynihan Report concluded that disintegration of the Negro family unit is a root cause of Negro deprivation in American cities.
T F 85. Neighborhood school enrollment zones tend to create racially segregated and socially stratified schools.
T F 86. Ideas tried out in pilot projects may have more success than the same ideas implemented in the permanent structures of the organization.
T F 87. A school with an "open" rather than a "closed" organizational climate is characterized by a faculty with a high level of esprit and a principal with a high level of thrust.
T F 88. The idea of a "culture of poverty" suggest that poor people of all races are alike in more ways than they are different.
T F 89. Children from depressed racial minorities are likely to have self-rejecting attitudes, but these have little effect on school achievement.
T F 90. An individual will nearly always accept a change if he sees that a new practice is more effective than the old one.
T F 91. There is evidence that substandard expectations held by teacher for disadvantaged children contribute to their low academic performance.
T F 92. Alienation from society is reflected in alienation from school.
T F 93. The bureaucratic structure of school organizations promotes the development of new programs when old ones have been demonstrated to be unsatisfactory.
T F 94. Resistance to change in schools may stem from teachers' and principals' concern for pupil control.
T F 95. A tolerance for uncertainty is essential in the change process.
T F 96. Studies of instructional innovation suggest that the principal can impede innovation but cannot facilitate innovation.
T F 97. School districts have few organizational mechanisms to bring about change.
T F 98. The idea of change itself is repugnant to some people.
T F 99. Group norms offer resistance to change in school programs.
T F 100. Centralization impedes organizational adaptation in school districts.