DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 214 UD 017 827

TITLE	Fellowship Programs: Preparing Minority Group Members for Educational Leadership. Working Papers.
INSTITUTION	Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Apr 77
NOTE	89p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Educational Opportunities; *Educational Programs; *Fellowships; *Grants; Institutions; *Leadership Training; *Minority Groups; Program Descriptions

ABSTRACT

The result of a national working conference held in October, 1976, this publication describes twelve respected and successful internship/fellowship programs, each of which has had a demonstrated record of successful identification, selection, training, and finally, placement of minority group individuals in positions of leadership and responsibility. The programs that are reviewed are the following: (1) the Bush Leadership Fellows Program of Minnesota, (2) the Education Policy Fellowship Program of George Washington University, (3) the Atlanta Fellows Program of Atlanta University, (4) the Summer Institute of the Center for Creative Leadership, (5) the Community Fellows Program of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, (6) the American Indian Community College Administrative Internship Program, (7) the Southern Regional Council Leadership Development Program, (8) the Center for Educational Leadership Advanced Management Program for minority educators, (9) the National Aspira Fellowship Program, (10) the Consortium for Educational Leadership, (11) the Work-Education Consortium Project, and (12) the Rockefeller Foundation's program for training minority group school administrators at the superintendent level. The presentations and discussion that follow the program descriptions focus on the components of most internship programs. These include recruitment and selection, program design, assignment and placement, program objectives, and evaluation. A listing of special fellowship programs sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation are included. (Author/AM)

WORKING PAPERS

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS: PREPARING MINORITY GROUP MEMBERS FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

> RECRUITMENT

> PLACEMENT

> PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

> EVALUATION

PUBLICATION DATE APRIL 1977

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION WORKING PAPERS

Bellagio IV Population Conference

Children: In Pursuit of Justice

China Diary

Climate Change, Food Production, and Interstate Conflict (Out of Print)

Developing a Sense of Community (Out of Print)

Ethnic Studies

Fellowship Programs: Preparing Minority Group Members for Educational Leadership

Film and the Humanities

Food Crops in the Low-Income Countries

Food Production and the Energy Dilemma (Out of Print)

Higher Education: Cooperation with Developing Countries (Out of Print)

International Development Strategies for the Sahel (Out of Print)

International Problems in Environmental Monitoring

Notes on a Revolutionary Church: Human Rights in Latin America

Perspectives on Aquaculture (Out of Print)

Problems in Government Planning of Nutrition Policy

Reaching the Developing World's Small Farmers

Strategies for Agricultural Education in Developing Countries, I & II (Out of Print)

The Contemporary Humanities in an International Context (Out of Print)

The Education of Women for Technological Societies

The Management of Interdependence: The Planning Function (Out of Print)

The Role of Animals in the World Food Situation

The Role of the Social Sciences in Rural Development (Out of Print)

The Useful Humanists: Alternative Careers for Ph.D.'s in the Humanities

The World Food Situation: A New Initiative

Third Bellagio Conference on Population (Out of Print)

University Divinity Schools (Out of Print)

Values in Contemporary Society

Video: State of the Art

Youth Unemployment

WORKING PAPERS are free of charge. If you would like to order available reports address requests to:

Publication Office
The Rockefeller Foundation
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

National Working Conference on Fellowship and Internship Programs, New York, 1976.
Fellowship programs.

(Working papers - The Rockefeller Foundation)
1. Scholarships--United States--Congresses.
2. Minorities--Education--United States--Congresses.
I. Williams, Bruce E., 1931- II. Title. III.
III. Series: Rockefeller Foundation. Working papers - The Rockefeller Foundation.
LB2338.N33 1976 378.3'3'0973 77-3620

Published in April 1977 by The Rockefeller Foundation

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

	Page
Participants	v
Preface	vii
PROGRAM PRESENTATIONS	
Bush Leadership Fellows Donald Peddie	1
The Educational Policy Fellowship Program Paul Schindler	6
Atlanta Fellows Program/Atlanta University Barbara Jackson	9
Center for Creative Leadership - Summer Institute Ann Morrison	15
Community Fellows Program/Massachusetts Institute of Technology Hubie Jones	19
American Indian Community College Administrative Internship Program Richard E. Wilson	25
Southern Regional Council - Leadership Development Program K. Z. Chavis	30
Center for Educational Leadership - Advanced Management Program for Minority Educators Nathaniel Jackson	34
National ASPIRA Fellowship Program John Figueroa	38
Consortium for Educational Leadership Columbus Salley	42
Work-Education Consortium Project Richard Ungerer	46
The Rockefeller Foundation's Program for Training Minority-Group School Administrators at the Superintendent Level Bruce E. Williams	50
PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS	
Recruitment and Selection	55
Program Design: Modalities of Training	60
Assignment and Placement	65
Program Objectives	68
Evaluation	73
In Brief: Rockefeller Foundation Special Fellowships	78

PARTICIPANTS

Mario Anglada
Executive Director
ASPIRA of America
New York, New York

K. Z. Chavis
Executive Director
Leadership Development Program
Southern Regional Council
Atlanta, Georgia

John Figueroa
Program Director
National ASPIRA Fellowship Program
ASPIRA of America
New York, New York

Barbara Jackson
Director
Atlanta Fellows Program
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Nathaniel Jackson
Program Director
Center for Educational Leadership
Los Angeles, California

Carroll Johnson
Director, Field Services
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York

Hubie Jones
Director
Community Fellows Program
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Ann Morrison
Program Assistart
The Summer Institute
Center for Creative Leadership
Greensboro, North Carolina

Robert L. Newell
Superintendent Fellow
East Orange Public Schools
East Orange, New Jersey

Donald Peddie
Program Director
Bush Leadership Fellows
Bush Foundation
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Rocelia Roman
Former Fellow
ASPIRA of America
New York, New York

Columbus Salley
Executive Director
Consortium for Educational Leadership
Chicago, Illinois

Paul T. Schindler
Director
Educational Policy Fellowship Program
Institute for Educational Leadership
George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

Ted Tynes
County Coordinator of School Programs
Essex County Superintendents Office
East Orange, New Jersey
Superintendent Fellow 1975-76

Richard A. Ungerer
Director
Information Exchange Service
Manpower Institute
Washington, D.C.

Bernard C. Watson
Vice President
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Richard E. Wilson
Vice President for Programs
American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges
Washington, D.C.

From The Rockefeller Foundation:

Joseph E. Black
Director, Social Sciences

Robert L. Fischelis
Fellowship Officer

Elizabeth Muhlfeld
Program Associate, Information Services

Charles H. Smith
Associate Director, Social Sciences
Chairman, Equal Opportunity Committee

Bruce E. Williams
Assistant Director, Social Sciences
Chairman and Conference Coordinator

PREFACE

The Rockefeller Foundation has maintained a fellowship program for gifted, well-motivated individuals for almost sixty years. A safe estimate would place at almost 15,000 the number of individuals from all over the world and virtually every discipline who have held Foundation-supported fellowships.

Some years ago, the Foundation concluded that the slow pace of the promotion of minority-group educators to leadership positions was troublesome. It soon became aware that other agencies were similarly concerned. This publication seeks to distill the experience of twelve respected and successful internship/fellowship programs, each of which has had a demonstrated record of successful identification, selection, training, and finally placement of individuals in positions of leadership and responsibility.

The publication is the result of a national working conference held in October 1976. The focus of the conference was on program structure. Participants were asked to share information regarding program design, recruitment, placement, and evaluation.

For convenience the conference was divided into five parts, roughly corresponding to the components of most internship programs. Each of the several directors and representatives was requested to give a general overview of his or her program and then to take part in the discussion of the general topic under consideration.

The Rockefeller Foundation is indebted to their spirited painstaking which made the conference a success and this volume possible. Just as academic training without in-service experience cannot fully prepare a man or woman for leadership responsibilities, so an agency working in isolation cannot fully accomplish its objectives. We hope that this sharing experience will be helpful to others with similar interests.

April 1977

Bruce E. Williams

PROGRAM PRESENTATIONS

BUSH LEADERSHIP FELLOWS

Donald Peddie

Nearly sixty years ago, a researcher at the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company. then a struggling manufacturer of commercial abrasives, came to Archibald Bush and showed him the prototype of what later became scotch tape. Bush said, "Yes, I think we can sell that product. It has possibilities." Today, known as the 3M Company, it is a diversified giant, thanks to Bush's genius for sales management. Two years before his death in 1966, he decided to help others get the business or management training which he himself could not afford as a young man; so he founded the Bush Leadership Fellows program.

Mr. Bush's idea was to locate Minnesota's emerging leaders, somewhere in midcareer, and send them off to school and/or internship to pick up the broad training needed to bring out their potential as the area's leaders. He didn't limit this just to business. He thought good management was a short commodity in many fields. He hoped to help leaders bring vision, judgment, and integrity to the processes they directed. He stressed development of the individual.

The Sparse Country

The program started off in 1965 with only four fellows; the next year there were eight. The program was not offered in 1967 or 1968. It resumed in 1969 and has been operating continuously since, with a growing number of awards and a growing pool of business management applicants. By 1976, nearly 70 percent of the final award winners in Minnesota were taking management training. This had been a goal we couldn't achieve until recently. In our new territory the management percentage is considerably less.

In 1973 the board of directors of the Bush Foundation added a companion Summer Fellows program, for persons interested in short-term educational development, and, in 1974, the board voted to expand the program into both Dakotas and to the 26 northern and western Wisconsin counties that fall within the Ninth Federal Reserve District. This is what we like to call the sparse country.

By the end of the 1976 competition, 205 awards had been made both to long-term and summer fellows in four states, and the Bush Leadership Fellows, combining the academic and the internship, had become a truly regional program.

Criteria

Both Bush Leadership and Bush Summer Fellows are persons in mid-career who have already demonstrated their capacity for leadership. The average age is around 37. A Leadership Fellow must have five years of work experience; a Summer Fellow, three. A Leadership Fellow must be at least 28; a Summer Fellow, 25. The upper limit is 50 for both programs, although that is flexible.

Stipends

The Leadership Fellow draws a stipend of $1,500 monthly for up to 18 months of academic study and possible internship; up to $500 for moving expenses, and 50 percent of tuition. The Summer Fellow gets $300 a week for up to ten weeks, up to $300 for travel, and 50 percent of tuition.

Recruitment

Each year we put on a recruiting campaign, which contains several elements.

As the program opens in October, we advertise in all the dailies throughout the four states. This is our major recruiting thrust, even though it tends to be too broadside and not enough of a rifle-shot approach.

We also attempt to reach more precisely the kind of person who is likely to be successful in our competition in these ways:

1. Staff members travel throughout the four states to hold meetings with community groups, such as chambers of commerce.

2. We strongly encourage alumni and alumnae to recommend candidates. We work from two- to three-year inquiry lists, for we've learned that it often takes that long to get ready to be a serious applicant.

3. We are in touch with quite a few personnel directors or top executives of the major companies in the area and solicit

recommendations from them. We also have direct contacts in nonprofit institutions.

4. We mail out brochures for posting on bulletin and public information boards, detailing the variety of eligible fields.

5. We publish a bimonthly newsletter which goes to about 1,500 of the region's community and thought leaders, again very diversified as to field.

We have recently acquired a slide presentation which we will give throughout our territory in small meetings. We want to remove the mystery about what we do.

Word-of-mouth advertising brings in numerous prospects. Before we even open the annual competition, we have acquired a substantial mailing list of persons who have heard of us and who have written in for information. At this date, we have 125 such requests, and we have not even formally opened the 1977 campaign.

Finally, we are great believers in rifle-shot recruiting. We always want more of what we see as the rarity in our applicants pool. This means we mail information directly to trade union leaders, women in business, and minorities in all fields, all three of whom are rare in our pool. We almost never initiate the mailing of application forms, but we do mail leaflets to see if we can elicit response.

We have a six-page application blank, which in itself, we're sure, winnows out the less committed applicants. Filling it out is quite a task. Many people tell us it's a big benefit they received in the process, especially with regard to goals and plans. We try for fairly specific goal information. We are great believers in track records. We believe people will do in the future as they have before. Also, we are mindful that we are especially vulnerable to a certain element of "con artists." We need information. We accept some but not all employment form limitations. We like to hear directly from the people in the best position to judge an individual's work and estimate his or her potential. We're pretty wary of job switchers or career changers.

Selection

Our selection process is rigorous. The preliminary selection committee reads every application. About a third of these are sent on to interviewers, mostly our alumni(ae). If the interviewer decides he or she has a promising prospect, and I agree, that person goes to a local firm of consulting psychologists, which builds up without further interviewing a profile of the applicant on the basis of a detailed personal inventory and minimum psychological testing. But we do test, using instruments with the least amount of built-in cultural bias. Frankly, we believe in tests as a small but useful part of the selection process.

When the dossier is built up with the six-page application form, references from the person's superiors, and a personal interview, the four-person preliminary selection committee meets for a grueling session during which the semifinalists get a numerical rating. The committee does not see the psychologists' profile, but a member of the firm of psychologists is also a member of the committee, and brings with him test result knowledge of each applicant. Others on that committee bring personal knowledge from other vantage points. All have studied the application materials.

As the selection process is advancing, the program director, on seeing a likely prospect, may send some information about that person to several schools, to see what his or her chances for admission are, in advance. We maintain close contact with six or seven highly selective university programs, both nondegree and degree.

When the finalists for the Leadership program have been selected, they go to a final selection seminar. For Minnesota and Wisconsin, we have a three-day live-in, where each applicant has two 30-35 minute interviews with pairs of judges. For the Dakotas, we have a one-day session. The summer finalists appear for approximately thirty minutes before a traveling panel that meets in different cities, as required by the geographical location of the applicants. The program director is a member of all panels but not the chairperson. That role usually is handled by an industrial psychologist, limit of one per panel. Most of the other people on the complete roster of judges have reached the general manager

level of work.' Typically, they do a lot of homework, i.e., detailed reading of complete files, and are also provided (after final interviews begin) with special summaries.

Incidentally, the summer applicants are not required to undergo the screening at the firm of psychologists, since they are asking for considerably less time and money from the Foundation. However, all finalists, including summer people, take one standard test of critical thinking.

After the winners have been selected, the staff supplies considerable assistance in locating them in schools of their choice. The program deals both in academic and internship placements.

THE EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Paul Schindler

The Education Policy Fellowship Program - formerly Washington Internships in Education - is a program of the Institute for Educational Leadership of the George Washington University. Funded by grants from the Rockefeller, Ford, and Cleveland Foundations, and ten other funding sources, the Fellowship provides an intensive year-long leadership development experience for selected mid-career men and women. Candidates for this national program must have a strong interest in working in the policy arena, and have an interest in using their leadership skills to improve American education. Although only a bachelor's degree is required, almost half of the current Fellows have a doctorate or law degree; 90 percent have advanced degrees.

In general, participants in the program have been between 25-50 years of age and, in 1976-77, 60 percent of the Fellows are women and the program placed 30 minorities with sponsors. Approximately one out of ten applicants receives a fellowship placement.

One of the strengths of the Education Policy Fellowship Program (EPFP) lies in the fact that Fellows bring a rich and varied background to their sponsor's office. Fellows have backgrounds in education, law, journalism, physical and social sciences, and have worked in the public as well as the private sectors.

Placement Process

Sponsors of Education Policy Fellows are chosen by EPFP because of their impact on the education policy process; these persons either create policy or are critical agents in its implementation. Sponsors select Fellows to work with them for one year, not only to demonstrate the policy process by serving as a mentor to the Fellows, but to draw on the background of the mid-career Fellow. The matching of skills and backgrounds of the Fellows with needs of the sponsors is a critical element of EPFP because a sponsor delegates responsibilities and duties to the Fellow as well as pays the full salary of the Fellow for the twelve-month Fellowship. The average salary of the 1976-77 Fellows is $20,000.

The purpose of the Fellowship program is to provide the Fellow with an opportunity to gain a working knowledge of the major education policy issues being discussed at the local, state, and federal levels, and of the processes by which policy is formulated and implemented. The sponsor acts as an on-the-job mentor and provides the supervision necessary for the Fellow to obtain a realistic view of the role of the agency in the policy process, the issues with which it deals, and the client groups to which it relates. The Fellows work full time and perform the functions which are required of the position in which they are placed. The sponsor provides the Fellow with on-going evaluation and immediate feedback, remains accessible to the Fellow, and delegates responsibility in the form of specific task assignments, involving the Fellow, as much as possible, with the office's planning and deliberations.

Policy Seminars

In addition to the on-the-job learning about the policy process, EPFP also utilizes the resources at the program sites. Fellows meet regularly with men and women who articulate, implement, or impact on the policy process. In informal settings, they meet with scores of persons to explore workings of state, urban, or federal bureaucracy. The education component provides an opportunity for Fellows to share the agency experiences with colleagues, to meet with key officials, and to explore broad policy issues in the field of education. The Fellows are involved in the shaping of activities of the policy seminars and in evaluating their effectiveness.

Finally, Fellows analyze their own experiences through quarterly reports and a case study reflecting on the decision-making process in their placements, particularly delineating the agency's relationship to other offices and agencies, as well as the ways in which policy decisions were determined. The bulk of the material provides a case study which, in turn, provides vicarious learning for all the Fellows. This report is developed in conjunction with the sponsor and is helpful for planning and administrative purposes in that agency.

All three dimensions of the Fellowship experience are essential to EPFP and perhaps explain why former "graduates" of the nondegree program

attest that the Fellowship experience is worth five or more years of work in a pivotal position in education.

Long-range Goals

While the Fellowship program is not a respite from the world, neither is it drudgery. Fellows have developed strong friendships with one another and have become members of a network of alumni(ae) who have participated in the program since 1964. EPFP - a twentieth century apprenticeship model - has been successful in preparing over two hundred and fifty individuals to accept the challenge of improving the educational system because they better understand the policy process that has shaped it.

The Fellowship program is conceived to represent a deliberate and formal undertaking within the broad concept of lifelong learning. It is designed to offer mid-career (and a few exceptional early mid-career) persons both a situation and a setting within which they may experience significant individual growth and the development of various meaningful personal, social, and career-related skills. These opportunities include discovering their potential for exercising leadership roles, their abilities for collaborating with others at high levels of decision-making, and their talents for engaging in the analysis of multidimensional public issues.

Consequently, the Fellowship year is intended to provide its participants with much more than short-term experience in some government-related job. It is expected that the impact of this undertaking for each Fellow will contribute in a significant way to the subsequent course of their lives and careers as well as improve the quality of education available in America today.

The Education Policy Fellowship Program attracts and serves Fellows and sponsors who find excitement in continued professional development and who are concerned that decisions made by large organizations can and must improve the ability of students of all ages to learn, to grow, and to shape their environment.

ATLANTA FELLOWS PROGRAM
Atlanta University

Barbara Jackson

However valid the philosophical base, however valuable the activities and experiences proposed, without outstanding, committed students there will be no effective program. Moreover, a program whose explicit purpose is to prepare educational leaders must have students who have already demonstrated potential for leadership. When we add our other priority, the development of black leaders, it means that the program must seek people who have developed sufficient self-awareness to be sensitive to the forces of society that have impacted on the black experience and to be willing to assume the risks inherent in attempting to change the social order. To find such people, there must be a large pool of applicants who possess diverse talents. Our recruitment efforts have been directed primarily to discovering such a pool.

Recruitment and Selection of Students

Our applications, from which we selected our first ten Rockefeller Fellows, were more numerous this year due to several factors. We had the assistance of our advisory board, a group of distinguished scholars and practitioners who were able to tell more people more about the program and who also assisted in the selection process. Our program has been in existence for a few years so that we have established visibility along with some credibility. Even though we do not have many graduates, they did assist in referring people to the program. Finally, we were somewhat more systematic in our specific recruitment efforts: a brochure was developed and mailed to selected school systems, other colleges and universities, and selected individuals. Our presence at the major educational conventions during the past few years, our 1974 Summer Institute, and membership in the Consortium for Educational Leadership combined with a great deal of personal activity and travel on the part of the director all contributed to the increase in the size of our applicant group. We had 155 applications this year as compared to 90 in 1972, the first year of the program. Another notable difference in this year's group was the greater geographical spread. Since we

want ours to be a national program, we will need to expand our efforts outside the South and the city of Atlanta from where the majority of our students have come. Of the 81 admitted, 56 are from the South; 30 of these from the city of Atlanta and another 15 from the state of Georgia.

Each applicant is required to submit an admission application and fee, a health form, undergraduate and graduate transcripts, four letters of recommendation (two from professors, two from employers), test scores from the Miller Analogies or Graduate Record Exam with preference for the MAT, a resume, and a letter of intent. The latter is given high priority for it represents the applicant's own assessment of his past and a projection of his career goals and how Atlanta University might satisfy his aspirations. These are submitted prior to January 30 for admittance in the following summer or fall.

Our procedure used in the past that we plan to continue is to have a specially appointed selection committee review these paper credentials and select approximately 25 for a group interview. These committees have been composed of faculty, students, and people outside the University. For the Rockefeller Fellows, we used our advisory board in an intensive two-day interview schedule with each applicant having only a half hour. An informal dinner was held the previous night to provide an opportunity to interact on a more informal basis with the selection committee members.

Our procedure for deciding who should be recommended on the basis of the paper credentials and the interview was to name first those for whom there was greatest agreement - both for admittance and for rejection. The balance were then discussed and those showing the most promise were selected. These recommendations were then forwarded to the Department of Administration for review and finally to the School of Education Committee for final decision.

In determining the criteria for admission, we have tried not to give undue weight to written evidence, especially since we know that many black people do not always present themselves well in a written statement. At the same time, we are looking for leaders who are both intelligent and intellectual so that some attention is given to these skills as well as the previous academic record. But we feel that the most important attributes

are those that can only be evaluated in a face-to-face encounter. References can help in this area if the writer is asked to comment specifically on this aspect of the applicant. The group interview is demanding and yet we feel it does provide an excellent setting to judge how an applicant reacts to pressure - a primary prerequisite for an educational leader.

Program Design

Because our program is university-based leading to a doctorate degree, there are certain requirements we feel we must meet if our program is to be accepted by the higher education community and, more importantly, have legitimacy and credibility for our graduates. We also know that those graduates who want to work in public school systems need to meet state certification requirements. We do not want to deny them the opportunity to do so by not offering the appropriate preparation. As a result, the general outline of our program sounds quite traditional: candidates for the Doctor of Education degree must complete a minimum of 90 semester hours distributed in the areas of administration, social and behavioral sciences, curriculum, learning theory, research, dissertation, and elective courses in the areas of the student's special interest. At least 48 semester hours of the required minimum must be earned at Atlanta University. We have stated these requirements in terms of "areas" rather than specific courses in order to build flexibility into the program. This allows us to address the unique needs of our clientele and still meet requirements of accrediting agencies.

We have also described the program in competency terms: technical or managerial skills, human skills, and conceptual skills with emphasis on the social and behavioral sciences.

In order to make our program distinctive, however, we have concentrated on two aspects. The first has to do with methods. Even though we do emphasize reading and writing, we recognize that there are other skills that the administrator needs. These are primarily in the area of communication and human relations. Thus, we try to provide a variety of opportunities for the students to assume leadership roles during the period of their study, to make oral presentations, to defend a point of view, to critique and evaluate their own ideas and those of their colleagues, and to discuss and to argue different points of view. We have built in a variety of field-

experiences using research methods from anthropology and sociology. The internship has been reexamined and tailored to the needs of individual students.

The second aspect is directly related to the mission of Atlanta University and its commitment to develop black leadership. Beginning with this past summer, we have focused more explicitly on training from a black perspective. We began with an orientation under the direction of Dr. Alfred Pasteur that allowed the students to explore dimensions of race in a new and open way. One of our summer courses, Black Community Issues, taught by Dr. Donald Smith, again focused on this topic. We recognized the black aesthetic through a summer forum that blended the intellectual with the affective with the psychomotor. In other words, we are not only recognizing, but making a legitimate component of the program, the "spirit of black folks" to use the words of DuBois: to infuse all we do with the humaneness, dignity, and dogged strength expressed with style and color that has been characteristic of black people since they first came to this country.

As a part of the black perspective, we are also giving more attention to research. In our revised sequence, we will focus more on defining those problems and issues that relate directly to the black experience. We will provide our students with intensive and extensive training in all methodologies, especially the use of computer science and the analysis of quantitative data. In this way, our graduates will be prepared to participate in a more effective way in the on-going process of redefining black folk.

Assignment and Placement

Most of our graduates have depended on their own resources for placement. Some have received assistance from the Consortium for Educational Leadership where placement is a major program component.

Many of our graduates were required to return to their school system so that there was no immediate need for finding new positions. Our concern will come when they are ready for the next move. Several graduates have been limited in their options because of the lack of previous experience. This was especially true for the women in the early years of the program whose experience was not commensurate with academic training. This issue

is related to that of recruitment and program design. Recognizing this difficulty, we gave preference with the new Rockefeller Fellows to people who had already had administrative experience.

Of our twenty-five graduates, eleven did return to the same school system, though not all to the same position; four returned to the same city, but to different jobs; and ten moved to new communities.

Program Objectives

The original objectives for the doctoral program have been reaffirmed to prepare leaders:

> who have knowledge and skills, both theoretical and practical in all phases of the organization and management of institutions, especially public school systems;
>
> who are familiar with, and able to learn strategies from, the behavioral and social sciences for dealing with the forces and influences which impinge on the process of education;
>
> who can use with intelligence and discrimination the findings of research and evaluation to question the values and assumptions of those studies which relate to the abilities of children - especially black children - to learn; and
>
> who are sensitive to the interrelationship between school systems and the communities they serve, particularly if these are black communities.

In addition to these objectives for our graduates, we hope that the doctoral program will be an influence for change within Atlanta University so that it can respond to the broader needs of black communities. Finally, we hope our program will have some influence on the nature of preparation programs for all educational leaders.

Evaluation

The ultimate evaluation of our effectiveness in the preparation of educational leaders will be the impact our graduates have on the educational enterprise. To date, our graduates are too few and too recent to know if we have been effective based on this criterion.

For the evaluation of the elements of the program, we have depended heavily on student feedback, discussion among the faculty, and the opinions of others involved in various ways with the program. The students complete a written evaluation at the end of each course. The informal comments,

however, seem to be more helpful. We have also sent questionnaires to our graduates for comments on the usefulness of the courses as preparation for their jobs. Despite the small returns the comments have been useful in assessing our efforts. We also participated in the Career Patterns Study sponsored by the Consortium for Educational Leadership for students from all seven institutions in the Consortium.

With the present Rockefeller Foundation grant, we will have a more systematic evaluation using our advisory board and other people outside the University. We are in the process of drafting this plan now that will be put into operation during the current academic year.

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP
SUMMER INSTITUTE

Ann M. Morrison

Since 1974, the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) has sponsored the Summer Institute, a fellowship program for graduate students interested in the application of social and behavioral science research. Each year about 15 universities are invited to send one of their outstanding Ph.D. candidates in psychology, sociology, or business. The Center conducts the program for several reasons:

1. To build a network among future participants in the Center's areas of interest;
2. To create intellectual excitement among people with mutual interests;
3. To provide some of the best students in the field with an opportunity for practical application of social science knowledge; and
4. To acquaint more people with the Center's goals and facilities. One major goal is to bridge the gap between academia and the business world.

A diverse group of 12 Summer Fellows, three of whom hold foreign citizenship (Brazil, Canada, and Great Britain), participated in this year's Summer Institute. Each Fellow received a $1,000 stipend as well as food, housing, and transportation during the program. Several Special Fellows were also invited by the Center this year.

Schedule

The 1976 Institute ran eight weeks (June 4 through July 30), longer than those in previous years, mainly to accommodate a four-week internship. The Fellows' schedule included:

June 5-11	Leadership Development Program, a seven-day experiential training program in leadership skills, conducted by Center staff.
June 14-25	Training in "managerial performance appraisal and feedback," the research topic of the program, conducted by Center staff.

June 28-July 23	Internship projects at business and government institutions in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, and weekly seminars with Twin Cities executives.
July 26-30	Individual presentations and group exercises designed to "wrap up" the program.

A Research Theme

The 1976 Institute, unlike its predecessors, had a research theme - managerial performance appraisal and feedback - which tied the summer program in with an on-going Center research project.

Performance appraisal was selected as the summer topic because, as one executive put it, "Most organizational problems, when you get down to it, are problems of performance appraisal." Most organizations have appraisal systems which generally don't work very well for a variety of reasons. Also, information regarding recent affirmative action regulations dealing with performance evaluation is in demand by managers. Thus, this topic area was current, had potential and tangible outcomes, and would meet the needs and interests of both students and managers as an internship project.

Training

Although the Fellows came from different fields of study, there were some constants assumed in their prior training. Each graduate student would have had some formal education in human relations, communication, methodology, and statistics, which could be built upon during the three-week training period.

The first week, leadership training, gave the Fellows both content and personal/group exercises in using such leadership skills as decision-making, creative problem solving, and interpersonal feedback. Not only were certain skills developed, but that week also represented the Fellows' first common experience - an intensive and revealing program fostering a group cohesion that continued throughout the summer.

The next two weeks consisted of training in the topic area by C.L Research Division staff. The objectives were to prepare the Fellows to (1) conduct research in performance appraisal, and (2) provide training to managers at their internship site.

Through lectures, role-play exercises, and a three-hour organizational simulation, the Fellows learned about different aspects of managerial appraisal - basic principles and research issues, performance measurement, contextual factors, and the performance appraisal interview. Internship assignments, based on the interests and preferences of both Fellows and mentors, were given at the end of the first week.

Internships and Epilogue

The Fellows then flew to Minneapolis and settled into the Center's off-site headquarters - a sorority house on the University of Minnesota campus. Twelve mentors from Twin Cities organizations had been recruited to host an intern. The sites ranged from large corporations (General Mills, 3M, Honeywell) to smaller businesses (Medtronic, National Computer Systems, Minneapolis Star & Tribune) and government organizations (Ramsey County, Minnesota State Patrol). The internships were designed to give the Fellows experience in applying the theory and principles of performance appraisal in an organizational setting.

Fellows reported to their mentors Monday morning (June 28) for an orientation session and to agree upon a project that could be carried out within the month. The projects ranged from pure research to almost pure training. Most of the Fellows first interviewed a sample of managers and then made specific recommendations for modifying the organization's existing appraisal system. In some cases, the Fellows used managers' comments to design and conduct training sessions on using the current appraisal system more effectively.

During the internship period, several evening seminars were held with Twin Cities executives. Two dinners with the mentors, one early and one late in the month, helped to acquaint the program participants and CCL staff with one another and to share reactions to the program.

The Fellows returned to Greensboro for the final week of the program to report on their projects. They also participated in a group problem solving session on "future directions for appraisal" and a formal debate on the pros and cons of performance appraisal. The final activity was a feedback session with CCL staff on the entire summer program.

Monitoring and Evaluation

All phases of the Summer Institute were monitored via feedback from participants. Written feedback was received from the Fellows throughout the training period for assessment and planning by CCL staff. Site visits to host organizations were made by myself and research staff members to discuss with both mentors and Fellows the project itself, questions or problems that may have arisen, and their ideas and suggestions for the summer program.

The week after the internships, the Fellows each gave a formal presentation on their host organizations and internship projects and submitted a written report of their activities to the Center staff. All participants (except one mentor) completed a questionnaire on the program - design, training, and outcomes. These data are now being considered in planning the 1977 Summer Institute.

The feedback from Fellows and mentors was very positive. While they made suggestions for minor changes in the program, most of the Fellows felt that they had achieved a great deal of personal and professional growth. The internship experience was most rewarding for some because, in one Fellow's words: "The chance to really work in an organization was invaluable. (It) put academic information into perspective and allowed development of a new set of competencies."

Several mentors cited the "outsider's" perspective and recommendations as valuable organizational benefits. Others felt that their organizations had received benefits such as a training program designed for continued use in the organization, or a program analysis and evaluation. One mentor expressed a personal reaction in the comment: "I have over the years been exposed to many personnel management 'experts'; in contrast to those experiences, the weeks that I spent working with (the Fellow) were the most refreshing ones in a long time. I hope that what was begun in our analysis... can proceed. We owe much to your intern and feel privileged to have been able to work with (the Fellow)."

There is something about the "chemistry" of the Summer Institute - the interaction of personalities and talents within a structured program - that seems to work in achieving the objectives of all parties involved. We hope to duplicate the quality of this summer's experience in future programs.

COMMUNITY FELLOWS PROGRAM
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Hubie Jones

Program History

The Community Fellows Program began at MIT in September 1971 and was underwritten by funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and other private institutions. The Program was initiated by MIT in response to a recommendation from Melvin King, then Executive Director of the Boston Urban League. For four academic years, ten or eleven minority activists from communities throughout the United States have come to MIT to engage in a year of reflection, study, and research - utilizing the Institute's resources to become equipped with new knowledge and skills. As a mid-career program, CFP was aimed at preparing Fellows for more effective service upon return to their home organizations and communities or to gain readiness for the pursuit of other career opportunities, related to further service to minority communities. Each year five of the Fellows have come from the Boston community; the remainder from cities throughout the U.S. The Fellows' minority status has included: Black Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans. Collectively, they represent activists with a broad range of ideological and political positions; but all have been committed to pursuing community development strategies to achieve viability for minority communities in America.

The CFP provided each Fellow with a living stipend, moving expenses, if necessary, tuition payment, and funds to assist in research activities related to a major community development project of their choosing. The Fellows were required to totally disengage themselves from the organizational and community work in which they were involved prior to the onset of the CFP. This requirement was designed to create a "cultural island" effect so that Fellows would not be deflected from using the opportunities and resources available at MIT. A system of advisors and faculty mentors was developed in order to give Fellows the emotional support and technical assistance required to adapt to the MIT environment and achieve their growth objectives for the year.

Program Structure

Programmatically, Fellows were required to work in a research project that would be relevant to their continued work in minority communities. At the conclusion of the academic year the work product was presented to colleagues and invited guests for critique and recommendations as to how to acquire resources needed to implement the project. Throughout the course of the year, Fellows were advised by MIT faculty members and/or outside experts as they pursued their research efforts. Although there was no explicit requirement that Fellows take courses at MIT, there was an implicit expectation that they do so. In fact, most Fellows took at least two courses at MIT or Harvard during the year.

All Fellows were required to attend a weekly seminar on "Issues and Strategies of Community Development." This seminar was conducted by the director and associate director of the Program and was designed to meet the specific needs and interests of the Fellows. Guest speakers from the Institute and public and private organizations throughout the nation participated in the seminars. The seminars provided an opportunity for Fellows to have a consistent exchange of ideas, problems, concerns, and feelings. On many occasions, it provided Fellows with a vehicle for working on problems related to the operations of CFP.

In addition, all Fellows participated in a week-long orientation program held in August at Williams College. These sessions provided Fellows with the opportunity to get to know each other, to learn about resources at MIT, to master departmental mechanics, and to participate in seminars with guest lecturers designed to surface their common interests in problems of minority communities.

During this four-year period, the Program was under the directorship of Professor Frank S. Jones, Ford Professor of Urban Planning, and Melvin H. King, Institute Lecturer, Massachusetts State Legislator, and long-time community leader in Boston's black community. Messrs. Jones and King took CFP from a concept to a vital operational program that has had a powerful impact on the lives of minority activists involved, and on the DUSP students and faculty members who became engaged with the Program.

Program Evaluation

Every evaluative review of the Community Fellows Program, whether the formal evaluation conducted during academic year 1972-73, the periodic internal staff reviews, or the informal feedback from Fellows over the four-year period, reveals that the Program has been a powerful intervention into the lives of the community activists involved. Most Fellows feel that the Program provides both a rich opportunity for personal growth and a wrenching emotional challenge in terms of coping with the intellectual rigors and reflective life of the academy.

On the opportunity side, the Program has provided the following:

1. Ten months of life-space for Fellows to assess past experiences and achievements and to decide on and prepare for future career options.
2. The opportunity to sift through broad ranges of resources to learn how they can best be utilized to the benefit of minority communities.
3. The opportunity to produce a work product which can be of substantial benefit to community organizations and the focus for integrating past experience and newly acquired knowledge and skills.
4. The opportunity to anchor personal growth needs and career objectives in the moral and pragmatic imperatives of community development for minority communities. (This evolved out of tough intellectual and emotional exchanges among the Fellows over the year, brought into focus by seminars, collective work projects and social events.)
5. An opportunity to test theories and conceptual learnings derived from the activist experience against the intellectual rigors and resources, including students and faculty, at the Institute.

On the challenge side, Fellows report the following:

1. For many Fellows entrance into the high-powered intellectual environment of MIT initially produced a "crisis of confidence" - as some doubts were raised in their minds as to whether past experiences and achievements and academic preparation were adequate for functioning at MIT and utilizing its resources for specified purposes. With the individual and group support provided by the Program, most Fellows were able to surmount the "crisis in confidence" period.

2. The Program requirement that Fellows pull away from the active, crisis-oriented life of community work posed an adjustment of significant magnitude. A sustained period of reflective activity requires a different set of coping devices, radically different from those essential to survival on the community battle lines. A great many of these coping devices are enmeshed in activity/emotional engagement in battle. Therefore, the "non-active," reflective posture of life at the Institute necessitates the development of different coping devices in order to take advantage of the opportunities mentioned above. In short, most Fellows, to some degree, have had to fight against the pull to get actively involved in community issues and battles. During the first weeks of the Program, most Fellows experienced this internal struggle that drains away emotional energies needed to pursue their work plans for the year. Consequently, many Fellows report a feeling of "floundering" during this period.

3. Most Fellows during the year were faced with the challenge of realizing they had a range of life options. That is, they were "freed" to consider that they had control over how they used their past experiences, knowledge, and skills to the benefit of themselves and minority communities. For a few Fellows this meant that they came to realize that they should move into a different job situation. For others, it meant that when they returned to their organizations they should operate in very different ways if the growth experience at MIT was to be enhanced and continually nourished to the benefit of the Fellows and their organizations. The psychological adjustment required to face new options often challenged long held views about the nature of commitment to one's ethnic group and one's home community.

4. To some extent, the Fellows were caught between the Program's overriding emphasis on freedom to pursue intellectual development and professional growth needs and the pragmatic need for their presence and involvement in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning if mutual benefits of interaction were to occur. To be sure, the involvement of Fellows in classes and on departmental committees contributed to some of the recent constructive changes in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning. However, a more substantial impact was undermined by physical separation and "soft" commitments by faculty to support the CFP in concrete ways.

Our evaluation indicates that most Fellows agree that the tensions generated by the dynamics between the opportunities and the challenges are

essential to growth and learning. They also agree that supportive mechanisms in the Program are essential if Fellows are to utilize the opportunities available to the fullest possible extent. Over the course of the Program a great deal has been learned about ways to pursue supportive intervention without undermining the concept of the free agent. For instance, we learned that more active supervisory guidance by CFP advisors and faculty mentors is required during the first two months than the later months if the "crises" encountered are to be successfully mastered. Making mandatory requirements more explicit and contractual is also a learning process derived from the four-year experience. However, it is still true that the free agent aspect of the Program calls for constant review. The directors of the Program have struggled with the complicated task of establishing a balance between setting limited demands and expectations through explicit requirements, on the one hand, and allowing freedom of opportunity and action, on the other.

In addition, concerns were expressed by many Fellows about the purpose and objective of group experiences in the Program, such as the weekly Community Development Seminar attended by all Fellows. In essence, unclarity remains about the collective and individual responsibilities of each Fellow for his colleagues' performance and personal growth. This issue will also be focused upon by the new director.

Through participation in courses, departmental committees, and research projects, the Fellows brought a vital perspective and form of inquiry that infused issues of race, inequality, social justice, and program and policy implementation into our educational program. The CFP provided DUSP students with important role models in terms of contact with minority leaders who have demonstrated commitment to and competence in dealing with critical development problems in minority communities. Fellows provided many students with a mirror against which to view their professional and personal commitments and career objectives. In addition, CFP brought prominent minority scholars, governmental officials, and community leaders to the Institute for lectures and informal discussions. The lectures enriched the educational fare available because DUSP students gained greater access to resources and career opportunities in the outside world through their contacts with

Fellows. In fact, a number of our graduates are now working with former Fellows in their home organizations. This kind of linkage is critical to the healthy development of our professional degree program.

Ultimately, the success of the CFP must be measured by the personal and professional growth of the participants (as perceived by them) and their work, achievements, and contributions to minorities since leaving the Program.

AMERICAN INDIAN
COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Richard E. Wilson

There are very few Indian people on the faculties and in the administration of community and junior colleges. Of the twelve hundred community and junior colleges in 1974, only four had Indian presidents and three of these were Indian colleges on Indian reservations. Even more surprising, only one Indian vice president has been identified at community and junior colleges located off-reservation. This was the situation when AACJC and The Rockefeller Foundation instituted the Community College Administrative Internship Program for American Indians.

Why is this? Most often we were told that no one is qualified. Yet we know that the field of public school teaching is one that Indians have been directed to for many years. But, once established as public school teachers, they have stayed teachers. Very few have been able to cross into public school administration, and even fewer into college teaching and administration.

The last few years have seen a rise in Indian interest in community and junior colleges. These institutions have been recognized and accepted as a means of furthering one's education without leaving one's family, friends, and supportive environment.

A Need for Special Programs

With this increase in interest, community and junior colleges have felt an obligation to develop special programs to meet the needs of their Indian constituencies. Thus far, most of these efforts have been either "Native American studies programs" or special counseling services. Indians have been sought for these "Indian" positions. The ineptness revealed in these efforts indicates all too clearly how little higher education institutions know about Indian people. It also reveals that Indian people have been deprived of career opportunities and experiences in college administration.

It is critical to the Indian community - and to colleges - that Indian people be afforded an opportunity to serve as presidents, deans, financial

aid officers - all types of administrators - as well as faculty members, and that they not be limited to Indian studies or minority counselor programs, even though these are very important. It is also important that they have an opportunity to work in all types of community and junior colleges and not just Indian controlled community colleges.

Program Structure

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges is implementing a program designed to provide the in-service training experiences that are necessary to qualify American Indians for responsible administrative positions to which, historically, they have had only minimal access.

The AACJC intern program places Indian interns as administrators in community colleges for an entire academic year. Interns usually work directly with presidents (a common title is assistant to the president) part of the time. The primary objective of this assignment is to gain exposure to the daily responsibilities and pressures of the chief administrator of a community college. Interns also work with other administrators on specific assignments to learn about all operations and functions performed by community colleges. Interns are involved in curriculum development, personnel, purchasing, public relations, budget preparation, "grantsmanship," student affairs, and other activities performed at colleges. They become active and contributing staff members at the action level and experience the challenges, rewards, and frustrations of administration.

The interns are expected to submit monthly reports to the vice president for programs at AACJC, who is responsible for program monitoring. These reports are shared among the interns to keep each other informed and to share ideas that could be tried by several of the interns.

On-site visits are made by the vice president for programs during the program. The purpose of the visits is to review internship experiences and opportunities most beneficial for that individual, and to visit with college administrators who are working with each intern to ensure that they are pleased with the intern's work, attitudes, and plans.

Orientation

At the beginning of each internship year, the interns and their respective administrative mentors are brought together in an orientation

meeting to discuss the internship and make specific plans for the internship year. Although there are brief presentations, it is an informal workshop and an opportunity to answer questions the interns and administrators have about their responsibilities, benefits, and procedures to follow. It also provides the time for each intern and his/her administrative mentor to become acquainted and learn what each expects from the other. This can be done much more effectively away from the campuses where routine work and crises demand immediate attention and allow only infrequent discussions.

American Indians interested in this internship program contact AACJC.. Interns must have a baccalaureate degree and preference is given to people with graduate degrees and teaching and administrative experience. Applicants are people interested in college administration who state they want to stay in community and junior college administration. A panel of Indian educators selected by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges reviews the applications and awards the internships. The selection committee is comprised of individuals knowledgeable about the internship program and community college education. The last selection committee included two former interns and a vice president of a community college. The former interns are now employed as administrators in community colleges.

Requirements

Listed below are the actual requirements for becoming a community college administrative intern.

1. Candidates must be American or Canadian Indians.
2. Candidates must be or have been working in the junior/community college field or submit evidence that this is their career goal.
3. Candidates must have at least a baccalaureate degree and preferably a master's degree.
4. Candidates must supply five letters of recommendation.
5. Candidates must be available for interviews which will deal with interests in higher education and the candidate's plans for future professional development.
6. Candidates must submit a detailed resume providing information useful for the selection committee.

The Community College Administrative Internship Program is in its third academic year. Each year seven interns have been selected. Fourteen have

completed the internship and seven are interning. Of the fourteen interns who have completed this program, ten are employed as administrators in community and junior colleges.

Evaluation

The program has been evaluated continually. On the basis of these evaluations, two issues have been evaluated repeatedly and, for the most part, have been resolved. One of these is the amount of academic preparation needed by interns and the interrelating of academic work with the internship. Originally, graduate degrees were not viewed as experience separate from academic programs, such as doctoral programs. However, experience has shown that interns who have earned master's degrees and who are enrolled in doctoral programs have been more successful than other interns. A few of the interns had not earned their master's degrees. All of those interns have experienced more difficulty as interns and as applicants for administrative positions in community colleges.

Experience has also shown that interns enrolled in doctoral programs who are obtaining some credit for the internship have had more satisfactory experiences and found it much easier to obtain administrative positions after the internship. Because of these experiences, the selection committee was urged to give preference to candidates who had earned master's degrees and who are enrolled in doctoral programs.

Another issue was the placement of interns in Indian controlled and operated colleges. Some Indians have insisted that interns should be encouraged to serve their internships in Indian colleges. In their minds a major purpose of the program, perhaps the primary purpose, is to assist Indian colleges. Other people have insisted that the interns would benefit more from working in typical community colleges that enroll sizeable numbers of Indians. The latter view has been upheld and supported by almost all of the interns. At the orientation meetings, it has become clear that interns want to have internship experiences at typical colleges to enlarge their experiences and choices once they have completed the internship. From their standpoint, they will always be considered for administrative positions in Indian controlled community colleges, but they are not certain they will be attractive candidates for other community colleges if their experiences are

limited to Indian community colleges. Although this issue will never be fully resolved, the consensus of the program is to prepare Indians for community college administration and not provide support for Indian controlled community colleges.

Although the internship program has been generally successful, it is unfortunate that four of the interns are not presently employed by community colleges. There are several reasons. For example, community colleges have not been enlarging their administrative staff the last few years. In fact, financial limitations have required some community colleges to reduce the number of administrators they employ. Secondly, the former interns who are not in the community college field do not have graduate degrees which almost all community colleges require for administrative positions. The third important reason is that the former Indian interns will only consider community colleges that enroll large numbers of Indians. Although community colleges enroll more Indian students than other colleges, the number of community colleges enrolling sizeable numbers of Indians is small.

One development that should make it easier for the interns to become community college administrators is the growing number of Indian controlled community colleges and the growing number of community colleges that are actively recruiting Indians. It is anticipated that within a few years all of the people who participated as interns will be employed as community college administrators. This is a reasonable and likely development, and it is the goal of the program.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

K. Z. Chavis

The Leadership Development Program (LDP) is a special project of the Southern Regional Council funded by the Ford Foundation, which awards fellowships to rural teachers, school administrators, and community workers to help them upgrade themselves, their classrooms, their schools, and their communities.

The awardee (who is called an LDP Fellow) combines study and experience in his area of special concern at several different locations in the United States. Working with recognized authorities who serve as mentors and program advisors, they acquaint themselves with established and experimental programs and projects consistent with their interests. LDP is primarily a non-degree oriented program, focusing on informal study, internships, and participation in rewarding activities.

A full year fellowship recipient is awarded a salary supplement plus funds budgeted individually for his proposed travel, study, lodging, and miscellaneous expenditures. Additionally, short-term awards of one to six months of study/internship are available to those for whom a longer absence would be impractical.

Any individual living in a rural or small community who is concerned with upgrading the quality of education and/or improving the delivery of human and social services may apply. Generally, the applicant should be under 35, although exceptions are sometimes made. The applicant should be more interested in informal self-improvement than in obtaining an advanced graduate degree.

The Identification of Hidden Talent

There are many individuals in the rural areas of the South who are unobtrusively struggling to improve their educational systems and communities. Products, themselves, of isolation and inadequate services, they have defined the many problems in education, health, housing, economics, and politics, but are frustrated in their efforts to find solutions. Yet they are

committed to trying, to remaining in their home communities, to searching for effective approaches to develop their homelands, and to bettering the lives of their neighbors and, more important, the lives of the next generation.

The Leadership Development Program seeks to identify and develop this often hidden talent in the rural South. Begun in 1967 under the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the Leadership Development Program has awarded over 200 fellowships. Originally conceived to find and fund public elementary and secondary teachers in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, the Program has expanded its outreach to include individuals more broadly involved in educational reform and community development, recognizing the significant impact of the entire community system on educational efforts and outputs.

The Program in 1974 became a special project of the Southern Regional Council and has expanded its geographical area to more closely coincide with the organization's boundaries, and now includes Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, and the boot heel of Missouri.

Motivation and Education

Leadership Development Program efforts are based on the belief that the most valuable agents of change are those individuals who understand the intricacies, mores, and norms of their particular system, and who have a vested interest in improving that system because it is their home and the home of their children. The fellowship program is based on offering these individuals exposure and first-hand experience with organizations and individuals throughout the country and, in some instances, throughout the world who are involved in reform efforts. Thus, established leaders of innovation agree to serve as mentors and welcome the LDP Fellow as an intern and apprentice in their organizations. A typical Fellow would intern at five or six different locations during his Fellowship year, gaining exposure to various leadership styles, and different strategies and approaches to development, as eclectically he seeks to develop his own plan, program, and style, appropriate to his own personality and the needs and particularities of his home community.

While not designed as a degree-oriented program, a number of Fellows have profited also from course work and independent study at various universities throughout the country. The Leadership Development Program is unique in that there are no educational requirements for entry into the program. Many applicants have been deprived of early educational opportunities, victims of the tenant farm system and no compulsory school attendance laws, but are self-educated through their experiences. One such LDP Fellow came into the program with a sixth-grade education and returned to his community to become the first black county commissioner ever elected in his county. On the other hand, another LDP Fellow was able to complete his master's degree at a leading school of educational administration while on the program, and returned to his home community as a key administrator in the school system.

Working toward achieving nondiscrimination in the region, the Program's selection criteria and process reflect that goal. While an emphasis has been placed on recruiting individuals in the age range of 25 to 35, many individuals older and younger have been selected. Men and women have been selected in equal proportion throughout the seven years, as the program pioneered in recognizing the rights and outstanding leadership potential of women. The color of one's skin has never been a deterrent to selection, as the Program has sought to develop a coalition of black and white leadership efforts, cognizant of the importance of unity in developing a truly new South.

Selection

Selection has been based on that often elusive quality to define - "leadership potential." A panel of leading Southerners in their respective fields, from university deans to grass roots community organizers, has served as the selection committee, and each year has grappled with the difficult decisions of selecting Fellows. Interviewed a total of five different times, a candidate is queried regarding his past involvements and commitments, his proposed program, and his vision, as efforts are made to select tomorrow's future leaders. The rigor of selection has proven invaluable, as LDP Fellows, often enticed by lucrative job offers outside the region, have returned home at increasingly high rates. At this time, ninety-five percent of those awarded fellowships are actively involved in reform efforts within

the region or are pursuing further education with plans to return. Working at many different levels, former LDP Fellows can be found throughout the South, quietly and effectively trying out their new skills and knowledge, developing and implementing programs and plans to improve situations in the rural areas.

In the business of developing new leadership in the South, the Leadership Development Program, itself, has developed over the past seven years, as it has successfully adjusted to changing strategies, priorities, and programs in the region. Each individual has been recognized as possessing a unique set of needs, skills, hopes, and fears, as his Fellowship program was developed and modified accordingly. As an adult education program, through the utilization of staff input, information, and experience, individualized programming and experience-based learning have been proven to be viable approaches to developing leaders.

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVANCED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR MINORITY EDUCATORS

Nathaniel Jackson

Although public education has made great strides toward achieving the American dream of universal education, it has still fallen miserably short of the fulfillment of the parallel dream of equal education. Simply, the system has failed the racially, ethnically, and economically deprived 25 percent of the country's population. This failure is evident in the quality of education that minority children receive and in the distressing lack of minority men and women in positions of top educational leadership. For example, the minority student population in California is reaching 40 percent, yet the number of minority superintendents is about one percent.

The Rockefeller Foundation is acknowledged as a leader in the search for solutions to this problem, funding innovative projects in minority leadership development in education throughout the country.

Objectives

The Advanced Management Program for Minority Educators, conducted by the Center for Educational Leadership, is a Rockefeller Foundation program seeking to accelerate the upward career mobility of minority teachers and middle managers in California. It was funded in March 1975.

The program's objectives are to identify and recruit 50 to 60 minority educational administrators with potential upward mobility, to prepare them with modern management knowledge and skills through an intensive, graduate-level seminar program over a one-year period, and to follow their upward movement over an additional three-year period.

Candidates sought for the program are outstanding minority educators possessing a master's or bachelor's degree from an accredited academic institution and having at least three years of technical, professional, or administrative experience in education.

Selection

Participants were recruited through personal contacts with educational leaders throughout the state. Special recruitment attention was given to

school districts showing the highest percentage of minority student population. Efforts were also made to comply with the intent of Title IX and Executive Order #4. Successful application to the program required the full recommendation and encouragement of the district superintendent, as demonstrated by specific indications of how the candidate could be used to fulfill district needs upon completion of training.

Sixty-four participants, representing thirty-nine California school districts and eight county offices, were selected from more than 200 well-qualified candidates. They included twenty male and seven female blacks, eighteen male and eight female Spanish-surnamed Americans, one male and seven female Caucasians, one male and one female Asian-American, and one female American Indian. Academic backgrounds included three doctor's, forty-six master's, and fifteen bachelor's degrees. Ages ranged from 29 to 51, and length of service in current positions varied from six months to nine years. During the course of the training, two male and one female black participants found it necessary to withdraw, and one female black requested and was granted auditor status because of very heavy professional and personal pressures.

The advanced management curriculum presented in the program integrated the latest theory and research from the organization, behavioral, and policy sciences. The material was organized into a series of twelve two-day, overnight seminar sessions covering the following themes:

- Personal Renewal and Professional Development of Educators
- Policy Formation in Education
- Educational Philosophy and Management Philosophy
- Behavioral Perspectives on Educational Management
- Sociology of Educational Organization
- Management Research Design and Methodology
- Participative Management Performance System for Education
- Organizational Research and Evaluation in Education
- Management of Organization Change in Education
- Inferential Statistics and Data Analysis
- Conflict Management in Education
- Politics of Educational Finance and Community Support

Center staff faculty, qualified with doctorates in the social sciences and management, combine extensive teaching experience in universities and

special education management seminars with broad practical experience in managing and consulting for urban organizations. Guest faculty, highly successful practitioners of a variety of educational specialties, were dynamic additions to the seminar teaching design. Primarily minority in make-up, they enabled participants to view career opportunities realistically and to understand the qualities and abilities required to make promotional steps.

600 Hours

Seminar sessions consisted of a combination of lectures, discussions, workshops, process time, and personal style testing. Assigned readings and projects required about 600 hours of outside preparation by each participant over the year's training period, and actual seminar contact hours numbered about 240.

Participants were grouped into three seminar sections of about twenty each, one in northern and two in southern California. The seminars overlapped, the first southern group running from June 1975 through May 1976 and the northern group and second southern group running simultaneously from October 1975 through September 1976. One seminar session was held each month for each group, a meeting format which allowed participants to carry on as full-time education employees.

Student evaluations were based upon seminar participation, academic examinations, and the completion of practicum assignments and an applied management project to demonstrate ability to apply the knowledge and skills acquired in the seminar. Participants who fulfilled these requirements received a certificate attesting to their skills as management specialists.

Reviews

General and specific reaction by participants, superintendents, and outside reviewers has been very positive. Eleven participants, or 20 pe cent, have already experienced upward movement, one to a superintendency and most of the others to principalships. They candidly credit the program - the knowledge and tools they gained from it - for helping them interview positively for positions of greater leadership and for aiding the i in the sure handling of their increased responsibilities. Superintendents

have commented that although they had nominated people who had considerable possibilities, they had seen development beyond their estimates and were genuinely able to suggest promotive action for them.

Several types of evaluation are being used to judge the success of the program: formative, summative, and longitudinal. Formative evaluation assessed participants' reactions to content usefulness and presentation effectiveness for each seminar topic. Instructors at each seminar session were also evaluated by the participants as part of the formative evaluation. Evaluation employing a before-after design to measure changes in behavior and skill development of each participant will indicate the degree to which participants have utilized the management knowledge and tools they acquired during the program. Finally, the longitudinal evaluation will track the career advancement of participants for a three-year period, identifying those factors that contribute to their upward mobility.

NATIONAL ASPIRA FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

John Figueroa

Program Objectives

The Fellowship Program is designed to meet the training needs of men and women who want to make educational policy in the United States more responsive to the particular needs of the Puerto Rican community. There is presently a critical shortage of competent leaders in educational policy with reference to the Puerto Rican community. The overall goal of the program is to help alleviate this situation and to accelerate the development of a cadre of competent and responsible leaders in education for the Puerto Rican community. Participants meet this goal through a specialized approach that combines meaningful on-the-job and academic experience.

Program Design

The Fellowship year consists of three phases:

First Summer Session - six weeks
Field Assignment/Independent Study - nine months
Second Summer Session - six weeks

Academic Component

All Fellows are candidates for the Master of Science degree in Urban Education from Fordham University. Degree requirements are met through summer session courses and independent study courses during the field assignment period.

Field Assignment Component

All Fellows serve as full-time assistants to top level personnel in key educational policymaking agencies for a nine-month period.

Scope of Placement

Throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. In 1975-76, three Fellows were placed in Washington, D.C., two in California, and one in Connecticut.

Sponsors/Mentors

Top level executives in educational policymaking agencies ranging from the United States Office of Education (HEW) to State Departments of

Education and key administrators charged with the formulation and implementation of educational policy with reference to the Puerto Rican and Hispanic community.

Scope of Recruitment

Throughout the United States and in Puerto Rico.

Recruitment Strategies

Announcements in metropolitan dailies with large Hispanic readerships, general media press releases, publications of the National Center for Public Service Internships, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Aspira affiliates and the network of current and former Fellows and mentors.

Screening and Selection

Application materials must be requested by individuals seeking admission to the Fellowship Program. All completed applications are screened by a selection committee. Applicants meeting standards are invited for an interview. Interviews are required of all semi-finalists nominated to a national panel. Finalists are notified of selection as a Fellow upon final approval by the board of directors.

Admission Requirements

Age: no specific age requirement
Education: bachelor's degree minimum
Occupation: two-year work experience minimum, preferably in an administrative capacity
Additional criteria: U.S. citizen with demonstrated capacity and desire to become an educational policymaker with reference to the Puerto Rican community
Candidate must have demonstrated communication skills in the dominant language of the educational policymaking agency

Remuneration/Stipend

Fellows' salaries are matched at the rate of previous employment up to a ceiling of $15,000. Fringe benefits, summer stipends, and master's degree costs are paid by Aspira from grant funds.

Obligations Upon Completion

As a result of the Fellowship experience, all Fellows will be better equipped to make educational policy more responsive to the unique needs of

the Puerto Rican community. During the Fellowship year itself, the Fellows are in a tremendous position to impact on and contribute to the overall advancement and betterment of the Puerto Rican community.

Placement after Graduation

While the Fellowship cannot and will not assume responsibility for the post-Fellowship placement of a Fellow, every effort will be made to assist the graduates of the program in finding suitable employment in light of their Fellowship experience. In the third and fourth cycles of the program, we proposed to establish a placement component to aid the Fellow and bring available opportunities to the attention of graduates of the program.

Program Evaluation

Feedback is secured in a number of ways: monthly reports from the Fellows, reports from the mentors, on-site visits, questionnaires, and on-going seminars throughout the Fellowship year. We proposed to establish an evaluation component that will employ a consultant to design and implement a formal monitoring and reporting process. The consultant with the program director will then undertake a thorough evaluation of the program's impact and effectiveness at the conclusion of each cycle and the findings will be used as the basis for on-going planning for future cycles to make the program more responsive and effective. The ultimate objective of the evaluation component will be to ascertain and implement ways whereby the program can accelerate and nurture the participant's growth and acquisition of skills and experience requisite for policymakers desiring to serve the Puerto Rican community.

Program Expansion

Based on the success of the National Fellows in Education and Legislation thus far, we are now actively exploring ways to supplement current resources and to attract additional funding to enable significant expansion of the program in years to come. The current program will serve as the model for future additions or spinoffs in this direction.

Alumni Association

Already some of the graduates are eager to organize an Aspira Fellows Alumni Association. They seek to participate in the selection of future

Fellows and share in the orientation of those selected. There will be thus created a significant network which will be reinforced with each new class. The self-selected leadership of these alumni will become key contact persons in the future market for knowledgeable educational policy-makers. They will also become a ready resource for Aspira and the Hispanic community.

CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Columbus Salley

Background

The Consortium for Educational Leadership (CEL) is a cooperative seven-university effort to recruit, select, train, place, and support educational leaders. High priority is given to individuals from formerly excluded minority groups. As a result, CEL is comprised of a rich human mixture of women and men, blacks, whites, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Asian Americans of broad social vision. Graduates of CEL training programs assume key administrative positions in a variety of public and private institutions, as principals, superintendents, community training leaders, university professors, state department officials, and the like.

The Consortium was incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation in the state of Illinois on May 24, 1973. Its membership includes Atlanta University, the University of Chicago, Claremont Graduate School, Columbia University (Teachers College), the University of Massachusetts, Ohio State University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Financial support for the initial work of the Consortium has been provided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The value positions of CEL remain firm. First, while the organization has reflected wide diversity in terms of its student and faculty participants, the primary commitment of CEL is to individuals formerly excluded from the study and practice of educational leadership and administration. By "excluded" we mean women of all races and ethnic minority groups, men who are black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Asian American, American Indian, and white men who have been excluded by the educational establishment because they held values and implemented ideas that were threatening to the status quo. This commitment extends to those who have entered the ranks of CEL to become sensitized to the issues of exclusion or who participate in CEL because of prior commitments to confront exclusion policies and behavior.

Second, the idea of inter-university collaboration lies at the heart of CEL. Its programs strive to accomplish through collective action what might be less possible or feasible for a single university.

Working from these value premises, CEL has focused on the four major goals established at its inception:

- Development of improved training programs for educational administrators and leaders;
- Examination of the relationship of those programs to the field of practice;
- Assistance to agencies and persons who seek the services of CEL graduates; and
- Implementation of research which generates new knowledge related to leadership training and practice, particularly in terms of members of formerly excluded groups.

Recruitment, Selection, and Training

The particular educational program of CEL member institutions is the province of each university faculty. Although distinct differences among the graduate programs of the CEL institutions exist, a perspective of the educational leader is shared: a leader is one who can maximize the use of resources, stay close to the community, work directly with those who are being served, and, with them, define problems, articulate them, and muster collective will and resources to solve them.

Although 80 Fellows have completed graduate programs on the seven CEL campuses, it is only during the present period that serious attention has been given to scrutiny of the diversity and quality of those experiences. A CEL Career Patterns Study has been completed and this research provides a strong data base for an understanding of how CEL Fellows were recruited and trained and how their careers have ensued following graduation. During the next six months CEL will conduct a self-study which will document the successes and failures of its training effort and will examine the relevance of on-campus training for its graduates.

More specifically, what attitudes and needs did CEL Fellows bring with them that were in basic opposition to the standard university setting? What assumptions did the universities and their faculties make about their new clients, i.e., what they could learn easily and what would pose more difficulty? What specific barriers did the universities and students identify that needed to be overcome? What was done to break down these barriers? How was information regarding such efforts shared? What did this mean in terms of success or failure for individual students?

It is assumed that this work will be important not only for CEL universities, but also for other institutions that share CEL's values, in full or in part.

Placement and Support

In its early days, prior to the establishment of the Chicago office, CEL used traditional placement procedures available through professors and placement officers on each campus. Many jobs were secured, but in too many other instances CEL alumni/alumnae were unable to obtain work, or were accepting jobs not commensurate with training and experience, or were dissatisfied with their range of options in the job-locating process.

During the past two years, we have endeavored to supplement campus placement services by working directly with CEL Fellows, graduates, hiring agencies, and institutions. More specifically, information about CEL Fellows and alumni/alumnae (including resumes) was collected and circulated nationally, data regarding current positions of CEL graduates were collected to sharpen the focus of staff efforts, and dialogue was accelerated with local school districts, state departments of education, private organizations, and key groups such as the Council of the Great City Schools.

In 1973-76, we worked directly with 145 CEL Fellows and alumni/alumnae who requested assistance. Specific leads were developed in almost every case. Counseling on the process of job seeking was provided to many individuals.

We are pleased with this beginning but not satisfied. We must initiate more inquiries for individuals who are looking for work in unusual corners of the establishment, and we need to develop a system that can work in part without our intervention. In that light we are intensifying our cooperation with similar job information systems, such as the UCEA CORPS program, with the Council of the Great City Schools, and with a network of CEL alumni/alumnae in the various regions of the nation.

The first phase of a CEL national principalship study has been completed. The study is basically an occupational analysis of the school principalship. It speaks to the important interface between the work of principals and some of the nitty-gritty or day-to-day variables that affect or influence their work. This study is extremely important to us since a

recent analysis of the jobs CEL graduates hold indicates that 45 are presently functioning either as assistant principals or principals. Knowledge gained about what principals actually do and inferences about what they ought to do will help us revise training programs that are, given the background of our clients, preparing more people for principalship than for initial entry into school systems as superintendents and top echelon administrators.

In conclusion, CEL has made some strides toward meeting its goals of improving the quality of training programs for educational leaders, facilitating an exchange between the several university programs and the field of practice, bringing together CEL graduates and the various hiring agencies, and implementing research that will extend the knowledge base of leadership training and practice. We will continue to work toward these goals, always keeping in mind our value premises - inter-university collaboration and a commitment to individuals formerly excluded from the study and practice of educational administration.

WORK-EDUCATION CONSORTIUM PROJECT

Richard Ungerer

The National Manpower Institute, a private, non-profit institution, is under contract with the Department of Labor to assist in the establishment of a network of communities in which a variety of cooperative methods of assisting youth's transition from school to work are developing.

This Work-Education Consortium Project is a two-year joint public/private initiative. It is an outgrowth of President Ford's commitment to seek "new ways to bring the world of work and the institutions of education closer together," and of the policy recommendation, contained in The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education-Working Policy by Willard Wirtz and the National Manpower Institute, that community education-work councils be established at the local level to be concerned with youth's transition from school to work.

Under the contract the Institute has three broad responsibilities: first, to assist the Federal Interagency Committee in identifying a limited number of promising local community efforts that will form a Work-Education Consortium; second, to assist consortium communities in developing and implementing their plans; and third, to develop and maintain an Information Exchange Service on community education-work initiatives.

Identifying Communities for the Work-Education Consortium

The Institute is actively engaged in seeking information on efforts around the nation which rely on cooperative processes, at the local level, to bring the worlds of work and education closer together for the development and benefit of young people. NMI will be contacting and seeking advice and cooperation from national associations, state agencies, federal agencies, and other interested organizations for recommendations of communities which might be interested in the project. The project has received wide visibility in the media and NMI is responding to requests for information which come directly from interested communities. Based on an analysis of the information received from communities and on site visits to a number of communities, NMI will present information on the most promising

community initiatives to a federal interagency steering committee on work and education which will select a number of communities for participation in a work-education consortium. The consortium will provide access to technical assistance, will provide these communities with a unique network relationship with each other, as well as a special relationship with the federal government and with the National Manpower Institute. In addition, it will provide visibility to promising community efforts.

Selection of Consortium Communities - Information Requested

Over the next several months, the National Manpower Institute will be gathering information on local education-work initiatives, as well as basic information on the communities in which these developments are occurring. This information will be used for two purposes: (1) to collect the information needed to make recommendations to the federal government for community participation in the Work-Education Consortium, and (2) to establish and maintain the work-education Information Exchange Service.

Any community interested in being considered for participation in the Work-Education Consortium should submit the following information on current or prospective local programs:

1. Current membership and/or affiliation (individuals, organizations, etc.)
2. Stage of development of current or proposed program
3. Principal goals, objectives, activities, including involvement with other organizations
4. Principal areas of program focus
5. Funding and support sources
6. Available historical reports and evaluations
7. Copies of basic documents (prospectus, rationale, charter, by-laws, etc.)

In addition, any information on the community in general (such as demographic data) would be useful, as well as information on other local efforts which seek to address youth transition problems, particularly in the following areas:

1. Integration of work experience opportunities with classroom education, including private employment and community service. Examples might include cooperative education programs as well as projects sponsored by NAB, the Chamber of Commerce, CETA youth programs, WECEP, etc.

2. Curriculum development, including efforts such as cooperative business-education design of career components, the Experience-Based Career Education Program, etc.
3. Guidance and counseling assistance, such as use of multi-media materials, peer group procedures, non-professional volunteer counseling.
4. Placement assistance, such as job banks, occupational information systems, and in-school placement centers.
5. Career information, including identification of manpower needs and projections on the local level.
6. Exposure of counselors and teachers to the "world of work," through programs such as the exchange of business and school personnel, summer employment in local industry, etc.
7. Reduction of barriers between education and work experience, including administrative arrangements, such as year-round school, flexible modular scheduling, external degree options, easing of child labor restrictions, school attendance, etc.
8. Civic and special associations that are involved with youth and the nature of their involvement, including such groups as the National Alliance of Businessmen, chambers of commerce, the American Personnel and Guidance Association, teachers' organizations, local labor councils, the United Way, YWCA, YMCA, senior citizen groups, religious organizations, community centers, etc.
9. Local studies and surveys relating to community youth, such as felt need surveys, manpower studies, listings of available training and educational opportunities, etc.

Finally, it would be helpful if information (or an assessment) on the potential of the current or prospective program in the community could be provided in the following terms:

1. Level of commitment of participating institutions
2. Degree of time/effort/resources likely to be devoted to the project
3. Strengths and weaknesses/gaps in current or prospective program
4. Role that the National Manpower Institute and the Federal Interagency Steering Committee could play in assisting local programs.

The specifics listed above are intended as a guideline for sending information to the NMI. Communities should feel free to respond, however, with regard to the nature, stage of development, and range of activities of local programs in whatever written format they desire.

Although there is no formal deadline for receipt of information, communities are encouraged to respond as soon as possible, hopefully within the next several weeks. Assembling the information outlined above will be a time-consuming effort; however, time constraints require the National Manpower Institute to begin a more in-depth analysis of those communities from which the most promising responses have been received, as the first step in the comprehensive selection process. If it is impossible to provide all of the information in the next several weeks, communities should send, at a minimum, a letter outlining the nature and extent of their interest, an outline of their current activities, any materials readily available, and a date when the remaining information can be expected.

Information Exchange Service on Work-Education Initiatives

The Institute will establish an Information Exchange Service which will work to provide communication among participating Consortium communities. The information exchange will also serve a broader audience by acting as a source of information to other communities on developments within the Consortium as well as by serving as a clearinghouse for information on developing community education-work initiatives beyond the Consortium.

The Institute will serve as a resource center, providing technical assistance to participating communities. In addition, NMI will serve as the link between the Work-Education Consortium and the Federal Interagency Steering Committee on Work and Education, endeavoring to develop the strengths of a consortium relationship. NMI also will act as a link between the Consortium and other interested communities.

The National Manpower Institute welcomes for use by the Information Exchange Service any information on initiatives which encourage cooperation among educators, employers, labor unions, service agencies, and other community organizations aimed at assisting youth in the transition to the world of work.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION'S PROGRAM FOR TRAINING MINORITY-GROUP SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AT THE SUPERINTENDENT LEVEL

Bruce E. Williams

In 1970 The Rockefeller Foundation concluded that the slow pace of the promotion of minority-group educators in all but a few cities was troublesome, and if it were not accelerated, many years would pass before a cadre of well-trained, minority-group administrators would be available to assume roles of leadership at the top echelon of school systems in cities throughout the United States. The training provided for advanced education degree programs in colleges and universities has often proved inadequate to provide the type of in-service training needed to prepare educators to face the problems of the inner city. Moreover, the parochialism of many minority-group administrators, which has prevented them from viewing the broader picture, has also hindered them from obtaining maximum job flexibility and advancement

The Rockefeller Foundation is now in its seventh year of a program designed to provide the type of in-service training necessary for qualified and experienced minority-group administrators to advance to positions of major responsibility to which, historically, they have had only minimal access.

Program Design

An administrative fellow spends one semester in each of two cities under the direct supervision of some of the nation's foremost superintendents. The fellows are involved in decentralization, bond referendums and millage campaigns, PPBS, court litigations, budget preparation, training, open and closed board meetings, cabinet meetings, curriculum, personnel, purchasing, public relations, and the whole range of activities which make up the superintendent's world. They become part of the superintendency at the action level and absorb both the challenges and frustrations of operating a modern urban school district.

In addition to the availability of each superintendent, and his or her top staff, the program is also serviced by two outstanding administrators

who serve as consultants to the Program: Dr. Bernard C. Watson, formerly Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, now Vice President for Academic Services at Temple University, and Dr. J. L. Jones, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Dade County Public School System. The overall supervision of the Program is directed by Dr. Bruce E. Williams, Assistant Director for Social Sciences at The Rockefeller Foundation.

During the school year the two Foundation consultants monitor the Program and visit the fellows periodically to help them assess their program. In addition, the fellows have an opportunity to attend three meetings as a group: an orientation meeting for the new fellows in June of each year, which includes fellows from the outgoing group, participating superintendents, and consultants; a mid-year meeting just prior to the fellows' change of assignment, for discussion of their programs and common or individual problems; and a meeting in June of the following year, with the newly appointed fellows, the participating superintendents, and consultants, to review their year's experience. Three days of the June meeting, which is held in Washington, D.C., are devoted to discussion sessions for program participants, including the consultants, superintendents, and outside speakers; a fourth day is spent, usually at the invitation of the Commissioner of Education, at the U.S. Office of Education for a briefing session by the Commissioner and his senior staff.

Selection

Since the first year of the program 62 administrators have completed internships. Any young, experienced, and qualified minority-group school administrator may apply. Candidates must hold a master's degree in educational administration and administrative credentials, and have experience as a line administrator (principal or supervisor, director of programs, or assistant superintendent). Administrators interested in applying should send a letter of application to Dr. Bruce E. Williams, Superintendents' Training Program, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036. This letter should include the applicant's resume and the names of five persons (two of whom should be immediate supervisors) who can speak to the administrator's experience, qualifications, and potential for becoming a top echelon administrator. The deadline for receiving

applications is February 15 for the following school year. Superintendents may also nominate candidates from their school system.

Each application is reviewed by a screening committee. Those applicants whose qualifications, experience, and recommendations show potential for becoming high-level administrators are interviewed by one or two different Foundation representatives who are themselves top administrators. In early April, the Selection Panel, which is composed of superintendents, program consultants, and Foundation staff, meet to make the final selection of candidates. Each candidate is then notified of his or her status. Those who are selected must arrange for a leave of absence and list their choice of cities immediately after notification.

The total costs of the Program are met by the Foundation grant. The grant includes a ten-month salary, fringe benefits, relocation expenses, and a cost of living allowance (each administrator is free to determine whether or not to move his or her family). The school system must accept the responsibility for administering the grant and is held accountable for the expenditures.

Report Card

The immediate objective of the Program is to prepare experienced administrators for high-level duties in the nation's school systems. A survey done in 1974 showed that the twenty-nine administrators who had gone through the Foundation's program were working around the country in positions of leadership and responsibility - as superintendents, as deputy, associate, or assistant superintendents, or as educational program directors, area assistants, and regional superintendents. At that point, the only question we could answer was, How well have the fellows done? The yardstick chosen was: dollar increase in budgets they administer, increase in the number of people they supervise, and increase in the number of students for whom they were responsible.

Some of the results were:

- Fifteen fellows were in new positions where they administered budgets larger than those they were responsible for prior to participation in the Program. Budgets administered ranged from a low of $8,000 to a high of $218 million. The average gain was $20.2 million.

- Thirteen fellows were responsible for larger professional staffs. The low among the group was four and the high was 1,418, with an average gain of 297.
- Sixteen fellows were responsible for larger student bodies: the low, 150, the high 163,000, with an average gain of 23,474.

Comment

The year of training under the internship program is planned to be an intensive and wide-ranging experience. The fellow's involvement in the urban school systems to which he is assigned is extensive, and reports received by Foundation officers from former fellows indicate that the experience and knowledge acquired "on the firing line" cannot be duplicated. While learning the mechanics of administration, the fellows are also able to observe the political realities and ramifications of school problems and the anxieties and frustrations of a present-day urban school system superintendent.

Information received from the school systems to which the fellows have returned, or which they have joined, suggests that the application of their newly acquired skills is already having visible impact. The program continues to receive high praise from leading educators and professional organizations throughout the nation.

PRESENTATIONS

AND

DISCUSSION

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

Don Peddie of the Bush Foundation Leadership Fellows Program described his program which began in 1965 with four fellows offering fellowships for individuals interested in the management-training route. Education, business, and public service are the Bush Foundation's main interests, but they have fellows from a diversity of fields.

In 1973 the Bush Summer Fellows Program was added to its regular program because of the difficulty for many fellows of being away from their jobs for extended periods of time. According to Peddie, one employer commented, "Young man, if I found someone around here that I could do without for three or four months, I'd realize I never needed him in the first place."

The geographic area of interest of the Bush Foundation in its earlier years was exclusively Minnesota, but in recent years it has expanded to become truly a regional program, covering Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and parts of northern and western Wisconsin.

The Bush awards provide about 60 to 70 percent of what the fellow was making on the job - an average winner makes a salary of about $8,000 to $10,000 more than his or her stipend. The major recruiting technique is the use of newspaper ads, but fellowship officers also travel around the four states, holding meetings with community groups, chambers of commerce, and others. Bush alumni are encouraged to recommend candidates, as well as personnel officers and top executives in major organizations and educational institutions.

The program also has a brochure, a bi-monthly newsletter, and a low-budget slide presentation (costing about $500, with about 70 or 80 slides and voice coordination). Besides these massive "broadside" approaches, said Peddie, they also use a "rifle-shot" approach, making a special effort to make the program known to minorities, trade-union members, and women in business.

The program does not actually send out applications, but "we make sure the message is clear: 'We've heard of you.'" The application form is complicated - "on purpose, to screen out those who are not really interested."

The Bush program favors the generalist over the specialist. Selection is a rigorous process. Every application is read personally, and about one-third are sent on to interviewers (who are Bush alumni or business leaders in the area). A third step is to send the applications to a local firm of consulting psychologists, who develop a detailed personal history and work history. This is followed by a small amount of psychological testing.

After all this preliminary work is done, and a pool of about fifty people is developed, a "final selection seminar" is held. Each candidate is interviewed by a pair of judges, one of whom is always an industrial psychologist. Through this process the group is narrowed down to the 25 who receive awards.

- - - -

When the Educational Policy Fellowship Program of the Institute for Educational Leadership first began in the 1974-75 school year, said Paul Schindler, it had 26 fellows and was called the Washington Internship in Education Program. It now has over a hundred fellows and "a change in demography," Schindler says (i.e., recruitment is no longer exclusively from the Washington, D.C. area), so its name has been changed. The EPFP finds sponsors for fellows for a one-year period. Sponsors pay the mid-career salary (a range of about $14,000 to $30,000) and involve the fellow in a variety of learning activities designed to help him better understand educational policymaking. The program has gotten away from graduate students and early career people. The average age has gone from 30 to 34.

At the end of the internship year, each fellow writes an analytical study of what he did that year. The program uses a clinical psychologist, but his testing is done after selection and for the sake of the fellow rather than as an aid to selection. The EPFP currently has twelve sponsoring sites, of which five are small sites. A full site has up to fifteen fellows, with a coordinator.

In 1973 the program director first designated 35 fellows as Washington Interns, and <u>then</u> went to various organizations and asked them to select interns from that group. As it happened only 25 of the fellows were placed. To avoid this the program now chooses semi-finalists only - the final

choices are made by the sponsoring agency. For example, if a deputy assistant secretary or any other sponsor is going to work closely with a fellow, it is felt that he should choose that person. A fellow cannot be placed officially until the agency has actually gotten authorization to pay his salary. With government agencies this happens in June, July, and August.

The EPFP recruits by sending a press release to educational professional organizations and to newspapers. The program receives about 500 applications out of about 2,500 sent out. No interviews are held in the field; the process operates exclusively from the application form. Every evaluator reads the applications without knowing the comments of the other evaluators. In the past, when there has been doubt, the person has moved on to the semi-finals, but staff officers are reconsidering this policy on the grounds that it creates too large a pool.

Last year (1976) 200 semi-finalists were selected. These were then distributed (one each) to approximately 200 sponsors, who chose one applicant for each slot. There are no comparative interviews - a sponsor cannot shop around. He must reject one applicant before he is given the description of another.

- - - -

The final speaker, Barbara Jackson, Director of the Doctoral Program in Educational Administration, Atlanta University, pointed out that Atlanta University "is totally a graduate school with about 1,300 students." Further, until Texas Southern b[illegible]n its graduate program, AU was one of only two black institutions in the country offering graduate degrees, the other being Howard University.

The focus of the AU program is on the school superintendency, particularly the urban superintendency. The recruitment procedure at AU reflects that focus. Dr. Jackson feels that if they are going to train someone for the public school bureaucracy they need someone with public school experience. "As director of the program," she stated, "I have argued against artificial barriers such as grade-point averages." She pointed out that it's important to ask for test scores and to look at Graduate Record Examination scores and undergraduate transcripts, but she hoped that these

records would be used "imaginatively." The AU program gives a lot of importance to the candidate's interview. Because they are training students for careers in public life, they are interested in the way they handle themselves with individuals and in a group.

Last year 25 candidates came to Atlanta at their own expense and were interviewed - one at a time - by a group of administrators and teachers. This procedure puts the applicant under tremendous pressure, but according to Dr. Jackson, "If they are going to be superintendents they will be working constantly in groups, and it's important to know how they will handle themselves as well as how they answer questions."

Recruitment for the AU program is by word-of-mouth for the most part; there are, however, several publications describing the program.

Discussion

Questions on all three presentations were held until the discussion. The first of the questions was directed to Don Peddie of the Bush Fellowship Program and centered around the psychological testing activities that were used in connection with the selection process. Peddie stressed in his answer that test results were not known to the final selectors.

"Why do you give it then?" asked one of the participants. Peddie replied that "it's a small part of the evidence that is available when we narrow down competition. For instance, a high-level administrator often wants to get a Ph.D. degree and the test helps determine if that person has a fighting chance." The major test that is used is the Watson-Glazer Test of Critical Thinking; the California Personality Inventory is also used.

Nate Jackson asked about the objectives of the Bush Program. "We are looking for mid-career, emerging leaders who are in middle-management positions," Peddie replied. "The goal is to train them for top leadership."

In response to a question about minority participation in the program, Peddie replied, "We have a one percent minority population in our area and about 13 to 14 percent of our awards go to minorities." The selection panel for the Bush Program consists of eight or nine people: one black male, three women, and the remainder are white males.

Columbus Salley then warned of the realities of exclusion. "The psychological test," he reminded the group, "is biased against minorities.

By definition a leader is one who will alter the existing reality, and therefore should do b· .ly on tests which tend to choose people who perpetuate the existing reality." Hubie Jones mentioned "the trap of trying to be rigorous - of assuring ourselves that we've scanned all the turf." We may, he said, be "applying procedures which may not be relevant."

"But there is the problem," commented Ann Morrison, "of rigorous versus whimsical. You have to use some criteria. Whatever they are, some things are being u·ed for selection. Psychological tests, good or bad, are at least standardized." To which Nate Jackson replied that he "would rather standardize biases than standardize tests."

Mario Anglada suggested that the group was too linear in its definition of leader. He pointed out that "we could learn from anthropologists about various kinds of leaders in a community - for instance, some are charismatic, some are not. Some have wisdom, some do not."

The discussion then shifted to education, with a comment by one of the participants that "...women might be the most excluded group in the top levels of American education." He went on to say that "there are too few white women candidates for superintendents - there are more black women who are farther along the line." This statement was challenged by several of the conference participants. Dr. Watson reminded the group that "schools of education presently channel women into nonadministrative fields. If you accept the pool, then the shortage of women exists, but if you don't you can certainly find them. Certification," Watson went on to say, "is a matter not only of screening out but also of controlling the pool. Secondly," Watson continued, " can we please stop thinking in such categories as 'We've got too many blacks, now we need white women'? That puts people in a box. Let's stop the internecine warfare among excluded groups."

PROGRAM DESIGN: MODALITIES OF TRAINING

Ann Morrison, program assistant at the Center for Creative Leadership, described the Center's summer program for advanced graduate students in the areas of social and behavioral science. Its major goal is to bridge the gap between the university and the business world. Deans and department heads are sent an outline of the program and are asked to recommend students. This past summer, for the first time, the program had an eight-week internship program for twelve fellows. Each fellow received a $1,000 stipend, plus transportation from Greensboro, North Carolina, where CCL is located, to Minneapolis, Minnesota, and return.

The first seven days of the assignment were devoted to leadership development - decision-making, creative problem-solving, and so on, with a heavy emphasis on self-assessment. The second phase concentrated on training in the topic area, "Managerial Performance, Appraisal, and Feedback." Training was done by CCL staff.

Then followed a four-week internship in Minneapolis/St. Paul. Each fellow had a mentor from a local organization who, working closely with the intern, agreed on a four-week research project - usually to study and recommend modifications in the organization's appraisal system. In the final week of the program, fellows reported back to the group on their projects and submitted written reports to the Center.

The CCL considers the advantages of the summer internship program to be these: (1) students get business experience; (2) organizations have the benefit of the student's ideas and expertise in the research project; and (3) the CCL is building a network and in the process is becoming better known.

- - - -

Hubie Jones, director of the Community Fellows Program of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, spoke next. The Program was started in 1971, and was originally interested in community leaders and activists from the private sector, but now it is also looking for individuals from the public sector.

According to Jones, the program selects "people who have proven their effectiveness, who are burned out and fatigued, and who need a change to get it together, to reflect, and to get a little rest."

Selection and recruitment for the program comes mostly through alumni, stated Jones, but program staff members also interview applicants. Fellows do not need a college degree, but they must produce some evidence that they can deal with an academic environment as well as develop a project that can have a major impact on the home community.

Besides giving a stipend, MIT also relocates the fellow's family, and provides a modest research fund of about $1,200 per person, from which fellows can get support for research activities. The program begins with an orientation session which, in 1976, lasted for 16 days.

Dr. Jones pointed out that, for most of the community fellows, support is needed in three ways:

1. For many, there is a crisis of confidence: Can they function at MIT or Harvard?
2. There is an ambivalence about white, elitist institutions: Have they succumbed? and
3. There is a sense of loss: These people have lived very active, stressful lives, and the year at MIT can become depressing.

At the orientation session, the staff helps fellows select courses, and the fellows begin their required participation in the Tuesday evening seminars, "Strategies and Issues of Community Development." Each fellow has a mentor who is competent in the area in which he or she is working.

Fellows begin the program on August 15th. The semester begins on September 6th. By October 15th, they must have completed a written project statement. (This statement becomes a contractual understanding.) There is a critical assessment of each fellow's project from his colleagues on three different occasions. For the final presentation, if possible, people from the fellow's home community are brought in. The objective of the program, Jones said, is basically "that the fellows' leadership ability be enhanced, and that they come away with the understanding that no matter how talented they may be, or hooked into the power structure, the interests of minorities cannot be advanced without collective work..."

Discussion

The first questions directed to Dr. Jones dealt with the institutionalization of the program and the selection process. "As regards selection," Jones stated, "this year we shot for ten people, five from private organizations and five from the public sector - such as settlement houses, art associations, and so on." The private organizations produced about sixty applicants, which, according to Jones, "had to be boiled down to five."

Jones also mentioned that the selection committee "consisted of the chairman of the Department of Urban Studies, Mel King, associate director of the program, and myself."

Chuck Smith asked Jones to speak to the fact that directors of college-based internship programs traditionally do not have faculty appointments. Jones replied, "...If you don't have faculty status, there is no way to get your peers to make their resources available. A faculty appointment is essential. These fellowship programs deserve that status."

Columbus Salley brought the discussion around again to the question of institutionalizing a program. "If you're dealing with money, in too many cases, when the outside money dries up the faculty commitment, ephemeral at best, also dries up." Jones responded by describing briefly the "$4 million negotiation" in which MIT was persuaded to agree to a commitment for the endowment of the Community Fellows Program. "From the beginning," he said, "the institution was putting in some money. That is obviously important. MIT is currently running a development drive to raise $225 million. They found that many potential contributors wanted more minority programs. Basically, what we said to the university was, 'Here's a way to get some money for you - and also for us!'"

You must pick your institutions, however, Jones argued. "At some universities they might feel the three or four million dollars they would get would not be worth it because they would have to deal with the disruption of a totally white, male-dominated institution."

But, said Bernie Watson, "that's program money they'll turn down. Basic development money - even at a place like the ones you describe - would be more broadly based if enough people insisted."

Nate Jackson pointed out that there is the question of who controls those programs once they are institutionalized. "Does institutionalization mean 'retreatment' as well as permanence?"

At this point, Mario Anglada reminded the group that they were talking only about institutionalization in the university setting, i.e., "bureaucratization." "I am at least as concerned," he said, "with institutionalization in the community."

Barbara Jackson asked, "What is the role of students in changing that institution of which they are a part?"

Jones responded, "Students should get the faculty to do it. We should not have the students do our activities for us. The cost to them is too high. Also, they won't be around forever; the university can sit back and wait until they go."

Paul Schindler questioned the base on which the conversation took place: "I am bothered," he said, "by the assumption that universities are powerful. I believe them to be one of the weakest institutions in our society. We should be thinking of new institutional forms, new settings..."

"But is your constituency bound to a credential?" asked Richard Ungerer. "Because if it is, you're bound to a university."

Bernie Watson disagreed with Schindler, saying, "Universities are powerful. They are rich. They are one of the major gatekeepers in our society. I have become increasingly skeptical about delivering basic status, and basic incomes, with new models. There is no problem with creating 'new' access routes, but they are infrequently of long standing. You must have the same continuity for programs that provide access as for programs that deny access. The subject is trade-offs. Faculties, departments, and deans do that all the time. We need to teach our students how to do that."

Peddie: "I see a new network emerging - among those who have received nondegree training. Because of money, basically. For a nine-week management program, MIT charges $8,000."

Bruce Williams asked about monitoring. "What do you do when you find that performance is below standard?"

Chavis responded: "We insist that there be an exchange between the mentor and the fellow. We request a contract be drawn up on which the

mentor and the fellow agree - and if a contract cannot be worked out, we pull the intern out."

John Figueroa suggested, "The mentor is the key. What are they doing with that fellow? Also there is a built-in reporting system - what the mentor says the fellow is doing and what the fellow says he's doing. Any disparity can be discussed. But how do you terminate an assignment? That's the ugly question. If I can, I try to rearrange the assignment with the same agency, but with another mentor. But termination - that's very sticky. And along the same lines, how do you terminate a mentor?"

Carroll Johnson answered, "We review our mentors every year and those who have not worked out are not continued."

Anglada asked, "How do you train people from a more simple type of life to understand the complexity of organizations where there are hypocrisy and hidden agendas?"

"Lay it on the table," said Hubie Jones.

Bruce Williams went back to the question of terminations. "We made sure superintendents agreed to expose their world - the world of the superintendency - to the interns. Therefore, if certain doors were closed, our consultants would know. Whether an intern can take advantage of that world, of the open doors, is another question. We have never terminated an internship, but we have terminated assignments."

ASSIGNMENT AND PLACEMENT

The first speaker on this topic was Richard Wilson, Vice President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Wilson explained that the AACJC "is a voluntary association of college presidents and its program interests are staff development, occupational programs, community education, workshops in various areas, and a president's forum." The Community College Internship Program for Native Americans has seven men and women this year who were selected through applications and recommendations. Wilson explained how the interns are placed. "First we ask community colleges near the various Indian reservations if they are interested in having an Indian intern. The president of the college is contacted because the interns will be attached to the president's office throughout the academic year. The intern and the president negotiate the conditions of the internship.

Wilson pointed out that over the past eight or ten years several Indian-controlled community colleges have been established, and there is a continuing need for American Indian administrators for the top echelon in colleges. The majority of the interns in the program have been offered positions at the institutions at which they did their internships.

- - - -

The last speaker was K. Z. Chavis, Executive Director, Leadership Development Program of the Southern Regional Council. This program began in 1966 as an experimental project of the Ford Foundation and continued as a special Ford Foundation program from 1967 to 1974, at which point it became one of the projects of the Southern Regional Council.

"The application," Chavis said, "asks the following questions: What are your interests? What will you do upon completion of your fellowship year?" He went on to say that the application is followed by a proposal, in which the candidate lays out what he or she would like to do for the twelve-month period.

The next step, according to Chavis, is a field interview with the intern in his home community, followed by the selection conference, which

consists of four interviews in front of five interviewers - one team of two people, plus three other single people. "We have spent as much as ten hours with one individual."

As an illustration of what can happen during the fellowship year, Chavis described "a 56-year-old fellow with a fifth-grade education who wanted to visit various high school vocational programs so he could come back to his own town and change the high school there. But as he worked out his project, he discovered he needed to be on the County Board of Education to have some impact...so he changed his focus. Then he discovered the real power was not with the Board of Education but with the County Commissioners. And eventually he became a County Commissioner and has since been a real moving force."

"As mentors," Chavis said, "we recruit experienced people who are, first, interested in the development of the rural South and, second, of value as a role model for the fellow."

Discussion

Paul Schindler asked about the specific racial component. How did various programs handle inquiries from those who did not come under the racial guidelines? Bruce Williams commented that "maybe the name of the program should indicate 'minority.' The inquiries we have received from groups and individuals other than racial minorities are clearly meant to be tests, only, of our requirements; they come from individuals interested in a 'DeFunis' type case. We write that we do not consider them a minority group under our definition of the guidelines."

Nate Jackson noted that Chavis's program selected a range of people - from those who had practically no education to people with a Ph.D. - and asked, "Can your interviewers identify potential from that wide a range? Are they sufficiently sophisticated?"

Chavis replied that the selection committee was varied, consisting of "clusters of five people, very mixed, and randomly assigned."

Nate Jackson remarked that in his program, "We often come up with very different impressions and ratings and then we must discuss not only the candidate but what our personal criteria might be." Usually, he went on to

say that there is agreement on the two ends, the top and the bottom. "It's the group in the middle that is the problem."

Columbus Salley brought up the "interface" between conceptualization and strategies, suggesting that a number of different strategies must be pursued simultaneously while the conceptualization remains fixed. "My own program," he said, "has people who are highly credentialed and under-experienced. My question is: What can you do with your people once you process them?"

Chavis mentioned an acquaintance, a Ph.D. who was elected superintendent of a school district - the first minority-group person to hold that office. "But he didn't know how to staff, he didn't know how to budget, he had no teaching experience..."

Salley replied, "My people have the skills, but they still can't get the jobs."

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The first speaker to address himself on objectives was Nathaniel Jackson, Program Director of the Center for Educational Leadership in Los Angeles, California. Jackson began by stating simply that the objective of his fellowship program is that "school district superintendents be trained and placed in office, hopefully to remain there."

His problem, Jackson stated, is, "How do you recycle an executive, an administrator, so that he can persist in a difficult phase of educational leadership? California has 1,300 school districts. There are fewer than six black school superintendents, two Spanish-surnamed superintendents, two women superintendents, and no Asians...."

If members of the excluded population are moved into superintendency positions, they need three things in order to succeed, Jackson continued: "access to information, the basic rudiments of running a successful business, and enough political savvy to survive." Jackson became director of CEL only eight months before the conference. "I may be the newest director here." One problem that Jackson has been able to identify since he became director is the lack of involvement of minority educators who could help bring others through the system.

One early mistake, he said, was the recruitment of minority administrators who lack either an M.A. or a Ph.D. "We noted that those educators who had other basic requirements - i.e., experience at the principal or assistant principal level - already had those degrees." As a result placement has been good so far.

"In age," Jackson commented, "the group tends to be older than a similar group of Caucasians would be - it's rare to find a 49- or 50-year-old white vice principal, but it is common for excluded populations."

The CEL holds semi-monthly seminars, twenty in northern California and forty in southern California. According to Jackson, a lot of time is spent in "process" work - talking with administrators and business people and trying to strengthen the visiting faculty.

In his closing statement, Jackson stated, "The chance of a minority person becoming a school superintendent without all the accoutrements -

i.e., an advanced degree plus skills - is nil. We are interested in persons who need a master's degree; we are interested in those people who have master's degrees becoming school superintendents. The question is how to get these people through the funnel, place them, and once there make them effective."

- - - -

The next program to be described was the National ASPIRA Fellowship Program. Leading off the program description was John Figueroa, Program Director.

Figueroa began by briefly describing ASPIRA, a leadership and educational development agency specifically for Puerto Ricans and Hispanics. This program began in New York in 1961 and went national in 1969 because "Puerto Ricans are a national community with sizable populations in Illinois, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and so on. They do not live exclusively in the Northeast."

Figueroa explained that the program has contracted with Fordham University for credentialing. Courses are given within the School of Education. There are only six fellows in the program, but the University is giving courses to just those students and has sought out minority faculty members as role models. Keeping the six fellows together has kept them from getting lost in the large University and given them an "esprit de corps."

The fellowship period lasts for twelve months. It begins with three management courses - very rigorous - in a summer session. The second phase is a nine-month, nonstop placement - possibly a field assignment plus a semester of courses at Fordham - in which the fellow learns how educational policy, federal and local, is made.

That is the program layout but, said Figueroa, "I really want to talk about the mentors - they're the powerhouses. We have had superintendents in five states with large Puerto Rican populations, key congressmen on education committees, and people working in the HEW network. The mentor response in the program's first year was tremendous - 30 out of 35 people responded."

The goals of the program are to create a cadre of Puerto Rican policymakers, to respond in some effective way to the demands of the Puerto Rican community, and to put forward the mission of ASPIRA.

Mario Anglada, ASPIRA's executive director, added briefly to Figueroa's presentation. Anglada said, "Because 70 percent of all Puerto Ricans have never finished high school there is a lack of leadership within the Puerto Rican community. Therefore, ASPIRA's first objective was to keep kids in school. We tried to get youngsters to look at their roots. We are, after all, marginal in the United States; we don't belong here but neither do we belong back in Puerto Rico. So we began high school clubs on the Puerto Rican heritage. Then we began projects that gave high school students a sense of power, of controlling a social reality. Finally we added counseling to get them into and through college.

"About 25,000 students have gone through this process and 10,000 have been placed in college. In New York City, about 60 percent drop out. In Boston, it's around 80 percent. We are now at the point where we need to work with people other than students - people who understand the complexity, the bureaucracy of educational institutions."

A final word about the ASPIRA program was added by Rocelia Roman, an ASPIRA fellow and recent graduate of the program. She said, "There is a real mystique in our community about what happens in administration; we need to learn the mechanisms of the system. We have therefore developed courses to learn management techniques which we can put into practice in the field. My field placement was in the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and I worked on consumer education."

Discussion

The first question of the discussion period was from Barbara Jackson, who asked, "Do the Fordham courses relate to the Puerto Rican experience?" Roman responded that "the fellows are already knowledgeable about that." "How then," pursued Jackson, "do you translate that experience into ways of dealing with the mainstream culture?" Anglada answered the question: "We demand that some of our own people with experience in management teach fellowship courses." But he mentioned the problem that "once our people go through the system they often leave the community."

Hubie Jones then commented, "Looking at the history of all groups who have pursued mobility in this society, one is left with the question - Should we be locked into the community base, or should we say that wherever

a person ends up he should be tied in some meaningful, psychological and historical way to the group - so as to act in some way in the interests of that group?"

Anglada replied, "I make a distinction between neighborhood and community..."

Barbara Jackson then said, "But that question should be dealt with in the training process. It's very difficult, in some white establishments for instance, to stick your neck out - especially if you don't feel you're getting support."

Nate Jackson also spoke to the question of the "community base": "Our objective, in all these programs," he said, "is to upgrade blacks and browns. In California, for instance, there is a sizable black population in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego which is a possible power base. But most of the California school districts are predominantly white.

"The American black is now in a position where he can move in a variety of areas. Fellowship people should work to place minorities in places where the population is predominantly the same racial or ethnic group and also in places where there is a predominantly white group. It is not an either/or question. The question is access."

Columbus Salley pointed out that "because one is black, or has a sense of Puerto Ricanness or Indianness, there is no reason to assume that the job will be done significantly differently."

Ted Tynes, a Rockefeller Foundation superintendent's intern, asked about the racial/ethnic guidelines for ASPIRA. "Is it Puerto Rican or Latino?"

Figueroa replied that ASPIRA is an organization that embraces all Hispanic groups.

Tynes mentioned that, during his internship, "some Mexican Americans tried to apply to an ASPIRA program and were told that ASPIRA is predominantly for Puerto Ricans." Both Figueroa and Anglada stressed that that was incorrect.

Nate Jackson went back to the subject of recruitment, stressing its importance. He referred to their in-service program for superintendents in which, over the years, 160 people had been trained. "They are a major thrust for recruitment." Also, mentors are recruiters.

As regards placement, Nate Jackson mentioned the importance of explaining the resume - teaching fellows how to take a resume and make it applicable to the job. As far as hearing about jobs goes, "the fraternity of superintendents is probably the best base."

Don Peddie asked about CEL's criteria for admission, and Jackson in his answer stressed placement. "If a superintendent will use that person as an administrator after completion of our program, we will at least interview that person."

K. Z. Chavis talked about "missing people" in programs designed to move people faster through the system. "We know of people who are maybe a year away from being a superintendent who, if they got the credentials, would move." But the fellowship programs don't always zero in on those people. "We've got to work with some kind of strategy that gets us to cut across lines."

EVALUATION

According to the first speaker on this subject, Columbus Salley, Executive Director of the Consortium for Educational Leadership, Chicago, Illinois, the two major problems with which the Consortium must deal are: "the tension that arises from the diversity among the seven-college membership, and the fact that it is funded exclusively by the Ford Foundation."

The Consortium tries to equip its fellows with the requisite knowledge for leadership positions. According to Salley, "It's one thing to be committed, and another thing to be competent."

Salley spoke with intensity about the Consortium's commitment to excluded groups, "including whites who have been excluded because they have taken a position opposite to the mainstream of American life." The program, stated Salley, is interested in what it calls "recyclable research" research - not abstract research, but work that illuminates "the interface between research and practice."

Salley cited a recent Consortium project in which "we documented exactly what it is that principals do. We did a national sample of 700 principals and noted the similarities and differences among, say, a woman principal in an urban system and a male principal in a rural system, and so on. We now have an empirical data base from which we can test for reality - to use in performance appraisal, job clarification, and selection for certain positions. Thus we are now able to challenge requirements for various positions: those who select and hire must prove that their requirements are job related."

The Consortium's strength (and its uniqueness) lies in the fact that "we have identified 200-odd people and brought them into training programs which formerly excluded them. We have been able to get people within the system to look at the field of educational administration and redefine the rules of principalships and superintendencies. The Consortium has gatekeepers who can look at the requirements for these positions and see what those requirements have to do with exclusion." But an inherent defect is that the Consortium colleges do the recruitment and selection: according to Salley, "We get people who are short on experience and therefore can't fill the positions for which they are being trained."

About forty or fifty of the Consortium fellows had "initial entry jobs such as assistant principal." They had too little experience for the superintendency. The CEL feels it can do two things: train these people further, and initiate lawsuits challenging the current system of promotion for public employees.

- - - -

The next speaker was Richard Ungerer of the National Manpower Institute, who spoke briefly about the Institute's information exchange services. The National Manpower Institute was begun four years ago by former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who was interested in the relationship - or more precisely, lack of relationship - between educational policy and jobs. The Institute, according to Ungerer, initiated an education/work consortium which focused on youth; the educational programs were funded through union negotiated contracts. There was, surprisingly, only a five percent utilization rate. "So we began a cooperative evaluation project at the Institute," Ungerer said.

Ungerer felt that by working with a number of programs they would get a large enough population to study; they could compare several programs as to their relative success. Ungerer further stated that the main problems were:

- Money: "We thought the programs would be willing to pay a small amount for evaluation; they were not."
- Approach to Objectives: "Various programs said that their objectives did not fit into our list of eleven objectives; they wanted to reshape."
- Timing: "Some programs run through an academic year, some begin in the summer - it's difficult to have the pre- and post-evaluations done at the proper time."

In a comparative evaluation with a number of other programs it was found that the following problems recur frequently:

1. How do you compare the "design approach," where a project is worked out carefully, ahead of time, with the "position approach," in which a fellow intern as someone's assistant for a certain period?

2. What is the proper length of time for particular experiences? Fellowship programs range from one month to twelve months or more.

3. What is the proper stage of one's career at which to intervene? In other words, what is the program readiness of the individual?

4. What is the proper balance between the educational component and the work experience? "The rhetoric on this subject is fantastic, but in reality there is often a lack of integration of the two."

5. How do you get the proper kind of peer interaction? Fellows need to meet - to relate to each other, to learn from each other, to share experiences.

The conclusions reached, however, suggest that there is enough commonality among the various programs studied for a valid evaluation.

Bruce Williams then asked Robert Fischelis, of the Rockefeller Foundation's Fellowship program, to comment briefly on his work.

Fischelis reported that "The Rockefeller Foundation has been betting on peopl since 1913," through its fellowship program. There is an extensive selection process, related to the Foundation's programs in the developing countries. At present, RF fellows are likely to be predoctoral candidates, whereas in the past they were more often postdoctoral. Almost all the RF fellows return to their home countries after their fellowship period; "we make sure there is a job for them to return to." They are strongly motivated - "to the extent that we can test that ahead of time, we try to gauge motivation." The majority of RF fellowships go to people from developing countries and the Foundation intends to continue the program even though costs are increasing greatly. Programs for Americans are handled through the specific RF program areas - i.e., Equal Opportunity, Conflict in International Relations, etc.

Next, Bruce Williams briefly described the Superintendent's Training Program, which is a specific fellowship project of the RF's Equal Opportunity Program.

"In 1970," Williams said, "there were little more than a dozen black superintendents of schools. In working to change that, we had to take into account various realities, for instance, the problem of mobility. Usually

people who could be moved into a superintendent's position were locked into a certain location - often they had a spouse who was working, they had made a down payment on a house - they were closely bound to their home community. So we built mobility into the program, by assigning interns to school districts that were outside their home state, and paying their relocation costs.

"Our fellows work with two superintendents, in two different cities, for a semester each, so they can compare and contrast working styles. Often interns exchange cities - so that they can talk with each other, compare notes.

"At the end of the intern year, fellows are taken to the U.S. Office of Education for one exhausting day of seminars. They can't possibly remember every title and every name, but they do get an idea of the resources there, and how they might be tapped.

"Our greatest difficulty has been with insuring line experience - because many of our candidates are assistants to the principal, superintendent - and so on. We look to the cooperating superintendents for a constant supply of candidates and we advertise nationally.

"As regards evaluation - in 1974, we surveyed 29 former fellows to find out the dollar increase in the budgets for which they were responsible, the number of people they supervised, the change in position, title, and so on. The results were quite impressive. But our efforts to move people into superintendent positions raised a question in my mind: Are we just raising the frustration level for our people? I know, for instance, that Minneapolis, Minnesota, is not going to have a black school superintendent any time in the near future. Are we just playing games by having our people apply? My own feeling is that there is something to be said for applying - so that no one can say that nobody applied."

The participants were then asked for comments or questions still on their minds. K. B. Chavis suggested that black institutions should play a role in helping black superintendents who have lost their jobs, "not through incompetence but through a political situation." As happens in the white establishment, "they could be made adjunct professor or visiting professor at a black institution for a year," but foundation support would be necessary to do this.

Most of the other participants mentioned the importance to them of becoming better acquainted with their colleagues in other programs and with the programs themselves. Bruce Williams remarked that perhaps we should do this again, "and next time we won't have to spend so much time explaining our programs and we can concentrate on collective evaluations."

BRIEFLY NOTED:

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION SPECIAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

Special Rockefeller Foundation fellowship awards are administered and supported by the Foundation and are open to qualified candidates on a competitive basis. Starting in the 1970's, the Foundation initiated a series of special fellowship programs, primarily in support of domestic program objectives. The following special fellowship programs are in effect in 1977:

1. Fellowship Program in the Humanities - to support work of humanistic scholarship and reflection intended to illuminate and assess the values of contemporary society.
2. Fellowship Program in Environmental Affairs - to support highly qualified scholars undertaking interdisciplinary study, research, or public service on environmental problems.
3. The Rockefeller Foundation and Ford Foundation Program in Support of Population Policy Research - to support research in the social sciences that will increase understanding of the multiplicity of factors influencing population dynamics and population policy.
4. Fellowship Program in Conflict in International Relations - to support the research of individuals who can bring unusual experiences to bear on critical issues in the field of conflict anticipation and resolution.
5. Fellowship Program in Finance and Management for Minority Educators - to support experienced minority-group educators, interested in the financial management of public schools and college budgets, to study for a master's degree in business administration at selected graduate schools.
6. Superintendent Internship Program - to provide experienced and qualified minority-group school administrators with a year of in-service training so that they can assume positions of higher responsibility in U.S. urban school systems.
7. Fellowship Program for Playwrights-in-Residence - to support residencies of young, creative playwrights in recognized American theaters.
8. Fellowship Program in the Agricultural Sciences - to enable outstanding young American scholars to develop their potential as agricultural scientists or leaders through study or research.

9. Postdoctoral Research Fellowships in Reproductive Biology - to support scientists with demonstrated research capability in the field of reproductive biology who plan to undertake studies relating to contraception and population growth.

The Rockefeller Foundation

Board of Trustees

Theodore M. Hesburgh, *Chairman*

John H. Knowles, *President*

Kenneth N. Dayton
Robert H. Ebert
Clifford M. Hardin
Ben W. Heineman
Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.
Lane Kirkland
Mathilde Krim
Richard W. Lyman
Bill Moyers
Jane Cahill Pfeiffer
Robert V. Roosa
Henry B. Schacht
Nevin S. Scrimshaw
Frederick Seitz
Maurice F. Strong
Paul A. Volcker
Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.