DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 484 80 EA 006 330

AUTHOR	Wilsey, Carl E.; Schroeder, Glenn B.
TITLE	Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability.
INSTITUTION	Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver. Cooperative Accountability Project.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	57p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Cooperative Accountability Project, Colorado Department of Education, 1362 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203 (Single copy-Colorado Requesters) all others: SEAR, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 126 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53702
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; Boards of Education; Budgeting; *Citizen Role; *Educational Accountability; *Government Role; Planning; Programing; State Departments of Education; Student Role; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V; Planning Programming Budgeting Systems; PPBS

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to help professionals and laymen who have responsibility for, or a vital interest in, improving the accountability of the public schools to better understand the participants and their roles in the operation of accountability programs. The report is designed to stimulate analysis and discussion of roles as they apply to particular State and local education agency situations. The authors describe in some detail one approach to improved accountability in education, that of the Planning-Programing-Budgeting System (PPBS). Following the description of a model accountability program, the authors identify the roles that seem to be most appropriate, attempt to highlight areas of conflict or disagreement, and suggest ways in which conflicts could be resolved in the future. A selected bibliography is included. (Author)

PROJECT OPERATIONS BOARD

CAP is guided by a Project Operations Board consisting of the chief state school officers of the cooperating states or their designees.

COLORADO Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner*; and Edwin E. Steinbrecher, Assistant Commissioner, Department of Education

FLORIDA Floyd T. Christian, Commissioner; and Crane Walker, Administrator, Educational Accountability, Department of Education

MARYLAND James A. Sensenbaugh, State Superintendent; and Francis X. McIntyre, State Coordinator for Accountability, Department of Education

MICHIGAN John W. Porter, Superintendent of Public Instruction; and C. Philip Kearney, Associate Superintendent, Department of Education

MINNESOTA Howard B. Casmey, Commissioner; and John W. Adams, Director, State Educational Assessment, Department of Education

PENNSYLVANIA John C. Pittenger, Secretary; and Thomas E. Kendig, Chief, Division of Educational Quality Assessment, Department of Education

WISCONSIN Barbara S. Thompson, State Superintendent; and Archie A. Buchmiller, Assistant State Superintendent, Department of Public Instruction.

*Calvin M. Frazier, Chairman, CAP Project Operations Board

The Project Operations Board meets quarterly for Project development

Project Staff
Arthur R. Olson, Director

U.S. Office of Education
Dexter A. Magers, CAP Coordinator

CAP is a seven-state, three-year project initiated in April, 1972, and financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505, as amended) with Colorado as the administering state.

Cooperating states are: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

by

Carl E. Wilsey
Professor of Education
University of Northern Colorado

and

Glenn B. Schroeder
Associate Professor of Education
University of Northern Colorado

Research Assistants

Hugh Cowan
Ray Kilmer
David Krauser

Cooperative Accountability Project
Denver, Colorado
1974

Program Administrators

Alpheus White
Dexter A. Magers
U.S. Office of Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
Division of State Assistance

Single copies for Colorado requestors may be obtained from:

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT
Arthur R. Olson, Director
Colorado Department of Education
1362 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone (303) 892-2133

All other requests should be referred to:

STATE EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPOSITORY (SEAR)
Miss Phyllis Hawthorne, Research Analyst
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
Phone (608) 266-1344

FOREWORD

The introduction of the educational accountability process within the past decade has resulted largely from public concern with the conditions and costs of public education. While its basic objectives unquestionably are commendable, accountability has not been without its impediments in implementation. Definition of the term has posed difficulties; interpretation by educators has varied widely; legislation by the states requiring accountability has taken many forms. The "who," "what," and "how" of accountability have required clarification so the process may achieve its full potential.

This essential clarification has been the objective of Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) efforts since the inception of the Project in the spring of 1972. In-depth studies by professional educators in the seven cooperating CAP states have sought to explore existing accountability procedures and to project future directions for accountability.

In *Roles of the Participants in Educational Accountability*, an experienced research team at the University of Northern Colorado has approached the complex questions related to accountability participants, their various tasks and responsibilities. Reviews of the initial text by other key experts have strengthened the commentary. No claim is made that the document provides absolute solutions to all problems related to accountability roles. Rather it is designed to stimulate analysis and discussion of roles as they apply to particular SEA and LEA situations. Substantial coverage of roles on the local school district level will be of special interest to many readers.

While the authors have chosen the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) as their primary model for the accountability process, it should be noted that accountability programs may well be eclectic, drawing on the best of several methodologies and arriving at approaches which best fit the circumstances of a given educational setting.

This study will provide valuable stimulus and direction for initiating local definition of accountability roles. And the accountability movement will become more precise as roles are analyzed and clarified. In turn, there is every possibility that seeking and finding answers to questions concerning accountability roles may have long-range implications for educational roles in general.

Arthur R. Olson, Director
Cooperative Accountability Project

PREFACE

The report which follows was prepared by members of the professional staff of the Educational Planning Service of the University of Northern Colorado under a contract with the Cooperative Accountability Project and the Colorado Department of Education.

The Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) is a seven-state, three-year project initiated in April, 1972, and financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505), with Colorado as the administering state.

The overriding purpose of CAP has been to develop a better understanding of and clearer insight into the process of accountability in education, through the sponsorship of a series of studies or reports in five crucial areas, including the identification of the roles to be played in the accountability process by the various participants.

This report is the end result of an extensive review and analysis of the literature on educational accountability which was undertaken in an effort to arrive at a clearer understanding of roles in the accountability process.

The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to the school districts, public agencies, and individuals who contributed to the preparation of this report by making materials on accountability available for review.

Special thanks are directed to Dr. Arthur R. Olson and the staff of the Colorado Department of Education for their support and assistance and to those professional educators and laymen who were asked to make suggestions concerning the manuscript and the ideas expressed herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades observers of the educational scene have witnessed a decided increase in criticism leveled at the public schools by various segments of American society. While criticism of the public schools is not a new phenomenon in our culture, the severity, the depth, and the breadth of the criticism *are* new in our times. Perhaps, too, educators are beginning to hear and respond to this criticism for the first time.

Criticism of Public Education

Until the middle 1950s criticism of the public schools was generally concentrated on a relatively few areas. Educators were told by their critics that "Johnny couldn't read," or that the science and mathematics programs were inadequate for the times. We have progressed today, however, to the point where the whole system of public education is being questioned by some segments of society.

The schools are being indicted by their critics for a number of alleged offenses:

- Spiraling costs with little or no evidence that more dollars buy better education
- Lack of clear direction, or lack of clarity in goals and objectives
- Inefficiency in the operation of the schools
- A paucity of data on how well the schools are doing what they profess to do

Some critics have espoused the view that salvation rests only in devising some new way or ways by which the schools can be made more accountable for results. No piecemeal solutions will suffice, and the schools must, once and for all, be "held accountable" to the people who pay the taxes and otherwise support the schools.

For our purposes here "accountability" is defined as the condition of the public schools being answerable or liable to the citizenry in general for the efficient use of resources in achieving the goals which have been established by the people, or their official representatives, for the public schools.

The Accountability Movement

The national concern over the purposes and effectiveness of public education is the driving force behind the accountability movement in education as it exists in our country in the mid-1970s. This concern is one which is likely to be with us for some years to come, and educators are challenged to turn what may appear to some to be a destructive force into a positive force for improving educational opportunities for all students.

While some educators have hailed the accountability movement as the greatest thing to come upon the scene in recent decades, others are disclaiming it as simply another fad that will only interfere with the serious business of education. Still others express the fear that nonprofessionals such as private contractors or other laymen will become too involved in those areas or activities which are believed to be the prerogatives of the members of the profession, with a resultant loss of authority, freedom, and effectiveness for the professionals.

Nor have all school board members welcomed the push for greater accountability with open arms. Some boards fear the loss of authority to local citizen committees, while others see the accountability movement as an attempt by the state or federal government to dictate local school policy.

The method and extent to which the public schools are attempting to respond to this growing public pressure for increased accountability vary greatly from district to district and from state to state. At last count some 27 states had enacted accountability legislation,[1] and it has been predicted by some authorities that approximately 45 states will pass some kind of legislation dealing with educational accountability by 1976.

State-adopted programs vary in complexity from relatively simple student achievement testing programs to more complex accountability programs such as that embodied in the Colorado Educational Accountability Act of 1971. Locally adopted programs are equally as diverse.

---

[1] Phyllis Hawthorne, *Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education*, Revised (Madison, Wisconsin: State Educational Accountability Repository, Cooperative Accountability Project, August, 1973), p. i.

Difficulties in Improving Accountability

As school districts in increasing numbers have begun to wrestle with the implementation of new approaches to accountability, many have experienced a good deal of frustration and difficulty. Due to a lack of hard data concerning operational accountability programs in education, one can only speculate as to the basic reasons for these difficulties. Is it due to a lack of clear *definition* of "accountability?" Is it due to a lack of agreement over the *means* to achieve greater accountability? Or is it due to a general lack of agreement over who the *participants* in the process should be and their respective *roles*?

On the basis of what little evidence exists, it would appear that some of the confusion which presently surrounds accountability in education, as well as the difficulty being experienced by many states and local school districts in implementing some improved approach to accountability, arises from disagreement or confusion over the respective *roles* of the participants in the process of achieving accountability. Understanding of and agreement on roles is essential to the achievement of greater accountability in public education, and it is this issue which constitutes the central theme for the discussion which follows.

Purpose of This Paper

If one is willing to accept the premise that lack of understanding and agreement on roles is one of the basic factors underlying the present state of confusion with regard to improving the accountability of the public schools, then any attempt to help clarify role definitions must be considered a worthy endeavor.

Our purpose here is to help those professionals and laymen who have responsibility for, or a vital interest in, improving the accountability of the public schools to better understand the participants and their roles in the operation of accountability programs.

In the chapters that follow the authors will describe in some detail one approach to improved accountability in education. A discussion of the participants and their roles can take on real meaning only if the structure or framework within which those roles exist is fully understood. Thus the first task will be to describe that framework.

Following the description of a model accountability program, we will turn our attention to the participants and their roles. We will identify the roles that seem to the authors to be most appropriate, based on a review of the literature as well as their own experience with accountability programs. We will attempt to highlight areas of conflict or disagreement, and we will suggest ways in which conflicts might be resolved in the years ahead.

We do not expect all of our readers to agree with the roles which we have identified for the participants in accountability programs. Indeed, such agreement would be unlikely under the decentralized system of public education which exists in our country today and in light of the continuing power struggle between school boards, teachers' associations and unions. We do attempt, however, to stimulate the thinking of our readers, to identify some of the major issues involved, and to encourage the resolution of these issues in a rational manner.

It is our hope that administrators, teachers, school board members, teachers' organizations, citizens' committee members, state department of education staff members, and legislators will benefit from the discussion that follows, to the end that the accountability of the public schools will, ultimately, be enhanced.

CHAPTER II

ACCOUNTABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS

In Chapter I we defined "accountability" as the condition of the public schools being answerable or liable to the citizenry in general for the efficient use of resources in achieving the goals which have been established by the people, or by their official representatives, for the public schools.

Basic Assumptions

Inherent in that definition are a number of assumptions, including the following:

- Goals and objectives can be identified and agreed upon by the people or their representatives
- The schools can, in fact, achieve the goals and objectives for which they are held accountable
- Progress toward these goals and objectives can, in some acceptable manner, be measured
- Efficiency in the educational process can be measured
- The relative impact or influence of each participant in the educational process on the achievement of goals and objectives can be measured in some acceptable manner
- Recognition can be given in some tangible form to the participants in the process according to measures of their efficiency in achieving goals and objectives

So far in our experience with accountability in education, only the first of these assumptions seems to be a valid one. The second and third are open to some question, and the last three are almost completely untested.

It is this lack of verification of the basic assumptions underlying the accountability concept that seems to trouble so many school people, and laymen as well. It may also contribute to the differing philosophies concerning accountability which appear in practice and in the literature.

Philosophy

The discussions of accountability which are found in the literature typically revolve around two basic ideas—the *philosophy* and the *process* of being accountable. We will deal first with philosophy before turning our attention to the process of accountability, recognizing that the two are closely interrelated and cannot be analyzed in isolation from each other.

According to Nyquist,[1] one's philosophy of (or way of thinking about) accountability demands that one accept responsibility for his performance—or lack of it. Ideally, there is a continuous willingness to measure and evaluate performance, to explain and interpret the results with all candor, to divulge the results to the publics or constituencies that need to know them, and to be personally and organizationally responsible for the weaknesses as well as the strengths revealed.

In the view of the Colorado Department of Education, one's philosophy requires a commitment to the accountability process. This commitment is embedded in the idea that " . . . the drive toward accountability is to improve educational performance through measuring that performance and reporting it to the local community in understandable terms."[2]

This philosophical commitment to accountability must exist at the personal as well as the organizational or system level if accountability is to be achieved. Unfortunately, the degree of commitment may vary significantly from individual to individual within the organization. Many of the problems facing board members and administrators who are striving to improve the accountability of their school districts may, in fact, result from the philosophical differences *among* staff members, as well as *between* the staff and the administration (including the school board).

Still another problem arises when board members and administrators impose upon their teaching staffs new procedures for ensuring greater accountability, but are unwilling to grant teachers a sufficient degree of responsibility and authority so that they can reasonably be held accountable for their performance.

The National Education Association highlighted this inconsistency in stating that " . . . the Association believes that educators can be

---

[1] Ewald B. Nyquist, "Accountability in Elementary and Secondary Education" (Speech before the Education Commission of the States, Albany, New York, July 9, 1970).

[2] Arthur R. Olson, "Accountability III" (News release issued by the Colorado Department of Education, Assessment and Evaluation Unit, Denver, February 10, 1972), p. 2.

accountable only to the degree that they share responsibility in educational decision making and to the degree that others who share this responsibility—legislators, other government officials, school boards, parents, students and taxpayers—are also held accountable."[3]

Those outside the educational system hold differing philosophical views on accountability as well, and this may further complicate the achievement of greater accountability. Parent and student groups that are demanding a greater voice in shaping the direction and form of public education often hold quite different views from educators on "who" should be held accountable for "what" and "how."

If greater accountability is to be achieved, some measure of common agreement on philosophy must be achieved among the individuals and groups involved. If a reasonable amount of agreement is lacking, the implementation of any new accountability process, program, or system will be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Basic differences in philosophy also result in basic differences in role definitions. Obviously, agreement on, or clarification of, role definitions must be preceded by some measure of agreement on philosophy.

Just how such *philosophical* agreement can be achieved among all the groups and individuals involved in public education is, of course, a vital question. It is not likely that agreement on philosophy (as opposed to process) can be achieved by legislation or collective bargaining. It is more likely that philosophical agreement will grow out of practical experience with accountability programs in the years ahead, as well as from improved staff development and public information programs.

Process

The other major dimension of a definition of accountability has to do with the *process* by which accountability is to be achieved. Understandably, one's philosophy will influence one's choice of process to achieve accountability, and it is not surprising that proposals for achieving accountability in the schools are as diverse and varied as the philosophies, interests, and biases of the critics of education.

While the proponents of accountability have put forth a variety of plans or proposals for achieving greater accountability, there are some plans which seem to have attracted more supporters than others. The most widely discussed procedures for achieving greater accountability include performance contracting, local or state-wide testing programs, National Assessment, Management by Objectives, state-mandated personnel evaluation programs, program auditing and the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS).

One could analyze roles within the context of any one of these approaches to accountability. However, all of these approaches, with the exception of one, are relatively limited in both scope and application and do not provide us with a sufficiently complex model for analyzing in depth the roles of all those individuals and groups that might legitimately be involved in achieving greater accountability.

Of all the approaches mentioned above, the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System is the most comprehensive and all-encompassing. If fully implemented throughout a school system, it involves board members, administrators, teachers, noncertificated personnel, students, parents, lay advisory committee members, and the public generally.

This is not to say that PPBS is the only or the best approach to accountability in education, or that this is the approach that is most likely to emerge as common practice across the United States in the years ahead. However, PPBS does represent a comprehensive program for achieving accountability, it has been adopted by a number of school districts across the country, and it provides us with the laboratory we seek for our analysis. For these reasons we will be analyzing the roles of the participants in accountability within the context of PPBS in the chapters that follow.

PPBS As An Accountability Program

The accountability process known as PPBS is defined differently by various writers in the fields of business, public administration, and school administration. We define it here as an internalized accountability program in which the processes of planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluation are integrated for the purposes of improving decision making and increasing the efficiency of the organization in achieving its stated goals.

PPBS is a highly complex management process in which all, or nearly all, of the members of an organization can be involved

[3]National Education Association, *Accountability* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972), p. 2.

in setting goals and objectives and in seeking better and more efficient ways of achieving those goals and objectives. It includes careful measurement of the achievement of objectives and makes use of such tools as cost/effectiveness analysis and program budgeting. It can also involve parents and other citizens in significant ways.

It is worth noting here that there is a great deal of confusion concerning the terms PPBS and program budgeting. PPBS is a comprehensive management process, while program budgeting is a more limited concept which involves a change from the traditional school accounting practice of aggregating costs by function (i.e., administration, instruction, maintenance, etc.) to aggregating costs by identified program (i.e., English, physical education, transportation, etc.). Program accounting is a useful tool in budgeting and cost/effectiveness analysis, but it is only a *part* of PPBS.

One of the better discussions of PPBS as applied to education, in which this distinction is highlighted, is to be found in *Administrative Technology and the School Executive*, a publication of the American Association of School Administrators:

> There are various conceptions of PPBS. To some it is a fiscal tool, whereas others view it in broader terms and equate it with systems analysis. The word "budgeting" within PPBS may suggest that this new technology is little more than a fiscal device, that is, one of the instruments essential for effective financial administration. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that more than budgeting is involved. No PPBS can be designed, implemented, and utilized effectively by the school fiscal officer acting alone! PPBS is a sophisticated approach requiring the efforts and insights of all administrative echelons in a school system. The emphasis should be on the last word, "system," to suggest that the three processes that precede it are interrelated. The acronym PPBS is incomplete, as will be shown later, and does not imply processes that follow budgeting.
>
> There are four major dimensions to PPBS. It can be perceived in terms of structure, namely, as a particular kind of classification for budget items, exhibit arrangements, or report formats. The programmatic or output-oriented categorization of school budgetary accounts is part of the structural dimension of PPBS.
>
> The second important aspect is generation and analysis of alternative courses of action. The strategy behind arranging fiscal data in a program format is to facilitate the analyzing of alternative courses of action available to an organization pursuing varied objectives. The entire store of quantitative and nonquantitative analytical tools consistent with systems becomes part of PPBS as well. The often overlooked analysis dimension is most crucial. There can be no PPBS unless some staff members possess analytic capabilities. In other words, a program format for budgetary accounts is not an end in itself. The same can be said for the analysis, however sophisticated it may be.
>
> Facilitation of prudent decision making is the third and perhaps most important dimension. Structure and analysis are related to decision-making activity. PPBS is a decision technology—a way to present organized information, a definition of alternative courses of action, and an analysis of choices to select the most prudent. It does not lessen the pain or difficulty of making judgments. PPBS can contribute best to those decisions which focus on allocation of resources among competing purposes. This suggests that the technology is better labeled a "resource allocation decision system" (RADS) than the now popular PPBS. This new terminology is based on purpose or output rather than on processes or procedures involved. A label related to the end product is more consistent with systems thinking than one which is based on some of the processes involved (e.g., the processes of planning, programming, and budgeting). Another reason why the term "PPBS" is less desirable than "RADS" is that it can create confusion due to an incomplete identification of functions performed in the total process. To illustrate, the important processes of analysis and evaluation are not included in the PPBS acronym.
>
> The fourth dimension is time. Complex goals are not likely to be achieved within a single year. The multi-year planning and programming activity is an important characteristic of PPBS.[4]

In the chapter that follows we will identify in greater detail the functional components of an accountability program. We have taken as our model the Colorado Educational Accountability Act of 1971, which embodies within it the basic elements of a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System as applied to the school setting.

[4]Stephen J. Knezevich, ed., *Administrative Technology and the School Executive* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969), p. 69-70.

The choice of one state's approach to accountability as the setting in which to examine the participants and their roles should not limit the transferability of the concepts or ideas developed here, since the Colorado plan parallels very closely the process of accountability described by numerous writers who deal with PPBS in education. As a consequence, what is developed here should be readily transferable to other settings.

It should also be stressed that the accountability program described in the chapters that follow is an "ideal" one. Few school districts, regardless of size, resources, and expertise, will approach this ideal, but any district can benefit from even a partial implementation of such a program. There are benefits to be derived at each step along the way to complete implementation, and even the smallest district can share in these benefits. The program as presented is flexible enough to be adapted, modified, and revised by knowledgeable people at the local level to meet their unique needs.

CHAPTER III

FUNCTIONAL COMPONENTS OF AN ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM

The accountability program which was established for the State of Colorado by the enactment of Senate Bill 33 on June 7, 1971, is one of the more comprehensive programs to be enacted by a state legislature.

The Colorado Accountability Act

The law itself is rather general in nature, allowing local school districts a great deal of leeway in the development of specific operational approaches to accountability within the general framework set down by law. The process which the law describes in general terms is further defined and delineated in rules and regulations adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education on November 9, 1971.

The essential parts of the law, for our purposes here, are included in the following paragraphs:

ARTICLE 41
EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

. . . . . .

123-41-2. Legislative declaration. (1) The general assembly hereby declares that the purpose of this article is to institute an accountability program to define and measure quality in education, and thus to help the public schools of Colorado to achieve such quality and to expand the life opportunities and options of the students of this state; further, to provide to local school boards assistance in helping their school patrons to determine the relative value of their school program as compared to its cost.

(2) (a) The general assembly further declares that the educational accountability program developed under this article should be designed to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of the educational programs offered by the public schools. The program should begin by developing broad goals and specific performance objectives for the educational process and by identifying the activities of schools which can advance students toward these goals and objectives. The program should then develop a means for evaluating the achievements and performance of students. It is the belief of the general assembly that in developing the evaluation mechanism, the following approaches as a minimum, should be explored:

(b) Means for determining whether decisions affecting the educational process are advancing or impeding student achievement;

(c) Appropriate testing procedures to provide relevant comparative data at least in the fields of reading, language skills, and mathematical skills;

(d) The role of the department of education in assisting school districts to strengthen their educational programs;

(e) Reporting to students, parents, boards of education, educators, and the general public on the educational performance of the public schools and providing data for the appraisal of such performance; and

(f) Provision of information which could help school districts to increase their efficiency in using available financial resources.[1]

The rules and regulations pertaining to the Colorado Educational Accountability Act which were adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education further clarify or describe an accountability program for the state's schools in the following terms:

- Develop, analyze, redefine, and improve a statement of goals for the district
- Identify and prepare statements of performance objectives and operational objectives
- Improve, modify, or develop programs to achieve performance objectives and operational objectives
- Evaluate, determine, and report the effectiveness, efficiency, and costs of the established programs in terms of stated goals, performance objectives, and operational objectives
- Redefine and modify any of the sequential phases or parts of a sequential phase within a program in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the program that may appear

While the Colorado Educational Accountability Act and its attendant rules and regulations do not make specific reference to PPBS, the law encompasses all of the basic components of PPBS. These components are analyzed further in the material that follows.

[1] Colorado. *Educational Accountability Act of 1971, Statutes* (1971), sec. 123-41-2.

Basic Components of PPBS

McGivney and Hedges,[2] in their book entitled *An Introduction to PPBS*, identified the following six components, or elements, of PPBS:

- Setting goals
- Defining objectives
- Evaluation
- Planning
- Programming
- Budgeting

John Porter,[3] writing in *Phi Delta Kappan*, also identified six components, although they differ somewhat from those of McGivney and Hedges:

- Identification of common goals
- Development of performance objectives
- Assessment of needs
- Analysis of delivery systems
- Evaluation of programs[4]
- Recommendations for improvement

Knezevich[5] and his associates discussed the components of PPBS at some lengths, but their basic components can be summarized under the following nine headings:

- Specifying goals
- Formulating a future course of action
- Generating alternative approaches to goals
- Developing operational plans
- Developing program accounting and budgeting procedures
- Analyzing alternatives, including cost-utility analysis
- Selecting the optimum course of action for each goal
- Evaluating outcomes
- Monitoring the system and making modifications

The Department of Public Instruction for the State of North Carolina, in describing the components of an accountability program, utilized terminology which is not commonly used by other writers. However, the basic elements coincide with those put forth by others:

- Conduct a status study—determine how well a school system is doing with its current program
- Prepare a report on the results of the status study
- Develop a mission statement representing the central and continuing purpose of the system
- Develop a statement of continuing objectives based on philosophical statements
- Establish priorities
- Develop specific objectives—a statement of desired results
- Develop strategies to meet objectives
- Develop evaluation procedures which are consistent with performance criteria
- Develop a program budget[6]

No review of the literature concerning educational accountability would be complete without reference to Operation PEP, a statewide project to prepare educational planners in California which was financed by the U.S. Office of Education. That project produced a large number of documents for use by those charged with responsibility for developing accountability programs, and a brief review of the functional components identified by that project is in order. In one of the initial publications[7] of the project the project writers refer the reader to the following components, which were developed by Raymond Kitchell:

---

[2]Joseph H. McGivney and Robert E. Hedges, *An Introduction to PPBS* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 18 - 59.

[3]John W. Porter, "The Accountability Story in Michigan," *Phi Delta Kappan*, (October, 1972), p. 98.

[4]The term *program* is used here and elsewhere in this paper in discussions of the components of an accountability program to designate a group of interrelated activities which are designed to include one or more specific school district objectives.

[5]Knezevich, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[6]North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, *Accountability: Review of Literature and Recommendations for Implementation* (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, May, 1972), pp. 12-15.

[7]Donald Miller, *An Introduction to and Background for PPBS in Education* (San Mateo, California: Operation PEP, 1970), Appendix A, p. 3.

- Establish long-range goals
- Develop strategy
- Establish interim objectives
- Develop program plan
- Establish operational targets
- Develop operations plan

In our review of the literature dealing with accountability programs, we were able to identify a number of factors, or components, which were not frequently mentioned but which seem to be extremely important to the operation of PPBS in the school setting. Any successful accountability program must include the following elements, as well as those which are more commonly recognized by authorities in the field:

- Developing staff expertise and skills in many new areas that are essential to the success of PPBS (i.e., program budgeting, writing of objectives, cost/effectiveness analysis, etc.)
- Involving community, staff, and students in appropriate ways throughout the PPBS cycle
- Establishing priorities among goals, objectives, and programs
- Developing long-range as well as short-range plans
- Obtaining technical assistance from outside the school system where necessary to make PPBS operational
- Developing an effective Management Information System
- Developing appropriate ways for more effectively reporting to the public

Selected Functional Components

In the section that follows the authors have attempted to identify the essential elements, or functional components, of an accountability program in greater detail than is found in the literature. In developing our own analysis and description of the process, we have drawn upon the accountability program described in the Colorado Educational Accountability Act of 1971 and its attendant rules and regulations, writings of others in the field, and our own experience as consultants to school districts in the design and implementation of school accountability programs.

The authors have drawn heavily upon material developed by one of them while serving as a consultant to the Canon City (Colorado) Public Schools[8] in the design and implementation of an accountability program for that district.

An attempt has been made to blend the thinking of many writers in the field with the authors' own practical experience to arrive at a sufficiently detailed description of what an accountability program is, and how it works, so that the likely participants and their unique roles in the process may be better understood. While some gaps which exist in the literature have, hopefully, been filled, readers will need to identify and fill any gaps *they* may perceive in the material which follows.

For the sake of clarity and better understanding, the authors have used an outline form rather than a narrative form to describe the functional components as they see them. This approach carries with it the danger that the reader may be led to see the process as considerably simpler than it really is and may be encouraged to think of each of the components as being separate and distinct and following each other in some logical order. Such is not the case, however, and the reader is encouraged to think of the process which is being defined as a closed-loop system in which *each component is interrelated to the others in a variety of ways.* Information generated at one phase or step in the accountability program may be useful in many other phases or steps and for a variety of decision-making purposes. The components do not follow one after the other in a neat, precise order; most are operating simultaneously with the others, and each is subject to review and revision or readjustment at any time. It is a complex management process, and the reader should avoid the pitfall of seeing the process in too simplistic terms.

The essential components and sub-tasks of an educational accountability program, as identified by the authors, are presented below. Nine major components have been identified, and each of these is followed by an enumeration and discussion of the sub-tasks that are essential to the effective functioning of each major component.

[8]Carl E. Wilsey, *Community Information, Goals Statement and Accountability Plan for Fremont County School District Re-1* (Greeley, Colorado: Educational Planning Service, University of Northern Colorado, 1972), pp. 34 - 45.

1. Selecting Goals

1.1 Develop staff capability in accountability programs

(This sub-task arises out of the need for all staff members to understand the rationale behind accountability and for each to develop the skills which he will be called upon to utilize in designing, implementing, or operating an accountability program)

1.2 Solicit views and involvement of community, staff, teachers' organizations, and students

(The involvement of each of these groups is essential in the goal-setting process if the goals are to have any real meaning and if there is to be any commitment to the goals once they are adopted)

1.3 Assess community concerns and aims

(Before appropriate goals can be adopted, there must be a careful assessment made of community concerns and community aims as they relate to the schools)

1.4 Identify major goals for the schools

(Based on the assessment of community concerns and aims, and incorporating the input of staff, teachers' organizations, and students, the school board can identify those goals which seem most appropriate for the district or for individual schools)

1.5 Set priorities among goals

(As a part of the process of identifying goals, the school board should also establish some priorities among the goals. Some ordering of priorities among goals is essential to the development of budgets and programs and in making decisions on the allocation of resources)

1.6 Select goals for implementation

(The final sub-task of this functional component is the selection and adoption by the board of education of those specific goals which it intends to achieve through the implementation of appropriate programs)

2. Determine Objectives

2.1 Solicit views and involvement of community, staff, teachers' organizations, and students

(While the writing of behavioral and performance objectives is rather technical in nature and usually a task given to staff members, both students and lay members of the community have a legitimate role to play in recommending objectives to be achieved by the schools)

2.2 Identify specific student and school district needs, in accordance with adopted goals

(Hard data on such things as student achievement levels, dropout rates, etc., are necessary prerequisites to the development of objectives. This information also can be useful in relating objectives to goals)

2.3 Determine acceptable standards of performance, or achievement of objectives

(The levels of performance established in the writing of objectives should be set by staff members utilizing the input of citizens and students. If objectives are to have meaning and be realistic, they must have the support and understanding of students and the citizenry)

2.4 Develop specific, measurable objectives for students, staff, and school district

(Statements of objectives should be developed for the more important functions and activities of the schools. Such statements must include acceptable standards of performance, and they also must state the criterion for measuring success in achieving the objective. A time factor, or deadline for accomplishment, also is required if achievement of the objective is to be measured)

3. Analyze Alternative Programs and Activities

3.1 Develop staff capability in analyzing alternatives

(Staff members must be given the opportunity and encouragement to develop needed skills in problem solving and rational analysis through in-service training or through advanced work at colleges or universities)

Analyze discrepancies between adopted goals and objectives and present conditions

(It is in this sub-task and in the three that follow where problem-solving skills and the use of rational analysis are particularly important in finding new ways to achieve the objectives of the schools more efficiently and effectively. It is at this point data obtained from program accounting, cost/effectiveness analysis, and the evaluation of the achievement of objectives are combined and weighed against each other to make decisions concerning program revision)

3.3 Identify all feasible alternative programs and activities

3.4 Evaluate all feasible alternative programs and activities (review research findings, conduct cost/effectiveness analysis, etc.)

3.5 Select best alternative program or activity to achieve each objective

4. Develop or Revise Programs and Activities

4.1 Revise existing programs and activities

(Once discrepancies have been noted and a careful analysis of alternatives has been completed, plans can be made to revise existing programs to make them more effective)

4.2 Plan new programs and activities

(New programs designed to meet needs that are currently unmet can be designed at this point, taking into account priorities that have been established)

4.3 Allocate resources (human and material) to programs and activities

(Once new and revised programs have been designed, resources can be allocated to each according to their priority. Obviously, with limited resources, some cutting or trimming of programs may be necessary in order to balance the budget. Here again, the data generated elsewhere in the PPBS cycle are essential to the decision-making process with regard to resource allocation)

4.4 Implement new programs and activities

(At this point approved programs and the activities which go to make up a program can be implemented)

5. Develop Program Accounting and Budgeting Procedures

5.1 Develop staff capability in program accounting and computer utilization

(The development of knowledge and skills in program accounting and in the field of computer utilization, or the application of electronic data processing to the school setting, is essential if the necessary cost data are to be generated. The quantities of data required by PPBS dictate some degree of automation even for the smaller district)

5.2 Develop program accounting format and procedures

5.3 Develop computer (or electronic data processing) capabilities

5.4 Develop Management Information System

(If PPBS is to work, a highly sophisticated and integrated system for gathering, summarizing, and reporting data on costs and on the achievement of objectives is essential)

5.5 Implement integrated accounting-budgeting - computer - information system

6. Establish Timetables

6.1 Develop short-range timetables (one year) for operating programs, utilizing resources, evaluating progress, reporting, and revising the system

6.2 Develop medium-range timetables (two-four years) for operating programs, utilizing resources, evaluating progress, reporting, and revising the system

6.3 Develop long-range timetables (five+ years) for operating programs, utilizing resources, evaluating progress, reporting, and revising the system

7. Evaluate Achievement of Objectives

7.1 Develop staff capability in evaluation

(If statements of objectives are to have any meaning, there must be periodic attempts to evaluate the

extent to which objectives have been achieved. With this kind of knowledge adjustments can be made in the system and its components, and meaningful reports can be prepared for staff use and for the use of school board members and citizens. A great deal of work needs to be done to give school people the expertise to be skillful evaluators)

7.2 Select or develop evaluation procedures for each objective

7.3 Conduct evaluation

7.4 Audit programs

(Both internal and external audits of programs may be utilized in measuring the effectiveness of the processes and procedures which are in use)

7.5 Analyze data obtained from evaluation

7.6 Relate costs to achievement of objectives

(Here is where cost/effectiveness or benefit/cost analysis may be useful in evaluating programs. Although such approaches have their shortcomings, they may lead to more rational decisions than the less systematic approaches typically used by school people)

7.7 Identify and measure the relative effect of various influences on the achievement of objectives

(This is really the heart of the accountability process, and it is the most difficult sub-task of all. Techniques for accomplishing this task are in the embryonic stage, at best)

7.8 Relate major program and policy decisions to outcomes

(This sub-task is also a key part of the accountability process. Unfortunately, little is to be found in the literature or research to help the board member or school administrator who is charged with responsibility for deciding whether a particular policy decision really achieved the anticipated results)

8. Report to the Public

8.1 Report to the public on the achievement of objectives, cost/effectiveness, effect of decisions, etc.

8.2 Provide explanation to the public of strengths and weaknesses of programs

8.3 Make recommendations for changes in goals, objectives, programs, resources needed, etc.

9. Evaluate System and Revise

9.1 Evaluate and revise goals

9.2 Evaluate and revise objectives

9.3 Evaluate and revise programs and activities

9.4 Evaluate and revise evaluation procedures

9.5 Evaluate and revise reporting procedures

9.6 Reallocate resources

Implementing an Accountability Program

The process described in the preceding section is a complex one—one that is, to a large extent, still untested. The implementation PPBS is not an easy matter, as many school districts are finding out.

Some of the problems inherent in the implementation of PPBS are identified by Wilsey writing in the *Colorado School Board Bulletin:*

> Nearly every one of the steps in the PPBS cycle has its own unique pitfalls or difficulties. The adoption of district-wide goals, which may appear to be a rather straightforward matter of identifying the major aims of education in a community, may turn into a heated controversy in some communities because of the very strong political and social differences that exist in today's society. The major goals of education as seen by the leaders of alienated or militant minority groups are often in direct opposition to those of typically more conservative members of school boards. Oftentimes, too, the real goals and objectives of a politically motivated school board, or school board member, may never be stated publicly, but they may influence the actions or decisions of the board more strongly than the formally adopted goals of the district . . . .
>
> The development of performance of behavioral objectives is equally fraught with danger because of the varying expectations of different parts of the community with regard to the achievement of their children, as well as the varying abilities of students to achieve. Should we expect all students, regardless of ability, interest, background or motivation to achieve at exactly the same levels, or should we make allowances for such differences by establishing different performance objectives

for different schools or students? If we take the latter position, how do we answer the parents of disadvantaged children who claim that we are condemning their children to continued failure by not demanding enough of them, or not motivating them sufficiently?

The problem is compounded further by the simple fact that much of what we are trying to teach in the schools is not readily definable in terms of measurable objectives because of the human factors, or variables, involved.

Analyzing Alternatives and Developing Programs

Inherent in the concept of accountability is the granting of greater freedom to the principals and teachers who are to be held accountable. If professionals are to be held accountable for student performance, they must have the freedom to utilize their best professional judgment in selecting from among the various alternatives available to them in achieving a given objective and in the utilization of resources. Too many school board members and school superintendents fail to understand this basic concept and are reluctant to take the ultimate step necessary to make the system really work. They are unwilling to give teachers and principals the freedom they must have because of possible failure or embarrassment and the everpresent spectre of adverse community reaction.

The encouragement of creativity in discovering new ways of doing things so that costs can be reduced, performance improved, or both, is perhaps the most important aspect of PPBS. While most school board members and other laymen will readily subscribe to this philosophy in theory, they are often reluctant to see it put into action because of a low tolerance for the controversy that often surrounds innovative school programs. If professional freedom and creativity are to be encouraged, the school board and the community *must* be willing to accept a certain amount of controversy as well as a higher rate of failure.

In the extremely conservative community that has a low tolerance for change and innovation, one of the greatest values of PPBS may be totally lost and the probable end result may be little more than a more complex and costly accounting system or a somewhat more sophisticated procedure for analyzing costs and benefits. If only traditional programs and techniques are to be used, then a lower rate of controversy and failure should be expected—and also a lower rate of progress and improvement. This is certainly the more comfortable route for most teachers and administrators to take and it is surely the one that will be taken unless the school board pushes for more creativity and innovation, and supports its staff in their endeavors.

In the final analysis, where the school board and superintendent control and limit very strictly what is done in the classroom, and how it is done, only they can be held accountable for the results.

The careful analysis of alternative programs and solutions to problems envisioned in the ideal PPB System will require skills and a level of sophistication in the use of such techniques as operations research, cost-benefit analysis, and model building that are not possessed by most school people. The acquisition of these skills must be considered an essential element—and an added cost—of any effective PPB System.

Developing Budgets

Much of the early work that has been done on PPBS in the school field has been concentrated on the development of a new accounting and budgeting format rather than upon the other elements of PPBS being discussed here. This new format aggregates costs on the basis of programs (English, math, etc.) rather than function (administration, instruction, maintenance, etc.). While this work is basic to cost-benefit analysis and the analysis of alternatives, it represents a relatively straightforward and easily managed component of the overall PPB System.

Once we have gotten over the hurdle of developing the necessary new accounting tools, local school boards will still be faced with the infinitely more complex task of assessing program needs and allocating scarce resources among a growing number of competing demands. This process of assigning priorities so that costs can be trimmed and budgets can be balanced promises to be one of the more challenging aspects of PPBS.

Measuring Achievement

The remaining area to be discussed here is that of measurement of achievement of objectives. Most laymen tend to oversimplify this measurement process and expect the schools to be more precise than they can be at this point in time. The facts are simply this—we do not have sufficiently valid or reliable measurement instruments except in a few areas of student achievement that are easily quantifiable (mathematics, science, physical fitness, etc.). In many areas the human variables are just too difficult to measure and the results of formal education may not be seen or measured for many years to come.

In many areas to which the schools have attached great importance, such as social development, good citizenship, art

appreciation, and so forth, we have no precise means for measuring success. In these areas we will probably have to be content with teacher observation or expert opinion as the only available measurement techniques. So long as the school board and community are willing to accept this imprecision, no major problem should arise. But, where this is not the case, severe problems will surely arise.

Many teachers are fearful of PPBS because of the heavy emphasis that is placed upon the measurement of student achievement and, either directly or indirectly, the performance of the teacher. Many fear that they alone will be held accountable for the achievement of the students in their classes and that none of this accountability will be shared by the student himself, the administration, the school board, parents, or the community. Yet, if we are to be realistic about the matter, accountability must be shared by all those who have an influence on the final educational product.

The doctor whose patient dies, or at best is not cured of his malady, is seldom held accountable for the results of his treatment. More typically the failure to cure is blamed on the patient for not presenting himself to the doctor sooner, or on "psychological" factors within the patient himself, or on "unknown" factors that are beyond the ken of the medical profession.

Nor is the lawyer who loses a case held solely to account for this failure. The law, the court system, society in general, and even the client himself typically share the blame for lack of success.

And so it should be in education. Although the teacher should bear a major share of the responsibility for success or failure of students, it should be recognized that there are other factors involved over which the teacher has no control whatsoever.[9]

[9]Carl E. Wilsey, "Topic for the Decade: Some Perspectives on Accountability and PPBS," *Colorado School Board Bulletin*, (April, 1972), p. 4.

CHAPTER IV
THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR ROLES

In the preceding chapters we have attempted to define accountability in the field of education and to describe the functional components in *one* approach to accountability. With these preliminaries out of the way we now turn our attention to an analysis of the roles of the participants in the process of educational accountability. Throughout this paper we use the term "role" in a broad sense to refer to any or all of the responsibilities or functions which are performed by, or assigned to, any of the participants in the accountability process.

In the material that follows we have limited our discussion to those participants in accountability who have a direct influence on the educational process (teachers, administrators, board members, etc.). No attempt was made to investigate the role of noncertified employees such as secretaries, custodians, bus drivers, and the like. The literature sheds little light on the role of such employees, despite the fact that they do make a significant contribution to the learning environment. Our purpose in leaving such employees out of the analysis is not to disparage their importance to the system, but to limit our task to a manageable size.

Lack of Consensus on Roles

From a review of the literature dealing with educational accountability, there does not appear, at the present time, to be universal agreement concerning "who" should be responsible for "what" in the accountability process, and this is not particularly surprising.

The concept of accountability revolves around some of the most basic issues concerning the governance of education, including the extent of legal authority of school boards and administrators, the rights and responsibilities of teachers and teacher organizations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and citizens generally.

Teachers, parents, students, and community groups of various kinds have, in recent years, been striving for a stronger voice in the policy and decision-making processes of the schools, and their roles are in a continuous state of flux. Where strong disagreement exists concerning the extent of power and authority of the parties involved, agreement over respective roles in improving the accountability of the schools is made that much more difficult — though not impossible.

In practice each district has had to work out its own definition of roles where accountability programs are in operation and, in a sense, local "common practices" have evolved. But practices differ somewhat from district to district and from state to state and, even where role definitions have evolved out of practice, there is often disagreement or unhappiness over the roles that have been assigned to the various participants. For example teachers typically feel that they are being held accountable for results, or aspects of the program, over which they have little or no control, while others who may have more authority than they are *not* being held accountable.

Part of the problem in this whole area of role definition, we suspect, arises from the fact that most writers in the field have not really tried to define and differentiate among the various roles in specific terms. Most discussions of roles are general in nature, and highly detailed or specific definitions on which agreement or disagreement can be centered are virtually nonexistent.

While many references to the participants and their roles in accountability are to be found in the literature, the discussions generally suffer from the following weaknesses: (1) not all participants are identified and dealt with; (2) analysis of roles is mainly of a general nature and not sufficiently detailed; (3) the role analysis of a particular group or individual does not extend to all the various aspects, or functional components, of an accountability program in which the group or individual might be involved; and (4) individuals and groups are treated in categories too broad for detailed analysis.

It may be that true agreement or disagreement on the roles assigned to the various participants cannot even be assumed, let alone assessed, until more detailed role definitions are available for all to review, react to, and try out in actual practice.

Some Basic Issues

We alluded earlier to some of the basic issues which have an impact upon role definition in accountability. It would seem appropriate at this point to examine some of these issues in greater detail before attempting to present our own role descriptions.

Before roles can be assigned one must deal with the question of who should define those roles. Should the legislature, in its wisdom, assume this responsibility? Should the local school board or superintendent be held solely responsible for making such decisions? Should teachers and other employees be free to decide for themselves what roles, if any, they are to play in an accountability program? How, if at all, should students, parents, and other citizens be involved in the definition of their own, as well as other, roles in accountability?

It is our position that primary responsibility for seeing that local roles are defined in the accountability process lies with the local board of education. As the duly authorized representatives of the local community, they are held directly responsible to the citizens for the efficient operation of the schools; responsibility for the assignment of roles in accountability would logically and legally seem to come within their province. The development of role definitions, however, is something that should involve many more people than just the board members themselves.

The administrative staff and the teachers, either through their own professional associations or as individuals within the system, should have a major part in helping to define roles in operational terms. Students, parents, and other citizens should be afforded the opportunity to provide input into the role defining process since they are the ultimate recipients of the services being dispensed by the schools, and their understanding and support of the roles which are to be assigned are essential to the success of any accountability program.

A corollary issue to "who" should define roles is "how" these roles should be assigned. That is, what criteria should be used in deciding which individual, or group of individuals, ought to or can best perform a certain function? In making decisions concerning role definitions the following criteria, plus others that may be identified as being of importance to a particular school district, might be taken into account:

- Authority granted by law or policy
- Duties, rights, and responsibilities established by law or policy
- Expertise arising from specialized training, skill, or experience
- Unique perspective or insight
- Impact or influence of the accountability process on the individual

If these kinds of criteria are applied in a rational and judicious way, and if there is meaningful involvement on the part of those who will be affected, the assignment of roles ought to be facilitated and conflict and disagreement among the parties minimized. The ultimate definition and assignment of roles is, or ought to be, a *local* matter and not something imposed upon school districts by the state or federal government.

Another issue revolves around the still largely unanswered question of how individuals can be held accountable for results when so many people and so many factors have an influence on the process of education. David Selden, writing as president of the American Federation of Teachers, expressed a concern in this regard which is shared by many teachers:

> Teachers do not mind being held accountable for things over which they have some control. For instance, all teachers accept the idea that they must come to school on time, must plan lessons, must be as responsive as possible to student needs. But teachers bitterly resent having to teach in overcrowded classrooms, handle the emotional problems of disturbed children, and work without proper supplies and instructional materials. These are all matters that fall within the province of administrators, school boards, and the taxpayers. Teachers gain a semblance of control over such conditions only by exerting great collective effort.
>
> Accountability is a two-way street. If teachers are to be accountable to the public, the public must be accountable to teachers. James Colman identified most of the major influences on pupil achievement, and by far the most potent were environmental factors. Our teachers must be given the resources to overcome the crippling effects on children of the defects in our society — unemployment, racism, drug addiction, alcoholism, and the brutality of poverty.[1]

Without a doubt the question of how responsibility for results can fairly and equitably be apportioned among the participants is one of the toughest to be dealt with in educational accountability. We do not have the relatively simple measure of profitability to tell us when we have done a good job, and human organisms are infinitely more complex, unpredictable, and frustrating to work with than machines.

[1]David Selden, "Productivity, Yes. Accountability, No," *Nation's Schools* (May, 1972), p. 56.

Despite these difficulties, the hope of the supporters of the accountability movement is centered on faith in the ability of rational and educated men and women, through experience and over time, to develop more precise ways of determining the impact of specific individuals, decisions, or processes on the success of youngsters in school. At this point in time, however, it is still largely a matter of hope and one which may never be fully realized.

The final issue to be dealt with here can best be stated as a question. Should power to make decisions affecting the schools be shared with teachers, students, parents, and others and, if so, how? In recent years both parents and students have demanded a stronger voice in determining the direction of the schools. And the nationwide movement toward collective bargaining for teachers represents a growing interest on the part of teachers in playing a bigger part in decision making in the schools.

The question of "whether" there should be more involvement of these groups has largely been answered in the affirmative, and we are wrestling now with the "how." No one can predict with any degree of certainty where this movement will take us, but obviously the roles of the participants in accountability will be directly affected by the ways in which power and decision making in the schools are shared. It may well be that, in the long run, the process of accountability (and thus roles) will be further defined and clarified through collective bargaining even though philosophical differences may still be unresolved.

It is also reasonable to assume that teachers, as they attempt to deal more effectively with the governance of the *teaching profession* (e.g., through the control of certification and ethical and professional practices), will find decisions in that realm have an impact on the governance of *public education* and thus upon the roles to be assigned to the various participants in the accountability process.

The Main Participants

We turn our attention now to the roles of the participants in educational accountability. The descriptions which follow are not intended to answer all questions for all people concerning roles in accountability. They should be considered as tentative and subject to refinement and revision by people in the field who are charged with responsibility for making an accountability program work. They should be tested and modified in use by practioners in light of the demands, needs, and constraints of a specific setting. Hopefully they will serve as a springboard for discussion, analysis, agreement, disagreement and, ultimately, positive action in making school districts more accountable than they are today.

In analyzing roles the authors have identified 14 individuals and groups that play a significant part in educational accountability. The participants are not arranged in order of importance, but rather in what seems to be a logical sequence for analytical purposes. We look first at the governmental and social environment within which the local school district operates, then at the local district itself, and finally, at related organizations and individuals that have a somewhat limited role to play in accountability.

The following individuals and groups were selected for inclusion in this analysis:

- State Legislature/Governor (representing the law-making and fiscal powers of the state)
- State Department of Education (including the Chief State School Officer)
- State Board of Education
- Local school board
- Community members and groups (including parents)
- Citizens' committees (appointed by state or local school board)
- Superintendent of schools (local)
- District administrators and supervisors
- Principals
- Teachers
- Students
- Teachers' organizations
- Other school-related organizations (i.e., American Association of School Administrators, National School Boards Association, etc.)
- Consultants (college and university faculty members, teachers' organizations, accountants, auditors, management consultants, etc.)

In conducting their analysis of roles the authors developed a series of Role/Participant matrices in an effort to better understand how each element in the process related to the others. It was felt that a simple matrix form would be of greatest use to the practitioner who is interested in developing a deeper understanding of the accountability process.

The matrices referred to above are presented in the nine tables that follow page 18. Each

table describes the participants and their roles in each of the major functional components identified in Chapter III.

The choice or selection of participants is strictly that of the authors and represents an expansion of the individuals and groups generally found in the literature. While a more detailed breakdown could be developed, it was felt that this list provided a reasonably concise description of the major participants.

In order to keep the matrices simple, and at the same time provide sufficient detail to make the analysis of practical use, it was decided to utilize a keying system to identify roles. The following were selected to describe the various functions, or responsibilities, of each participant under each functional component:

- A Advise (to provide advice, but *not* approve or make decisions; similar to "C" but less formalized or technical in nature)
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate (to exercise duly constituted or legal authority in making decisions)
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services (to provide help, assistance, or guidance of a technical nature or assist in training programs)
- F Provide Funding (to make necessary funds available)
- I Provide Information or Data (to provide information, but *not* be involved in making a decision)
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation (charged with responsibility for seeing that a particular function is carried out on a regular basis. This implies the exercise of authority in making decisions, although these decisions may be subject to *review* by some higher authority.)
- R Recommend (to make recommendations to the policy-making board or the legislature for action)
- S Supervise (to supervise the work of others, including controlling, evaluating, and enforcing)

As an example of the use of this key, note in Table 1 under the functional component, "Develop Staff Capability in Accountability Programs," we have identified the roles of the state legislature and governor to be those of approving, authorizing, or mandating (Ap) staff development and providing funds (F) for training. In like manner, the roles of each participant under each of the functional components are identified using letter keys.

In the sections that follow we will highlight the principal roles for each individual or group and also discuss some of the major issues which currently surround the question of role descriptions for each participant.

(Text resumes following Charts, page 28)

TABLE 1

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN SELECTING GOALS

Participants	Functional Components					
	Develop Staff Capability in Accountability Programs	Solicit Views and Involvement of Community, Staff and Students	Assess Community Concerns and Aims	Identify Major Goals for the Schools	Set Priorities Among Goals	Select Goals for Implementation
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F N	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I	A I S	A I	A I R	A I R	A I R
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	A Ap R S	A I R S	A I R S	A I R S	A I R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A C I O S	A I O	A I O	A I	A I	A I
Principals	A C I O	A I O	A I O	A I	A I	A I
Teachers	A C	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Students	N	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A C I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A C I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 2

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN DETERMINING OBJECTIVES

Participants	Functional Components			
	Solicit Views and Involvement of Community, Staff, and Students	Identify Specific Student and School District Needs	Determine Acceptable Standards of Performance or Achievement of Objectives	Develop Specific, Measurable Objectives for Students, Staff, and School Dist.
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I S	A I S	A I R	A I R
Superintendent of Schools (local)	A Ap R S	A I R S	A I R S	A I R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	A I	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 3

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN ANALYZING ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Participants	Functional Components				
	Develop Staff Capability in Analyzing Alternatives	Analyze Discrepancies Between Adopted Goals and Objectives and Present Conditions	Identify all Feasible Alternative Programs and Activities	Evaluate All Feasible Alternative Programs and Activities	Select Best Alternative Program or Activity to Achieve Each Objective
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F	F	F	F	F
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A C	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	N	A I	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A C I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A C I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 4

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN DEVELOPING OR REVISING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Participants	Functional Components			
	Revise Existing Programs and Activities	Plan New Programs and Activities	Allocate Resources to Programs and Activities	Implement New Programs and Activities
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F	F	F	F
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I	A I	A I	A I
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	A I	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 5

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN DEVELOPING PROGRAM ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING PROCEDURES

Participants	Functional Components				
	Develop Staff Capability in Program Accounting And Computer Utilization	Develop Program Accounting Format and Procedures	Develop Computer Capabilities	Develop Management Information System	Implement Integrated Accounting - Budgeting - Computer - Information System
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F	F	F	F	F
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	N	N	N	N	N
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I O
Students	N	N	N	N	N
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A C I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
A Advise
Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
C Provide Consultative or Training Services
F Provide Funding
I Provide Information or Data
N No Identifiable Role
O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 6

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN ESTABLISHING TIMETABLES

Participants	Functional Components		
	Develop Short-Range Timetables	Develop Medium-Range Timetables	Develop Long-Range Timetables
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F	F	F
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I R	A I R	A I R
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 7

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN EVALUATING ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Participants	Functional Components							
	Develop Staff Capability in Evaluation	Select or Develop Evaluation Procedures for each Objective	Conduct Evaluation	Audit Programs	Analyze Data Obtained from Evaluation	Relate Costs to Achievement of Objectives	Identify and Measure the Relative Effect of Various Influences on the Achievement of Objectives	Relate Major Program and Policy Decisions to Outcomes
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	N	A I R	N	N	N	N	N	N
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A C I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A C	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	N	A I	A I	N	N	N	N	N
Teachers' Organizations	A C I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A C I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 8

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN REPORTING TO THE PUBLIC

Participants	Functional Components		
	Report to the Public on the Achievement of Objectives, Cost/Effectiveness, Effect of Decisions, etc.	Provide Explanation to the Public of Strengths and Weaknesses of Programs	Make Recommendations for Changes in Goals, Objectives, Programs, Resources, etc. needed
State Legislature/Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	A F I	A F I	A F I
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I R	A I R	A I R
Superintendent of Schools (local)	Ap R S	Ap R S	Ap R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

TABLE 9

ROLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN EVALUATING AND REVISING THE SYSTEM

Participants	Functional Components					
	Evaluate and Revise Goals	Evaluate and Revise Objectives	Evaluate and Revise Programs and Activities	Evaluate and Revise Evaluation Procedures	Evaluate and Revise Reporting Procedures	Reallocate Resources
State Legislature Governor	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F	Ap F
State Department of Education (incl. Chief State School Officer)	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S	A C I R S
State Board of Education	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R	Ap F R
Local School Board	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S	Ap F S
Community Members & Groups (incl. parents)	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I	A F I
Citizens' Committees (app. by state or local school board)	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Superintendent of Schools (local,	A I R	A Ap I R S	A Ap I R S	A Ap I R S	A Ap I R S	A Ap I R S
District Administrators and Supervisors	A I	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Principals	A I	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S	A I O S
Teachers	A I	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O	A I O
Students	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Teachers' Organizations	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R	A I R
Other School-Related Organizations (AASA, NSBA, etc.)	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I	A I
Consultants	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I	A C I

KEY:
- A Advise
- Ap Approve, Authorize, or Mandate
- C Provide Consultative or Training Services
- F Provide Funding
- I Provide Information or Data
- N No Identifiable Role
- O Responsible for Day-to-Day Operation
- R Recommend (to Board or Legislature for Action)
- S Supervise (Control, Evaluate, Enforce)

State Legislature and Governor

In our analysis we have assigned to the legislative and executive branches of the state government two very broad, general roles in educational accountability—the roles of (1) approving, authorizing or mandating various aspects of accountability programs and (2) of providing funds to implement such programs.

In fulfilling these roles a number of specific acts are required, obviously. Such acts would include those identified by Insgroup, Inc.:

- Developing policy statements endorsing school improvement processes
- Preparing and passing laws (modifying when needed) which will implement the previously mentioned policy
- Defining responsibilities of groups and individuals for the various aspects of accountability (e.g., State Board of Education and Commissioner, local school boards)
- Delegating responsibility and authority for local goals to local districts
- "Decreeing" commitment and involvement of decision makers and public servants to the concept of accountability
- Ensuring that positive contributions are rewarded and recognized[2]

In general, however, we see the state delegating the *details* of accountability to the local district, under the general supervision and guidance of the state board of education.

State Department of Education
(Including Chief State School Officer)

Much of the literature dealing with accountability in the public schools treats the state educational agency and the chief state school officer as one entity, regardless of whether the chief state school officer is elected or appointed. The chief state school officer (and the department he heads) is viewed as being responsible for administering the policies adopted by the state board of education and for enforcing the laws of the state.

Where accountability laws exist, the state educational agency is held responsible for implementing those laws, often without adequate authority or resources to carry out that charge. In practice the role of the state educational agency often becomes one of influencing or coordinating the activities of local districts rather than mandating or directing, although there are areas in which the state agency is typically given strong authority by the legislature (i.e., budgetary and reporting procedures).

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction sees its role in accountability as including the following activities:

- Modifying budget processes used by local systems
- Developing goal-setting processes
- Developing performance measures
- Developing information systems[3]

The Cooperative Accountability Project analyzes the role of state departments generally by identifying the following major duties:

- Operationalizing laws through the preparation of rules and regulations
- Providing technical assistance to local districts
- Disseminating guidelines or other informative materials which will improve effectiveness of the total educational program
- Conducting workshops or in-service training of department personnel and local district personnel when the situation demands continuity of program and expert advice
- Disbursing financial assistance provided by law
- Coordinating accountability programs throughout the state
- Involving other institutions[4]

In all likelihood the role of state departments of education will become stronger and more directive if local districts cannot meet the demands of legislators for improved accountability, thus further eroding the doctrine and practice of local control.

For the present, however, we have assigned to the state department of education the roles of (1) advising local school districts on accountability programs; (2) providing consultative or training services; (3) providing information; and (4) generally supervising the development of

---

[2]Insgroup, Inc., *Suggested Standards for Accountability Policies, Plans and Programs* (Orange, California: Insgroup, Inc., 1973), p. 4.

[3]North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[4]Cooperative Accountability Project, "Group Roles in Accountability—Objective #4—Colorado," (Denver: Cooperative Accountability Project, 1972), p. 1, mimeographed.

accountability programs at the local level.

Obviously, the extent to which the state department can supervise what goes on at the local level will depend upon the extent and strength of authority it is given by the legislature.

In addition we see the state department as being responsible for making recommendations to the state board of education, and in turn to the legislature, on needed rules and regulations, or laws, concerning the accountability process.

State Board of Education

Governing boards of education, whether they be local or state, are universally recognized in the literature as the duly appointed or elected public bodies that carry the overall legal responsibility for the functioning of the schools. This responsibility is distinct from that of the superintendent of schools, whose responsibilities are generally held to be contractual in nature. The board, on the one hand, is responsible to the people, while the superintendent is responsible to the board.

Some confusion exists in the law, and in practice, concerning the respective duties and responsibilities of local school boards and state boards of education. For example, in Colorado, Article IX, Section 1 of the State Constitution declares that "general supervision of the public schools shall be vested in a state board of education." Section 15 of the same article, on the other hand, says that "Directors of local school districts shall have control of instruction in the public schools of their respective districts."

The responsibilities of the state board of education are, in general, the same as those of the state department of education. The primary distinction is that the board is responsible for policy matters while the state department and the chief state school officer are responsible for administering the policies of the state board.

We see the major roles of the state board in the accountability process to be those of (1) approving, authorizing or mandating the procedures whereby accountability will be enhanced; (2) recommending needed legislation to the state; and (3) providing funds for the enhancement of accountability programs in those areas where the state board has control of, or access to, funds.

Local School Board

The local school board should, in our opinion, carry the major responsibility for seeing that an accountability program is implemented and operating within the district. An accountability program works best when there is a strong commitment by the school board to both the concept and the process of accountability.

In our analysis we have assigned to the local school board roles in the following areas: (1) approving, authorizing or mandating all aspects of the accountability process; (2) providing the necessary funds to make the program operational; and (3) supervising certain selected elements or parts of the system.

It is in the development of goals and objectives, in reporting to the public, and in evaluating and revising the system that we see direct and close supervision by the local board as being particularly important.

Community Members and Groups

In attempting to delineate the specific roles of members of the community in the accountability process, we have cast these individuals and groups as advisors and providers in a few key areas such as (1) the development of goals and objectives; (2) providing funding; (3) reporting to the public; and (4) revising the system.

We have also identified a number of areas where we feel the general public should *not* be involved, primarily because of their lack of expertise in technical and professional areas. Such areas include (1) developing staff capabilities; (2) analyzing alternative programs and activities; (3) developing or revising programs and activities; (4) developing accounting and budgeting procedures; (5) establishing timetables; and (6) evaluating the achievement of objectives.

Other writers in the field also see the general community as having major responsibilities in the operation of accountability programs. The following are typical of roles found elsewhere in the literature:

- Identifying needs and goals
- Reinforcing school efforts within the home and community
- Supporting bond issues needed to implement change and improvement
- Being responsive to the identified needs of students
- Interpreting the results of student assessments and evaluation
- Serving on advisory committees[5]

[5] Insgroup, Inc., *op. cit.*, p. 6.

- Knowing the accountability laws
- Voicing opinions to advisory committees[6]
- Providing physical and psychological support for their children and the school program
- Insuring regular attendance of children
- Serving as information givers and receivers
- Serving as the primary audience for information about the effectiveness of the schools resulting from evaluation[7]
- Supporting the fiscal aspect of school operations through the payment of the prescribed taxes[8]

A good overview of the role of the community in accountability is to be found in the U.S. Office of Education manual for implementing accountability programs:

> In terms of values, goals, and objectives . . . the "why" and "what" of education as distinct from the "how" . . . the community is the *only proper locus of authority* and it is to this community that the educator must be strictly responsible. . . .
>
> Participation can be viewed as an act or a series of acts by which the "citizen" has the opportunity to influence the distribution of benefits or losses which may be visited upon him (or upon those he represents).[9]

Citizens' Committees

The literature tends to place citizens' advisory committees in a different category from the community as a whole since such committees are officially given specific duties and responsibilities by a school board.

Nearly all the literature dealing with school accountability processes advocates the extensive involvement of citizens' advisory committees. While they often have no legal status or authority, they do represent an important and potent element in educational accountability in our society.

Typical of the responsibilities ascribed to citizens' committees by the literature are the following:

- Making recommendations to the board of education relative to educational accountability programs[10]
- Developing individual components of the accountability plan
- Reviewing the current philosophy and goals of the district
- Determining the current status of educational goals
- Determining the decision-making framework of the local board and administration
- Determining activities that will identify the needs of the district
- Facilitating a needs survey and assessment[11]
- Serving as a sounding board for the community
- Knowing the accountability laws[12]

Drawing again upon the U.S. Office of Education implementation manual, we find the following recommendations concerning the role of advisory committees:

> Such committees are the standard procedure for including citizen participants in any kind of power structure . . . The advisory committee can function as the principal vehicle for liaison between the community-at-large and the project (program) . . . the advisory committees' role should include that of a "Devil's advocate" with respect to what the project is all about.

---

[6]Cooperative Accountability Project, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[7]U.S. Office of Education, *Educational Accountability and Evaluation (PREP Report #35)* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 5.

[8]University of Colorado School of Education, *Educational Accountability: Concepts and Processes Manual* (Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado School of Education, 1973), p. 141.

[9]U.S. Office of Education, Institute for Development of Educational Auditing, *A Manual for Implementation of Accountability in the Design and Management of Educational Projects* (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Office of Education, Institute for Development of Educational Auditing, 1972), p. 1-6.

[10]North Carolina Department of Education, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[11]Kay DePew, *Helpful Hints for Local Accountability Advisory Committees* (Denver: Colorado Department of Education, 1972), p. 3.

[12]Cooperative Accountability Project, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

Functions and responsibilities of the advisory committee —

- Assistance in program planning, including the assessment needs and the selection of project activities and priorities.
- Participation in the establishment of criteria for the selection of project personnel.
- Recruitment of volunteers and assistance in the mobilization of community resources.
- Assistance in staff development programs.
- Assistance in program evaluation activities.
- Serve as a channel for suggestions and complaints for program improvement.
- Assist in the dissemination of information.

The main body of the committee should be made up of parents, with appropriate school staff, students, representatives of community groups, federal and state programs, colleges and universities, and business and industry.[13]

In our analysis of the role of citizens' committees we have assigned major responsibilities to such committees in all areas but two. These two areas which are omitted are developing program accounting and budgeting and evaluating achievement of objectives.

The primary roles of citizens' committees, as we see them, are in the areas of (1) advising, (2) providing information, and (3) recommending action to the local board. This latter function is extremely important to the success of the accountability process and places such committees in an extremely influential position.

Superintendent of Schools

The superintendent of the local school district is universally recognized in the literature as sharing responsibility with the board for seeing that a district-wide accountability program is implemented and operating effectively. His commitment to the success of such a program is as essential as that of the school board, and it is he who must administer the program.

The responsibilities of the superintendent in the area of accountability encompass the following, in the eyes of one state department of education:

- Implementing policies and responsibilities accepted or established by the school board
- Providing leadership in developing a comprehensive plan for the entire school system
- Presenting plans to school boards, other local groups, and independent evaluation teams for approval
- Establishing priorities and policies which support rather than conflict with those established by the school board
- Assigning specific responsibilities for planning activities, including recommendations for the appointment of a planning team
- Providing resources for the planning team, as well as an information collection system, and other support activities essential for comprehensive planning
- Reporting costs by district, school, and program level
- Establishing and maintaining an adequate fiscal review of all categorical aid, federal and state programs
- Establishing and maintaining an adequate fiscal review of all district funds
- Preparing and disseminating required reports
- Promoting an ongoing community information program regarding needs, goals, attainments of goals, etc.[14]

The authors view the superintendent as one of the most important individuals in the process of educational accountability. We have assigned to him the key roles of (1) approving, authorizing or mandating; (2) recommending to the board; and (3) supervising in every one of the nine functional components that go to make up an operational accountability program.

District Administrators and Supervisors

District administrators are viewed by the

[13]U.S. Office of Education, Institute for Development of Educational Auditing, *op. cit.*, p. 1-12.

[14]North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, *op. cit.*, pp. 11, 38.

authors as extensions of the authority of the chief administrative officer, the superintendent. Their major responsibilities in accountability include those of (1) advising the superintendent; (2) providing information or data; (3) sharing responsibility with others for day-to-day operations; and (4) supervising the work of others. They also carry a share of the load in providing consultative or training services to other staff members and citizens. They do not, however, share the superintendent's responsibility for approving, authorizing, and mandating, or for making recommendations.

Principals

As the chief administrative officer of a school building, the principal carries a major responsibility for the effective operation of an accountability program within his or her building. While it is recognized that accountability is a shared process, the principal certainly must be considered a key person in the day-to-day operation of an accountability program since he or she will be held accountable to the superintendent for the effectiveness of programs within their school.

The roles we have assigned to the principal are similar to those assigned to central office administrators. The major distinctions lie in the *breadth* and *level* of responsibility assigned to each. For example, a district director of elementary education will be responsible for all schools in the district, while a principal generally will be responsible for only one school. This kind of distinction between roles and positions can best be made at the local level, based on specific local conditions and needs.

Some of the responsibilities assigned by the literature to principals, as well as to other administrators, are summarized below:

- Studying and determining who has impact on what process, or output, so that the appropriate person or groups can be held accountable for their portion
- Preparing and disseminating required reports
- Providing representation and input to advisory boards
- Providing for moral support and material resources
- Providing for in-service training of teachers
- Facilitating the collection and dispersal of information on student progress toward goals[15]
- Using progress reports to influence decision making regarding the instructional program
- Rewarding the contributions of all those providing worthwhile input
- Increasing public awareness of administrators' support of school improvement[16]
- Maintaining a program which will accomplish the agreed upon objectives
- Providing and maintaining a good learning environment[17]
- Providing efficient and effective managerial and instructional practices
- Assuring efficient and effective use of resources
- Assuring fiscal responsibility[18]
- Working out specific school goals and class objectives with teachers
- Evaluating achievements and setting new goals
- Coordinating such procedures or systems as developing the budget[19] or directing the operation of PPBS[20]

Teachers

Teachers are, obviously, central figures in

[15] U.S. Office of Education, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[16] Irisgroup, Inc., *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[17] Donald D. Woodington, "The Challenge of Accountability for Effective S.E.A. Administration," in *Cooperative Accountability for State and Local Educational Agencies: A Symposium* (New Orleans: American Educational Research Association, 1973), p. 3.

[18] J. P. Wescott, *Accountability: For Whom, To Whom, For What?* (Atlantic City: American Association of School Administrators, 1972), p. 2.

[19] John P. Von Gigeh and Richard E. Hill, *Using Systems Analysis to Implement Cost-Effectiveness and Program Budgeting in Education* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1971), pp. 16-19.

[20] Harry J. Hartley, "PPBS: A Systems Approach to Educational Accountability" (speech before the Supervision and Instruction Symposium, Columbus, Ohio, April, 1972).

accountability. The literature recognizes the importance of the teacher by assigning to him or her some of the most demanding and important functions and responsibilities in the accountability process. While teachers have generally been willing to accept their share of the responsibility for the success of the public schools, at least within the constraints of the facilities and programs with which they have been provided, they show an increasing resistance to accountability programs that attempt to place all, or most, of the responsibility for success or failure of the schools on teachers alone.

Most of the writings tend to focus on the teacher within the confines of the teacher-pupil relationship. While teachers are recognized as having primary responsibility for day-to-day program planning, operation, and evaluation, their expertise and responsibilities are seen by most writers to end there. While they are given decision-making authority in many key areas (i.e., lesson planning, utilization of physical resources, student evaluation, teaching strategies, selection of teaching materials, etc.), their authority frequently is subject to review and approval by some higher authority. Teachers quite often are given very little voice, and no final authority, in such vital areas as budgeting, resource allocation, and personnel selection and evaluation.

With the limited amount of authority which is afforded the teacher, it is extremely difficult to hold him or her solely accountable for the end product of the teaching/learning process. It is much easier to hold the teacher accountable for certain specific inputs (appearance of person and classroom, promptness, timely preparation of lesson plans, etc.), but it is difficult to tie these inputs to present measures of output (student achievement, attitude, etc.)

Until such time as teachers *are* given greater authority in making decisions on a broader basis than is now typical, it will continue to be extremely difficult to hold them *solely* accountable for results, or output, no matter how well-designed the accountability program.

Briefly, the literature assigns the following kinds of accountability roles to the classroom teacher:

- Developing performance objectives
- Guiding learning activities[21]
- Selecting instructional strategies or objectives that are most effective for achieving the identified goals[22]
- Knowing and using the preferred practices in the field of teaching in general and in their particular areas of specialization[23]
- Working to individualize instruction for optimum student growth
- Providing "straightforward" reports of student progress to parents and community
- Providing students with knowledge of personal progress toward goals; recognize or reward success
- Informing the public of support for school improvement; recognize community effort
- Participating in in-service and personal professional development for improvement
- Serving as a resource in planning an accountability program[24]

In our analysis of the teacher's role in accountability we perhaps have given the individual teacher a somewhat less responsible role than some teachers' organizations would like him or her to have. We have *not* given the teacher final authority to make all decisions affecting his or her part in the accountability process. In a public, tax-supported institution, we do not see this as feasible or desirable. We have, however, assigned the teacher key roles throughout the accountability process as an advisor and as a provider of information to the board, the administration, and the community. In addition, and infinitely more important, we have assinged to the teacher *shared* responsibility, along with the administration, for the day-to-day operation of most aspects of the accountability process which *includes* the exercise of authority in making decisions that directly affect the student.

While we have not assigned to the teacher the same power to approve, authorize or mandate that we have to the superintendent and the school board, this does not preclude the delegation or assignment of such power to teachers by a local superintendent or board

[21]Wescott, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[22]Woodington, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[23]North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[24]Insgroup, Inc., *op. cit.*, p. 9.

of education, or by the state. As roles become more clearly defined in practice, this may well happen as efforts are made to more clearly pinpoint responsibility for the achievement of objectives.

We have not assigned to the individual teacher the role of "recommender" of action to the board. Recommendations for action, we believe, should go through the appropriate administrative channels, or through the teachers' professional organization, if communication and efficiency are to be enhanced.

Students

Unfortunately, the literature does not devote a great deal of attention to the students' role in accountability. The responsibilities of the students, as seen by several writers who *do* recognize their importance to the process, are summarized below:

- Helping to establish and maintain the learning environment[25]
- Trying to understand the situation in which they find themselves
- Asserting themselves in ways that will be likely to improve the quality of education
- Acting as citizens of the school and of the community[26]
- Cooperating and responding to teachers' efforts to provide critical learning skills
- Cooperating in evaluation of progress
- Informing parents and community of weaknesses and failure of the schools to meet needs
- Providing input in defining relevant educational goals
- Knowing accountability laws
- Serving on advisory committees[27]

Throughout the nine tables in which we set forth our analysis of roles in accountability, we assigned to students the roles of (1) advising and (2) providing information to others who are involved in the process. The effectiveness of the accountability process depends, to a large extent, upon appropriate input from those who are being served by the system. However, the maturity level and expertise of students precludes their playing a more directive or authoritative role in accountability programs, in our judgment.

The roles assigned to students should be meaningful ones and not just the trappings of "tokenism." In many districts where students have been given the opportunity to be true working partners in accountability programs, and have had an opportunity to "tell it like it is" without fear of reprisals, they have added a real spark of life to advisory committees.

Teachers' Organizations

Teachers' organizations have several major roles to play in accountability, as we see it. First, they have a legitimate role in making recommendations to the school board concerning *all* aspects of the accountability process.

Prior to the advent of collective negotiation, or bargaining, in the public schools, such a suggestion would have been unheard of, and there are many board members, administrators, and citizens today who will take strong exception to our position. We believe, however, that an accountability program can be effective only when there is a commitment to make it work on the part of all the individuals and groups involved. Teachers have a right to be heard, collectively, with regard to their views on accountability programs, and their commitment to accountability certainly will not be enhanced if they are denied the right to be heard and to make recommendations.

In certain situations where an accountability program is covered by a master agreement or contract, the teachers' organization may be given a great deal more authority in the accountability process than we have indicated. The teachers' association might well be delegated or "given" the power to approve, authorize, or mandate, certain aspects of the accountability program by the local school board as a result of the collective bargaining or negotiating process.

Second, teachers' organizations have an important role to play in advising and providing information to the state and to local school districts concerning the design and operation of accountability programs. Their state and national offices typically employ staff members who are knowledgeable about accountability programs and who can be of great assistance to local districts, particularly the smaller ones.

Finally, teachers' organizations have a role

---

[25]Wescott, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[26]Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project, *Role Expectations in an Accountability Program* (Charleston: West Virginia Department of Education, 1972), Appendix C.

[27]Insgroup, Inc., *op. cit.*, p. 7.

to play as consultants to state offices and local districts in the development of in-service training programs for teachers, administrators, board members, and other laymen.

Other School-Related Organizations

Other organizations that have a continuing interest in the schools also have roles to play in accountability programs. We would generally assign to such organizations the same roles as those assigned to students (i.e., advising and providing information).

In some cases these organizations are in a position to provide consultative or training services to the schools which may be of great assistance in making accountability work.

Consultants

The last group which we have identified for inclusion in our analysis of roles in accountability is that of consultants. This category includes professional consultants from colleges and universities as well as from private business. Professional staff members from state and national teachers' organizations also may be considered in this category.

Aside from providing advice and information to school districts on a fee basis, consultants have a key role to play in planning and conducting in-service training programs for school board members, professional staff members, citizens, and students who are involved in the planning, implementation, and operation of educational accountability programs.

Summary

In the preceding pages we have attempted to highlight our analysis of roles in educational accountability in such a way as to enhance the reader's understanding of the process, the participants, the roles, and the major issues.

Accountability is not a simple process, nor is education a simple process. Much remains unclear in our understanding of what accountability is and how it can best be achieved, and we are a long way from having any kind of general agreement on "who" should be held accountable for "what" in public education. Hopefully, however, this paper has shed some light on the matter, and school board members, administrators, teachers, citizens, and others will be encouraged to continue the search for better ways to make the schools more accountable to the public which they serve as well as more efficient in the pursuit of their goals and objectives.

CHAPTER V
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

The analysis and discussion presented in this paper suggest some major implications for accountability programs in education. The most significant of these implications are identified and discussed very briefly in this chapter.

The Future of Accountability Programs

The authors are firmly convinced that the concept of accountability will not disappear from the scene in public education. At the moment there is confusion, lack of direction, and uncertainty about the participants and their roles in an accountability system. People tend to view as a threat ideas they do not understand and, hence, take a negative posture toward such ideas. However, a clearer definition of accountability, coupled with an understanding of the participants and their roles, can be of significant help in alleviating the confusion and negativism that exists today.

At this juncture attitudes toward the word "accountability" are both positive and negative depending upon one's perceptions of "whose ox is being gored" and the purposes for implementing a particular accountability system. It is predicted that the future of the accountability movement is bright, but that the brightness will have a direct correlation with the extent of understanding of the concept itself and the process selected for implementation.

Needed Legislation

Attitudes and understandings cannot be legislated, but legislation does establish policy for the system of public education. In order to establish accountability on a state-wide or national basis, the concept must be mandated by state legislatures and governors in such a way that the incentives for implementation are more attractive than is now the case in most states. Provisions for developmental capital also must be made by the state legislatures. Mandating action without supplying adequate resources to accomplish the action is an unrealistic approach.

The school districts in a given state have many commonalities, but each also has certain features which make it unique. Because of these varying conditions, state legislatures ought not to mandate a *detailed* accountability system and impose it upon all of the school districts. It would seem more effective and realistic for the legislature to adopt a *general* statute dealing with accountability, leaving each school district to develop its own accountability system under the rules and regulations, general supervision, and technical assistance of the state department of education.

The major responsibility for designing and implementing an accountability program for a school district ought to lie with the local district, and not with the state or federal government. The state department of education should coordinate and generally supervise the work of individual school districts but should not dictate the detailed procedures to be followed at the local level.

Needed Research

Continuous research needs to be done to identify strengths, weaknesses, and problems involved in the design, implementation, operation, and evaluation of *any* system, and accountability programs are no exception. Some of the most critical areas in which research needs to be conducted are identified and discussed in the following paragraphs.

People have difficulty implementing a program or system they do not understand. Research needs to be conducted at the local, state, and national levels to determine the extent to which educators and laymen alike understand accountability programs and the roles of the participants. The results of such research should be helpful in identifying the kinds of training and the kinds of information needed by various individuals and groups. This research also would provide some baseline data about the *status quo*. Ongoing research in this area can provide needed data about the effectiveness of efforts to raise the current level of understanding.

If an accountability program is to be effective, individuals and groups asked to play specific roles must accept those roles and their attendant responsibilities. Research is needed to determine the extent to which roles *are* accepted by the participants. Information is needed about why roles are accepted or unaccepted as well as the level of acceptance for each role. This information would be most helpful for training and information dissemination efforts.

If the data so indicate, they could also be useful in refining the accountability program by realigning role responsibilities and by adding or deleting roles. This research could also

establish base data against which comparisons could be made in the future to determine the effectiveness of corrective efforts taken.

It is unlikely that the development of an accountability system can be accomplished without some difficulties. Even if accountability is fully understood and its roles are fully accepted, problems are likely to crop up, and constraints may be placed on participants that make the fulfillment of their roles difficult or impossible. Research is needed to identify those problems and constraints as they occur. Obtaining or generating information about problems and constraints is necessary if corrections are to be made within a system as it is being implemented. Data about when and where difficulties *did not* occur also would be useful.

An accountability program is designed to provide information about the educational system's effectiveness (how well did we do what we said we would do?) and its efficiency (are we getting the best mileage from our resources?). Research is needed to determine what impact, if any, accountability has had on the effectiveness and efficiency of educational systems. Do school districts which implement an accountability system do a "better job" than those which don't?

If school districts develop different kinds of accountability systems, which one(s) seem to produce the best results in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? If differing results are found, this might call for an analysis of the "best" system(s) in terms of design, implementation, operation, and evaluation. This kind of research and analysis would be extremely useful in model correction.

School Staff Training and Development

Training in the skills required by an accountability program is needed for all school staff members who are involved in the educational enterprise at all levels. Expertise in the design, implementation, and operation of an accountability program must be developed at the *local* level, since this is where the major portion of the action takes place. However, personnel in state departments of education also need training in the functional components of an accountability system so they can provide technical assistance to local school districts. The same would hold true for college and university instructors.

Training programs should be ongoing and funded out of development capital provided by the state. Technical assistance should be sought from accomplished sources to make such training programs meaningful.

The first priority in school staff training programs should be to develop an understanding of accountability, including a definition of roles and acceptance of roles by participants within the educational system and within the community. The next priority should be to develop the necessary expertise that will allow each role incumbent to carry out the expectations and responsibilities of their role(s).

The importance of staff training and development at the local level *cannot be overemphasized*. The success of the entire accountability program rests upon the understanding, acceptance, and expertise of the participants. Asking people to do something they don't understand, haven't accepted, and don't know how to do is a sure way to failure.

College Training Programs

Since accountability is not likely to disappear from the arena of public education, it is essential that colleges of education deal with this concept, both in their on-campus training programs and in their field work. Students in teacher and administrator preparation programs must learn how to deal with this concept. They should be given enough training to develop an understanding of accountability, the roles involved, and the functional components; and they should develop expertise in filling the role(s) they will have as school district employees. Employers will be looking for this knowledge and ability in prospective employees in the future, and students have a right to expect to be trained in these areas if they are to be readily employable.

Colleges providing in-service work for school personnel also will need to create programs that help to develop the kinds of expertise that will be required of practicing educators.

College programs probably will have to be adjusted to provide for the delivery of more on-site training in school districts. Workshops to develop expertise in various roles and functional components will be necessary. Providing consultant help in the design, implementation, and operation of accountability programs also is a function college personnel will be asked to perform in the future.

Training the Community and Citizens' Committees

The community as a whole and the members of citizens' committees have vital roles in an accountability program. Some of the same training needs alluded to for other groups pertain to the laymen as well. Citizens need

to develop an understanding of the concept of accountability, plus an understanding of their particular role and how it relates to other roles; and they need to develop the skills necessary to fulfill their role.

Citizens' committees working with accountability programs should be provided training in accountability along with the members of school staffs. Consultants should be provided to assist and guide these committees when the need for their expertise is identified.

Future Teacher Negotiations

Teachers and their professional organizations will, in all likelihood, continue to strive for a larger role for the teacher in accountability than is currently defined in the literature and in our discussion of roles. Teachers' associations are likely to push for more decision-making power in resource allocation, in program development, in program implementation, and in the use and interpretation of the data generated by an accountability system. As stated earlier in this paper, much of the needed clarity in defining roles and in determining precisely "who" will be held accountable for "what" is likely to arise out of the collective negotiation, or bargaining, process in the future.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alioto, Robert, and Jungherr, J. A. *Operational PPBS for Education.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

Anderson, Scarvia B. "Accountability: What, Who, and Wither?" *School Management*, September 1971, pp. 28-29.

Bhaerman, Robert. "A Paradigm for Accountabil..y." QuEST Paper No. 12. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, August, 1970.

_____. "Response to Lessinger: The Great Day of Judgment." *American Teacher*, October 19, 1970, p. 6.

Browder, Leslie H., Jr. *Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability.* Berkeley, California: McCutchan Corp., 1971.

Buckner, Allen L. *Network Based Management Procedures.* San Mateo, California: Operation PEP, February, 1970.

Bushnell, David S., and Rappaport, Donald. *Planned Changes in Education.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

Carpenter, Margaret. *Program Budgeting As A Way to Focus on Objectives in Education.* Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1969.

Christian, Floyd. *The Role of State Government in Education.* Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1972.

Colorado. *Educational Accountability Act of 1971. Statutes* (1971).

Colorado Department of Education. *Rules and Regulations for the Administration of the Educational Accountability Act of 1971.* Denver: Colorado Department of Education, 1971.

Cooperative Accountability Project. "Cooperative Accountability — Toward Educational Accountability." Pamphlet. Denver: Cooperative Accountability Project, 1972.

Cornell, Terry D. *A Format for Monitoring the Teaching-Learning Process: Educational Accountability.* Tucson: EPIC Evaluation Center, 1971.

Curtis, William H. *Educational Resources Management System.* Chicago: Association of School Business Officials, 1971.

DePew, Kay. *Helpful Hints for Local Accountability Advisory Committees.* Denver: Colorado Department of Education, 1972.

Doherty, Victor. *PPBES and School System Evaluation — A Progress Report.* Portland, Oregon: Portland Public Schools, 1972.

Elam, Stanley. *Performance Based Teacher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges For Teacher Education, 1971.

Evaluation and Accountability: A Resource Unit for Educators. Springfield, Illinois: The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972.

Fairly, Richard. "Accountability's New Tool." *American Education*, June 1972, p. 33.

Hartley, Harry J. "PPBS: A Systems Approach to Educational Accountability." Paper read at the Supervision of Instruction Symposium, April 13, 1972, Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.

Hawthorne, Phyllis. *Characteristics of and Proposed Models for State Accountability Legislation.* Madison, Wisconsin: State Educational Accountability Repository, 1973.

_____. *Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education.* Madison, Wisconsin: State Educational Accountability Repository, 1973.

Insgroup, Inc. *Suggested Standards for Accountability Policies, Plans and Programs.* Orange, California: Insgroup, Inc., 1973.

Jenks, Charles L. *Educational Evaluation and Assessment System For You EASY.* Denver: Colorado Department of Education, 1972.

Kennedy, John D. *Theory, Principles and Operational Concepts of Management by*

Objectives. A publication of the Southeastern Interstate Project for State Planning and Program Consolidation. Atlanta, Georgia: Robert Davis Associates, Inc., 1971.

Knezevich, Stephen J. *Administrative Technology and the School Executive*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.

Kruger, Stanley W. "The Implications of Accountability For Educational Program Evaluation." Paper read at the Conference on Measurement in Education, April, 1970, University of Chicago.

Lopez, Felix M. "Accountability in Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1970, pp. 231-235.

McGivney, Joseph H., and Hedges, Robert E. *An Introduction to PPBS*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1972.

Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project. *Role Expectations in an Accountability Program*. Charleston: West Virginia Department of Education, 1972.

_____. *Shared Accountability: A Guide to Suggested Levels of Responsibility*. Charleston: West Virginia Department of Education, 1973.

Miller, Donald. *A Systems Approach to Planned Change in Education*. San Mateo, California: Operation PEP, 1970.

_____. *An Introduction to and Background for PPBS in Education*. San Mateo, California: Operation PEP, 1970.

National Education Association. *Accountability*. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1972.

New England Assessment Project. *Guide to Assessment and Evaluation Procedures*. Providence, Rhode Island: New England Assessment Project, 1966.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *Accountability: Review of Literature and Recommendations for Improvement*. Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1972.

Nyquist, Ewald B. "Accountability in Elementary and Secondary Education." Speech before the Education Commission of the States, July 9, 1970, Albany, New York.

Olson, Arthur R. "Accountability III." News release issued by the Colorado Department of Education, Assessment and Evaluation Unit, Denver, February 10, 1972.

Popham, James. *An Evaluation Guide*. Los Angeles: The Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1971.

Porter, John W. "The Accountability Story in Michigan." *Phi Delta Kappan*, October 1972, p. 98.

Radcliffe, Vickey W., and Colgan, Francis E. *Evaluation — Accountability*. Lincoln: Nebraska State Department of Education, 1971.

Selden, David. "Productivity, Yes. Accountability, No." *Nation's Schools*, May 1972, p. 56.

University of Colorado School of Education. *Educational Accountability: Concepts and Processes Manual*. Boulder: University of Colorado, 1973.

U.S. Office of Education. *Educational Accountability and Evaluation. (PREP Report # 35)*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Office of Education, Institute for Development of Educational Auditing. *A Manual for Implementation of Accountability in the Design and Management of Educational Projects*. Arlington, Virginia: Institute for Development of Educational Auditing, 1972.

Von Gigeh, John P., and Hill, Richard E. *Using Systems Analysis to Implement Cost-Effectiveness and Program Budgeting in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1971.

Wescott, J. P. *Accountability: For Whom, To Whom, For What?* Atlantic City: American Association of School Administrators, 1972.

Wilsey, Carl E. *Community Information, Goals Statement and Accountability Plan for Fremont County School District Re-1 Canon City, Colorado*. Greeley, Colorado: Educational Planning Service, University of Northern Colorado, 1972.

_____. "Topic for the Decade: Some Perspectives on Accountability and PPBS," *Colorado School Board Bulletin*, April 1972, p. 4.

_____. "Wanted — Decentralization of School Management." *California Journal of Instructional Improvement*, March 1971, pp. 22-26.

Woodington, Donald D. "The Challenge of Accountability for Effective SEA Administration." *Cooperative Accountability for State and Local Educational Agencies: A Symposium*. New Orleans: American Educational Research Association, 1973.

Yorden, Wesley. *An Economist's Analysis of Accountability in Education: The National Assessment, the Colorado Evaluation, and the Colorado Plan for Contract Accreditation*. Boulder, Colorado: Bureau of Educational Research, 1971.