ABSTRACT
        Gaining insight into rural school superintendents' concerns
about serving special needs students in inclusive classrooms could help
minimize problems in implementing this change. A survey using the Change
Facilitator's Stages of Concerns Questionnaire was mailed to superintendents
in all 708 rural school districts in Texas; 484 responses were received.
Combining all three stages of implementation, 92.7 percent of the districts
reported they were actively engaged with inclusion. Findings suggest that
rural school superintendents wanted to know more about the "how-tos" of
implementation, were not concerned about working with others to facilitate
implementation, and were thinking about possible alternatives to inclusion.
Superintendents' concerns were not affected by school district size or the
proportion of special needs children in the total student population, but
were affected by the stage of implementation in their district. (CDS)

91st Annual NREA Convention

October 13-17, 1999
Colorado Springs, Colorado

"LEADERSHIP IN RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS: WHERE IS THE SUPERINTENDENT?"

by

H. H. (Buddy) Hooper Jr., Ed. D. - Principal
Turner Unified School District #202
Oak Grove Elementary School
Kansas City, Kansas

2

PRIMARY PRESENTER:

H. H. (Buddy) Hooper Jr., Ed.D.
11471 S. Hunter Drive
Olathe, Kansas 66061
(913) 438-8346 (H)
(913) 262-7416 (O)

Dr. Hooper is currently serving as a principal in the Turner Unified School District in Kansas City, Kansas, at one of the largest elementary schools in the state. His school serves nearly 700 students in grades PK through 5.

He has previously served as a high school teacher, elementary school principal, junior high school principal, high school principal, and a superintendent of schools in Texas for five years. Dr. Hooper has over seventeen year of successful educational experience. He is noted for his research in school violence, school restructuring, and educational leadership. In addition he is an adjunct professor, consultant, and he and his wife own and operate their own private business.

DESCRIPTION OF SESSION

Ordinarily one would assume that rural school superintendents provide leadership to all the district's programs. Results from a study investigating the implementation of inclusion in Texas rural schools raises some question regarding this assumption. This session provides an overview of the study, findings, conclusions, and recommended actions for facilitating the superintendents leadership role in implementing inclusive practices.

INCLUSION IN RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS; WHERE IS THE SUPERINTENDENT?

Today's superintendents are faced with the ever increasing implications of responding to federal laws and civil rights court cases that have been initiated by state and federal governments (Hill, 1993). Superintendents realize that with the change of placing students with special needs in the regular classrooms will come resistance; the concerns of teachers, administrators and parents will have to be considered. According to Kelly (1974), "leadership is the performance of acts which assist the group in achieving certain ends" (p. 365). As the key leader in the school district in regard to the school's programs the superintendent's concerns can facilitate the nature of or discourage the school's personnel in achieving certain desired changes. In other words, the school superintendent's concerns influence the way those in the organization think, feel and behave toward change. Their concerns toward the impending changes involved in the inclusion of special needs children will probably influence the level of acceptance of others in his/her district.

As districts move toward serving special needs children in inclusive arrangements, knowing what concerns superintendents have allows the development of strategies for addressing them. Internal and external agents (ex., state department representatives, university preparation programs, consultants, intermediate units, special education cooperative representatives, etc.) can better serve district leaders if they know the kinds of concerns these leaders have. Gaining insight into rural school superintendents' concerns toward serving children with special needs in inclusive classrooms could help minimize problems in implementing this innovation at all levels of

the organization. Given the less than stellar history of successful implementation of
planned changes in education, information regarding implementation processes is crucial
if the future is to boast of a greater number of successes.

Knowing an individual's stage of concern regarding an innovation is important
information. It can guide facilitators of change in selecting the type of information,
development activities, or support to provide the individual that will move him/her
through the stages and ultimately to the routine use of the innovation. The results of this
study offer some interesting perspectives regarding the implementation of an innovation
in rural schools and the role which the superintendent plays in the implementation
process.

The overall objectives of this paper are: (1) to provide information regarding the
results of a study identifying the concerns of rural school superintendents in Texas toward
serving children with special needs in inclusive classroom arrangements, and (2) to
discuss the implications of these findings for change facilitators at all levels of the
educational community. An overview of the study including population, guiding
questions and the methodology are presented. Major findings, conclusions and
recommendations for practice make up the major portion of the presentation.

An Overview of the Study

The study focused on rural school districts and the concerns (as measured by the
Change Facilitator's Stages of Concerns Questionnaire) of their chief executive officers
regarding the innovation of inclusion as a method of serving students with special needs.
The major purpose of the study was to identify the concerns of rural school

superintendents toward inclusion. The population for the study was the 708

superintendents of rural school districts in Texas, i.e., those districts with average daily

attendance of 1,600 or fewer students. A survey packet was mailed to each

superintendent. It contained a cover letter, a survey instrument (i.e., the CFSoCQ), a

demographic data sheet, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope.

The instrument used was the Change Facilitator Stages of Concerns Questionnaire

(CFSoCQ) (Hall, et al, 1991). Permission to use the CFSoCQ was secured from the

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas. The CFSoCQ is based

on the seven stages of concern identified through the work of Hord, Rutherford, Huling-

Austin, and Hall (1987). Hord, et al state that research has identified seven stages of

concern that users, or potential users, of an innovation may have. These include:

(a) Stage 0-Awareness Concerns, (b) Stage 1-Informational Concerns, (c) Stage 2-

Personal Concerns, (d) Stage 3-Management Concerns, (e) Stage 4-Consequence

Concerns, (f) Stage 5-Collaboration Concerns, and (g) Stage 6-Refocusing Concerns.

The CFSoCQ requires respondents to indicate what they think about a specific

innovation by marking each of 35 items on a 0 to 7 Likert scale according to how

accurately the items describe the respondent's current feeling about the innovation. The

35 items represent seven stages of concern, five items for each stage. Raw scores for

each stage of concern are converted to percentile scores and arrayed on a stages of

concern profile. A demographic data sheet asking respondents to indicate: district

enrollment (under 500, 501-999, 1,000-1,600, and over 1,600), percent of total

enrollment who are special needs children (0-5%, 6-10%, 11-15%, 16-20%, and more

than 20%), and the status of inclusion by implementation stage (not implemented, in

planning stages only, partially implemented, and fully implemented) was also developed.

An exceptionally good return of 484 questionnaires (68%) was received. Raw

data generated by the usable CFSoCQ's and demographic data sheets were scored,

entered on a disk according to the protocol and mailed to the research analyst at the

University of Texas - Austin. Total group and subgroups based on demographic

categories were profiled by a computer program which displays raw scores,

corresponding percentile scores, and graphs the respondent data according to each of the

seven stages of concern. The data were analyzed to determine the overall concerns of

rural school superintendents toward inclusion and what differences in superintendents'

concerns by enrollment categories, in terms of special needs children as a percent of the

total district enrollment, and in terms of the status of program implementation.

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations for Practice.

Of the 482 respondents who completed the demographic section of the survey,

nearly half (236, 49.0%) were from school districts with an enrollment under 500

students. Just under 30% (28.4%) were from districts with and enrollment of 501-999; 93

(19.3%) were from districts with an enrollment of 1,000-1,600; and slightly over 3% (16)

were districts identified (by Texas Education Agency) previously as rural schools, i.e.,

1,600 or less ADA. There were 481 respondents who completed the data section

concerning special needs children as a percent of district enrollment. Slightly less than

60% (59.0%) were from districts with 6-10% or 11-15% of special needs children as a

percent of district enrollment. Just over 30% (31.6%) reported 16% or more special

needs children as a percent of district enrollment. Finally, 481 respondents indicated the

status of program (inclusion) implementation. When combining all three stages of implementation, 92.7% of the districts reported they were actively engaged with inclusion. The majority of the superintendents reported their districts as having inclusion partially implemented (60.9%). Only 7.3% reported "not implemented" as the status of inclusion in their districts and 28% reported the status of inclusion in their district as "fully implemented".

A summary analysis of data indicated that the overall superintendents expressed their greatest concerns at CFSoCQ Stages 0 (Awareness), 1 (Informational), 3 (Management), and 6 (Refocusing); less concern at Stage 2 (Personal), and much less concern at Stages 4 (Consequence) and 5 (Collaboration):

o   Rural school superintendents as a total group (N=484) generated the following CFSoCQ Profile of Concerns regarding inclusion: Their most intense concerns were at Stage 0, moderately intense concerns at Stages 1, 3, and 6, less intense concerns at Stage 2 and few concerns at Stages 4 and 5. It is probable that the rural school superintendents gave little attention to inclusion but wanted to know more about the "how to do its" of implementation, were not concerned about working with others to facilitate its implementation, and were thinking about possible alternatives for it.

Importantly, the superintendents' concerns relative to their districts' status regarding the implementation of inclusion indicated some significant differences:

o   Rural superintendents whose districts were at different stages of implementing inclusion (not implemented, planning for it or fully implemented) vary somewhat

from the total group profile. Those in the planning category (N=18) wanted to

know more about inclusion, the "how to do its" of implementation, and how to

work with others effectively regarding its implementation. Those in the fully

implemented category (N=135) were somewhat less interested in knowing more

about inclusion, the "how to do its" of implementation, and were less concerned

about alternatives to or replacements for it. Superintendents who reported their

district to be not implemented (N=293) were similar to the total group (N=484).

Considering both demographic and CFSoCQ data resulted in several

conclusions/hypotheses.

Among them were the following:

o   School district size appeared to make no significant difference regarding the

        superintendents' concerns about inclusion.

o   The proportion of special needs children in the total student population did not

        appear to make a significant difference regarding the superintendents' concerns

        about inclusion.

o   The status of implementing inclusion appeared to generate significantly different

        kinds and intensities of concerns among superintendents

o   Superintendents do not perceive themselves as facilitators regarding the

        implementation of inclusion.

o   Superintendents see themselves playing a significant role when the district is

        planning for the implementation of inclusion.

o   Rural school superintendents appear to be meeting their leadership responsibilities regarding the implementation of inclusion. They are significantly involved during the discussion and planning stage and less so when implementation occurs. They maintain their oversight responsibility regarding the management function and maintain their oversight responsibility regarding the management function and keep their options open by considering alternatives to or replacements for inclusion.

o   Superintendents are uncertain whether inclusion is the preferred or most effective method for serving special needs children.

Data from this study point to several actions that might be taken by rural school superintendents and others associated with this group:

o   Districts are a "rich" in-house resource as regards the implementation of inclusion. Several groups (Texas Education Agency, Texas Association for School Boards, Texas Association of School Administrators, and others) should help these districts disseminate their knowledge regarding the successful implementation of this change.

o   Rural school superintendents should seriously consider using the materials available from the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas to determine the profile of concerns shared by administrators and teachers regarding the implementation of inclusion or any other substantive change in their district.

and,

o　Superintendents should consider developing a district profile of successful

implementation processes in building support for and confidence in future

implementation efforts. This profile could be one feature of the district's

internal and community public relations program throughout the change process.

o　Rural school superintendents can assist in the implementation of inclusion by

seeking answers to the following questions. Who is facilitating inclusion in the

school district? What concerns do they have? What can (and should) be done to

address those concerns?

Some Additional Considerations

o　Implementation of innovations moves through several phases, i.e. planning,

initiation, on-site implementation, and institutionalization. The superintendent's

role as facilitator may change as the phases change. If so, more needs to be

known about that role change.

o　Although this study did not focus on the effectiveness of inclusion as a method for

serving special needs children, there are some indications that superintendents

have concerns in this area. Therefore, an effort should be initiated to determine

whether or not inclusion is achieving its objectives and doing it more effectively

than methods utilized prior to its implementation.

o　All of the rural school superintendents (484) indicated they were thinking about

alternatives to or replacements for inclusion. It might be helpful to know what

they had in mind. Improved programs for serving special needs children could

result.

References

Hall, G.E., Newlove, B.W., George, A.A., Rutherford, W.L., & Hord, S.M. (1991). Measuring Change Facilitator Stages of Concern, A Manual for use of the CFSoC Questionnaire. Colorado: Center for Research on Teaching and Learning.

Hill, F.W. (1993). Inclusion and the administrative structure. American Schools and Universities, 66, 20.

Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L.L., & Hall, G.E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kelly, J. (1974). Organizational behavior: Its data, first principles and applications (3rd ed.) Homewood, IL: Richard Irwin, Inc.

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:

Leadership in Rural School Districts: Where is the Superintendent?

Author(s): H.H. (Buddy) Hooper Jr., Ed.D.

Corporate Source: N/A	Publication Date: October - 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [✓]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: *H. H. Hooper Jr.*	Printed Name/Position/Title: H. H. Hooper Jr. - Principal	
Organization/Address: 11471 S. Hunter Dr., Olathe, KS	Telephone: (913) 438-8346	FAX:
	E-Mail Address:	Date: 1/25/00

66061

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC/CRESS AT AEL
1031 QUARRIER STREET - 8TH FLOOR
P O BOX 1348
CHARLESTON WV 25325

phone: 800/624-9120

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.