EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Vol. 8, No. 1

The Journal of The International Society for Educational Planning

PROMOTING THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Reprints: Articles and reviews are available from the publisher at a cost of $10 (U.S.) plus postage for orders of less that 25 copies. For sets of 25 copies, the cost is $30 (U.S.)

Translations: *Educational Planning* will attempt to provide readers with major language translations of journal articles. Interested members should contact the editor regarding availability, costs, lead time, etc.

Educational Planning is the refereed journal of the International Society for Educational Planning. *Educational Planning* is published quarterly by the Society, which maintains editorial, production, and correspondence offices at Memphis State University, Building 48 - South Campus, Memphis, TN 38152. The Journal is assigned ISSN 0315-9388 by the International Serials Data System/Canada.

For manuscript submission and membership information, please see last pages.

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

VOLUME 8 SUMMER 1989 NUMBER 1

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Grover H. Baldwin is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at Indiana State University.

Frank W. Lutz is a professor in Educational Administration and Director of the Center for Policy Studies and Research in Elementary and Secondary Education at East Texas State University.

Susan B. Lutz is a high-school science teacher in Commerce, Texas.

John M. McLaughlin is an Assistant Professor of Educational Administration at St. Cloud University in St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Robert O. Riggs is a former university president and dean of a college of education. In his current assignment as Regents Professor at Memphis State University, he teaches courses in higher education law, finance and management.

Thomas C. Valesky worked in K-12 schools as a teacher, counselor, principal, and as a private school director prior to his present position as Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision at Memphis State University.

Belle Ruth Witkin is a writer and educational consultant, living in Renton, Washington. She is the author of *Assessing Needs in Educational and Social Programs: Using Information to Make Decisions, Set Priorities, and Allocate Resources*, a Jossey-Bass publication.

THE APPLICATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Robert O. Riggs and Thomas C. Valesky

Since the publication of *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (1986) two issues have, in the judgment of the authors, crystallized. First, the educational reform movement, whether it is characterized as first, second or third wave, is and will remain a powerful force in American society. The recent adoption of a national agenda for public education by President Bush and the nation's governors (Brosnan, 1990) serves as a significant reinforcement of the strength of the reform movement. Second, the responsibility for conceptualizing, planning, and effecting the reforms will clearly reside with the individual states. The federal role will be that of advocate and cheerleader, not fiscal sponsor (Riggs & Goodwin, 1988).

Given this premise, the question arises, to what extent are the individual states utilizing modern strategic planning techniques to chart courses for their public education systems? A brief discussion of early education planning models, programs for statewide educational planning, and the contemporary strategic planning method follows.

Early Education Planning Models

Contemporary educational planning models have their genesis in the "systems era" which began in the 1950s (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983). Herbert Simon (1957) and his later work with James March (1958) are exemplary of the movement. Simon's concept of bounded rationality recognized the overwhelming complexity of "pure" decisioning as he advocated reduction of decisioning to satisficing rather than maximizing. Building on this early conceptualization of organizations as systems, educational agencies and schools have, over the past three decades, adopted a variety of planning techniques. Three of the most widely used techniques are the incremental approach, the modeling/forecasting approach, and the systems approach.

The incremental planning technique came into broad application during the 1960s. The technique focuses on achieving short-term solutions. It also seeks to balance the various political power groups within and external to the institution by encouraging power brokering and "asking the right questions."

During the 1970s, modeling or forecasting techniques gained significant support as a planning technique within the education community. This technique had its roots in management science and relied heavily on rational decision-making processes supported by quantitative information and sophisticated modeling and forecasting procedures (Richardson & Rhodes, 1985). The approach was viewed as a rational method for the deployment of resources with an emphasis on managing for efficiency and on "doing it right." The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) was a major proponent of this planning approach. Kaufman's (1988) work is an illustration of the application of the systems approach to educational planning. His methodology utilizes the steps of needs assessment, mission analysis, and function analysis.

Statewide Education Planning

A review of the literature suggests that there have been few formal efforts to develop statewide plans for public education. This dearth of statewide planning is evident in a study which was designed to assess the status of "distant learning" in K-12 public education (Downing, 1984). A questionnaire mailed to the 50 states asked for information on the characteristics of long-range planning performed at the state department of education level. With 28 states responding, only one (New York) indicated that a "long range strategic plan" was being developed. Downing concluded that "the same issues raised by computer technology today will confront state departments of education tomorrow unless strategic planning takes place today" (p. 26).

Kaufman (1989) in his discussion on mega-planning suggests that successful planning efforts deal not only with the questions *what is* and *what should be*, but also adds the dimension of *what could be*. The Minnesota Plan (Berman, 1985) meets such standards. Convinced that fine-tuning the existing structure would not bring about necessary changes, Minnesota state education officials decided a major redesign was in order. Their comprehensive long-range plan embraced transitional plans, budgets, and projections for a 10-year period. The plan's uniqueness is illustrated in one section which gives students the option of attending secondary school or post-secondary school starting in the tenth grade.

Texas provides another example of a well-designed state plan. Legislation passed as Texas House Bill 72 (Levinson, 1988) mandates that the state board of education review the educational needs of the state, establish goals for the public school system, and adopt and promote four-year plans for meeting these needs and goals. With the governor in the lead, the state department of education was completely reorganized to accommodate the formation of 40 work groups—one group for each statewide planning goal.

James Moss (1988) cites another example of a forward-looking state education agency. To resolve the problems of increasing enrollment, low per capita income, and a very low per student expenditure, Utah's five-year plan called for the use of advanced technology to turn schools into learning centers. By employing technology, the state expects to maintain high academic standards without bankrupting the system.

Still other models of futuristic planning include New Hampshire's telecommunications program for public education (Watt, 1988). Governor Sununu launched a five million dollar initiative that focused on technology to "leverage the capacity of teachers as professionals" (p.114). In addition, Missouri's plan for education embodies the need to reduce the number of students in remedial classes (Hausman, 1989). With a statutory mandate to provide parent and family support at every school, Missouri expects to greatly reduce the cost of remedial education.

Apart from California's Omnibus Reform Acts, most examples of long-range planning and strategic planning occur within the school district or at the school level. These efforts are apparently fostered by the lack of planning at the state agency level. To compensate for the lack of state leadership in planning, many schools are forming consortiums to meet the heavy demands of long-range planning (Cawelti, 1989).

Kirst (1988) makes the point that since *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* was published, most of the reform effort has fallen on the unit schools. Initially they were asked only to change course offerings and tests, but now educators are asked to change the nature of pedagogy. This task may be too difficult to achieve at the school level given the continuing demand for other improvements. The problem, according to Kirst, may be that state

politicians are confused as to the meaning of restructuring and the need for long-range planning.

The review of the literature indicates that there has been a lack of educational planning at the state level. This is puzzling since it has not been due to a lack of information or resources. In his guide for policymakers, Cooper (1985) points to the numerous planning activities in the areas of budget, management, human services, and economics that exist within the state bureaucracies. Evidence of long-range planning for education programs, however, has been absent.

Strategic Planning

The concept of strategic planning has been actively embraced by the education community following the publication of George Keller's (1983) best seller, *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education.* As defined in this context, strategic planning consists of an analysis of data about an organization's internal and external environments, e.g., demographic, social, economic, technological, and political factors. These analyses provide a basis for developing a vision for the future of the institution. In turn, this process yields a listing of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, from which an organization derives a set of assumptions about future conditions. As a final step the organization focuses on a strategy for long-term survival that supports short-term operational decisions.

> Strategic planning has been characterized as seeking to foster institutional adaptation by assuring congruence between an institution and its relevant and often changing environment, by developing a viable design for the future of the institution, by modifying it as needed, and by devising strategies that facilitate its accomplishment (Peterson, 1980, p. 140).

Numerous models of strategic planning are cited in the professional literature (Groff, 1988; Cope, 1986; McCune, 1986). These models all suggest an assessment of an organization's external environment to determine opportunities and threats, an audit of an organization's internal environment to determine strengths and weaknesses, and the activation of a proactive plan to favorably position the organization given changing environmental parameters. This process, described as strategic choice by Cope (1986), stipulates that:

> Strategic choice involves a major decision altering the relationship of the institution to its environments. Too often, any important decision is considered strategic. The key word is environment. A strategic decision alters the institution's resource-acquisition or resource-depletion relationship with the environment. Strategy determines the nature and the direction of the institution. Strategic choices relate to scope of services, choice of those served, growth considerations, and the nature of relationships with other organizations. Strategic choices deal with "what" rather than "how" (p. 73).

The educational organization moves over time through an external environment. During this journey there is an ongoing process of adaptation and accommodation as the organization seeks to survive. The organization itself can be characterized as having four dimensions: structure, goals and values, psychosocial and technical. The strategic plan seeks to array its internal characteristics as complementary to the external environment in a manner most likely to achieve desired results.

Methodology

The Survey Instrument

Meredith, Cope, and Lenning (1987) developed a "Strategic Planning Questionnaire" that distinguishes among those institutions of higher education actually engaged in strategic planning and those not conforming to the principles of the planning technique. The authors of this survey instrument assert that it "can be used by institution officials to assess their planning or how well campus personnel understand strategic planning" (p. 1). Meredith, Cope, and Lenning are noted researchers in the area of strategic planning, and through their work and earlier work by Lenning (1982), they identified those items differentiating strategic planning from other forms of planning or those items that are important for strategic planning to succeed. Items for their instrument "went through extensive review and fine-tuning" (p. 8). It is the authors' opinion that the Meredith, Cope, and Lenning instrument is a valid measurement of strategic planning implementation in higher education institutions.

For the current study, the instrument developed by Meredith, Cope, and Lenning (1987) was modified to assess the extent to which state departments of education were utilizing strategic planning in the development of statewide programs for public education. Items from the original questionnaire were reworded to address the strategic planning concepts as understood by respondents at state-level public education institutions. One question from the original instrument was changed to include the use of the word "proactive," which the strategic planning literature consistently indicates is a key element in the implementation of strategic planning techniques. The revised questionnaire presents twenty questions and invites responses using four-point Likert scales. Questions on the instrument request respondents to indicate the planning efforts at their state department of education by marking whether or not each question is *Definitely True, Somewhat True, Somewhat Untrue,* or *Definitely Untrue.* Using the Meredith, Cope, and Lenning classification of the correct "strategic" responses, answers of *Definitely True* or *Definitely Untrue* receive a score of four if correct and a score of one if incorrect. Answers of *Somewhat True* or *Somewhat Untrue* receive a score of three if correct and a score of two if incorrect. The list of questions is provided in Table 1 (see page 10). An additional item on the questionnaire invites respondents to comment on any of the issues addressed by the survey questions. The modified instrument is designated as the "1990 Strategic Planning Questionnaire."

Meredith, Cope, and Lenning do not report any psychometric parameters for their instrument. Consequently, for the current study, a measure of the instrument's reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha resulting in a coefficient alpha of 0.57. Four questions (Questions 1, 7, 12, and 15) had low item correlation scores and were deleted to produce an alpha of 0.70. This is a fairly strong measure of the internal consistency of the remaining questionnaire items, indicating that this instrument is a reliable measure of the underlying construct—strategic planning (Crocker & Algina, 1986).

Some respondents were critical of the wording of several questions, and indicated they were not able to accurately interpret them. It is the authors' belief that the respondents' lack of knowledge about the vocabulary used to describe strategic planning may have led to their problems with interpretation. Therefore, prior to adopting this instrument for further studies, it is recommended that either: (a) respondents clearly have a working vocabulary used in strategic planning, or (b) the questions are reworded through example or definition to ensure respondents accurately interpret the questions.

Data Source and Results

During January 1990, a letter was mailed to the chief state school officer of each of 56 states and territories requesting that the "1990 Strategic Planning Questionnaire" be completed by the state department of education staff member responsible for coordinating statewide educational planning. A follow-up letter was mailed three weeks after the initial communication to stimulate non-respondents to complete and return the questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were received from 45 states and territories for an 80% response rate.

Table 1 shows the mean scores for each question, ranging from a high of 3.49 (Question 18), which is a strong strategic response, to a low of 1.48 (Question 1). The overall mean for all states and territories responding was 2.80. State or territory scores ranged from a high of 3.63 (strongly strategic responses) to a low of 2.37. Using the middle score of 2.5 or higher to indicate those having a better understanding of the process of strategic planning, 91% of the respondents scored at or above 2.5 and 9% scored below 2.5.

Discussion

With the overall mean score of 2.74 approaching the Likert scale anchor of *Somewhat* strategic and with 91% of the respondents scoring at or above 2.5, it can be stated that, on the aggregate, state-level education policy makers adhere to many of the principles of strategic planning. An analysis of the individual question responses that received the highest strategic responses indicates that most state departments understand basic tenets of strategic planning, including:

1. an articulated vision of the planning process,
2. a regular evaluation of the department's mission as well as the individual decisions and goals of the department,
3. all levels within the department must develop their own strategic plans,
4. scanning of the external environment is a key component to successful planning,
5. change is an essential feature when the external environments demand change, and
6. implementation of formulated plans is a necessary feature of good strategic planning.

It is apparent that some state departments of education (those with lower "strategic" scores) are not implementing strategic planning as defined by this survey instrument. Certainly for these policy planners, and even for those who do indicate some use of strategic planning, additional information about the benefits of strategic planning and appropriate implementation techniques would ensure better planning at the state level. It is further suggested that state departments of education implement strong programs to inform their staffs, public officials, and other public school authorities about the effectiveness of strategic planning. The instrument used in this study or a modification of it could be an excellent basis for beginning the discussions in the use of strategic planning in state departments of education.

The high response rate obtained by this study (80%) suggests that there are strong interest levels by state departments of education in strategic planning. Some of the comments that were included in the respondents' answers to the questionnaire are indicative of state department efforts to implement strategic planning:

"We are in our third year of strategic planning.... We are... systematically developing a vision of the information society and the needed role of public education."
"Our planning efforts are tightly linked to our policy analysis efforts."

Perhaps the best recommendation that can be made concerning the use of strategic planning by state departments of education came from one respondent who wrote: "There is a need for state level (K-12) educational planners to form a group for helping each other and sharing ideas."

Earlier investigations into state-level planning processes implied that little was being done to plan effectively. It is clear to the authors of this study that states are becoming more active in planning systems of public education through the use of strategic planning. The respondents to this study seem to be aware of their planning responsibilities. Nevertheless, we encourage state departments of education to analyze and compare their individual state-level efforts in strategic planning to the "correct" strategic responses in Table 1 so that continued and additional benefit may be obtained from the strategic planning process.

References

Berman, P. (1985, November). The next step: The Minnesota Plan. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67* (3), 188-193.

Brosnan, J. W. (1990, February 24). Governors to tackle goals for education. *Commercial Appeal*, pp. 1, 5.

Cawelti, G. (1989, September). Designing high schools for the future. *Educational Leadership. 47* (1), 30-35.

Cooper, H. A. (1985). *Strategic planning in education: A guide for policymakers.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Cope, R. G. (1986, Winter). Information system requirements for strategic choices. *Environmental Scanning for Strategic Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Downing, D. (1984). *Survey on uses of distance learning in the United States.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Groff, W. H. & Cope, R. G. (1988, July). *Achieving excellence through strategic planning.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Management Institute for College and University Executives.

Hausman, B. (1989, Fall/Winter). Parents as teachers: The right fit for Missouri. *Educational Horizons, 67* (1-2), 36 - 39.

Kaufman, R. (1988). *Planning educational systems: A results-based approach.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.

Kaufman, R. (1989, October). Where's the mega plan? *Performance & Instruction,* p. 9-11.

Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kimbrough, R. B. & Nunnery, M. Y. (1983). *Educational Administration.* 2nd ed. NY: Macmillan, 296.

Kirst, M. W. (1988, August). Recent state education reform in the United States: Looking backward and forward. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24* (3), pp. 319, 326.

Levinson, C. (1988, April). *Education planning in Texas: Long-range plan of the state board of education for Texas public school education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, p. 3.

March, J. G. & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations.* NY: Wiley.

McCune, S. (1986). *Guide to strategic planning for educators.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Meredith, M., Cope, R. G., & Lenning, O. T. (1987, May 1). *Differentiating bona fide strategic planning from other planning.* (Report No. HE 020 503). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Boulder, Management Information Analyses. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 329).

Moss, J. R. (1988, September). Utah: A case study. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70* (1), p. 25.

National Governors' Association. (1986, August). *Time for results: The Governors' 1991 report on education.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

Peterson, M. W. (1980). Analyzing alternative approaches to planning. In P. Jedamus & M.W. Peterson (Eds.), *Improving academic management: A handbook of planning and institutional research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richardson, R. C., Jr., & Rhodes, W. R. (1985). Effective strategic planning: Balancing demands for quality and fiscal realities. In W. L. Deegan & D. Tillery (Eds.), *Renewing the American community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riggs, R. O. & Goodwin, K. F. (1988, November). The federal role in financing secondary education: The Reagan years and beyond. *The Clearing House for the Contemporary Educator in Middle and Secondary Schools, 62* (3), 121-123.

Simon, H. A. (1957). *Administrative Behavior*. 2nd ed. NY: Macmillan.

Watt, D. (1988, November). New Hampshire: A case study. *Learning Tomorrow, 4*, p. 114.

Table 1
Mean Score for Questions on the Strategic Planning Questionnaire

	Correct Strategic Planning Answer	Mean Score
1. The primary purpose of planning is to develop a blueprint for the state's educational programs.	False	1.48
2. The mission of the State Department of Education (SDE) is regularly reviewed and clarified in terms of "What business we are in."	True	3.30
3. "Doing things right" is considered more important than "doing the right things."	False	2.76
4. The SDE's statement of mission/purposes is considered more important for public relations than as a guide for the SDE's future.	False	3.44
5. Central to the planning process is a clearly articulated vision of what the state educational program is to become.	True	3.38
6. It is desired that the state educational program be stable and relatively unchanging so it can withstand a turbulent environment.	False	3.00
7. Assessment of strengths and weaknesses *of the SDE* is important, but not important as regular assessment of opportunities and threats *in the environment.*	True	2.61
8. Planning relies primarily on analysis of concrete, objective data, rather than on opinions, values, traditions, and aspirations.	False	2.51
9. Environmental scanning is done regularly to assess trends and changes in social/ demographic technological, economic, and political influences.	True	3.14

[Table 1 cont'd.]

	Correct Strategic Planning Answer	Mean Score
10. Annual budgets and/or the governing structure largely determine what the state educational program will be doing in the future.	False	1.96
11. Extrapolation is used as a primary method to anticipate change in the external environment.	False	2.32
12. Strengths of other state education departments arc regularly assessed.	True	2.38
13. New program decisions are usually a reaction to outside influences, such as other governmental programs or mandates and public opinion.	False	2.42
14. The SDE is proactive.	True	3.11
15. Ambiguity, when it occurs in planning, requires more study so that certainty can be improved before decisions are made.	False	2.14
16. Strategic plans are developed at other organizational levels within the SDE in addition to an overall SDE Strategic Plan.	True	3.09
17. Strategic choices are consistently made that reposition the SDE in more favorable positions.	True	2.77
18. There are both formulation and implementation stages in the strategic process.	True	3.49
19. Following strategic decisions, resources are, in fact, directed/redirected to insure that decisions are implemented.	True	3.20
20. Following implementation of strategic decisions, re-view and evaluation is carried out to insure that decisions and goals are met, with modification as necessary.	True	3.27

REFORMING RURAL EDUCATION: "THE BEST LAID PLANS OF MICE AND MEN. . . ."

Frank W. Lutz and Susan B. Lutz

The purpose of this article is to discuss the nature of the recent policy reforms in education and how those policies and reforms may have certain value biases and may result in diverse planning processes. The use of cultural anthropology and ethnography as a tool of policy analysis and planning is not new. It has been particularly noted within the British Social Anthropology school and the attendant rise and support of colonialism during the late 1800s and early 1900s in the British Empire (Harris, 1968: 516-517).

Ethnography may present two types of realities. The first reality is seen through the concepts the observer brings to the research. This description of reality creates scientific order by interposing a set of rules that in themselves create a reality. A second reality occurs, in spite of protestations to the contrary, because human behavior is persistent and insists on a reality of its own. It is the reality that the people who live in the society believe in and preserve.

Sahlins (1976: 83-85) describes this conflict of realities. He says,

> Malinowski could 'see things as the natives saw them' provided, as it were, they agreed to see things his way. . . . The truest data of ethnography consist not in facts of cultural order but in the way that order is subjectively lived, the famous 'imponderabilia of everyday life' . . . . The importance of this natural impulsive code 'is that in the end it prevails over the conventional: in the end, the cultural form submits to the "spontaneous" praxes.' The true problem is not to study how human life submits to rules - it simply does not: the real problem is how the rules become adapted to life (Malinowski, 1966: 127).

Certain value choices have driven the recent educational reforms in a particular direction. The policies that have emerged tend to advantage some and disadvantage others. The accounts of the success of these reform policies may be overstated. As Shalims suggests, "native" behavior persists in spite of bureaucratic policy; even if it cannot exist because of it. The planning question is then, what is actually happening and what can or should be done about it?

Perhaps there are several realities in a single story. Maybe neither traditional nor interpretive ethnography is bad ethnography. Each may describe a different reality and, therefore, elect a different planning process. Given two descriptions of reality, resulting in two different plans of action, the best plan may be in the merging of these different (yet each correct) descriptions of the organization and culture. The best plan satisfies both views. Such a process may be similar to merging the empirical and representational models into the explanatory model discussed by Caws (1974).

Method

Both authors entered the Dairyland school district, one as an administrator and the other as a teacher, each with the commensurate set of concepts attached to our positions. Although Susan was an outsider to the community, as a teacher she became a full participant in the school

environment. Frank, on the other hand, in his role as university supervisor of administrative interns in the school, was more a non-participating observer whose visits to the school and readings of intern logs gave him a different perspective on the school environment. Because of these multiple roles, several views of the district were possible. Frank had the opportunity to engage in frequent discussions with the principal and superintendent while Susan's position provided a clear and continuous view of the classroom and the teacher/pupil culture. Both regularly attended after-school/community functions.

The Description

Official observations continued for two school years, 1983-84 and 1984-85, in this rural, K-12, single-campus school district. Dairyland was composed of what had earlier been eight smaller two- to four-room schools, each operating under separate school boards. Merging in 1942 into a single district, Dairyland operated a segregated black school until 1966. Presently housing 230 K-12 black, white and Hispanic pupils, Dairyland operates in an integrated building. By 1996, a 104% growth is projected, for a total of 470 pupils.

Dairyland, a rural agrarian area, is a picture of pastoral tranquility. Narrow, winding blacktop roads connect dirt roads through gently rolling hills upon which cows graze in the Texas sun. There are numerous trees in the area and the black earth holds water in the shallow "stock tanks." There is an occasional farmhouse, often not well kept. The area's major non-agricultural business is a gas-station/food-store which employs four people. Aside from the school there is almost no employment within the school district except for farm labor, e.g. milking cows, haying, maintaining fences, etc. All the agriculture is dairy farming with the exception of one large foreign-owned farm which produces food suitable to the climate (i. e. irrigated long grain rice). Most of the dairy farms are small, family-owned operations with neither the capital nor the land to expand. Most of the larger farms, also family operated, lease much of their land and have done so for generations. Those who choose to do other types of work must live or at least work elsewhere. Some former Dairyland residents live and work in the nearby small town of Clear Wells. Thus they maintain close contact with family and friends in Dairyland. Others move to "seek their fortune" elsewhere. The racial composition is mostly Anglo. There are few blacks, about 2%, and fewer Hispanics, less than 1%. Hispanics who do live in the district are usually migrant and often without children or family living in the district.

Dairyland is one of about 430 school districts in Texas classified by the state as "rural." These districts represent 40.6% of the total school districts in Texas but house only 6.5% of the public school pupils. While all rural districts are not exactly alike, they do share certain common cultural characteristics. Loomis (1950, 1960), Peshkin (1970) and Nash (1980) all provide evidence of common cultural characteristics in rural American schools. Therefore, one carefully documented response of a rural school to the state reforms should be of educational, cultural and policy/planning significance.

In 1981, the Texas legislature passed H.B. 246 mandating a revised state-wide curriculum in all grades and all subjects. These contained "essential elements" that are required to be taught by every teacher; evidence of that teaching must be recorded in order to satisfy state accreditation visits. Additionally, in a special session in 1984, H.B. 72 was passed by the legislature which enacted a major policy reform including a "no pass/no play" rule and a longer school year, and mandated testing of both pupils and teachers. This policy reform was oriented to urban and high-tech interests to meet the "necessities of economic transition" (Plank, 1986, p. 13). Without belaboring the point, it is safe to say that the Texas reform, like most state

education policy reform of the 1980s, was calculated to change public education in ways making it more characteristically urban and less rural. In the fall of 1983, just after the 1981 H.B. 246 reform act, Dairyland hired Susan Lutz, a newcomer to Texas who had lived all her life in the North. Her values were more urban, having grown up in a major city and lived in New York City for four and one-half years. The Texas 1984 reform was enacted during her first year teaching in Dairyland.

On the seven-person Dairyland school board, all but one member had some relative who had previously served on that school board. Two were "third generation" board members. Of the 22 faculty, 5 lived in Dairyland's boundaries (no other active, certified teacher was known to live within the boundaries), 4 lived in neighboring rural areas, and 9 more lived in the neighboring small city. The 4 others lived within 40 miles of the school, none in a large city. Of 13 non-professional staff (part- or full-time) all but 4 lived within Dairyland's boundaries. Dairyland itself had no town government, no major industry, and no business employing more than four persons (except in agriculture).

The new (K-12) Dairyland school building was only 6 months old when Susan arrived. On the same site was the old wooden gymnasium, an old metal agriculture building that was replaced with a new brick Ag. building in 1986, and an old building that was rebuilt (in 1986) as two primary classrooms in order to meet reform teacher/pupil mandates. An old wooden house on the same site had been renovated and served as the residence provided for the superintendent.

Before getting her position in Dairyland and while still living "back East," Susan was asked to interview with the school board. She flew into Metroplex and drove 100 miles to the Dairyland exit. There she ate dinner at a truck stop where the waitress asked, "Are you the new science teacher-lady?" Her eastern accent and the town gossip had already caught up with her. She was known to the community even before she accepted the position. Susan met with the board, got the job, and began teaching in Dairyland on August 17. Within a week she was dubbed the "Resident Yankee" by her colleagues. The differences were clear but without any observable hostility. In fact, there appeared to be considerable good humor about the kidding on both parts, hers and the rest of the Dairyland faculty.

Susan taught 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th grade science classes, six straight periods a day with a 10-minute morning break and a 20-minute lunch break, during which, one week in four, she was on duty. The following year, she taught basically the same schedule, except that a 6th-grade gifted class replaced 6th-grade science, and 11th-grade chemistry replaced her 4th grade science class. The 10th grade biology was split into two groups (pre-biology and biology, both taught during the same single period in the same room). This arrangement allowed less academically oriented pupils a better chance to pass in pre-biology. The first period of the seven-period day was a preparation period for all teachers, making a 7:45 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. school day standard.

Teaching School in Dairyland - Pre-H.B. 72

Susan had seen the school and the science laboratory during her visit to the school for her interview. It was new and modern. She had been told that the previous science teacher,who had been fired, had not used the lab sufficiently during the half year it had been open and that the board hoped Susan would make maximum use of it. What she and, apparently, the board did

not know was that there was no gas to the gas outlets in the science lab (and no way to get it there) and there were not even the most basic lab materials with which to work.

As the semester continued, several thousand dollars worth of materials were purchased at Susan's request. To the credit of the board, they never refused a request for science materials once the superintendent could be convinced the materials were needed. As a former science teacher, he would always respond initially, "I never needed that to teach science. Do you know how much that will cost?" However, he would usually recommend it to the board.

The First Teaching Days

The things that seemed most startling to Susan during the first days and weeks can be categorized in three related ways: (1) the students' general knowledge was lower than she had been used to; (2) the math and English skills needed to do science were often at a low level (sometimes several grades below their grade level), and (3) most of the students, parents, and even the teachers and administrators felt that the above situation was quite all right. The people in the community felt that most students could not practically use, and, therefore, should not be expected to learn basic science knowledge and concepts. A common response from pupils to a request to some homework assignment was, "My mother said I shouldn't have to learn this stuff. It don't help milk cows."

Rural people, like many inner city residents, not only have their own culture but to some extent a unique dialect as well. For at least 20 years, there has been a debate about "non-standard" English, its acceptability, and its use (for example, see Grill & Bartel, 1977; McCarthey, 1977). Dairyland was no exception. The vast majority of students, parents, and even school board members, teachers, and school administrators spoke non-standard English to some degree. The tense of the verb was often incorrect. Double negatives were more the rule than the exception. When communicating with teachers the principal consistently wrote as he spoke, "we or [instead of 'we are'] going . . . ." Whether one personally takes an accepting attitude toward non-standard English or not, the standardized state-mandated tests (used as a state measurement of effective reform) are unforgiving.

Students were accustomed to true/false tests and simply could not respond to questions requiring two or three sentence answers, which Susan often required. They would usually leave the question blank. When they answered, it would often be with incomplete sentences, poor grammar and spelling, and frequently with a totally wrong answer. One extreme example was Jimmy, a pupil in eighth grade, who could neither spell nor construct a sentence. Jimmy printed everything in capital letters, using no punctuation, not even spaces between words. He answered a question about the center of the solar system: "SUNCENTREOFSISTUM." Translation: [The] sun [is the] center of [the solar] system.

There was a single "noncategorical room" for all special education pupils, grades 1-12. This was called a "resource room." The single teacher and one aide provided no resources for teachers teaching "mainstreamed resource" pupils. The resource teacher had no time to help other teachers. With as many as 24 pupils to teach at various levels and with various problems, this teacher was lucky to survive. As a matter of district policy, all special education pupils were "mainstreamed" in science at all grade levels.

Corporal punishment is much in vogue in Texas, especially in rural Texas. Susan, however, had never used corporal punishment and made it clear she neither intended to use it nor to have disruptive pupils in her classes. At first, neither students, other teachers, the principal nor most

parents could understand this. "How else can you keep order?" "Sometimes you've got to get their attention," and "A couple of licks can do the trick" were typical comments.

A Typical Teaching Day in Dairyland

Half of the students in Susan's first period 10th grade biology class were 15 minutes late because the dirt roads were muddy and nearly impassible. The buses and several students who drove their trucks had gotten stuck. Just after they all arrived, an announcement came over the intercom, "All those in the Future Farmers of America report to have your club picture taken." As they returned, there was another announcement, "The Homemakers report to have their picture taken." By the time all returned, 35 minutes of the 55-minute period were gone. When order was restored, only 15 minutes were left and little could be accomplished. That time was spent teaching about taxonomies.

The second period was ninth grade physical science. Two of the class' major "trouble makers" who had been absent for several days had returned that day. Almost as soon as the lesson started, they began to complain about how hard the work was and that they shouldn't have to learn all of "that stuff." They claimed that the neighboring school districts did not expect so much. The two were then joined by several others who had been willing to try to learn when the other two had been absent. "What other school districts do is of no concern to this class," Susan said. "We are going to complete all of the physical science course prescribed by the state." Order was restored and class continued.

During the 10-minute morning break, Susan visited with her colleagues in the teachers' room. The discussion centered on the new state policy proposal that students had to pass all of their classes if they were to be able to participate in co-curricular activities/athletics. The principal, superintendent, and the majority of teachers seemed to think the rule was unfair. The superintendent and principal were the major verbal antagonists of this state intrusion on the way Dairyland ran its school. There was not a single favorable comment about having to pass academic classes in order to participate in athletics and "ag-shows." "This could really ruin basketball in Dairyland," the principal said. "Might even we can't put players on the floor." Susan said nothing.

The third period was interrupted by a boy named Billy Joe complaining about the difficulty of the work and refusing to do it. He was sent to the principal who assigned him to "in-house detention" for the day. This meant that he would spend the day with the second grade, supposedly doing regular assignments but away from his regular classmates. Usually in such situations little was completed on assignments, but the penalty was more effective than "licks" because the pupils preferred licks to being isolated from their classmates. Susan had talked with Billy Joe's parents several times before. His behavior would usually improve for a few days but soon return to inattentiveness and disruption.

Lunch period followed. The line at the snack bar in the gym was long. Most students ate candy, nachos, hamburgers, and cokes rather than the lunch served in the cafeteria. Susan ate her "sack" lunch while on duty outside. A fifth-grade girl reported that the boys were behind the school chewing tobacco. Susan checked the story but saw no one. As she returned, a third-grade boy reported high school kids "kissing and necking" behind the school. Again, Susan checked and found no one. Then a fight broke out among several fifth-grade boys. She broke that up as the bell rang.

During the fourth period, a test was given to the eighth-grade life science class. "This is too hard; do we have to do this?" the class complained. But the test went off without major

disruption. When the test was completed Susan told the class how much better they had been doing recently.

The fourth-grade science class met during fifth period. Just after the class began, the principal came into the room and asked Susan to step out into the hall. He said the superintendent had been upset about the zero she had given to a school board member's daughter for cheating on a test. Additionally, her mother was the school secretary. The test had been given on a day Susan had been absent, and the incident was reported to her by the substitute teacher. "How did he [the Superintendent] find out?" asked the principal. The major problem, the principal said, was that the superintendent felt he should have been informed and that the mother claimed that the substitute had lied, in spite of the fact that the girl admitted having cheated.

The final class of the day was sixth-grade science. It was a lab class about electric current and circuits in series and parallel. The students seemed to show interest, and there were no outside interruptions.

As Susan prepared to leave school at 3:45 p.m., she picked up a fourth-grade book from a desk in her room. A note fell out of the book. It was from a boy to the principal's daughter, a fourth-grader, about how much he liked her. Susan stopped to see the principal and give him the note, but he had left to change a flat tire on a bus.

Co-Curricular Activities

One of the problems plaguing instruction during the first year of this study was the constant interruption of instructional time for other "school related" activities. Every class and school organization (e. g. Future Farmers of America, the Honors Club, the Cheerleaders) had certain fund-raising activities. These activities included raffles and the sale of items from jackets to apples to hams. There was never a day, and sometimes never a period during the day, that was not interrupted either by some student coming into the classroom to sell something or a period lost to make a banner or a poster for an athletic event, PTA night, Halloween night, Christmas presentation, Education Week, etc. While this improved after the reform bill, it remained a problem for Susan.

Because of the nature of the rural consolidated school most of the pupils rode school buses. Others who drove or rode with students driving (mostly in pick-up trucks) had to leave at the end of school to do farm chores.

Therefore, athletic teams practiced only during the 50-minute "athletic period" which was the seventh period of the day. This greatly limited their ability to practice and, therefore, to excel. It did not limit the interscholastic participation, however. Although the school track team never practiced, the "track team" left school on four occasions during the school year to participate in track meets. They never won a meet.

There was minimal practice time for the baseball team as well and barely enough 10th, 11th and 12th graders to make up a baseball team. One day an "away" game had been scheduled. The trip required the team to leave at 10 a.m., but only eight boys were in school that morning. "Jack's at home sleepin,'" reported one player. The principal "excused" him to drive to Jack's house. By 10 a.m., he had returned with Jack, and everyone boarded the bus. The team and certain "excused" rooters left for the day. Dairyland lost 10-1.

Both the boys' and girls' basketball teams did practice regularly. Basketball games were attended by between 75 and 100 people. Although the boys' team seldom won, the girls' team did well in 1983-84 and went to district finals. But, win or lose, games were community events.

Spectator enthusiasm was always high. The major difference from game to game was spectator "evaluation" of the officials.

The major school/community event was "Halloween Night." This event attracted more community participation than any other school event. Each grade ran a "booth" of some kind. There was the basketball throw, the football throw, the cake walk, dart throw, pitch the rings, the jail, the golf putt, etc. The evening began at 6:00 p.m. and ended about 8:30 p.m. At the end of the evening, there was a "Parade of Goblins" when 35-50 young children marched across the front of the gym. The child with the best costume was given a prize. This event, held in the gymnasium, attracted several hundred community members of every age as well as the entire faculty of Dairyland.

Graduations for both the 8th and the 12th grades ranked second among school/community events. Each of these graduations appeared to be important socializing events in the local culture, although they had limited academic significance as many pupils would not continue their education but would instead return to farm jobs. They were more a symbol of passage as a birthday or wedding would be.

The Junior-Senior Prom was also a major event each year. Girls spent hundreds of dollars for their formal gowns, and the boys rented tuxedos; most boys wore a western hat which was never removed. A catered dinner was the first order of the event. Four couples sat around a table lighted by a candle, girls in their beautiful gowns and expensive hairdos, boys in their many-colored tuxes and their cowboy hats.

Dinner was followed by a presentation of the traditional class speeches and prophecies. A few of the boys, still wearing their broad brimmed hats, read so badly that their female counterparts had to stand by their sides, prompting them. The speeches ended with the class prophecy, and the dance began to recorded music. Within 45 minutes, the girls had changed their expensive gowns and were in jeans and blouses, and the boys' tuxedos were replaced with jeans and western shirts. Western hats remained in place.

In 1986, for the first time, the prom was held in a rented space in a motel in nearby Clear Wells. For the first time, the faculty of Dairyland was not invited to the prom. In spite of everything, things were changing in Dairyland.

Homecoming could have been any basketball homegame except the parking lot was more crowded. Inside, the old wooden gym was decorated with banners made in classes that day. The stands were filled with families and recent graduates with dates or perhaps their spouses. Many of the girls from 6th to 12th grades had homecoming "mums" composed of ribbons with a button center proclaiming "Go Bears" and streamers decorated with "bronzed trinkets." Worn by the younger, smaller girls, the ribbons nearly touched the ground. The first game was played by the girls' team. They won due largely to one Hispanic girl who was selected as "All District" in Dairyland's classification and who had received an athletic "scholarship" to a state college.

Between games, the Homecoming Queen candidates retired to the girls' restroom/dressing room to put on formal dresses. Each of the upper grades had a queen candidate. Everyone in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 had a chance to cast a vote. There had been no formal campaigning, although candidates from each grade were previously known.

The principal, who had been timer during the game, introduced the superintendent. The superintendent made a few welcoming remarks and then introduced each candidate, giving her name and the names of her parents and her escort. The escorts wore suits and ties. Some, not all, wore the traditional western hat. When introduced, each girl walked with her escort down the center of the gym where they took their places in the middle of the gym. Finally, the

Superintendent announced the winner—the Hispanic basketball star, a senior.

She walked down the center to receive her crown to the cheers of the crowd and retired to her "throne," a chair in the jump circle at the center of the basketball court. She sat flanked by her court and the escorts while the crowd cheered. Then she and the court retired, changed to party dresses (the escorts changed to jeans) and returned to watch the boys' game.

The evening ended with the usual loss by the boys' team. But it was close. Everyone would have enjoyed it more if they had won. However, it didn't seem to matter all that much. Dairyland had its Homecoming.

Epilogue 1984-85

The road to operational change in local districts through state legislated policy will be slow and painful. Peshkin (1970) studied a rural Midwest town, which he called Mansfield, and found many of the same norms and values there that are evident in Dairyland. Mansfield's teachers were reconciled to a lax academic environment, "football was king," national pressures were always filtered through rurally oriented educators. The school board rejected educators who were too academically oriented. Peshkin concludes, "Given local control, could it be otherwise? And, given the behavior of local students, need it be otherwise?" (p. 198). Both questions are relevant ones in Dairyland.

In answer to Peshkin's local control question, the Dairyland board has made up its mind. It will not be otherwise if they can help it. With the full cooperation and recommendation of their superintendent and principal, they opposed and avoided many of the new state mandated policies. The basketball team still left school as early as 2:00 p.m., played a game, stopped to have dinner on the way home (paid for from the superintendent's fund) and arrived back as late as 11 p.m. They often repeated this several times a year, and they played again on the weekend. Games were scheduled during six-week testing days, requiring the testing schedule to be changed. A notice from the principal informed teachers that they should be aware of the situation and "take it into account."

During the testing week, teachers were informed that the board had elected *not* to follow the mandate that students could not pass unless they mastered 70% of the mandated "essential elements." Further, they were told the following year that the emphasis was to be only on the 70% of the elements required to pass, thus limiting teaching to the bare minimum requirements. Susan felt the board was saying, "Everyone is to pass and we don't care much about other students with a college orientation who want to learn more." Actually, the state board backed off that mandate in 1986-87, making it more comfortable for districts like Dairyland.

The state reform intended a major emphasis on college preparatory and preparing students to participate in a 21st century technological economy. The "essential elements" (100% of them) were originally intended as a minimum curriculum, not a maximum. Dairyland however did not intend to emphasize high academic standards for all pupils. That is the way it was to be. Given local control and given the behavior of the students and the norms, values and economics of the community, need it be otherwise?

The Interpretation

There is no disagreement between the two major researchers about the foregoing description. Two other teachers who have lived and worked for years in Dairyland have read it and agree, "This is Dairyland and it could be other 'rural' districts as well." The data appear to be

valid and generalizable to some other rural districts in Texas, at least. But what do the data mean for policy and planning?

A Local Interpretation

In the above description the "voices" of the natives can be heard (Marcus and Fisher, 1986): "I never needed that to teach science"; "My mother said I shouldn't have to learn this stuff. It don't help milk cows"; "A couple of licks can do the trick."

The Dairyland District has operated for a long time, and it has come a long way. From a group of two- to four-room schools, from a segregated system, from a school house built with the leftover materials from the old schools and with WPA labor, it is now an integrated school with a range of courses including trigonometry, chemistry, and foreign language. It is housed in a brand new, modern structure. About 20-30% of its graduates go on to post-secondary education of some type. All of its third graders in 1986-87 passed the minimum standard state-mandated test. Not all districts, rural, urban or suburban, can say that.

What if Dairyland isn't the public school equivalent of Harvard? No one in Dairyland wants it to be. They are proud of their school, its basketball team, its former graduates, and its present students. In Dairyland, families are important. One is born in Dairyland, grows up and goes to school, usually meets a future spouse in high school, gets married, and raises a family, all within 50 miles of the Dairyland school. Most cannot imagine another kind of life.

Dairyland School District is an important element in Dairyland's cultural life, perhaps *the* important element to this "community" without a town. Without a school the culture, the society, may not survive. The primary economic base in Dairyland is agriculture and, for all but managers of the larger operations, that work does not require a lot of education. In fact a lot of education sometimes conflicts with Dairyland's culture and the family values. The more education, the more likely one will leave Dairyland and one's kinship family.

For more than 100 years, people have lived in Dairyland and gone to school there. The Dairyland school has, for the most part, served them very well. To change the school, to make it more urban, is to change Dairyland in ways the people of Dairyland do not choose, and actually *plan* to avoid. In Dairyland, the people believe that parents have the right to control their children's education, shaping their children's value systems as the parents choose. They believe that the state does not have that right unless the people grant it. It is on those grounds, and to that extent, that Dairyland is resisting, and will continue to resist, the mandated reforms. Perhaps without the school this Dairyland society will cease to exist. There would be no more Halloween Nights, no homecomings, no graduations, no pictures on the school walls. Turnbull has reminded us of these things:

> Any description of another people, another way of life, is to some extent bound to be subjective, especially when, as an anthropologist, one has shared that way of life.

And again, and more eloquently:

> Old Moke sat back in his chair and puffed his pipe, gazing up at the tree tops so very high above. I heard him murmur once more, 'You will see things you have never seen before.... You will understand why we are called People of the Forest.... When the Forest dies, we shall die!' And for the last time I heard the chorus of that great song of praise: 'If Darkness *is*, Darkness is Good' (1961: 278).

A Bureaucratic Interpretation

Plans have been made by other people to force change in Dairyland. In an effort to equalize educational opportunity across the state, two reform bills were passed by the Texas State Legislature, H.B. 246 in 1981 and H.B. 72 in 1984. These bills are state law, and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is charged with the administrative responsibility of planning for, operationalizing, and enforcing that code and the regulations concerned with that code.

It is obvious that Dairyland is modifying, circumventing, and sometimes defying that code. Further, it seems clear that when and where Dairyland has complied, it is because they were prone in that direction before the mandate arrived or they felt they would be severely penalized or perhaps even consolidated with another district if they had not. Exactly to that extent, and only under those circumstances, will Dairyland comply with the reforms.

Dairyland's "non-compliance" is not without consequence. It does not go forever unnoticed nor is it always unobservable. Dairyland underwent a state agency accreditation visit in 1988-89 and received a very good report. However, in the winter of 1989, the NCPA (1990: 24) noted that Dairyland was in the lower 3% of the 1,063 Texas school districts, with only 24% of their ninth graders being able to pass all areas of the state-required competency test.

Given that the state, through the Texas Education Agency, is legally and morally obligated to create an equal educational opportunity for the students of Dairyland and for all students in the state, stricter, more rigid and more bureaucratic methods, along with more stringent penalties, may be instigated in order to meet that goal in Dairyland and in all the other 1,062 school districts in the state. This suggests that there are two planning processes which appear to be on a collision course. Yet it is possible for a planning process to take place, as suggested by Goodenough (1963: 49-60) when planners and change agents can understand the "wants" of the people of Dairyland, and transform them into the "needs" of a modern, more urban society.

Summary

Presently some individuals and groups seem to find it more important and more rewarding to exaggerate and polarize differences than to find a middle ground which, if not more "truthful," might be more heuristic and helpful in planning public policy. The world is not just what we want it to be and reality continually reminds us of that. Change agents are constantly reminded that their view of the world, often the world of science and technology, for all its rationality, just does not work. People often do not think or act that way. Consequently, the world does not operate that way. What seems to be needed for policy planning is a process taking several differing positions into consideration in order to obtain as much of what both sides value as possible.

What type of public education policy is needed? Whose values would it serve? Do subgroups within a larger society have a right to exist when their way of life seems counter to the purpose of that larger society and to the policy it establishes? Are we engaged in a planning process akin to a new colonialism which dominates and rules rural America for the purposes of urban America? How can the planning process be made useful in formulating policy without subjugating the powerless?

Sometimes planners choose not to see or hear. The anthropologist is not likely to be as effective, being seen, as an article in the *Washington Post* or a network news documentary. Even

those media are not always convincing. Some policy makers and planners have claimed that there are no hungry or homeless, other than those who choose to be. There are others who claim to want a kinder, gentler society. We shall see the policy they operationalize.

It has been said that anthropology is the mirror for mankind. Surely it could be the mirror for educational professionals. In the foregoing description educational planners can see, if they will, what their policy is doing to rural America and its schools. The description tells the story. It does not dictate the conclusion. The description tells of evasion, planning, and subterfuge in local attempts to avoid certain "unpleasant" effects of state education policy reform. To follow the set of no pass/no play policies may prevent Dairyland from putting a team on the basketball court. To press for quick and total reform may close the school entirely. To ignore the lack of academic scholarship condoned by the community, the board and most of Dairyland's professional educators is to ill-equip their youth for many opportunities in the larger society.

That is the story. It suggests some kind of planning and policy revision along a continuum of policy reform. One plan would crack down and enforce the rules: "improve" public education and if it closes Dairyland ISD so much the better—that will probably be economically efficient as well as educationally effective. An alternative plan might describe broad goals and parameters and establish measures of a local district position in relationship to that plan. Still another could simply play "Little Bo Peep" and "leave them alone." Local values, operationalized in terms of local school board decision making, might be permitted and thus be able to see their position relative to state goals. They might be able to find ways to satisfy the community's "wants" while seeing and evaluating those in terms of the "needs" of the larger society. In such a fashion local "wants" may become commensurate with state "needs."

Unlike carefully "chosen" positivistic policy analysis designs, where both data and analysis are selected by an "elite" so as to be free of the cultural bias of the people whom the policy affects, interpretive anthropology suggests that it is that very bias which should be the heart of and therefore the object of public planning in a free democratic society. Shall we force the Dairylands of America to be what we choose them to be, within a time frame suitable to us? Shall we choose to allow them to be at all? Perhaps these questions overdraw the issue, but better to have such a characterization than to close our eyes to the "condition of the people."

References

Caws, P. (1974).Operational, representative, and explanatory models. *American Anthropologists, 76*, 1-10.

Goodenough, W.H. (1963). *Cooperation and change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Grill, J. J., & Bartel, N.R.(1977). Language bias in tests: ITPA grammatic closure. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10*, 41-47.

Harris, M. (1968). *The rise of anthropological theory*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Loomis, C.P. & Beegle, J.A. (1950). *Rural social systems*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Loomis, C.P. (1960). *Social systems: Essays on their persistence and change.* Princeton: Van Nostrand Company.

Malinowski, B. (1966). *Crime and customs in savage society.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marcus, C.E. & Fisher, M.M.J. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCarthey, J.J. (1977). Language bias in tests: Replies to Grill & Bartell [Letter to the editor]. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10,* 544-548.

NCPA (1990). *Report card on Texas schools.* Dallas, TX: National Center for Policy Analysis.

Nash, R. (1980). *Schooling in rural societies.* London: Methuen and Company Limited.

Peshkin, A. 1978). *Whose city?* London: Longman Group Limited.

Plank, D. (1986). The ayes of Texas: Rhetoric, reality, and school reform. *Politics of Education Bulletin, 13,* 13-16.

Sahlins, M. (1976). *Culture and practical reason.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Turnbull, C.M. (1961). *The forest people.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Turnbull, C.M. (1972). *The mountain people.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

RESPONSES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

John M. McLaughlin

It has been over a year since the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPB) issued *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform* (1989). This agenda for changing the way school administrators are trained and licensed was the result of years of work by the National Policy Board for Excellence in Administration. The nine items addressed include:

1. Recruiting the best and the brightest,
2. Raising entrance standards to preparation programs,
3. Ensuring the quality of faculty in preparation programs,
4. Requiring the Ed.D. for administrators in charge of a school or school district,
5. Requiring a year of full-time academic residency and a year of full-time field work for the Ed.D.,
6. Creating a curriculum grounded in the problems of the practice,
7. Establishing partnerships between universities and school districts,
8. Developing an examination for national certification,
9. Establishing national accreditation of administrator preparation programs.

In preparing and issuing the agenda for reform, the NPB was fully aware of the cost factor involved in the implementation of its recommendations. The costs include: ways of developing support for students five to ten years into their careers which will allow them to devote themselves to full-time study; changing the attitudes of university administrators to put money into preparation programs usually viewed as revenue producers; and the ultimate cost—the elimination of departments which cannot or will not offer programs which meet NPB, or its offspring's, standards.

Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform characterized the current state of preparation programs as "frozen through years of accommodation" (p. 12). To the point-by-point criticisms of current preparation procedures, many, if not most, programs could respond, "guilty." The sum and substance of years of work by the NPB was to assess the current practice of preparing school administrators and to create a comprehensive, cohesive, and logical package of reforms. The work of the NPB is not over. But one year after the NPB issued its reform statement, what has been the response from the profession?

A review of the literature focusing upon the NPB's report reveals a paltry response to what could have meant major fireworks in the battle to improve preparation programs. Instead of fireworks, however, the report has received little attention in the literature. Although it is too early to pronounce the report a total "dud," responses to *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators* have been few and far between. What is most telling, perhaps, is the ink the report has received or not received via the ten organizations which have representation on the NPB. The NPB appeared adequately "front-end loaded" to have an impact on the stagnant state of administration preparation programs. However, a review of the journals and newsletters of the NPB's member groups shows little mention of the report and even fewer articles critiquing the proposals.

Why so little response, and what is the tone of that response? First, let's consider the written

reactions to the NPB proposals. Then an analysis of the attention the report has received will be made as well as suggestions for the NPB in its future efforts.

Even before the NPB had officially released its final report, Thomas Shannon saw the forthcoming reforms as a new day dawning for school administrators. In the May 1989 issue of *School Administrator* Shannon praised the efforts of the NPB as a long overdue housecleaning. Shannon's voice, however, was one in a wilderness. As the months passed following the release of the NPB's report, others agreed with Shannon that reform was needed but argued that the recommendations of the National Policy Board missed the target.

In November of 1989, the *School Administrator* published two articles on the NPB's proposals. Willis Hawley provided a scathing point-by-point rebuttal of the nine recommendations issued. Hawley, while agreeing that the current state of administrator preparation programs is poor, attacked the report as misguided and not based on research.

Hawley viewed the report as not addressing the fundamental questions as to what it is that school administrators do, what skills are necessary for success, how those skills can be developed, and how potential leaders should be selected and nurtured. Hawley lambasted the report as a full employment program for professors of educational administration.

In the same issue of *School Administrator*, William Drury approached the report from the theme of "here we go again." Drury surmised that the obstacles which have halted previous reform movements will do the same to the NPB's recommendations. Drury directed his response to the very real problems that the structure of universities creates: credit-hour funding, research rather than field based, and decrease in rigor to maintain enrollment in a field that has too many programs.

In a more recent report, Del Stover (1990) provided a commentary on the work of the NPB and provided insight into the inertia which has characterized the recommendations:

> For a time, it seemed the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (with the political clout of its member organizations behind it) was the logical candidate to lead any national reform effort. But many say that the board fumbled the ball when it failed to seek educators' opinions before publishing reform proposals that included some daring and controversial ideas....A swift backlash against these proposals led many members of the national policy board to recant on parts of their own report and reorganize the board under the direction of N.A.S.S.P.'s Scott Thomson (p. 19).

Despite the demonstrated lack of support for *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*, the work of the National Policy Board and the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration continues to influence the general direction of educational reform in America. Joseph Murphy (1990a and 1990b) viewed the work of the National Commission as a key component in the identification and documentation of problems in the current preparation paradigm. James Doud and Don Lemon, chief authors of the NAESP's (1990) *Principals for 21st Century Schools*, recognized the ongoing efforts of the National Policy Board while offering a five point plan for the preparation of elementary principals.

Thus, while the NPB refocuses its energies and direction under the leadership of Scott Thomson, its work has already become a part of the larger body of reform literature which characterized the 1980s. Hawley (1989), Drury (1989), and Stover (1990) have offered insight into the reasons for the lack of support in the field for the recommendations of the NPB. But

there appear to be a number of other points which the current reviews have failed to address which might aid the NPB in redirecting its efforts.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) was the first professional group to develop a set of administrator preparation guidelines. Its 1983 *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators* was a "major attempt to bring order to professional preparation in educational administration and to provide a comprehensive, practical knowledge base" (Hoyle, 1985, p. 75). The AASA guidelines were a user-friendly set of criteria for assessing programs and planning their development. The guidelines allowed flexibility for programs to build upon their own strengths and to structure opportunities tailored to the specific needs of an institution and its service area. What the AASA offered was "opportunity rather than threat" (McCarty, 1983, p. 15).

It would be difficult to state that the AASA guidelines of 1983 offered a significant turning point in the development of preparation programs. However, the tone of the document stands in stark contrast to that in *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators*. Whereas the AASA offered opportunity, the NPB proposed regulation. Perhaps the developments in education which occurred in the six years which separate the two reports are the primary reason for their different tones. Since 1983 national reports on education in America have become commonplace. Murphy (1990a) reviewed 32 major reports on educational reform written between 1982 and 1988. This steady stream of reports has created reform fatigue among many. The NPB's timing was poor. Coming in toward the end of the reform movement it met a tired and skeptical audience. The audience may have agreed with the analysis of the problem but it did not agree with the solution.

Why then, if there is some semblance of agreement on the problems plaguing preparation programs, is reform so difficult? I offer these possibilities to the NPB. A significant issue is the political geography of administrator preparation. The reform agenda of the NPB drew the lines of battle between the big universities and the little universities, between the research institutions and the practice-oriented institutions, between the haves and the have-nots of American higher education. But, beyond these old and familiar battles lie other reasons for the failure of the NPB's proposals to find strong general support. *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform* proposed to take away power from the states to control education. The right of states to provide and regulate education within their own boundaries is guaranteed by the Tenth Amendment. Although the NPB's proposals do not propose that states give their authority to the federal government, it does propose that states yield in the ultimate decisions upon administrative licensure to a yet-to-be-created national professional standards board. This proposed quasi-federalism goes beyond the realm of educational reform and enters the realm of states' rights. A parallel can be drawn between states granting medical doctors licenses via nationally standardized tests while national board examinations provide the extremely beneficial, yet not absolutely essential, board certification for specialists. This example, though administratively similar, pales when the rabid loyalty which states and communities provide their schools enters the equation.

Although a significant argument can be made that similarities greatly exceed differences in the administration of public schools whether in Idaho or Alabama, it is the differences to which people cling that provide them with a sense of place and pride. The yielding of state standards for school administrators to national boards along with the requirements of national certification and the Ed.D. exceed what is prudent at this juncture. These recommendations of the NPB simply further erode the concept of local control. The establishment of national

standards for local school leaders runs counter to the way, be it right or wrong, in which most school administrators are selected—they must fit the culture of the community (Gips, 1988).

In addition, the variation of the American landscape does not lend itself to the implementation of the NPB's proposals for full-time years of study and internships. The proposals appear naïvely urban with little knowledge or respect for the tremendous distances that separate students and universities in many parts of America. In fact, implementation of the NPB's recommendations will only widen the gulf between the haves and have-nots of American higher education. The institutions of the northern prairies and the universities of the southwest plains along with other regions and pockets of the hinterland will suffer greatly should the NPB's proposals be implemented. The closing of programs which end in master's degrees will not strengthen the profession of educational administration in these areas; it will only make it more difficult for future administrators to receive training and more difficult for schools to employ quality administrators. The recommendation of the NPB to increase the standards for admission to the field (requiring an Ed.D.) appears to be a direct consequence of the demographic composition of America. The fate of the baby boom generation, because of its size, is to have targeted upon its members the most demanding criterion for participating or qualifying for employment positions. As Hawley noted, the research is just not available which shows that administrators with doctorates are more effective than those without doctorates. With the current explosion of programs offering the Ed.D., it is very likely that the profession of educational administration will see a sharp upturn throughout this decade of the percentage of administrators holding doctorates. It would be wise for the NPB to let this trend occur of its own momentum rather than mandating a requirement which lacks research to support its implementation.

In conclusion, the work of the National Policy Board is not over, nor should it be over. Many of the issues raised with regard to curriculum revision, higher admissions standards, and improved relations with local school districts are needed and attainable. The addressing of problems in the preparation of school administrators from a national level is crucial and should be very helpful in state and university reform. The caveat is—offer guidelines not mandates, opportunities not threats. Have faith that the field has been made acutely aware of its problems and will rise to the challenge of implementing a voluntary agenda of reform which a) does not increase requirements on students without research to support the changes, b) does not diminish local or state control, c) is gender fair and multicultural in emphasis, and d) offers a realistic target which improving preparation programs can work to achieve.

References

Drury, W. R. (1989). Reforming administrator training: Here we go again. *The School Administrator, 10* (46), 16-17.

Gips, C. J. (1988). Selection of secondary school assistant principals: Selected case studies. *High School Journal, 71*, 167-177.

Hawley, W. D. (1989). Policy board proposals ignore real problems. *The School Administrator, 10* (46), 8-15.

Hoyle, J. R. (1985). Programs in educational administration and the AASA preparation guidelines. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21* (1), 71-93.

McCarty, R. J. (1983). Preparing administrators. *The School Administrator, 40* (5), 15.

Murphy, J. (1990a). Preparing school administrators for the twenty-first century: The reform agenda. In B. Mitchell & L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Changing contexts of families, communities, and scholars* (pp. 232- 251). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Murphy, J. (1990b). The reform of administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases* (pp. 277-304). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990). *Principals for 21st century schools.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989, May). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform.* A Report of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Shannon, T. A. (1989). A new day for school administration. *The School Administrator, 46* (5), 48.

Stover, D. (1990) Education is getting serious about administrator preparation. *The Executive Educator, 12* (4), 18-20, 28.

SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGETING FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Grover H. Baldwin

With the publication of *A Nation at Risk* and *Time for Results*, state political and educational leaders moved to institute educational reforms. The degree of success of these reforms varies. Plank (1988) indicates that while there were 295 total approved reforms during 1983-1985, 251 of these fell into either the external or regulatory type which produced no lasting or structural changes within the education process. After several years of educational reform, what effect have such plans had on the financial efforts of local districts? It is not enough to merely infuse more funds into education or to show results for the dollars.

Ginsberg and Wimpelberg (1987) indicate that educational change by commission has fostered a "trickle down" approach to reform with the exclusion of the wisdom of the local authorities. Dansberger, et al., (1987) also indicated that the local school board and the local professional staff have been precluded from the reform process, save implementation of mandatory state initiatives. More importantly, the question is raised as to the level of support the "trickle down" funding process has had on local school districts, especially districts with low and medium low enrollments. As McGuire (1985) points out, the link must be made between the financial changes of the state and local governing bodies and the effects of the reform movement, or the educational establishment will lose the initiative and not sustain the infusion of new funds as the political nature of the environment changes with the winds of political fortune.

The school budget is one key to understanding the intention of the administration and school board to expend public funds for specific areas of educational concern. The budget document provides insight into what the governing body regards as important for education in its district. In his concluding thoughts on the budget process for school reform, Kirst (1988) indicates that

> The 1983-1987 education reform era and recent economic growth of the U.S. stimulate concern about increasing resources for school rather than efficiency issues. The nation's economic growth permitted more money for schools to be linked with political demands for higher academic standards and school improvement (p. 387).

The concern for the reforms did permit the infusion of additional revenues by the states to the local education agencies. Yet unknown are the goals set by the local education agency and the reaction to the demand for, and provision of, funds for improvement in education. Specific demands in the reform movement called for increased emphasis on instruction and an increase in teacher compensation.

Such emphasis was true in the state of Indiana under the leadership of the governor and the secretary of education who proposed, and saw passed by the legislature, the A+ Educational Improvement Program (Williams, 1986). With the passage of this program, educators in Indiana saw resources allocated to effect these changes. Inman (1987) reported that the resource allocation in Indiana for these two areas increased since 1983. This included an added $3,000,000 per year in teacher career benefits and compensation and from $2,754,051 to $9,000,000 in the area of instructional programs. These allocations point to the overall expenditure, but miss the impact of reform on the local level. As the allocations are provided

for statewide educational reform, it might be expected that local districts will demonstrate increased budgeting of funds for these educational areas.

Yet, which districts actually benefit from the allocations? Jones (1985) and Johns, Morphet and Alexander (1983) point to the concept of "lighthouse districts" as those that will establish educational innovations first and will be rewarded accordingly. In Indiana, this trend tends to support larger and wealthier districts to the detriment of the smaller and medium sized districts. As a result of the challenge of educational reform, increases in state aid in Indiana took the form of categorical aid for specific instructional and salary purposes (Williams, 1986). The question then arises, what effect did these resource allocations and appropriations by the state legislature have on the budgeted expenditures of local school districts over the five-year reform period?

With the categorical funding of specific programs in the state of Indiana, the issues raised by Carroll (1976) and Feldstein (1978) in varying degrees lend support to the notion of local school board choice and expenditure of limited resources. A consolidation of their individual research efforts indicates that local districts expend marginal or categorical funds differently and more effectively within the prescribed area than the normal allocation and budget expenditure for similar items. The conclusions of Jacobs (1982) and Monk (1984), dealing with school district size and economic condition, also indicate that these two conditions are indicators of expenditures for school districts and revenue raising capacity. These points also raise the issues of equity in allocation and spending. Lastly, the examination by Feldstein (1978) of the effect of an add-on grant on the categorical program and local district spending further supports the notion that such grants can spur the district to shift funds to areas of instruction not unlike that found within categorical grants for specific instructional/reform programs.

There were two objectives of this study. First, the author sought to determine the change in the level of budgeted expenditures under educational reform in the area of instructional and compensation programs on differing size school districts. Second, the study sought to determine if budgeted expenditures under educational reform in the areas of instruction programs and teacher compensation to differing size school districts kept pace with inflation for that period.

Methodology

The population for the study was 300 school districts in Indiana. Eliminated were three "paper" districts that send students to other districts and the city of Indianapolis. Examination of district enrollment yielded the following population in the various district categories. For district size 1 schools (4,001+ pupils), there were 52 districts. For district size 2 schools (2,001 to 4,000 pupils), there were 78 districts. For district size 3 schools (1,001 to 2,000 pupils), there were 117 districts. For district size 4 schools (0 to 1,000 pupils), there were 53 districts. With a total sample of 122 school districts, and using a proportional stratified sampling procedure, the following distribution was made: size 1: 22 districts; size 2: 31 districts; size 3: 47 districts; and size 4: 22 districts.

The source of data was the annual *School Statistical Report* of the Indiana Farm Bureau for the budget years 1982 through 1988. The use of the Farm Bureau data was precipitated by the lack of available information from official state sources as to the budgets and/or expenditures of Indiana school districts since FY 1985. The caveat is offered here that the data are based on projected and estimated expenditures. While recognizing that the figures reflect only budgeted amounts, the data do reflect the values and intentions of school boards and administration regarding the educational reform movement and, over a period of time, will demonstrate a shift in priorities.

Following the notion of Monk (1984) dealing with internal allocation of funds, data were gathered for each of the selected school districts for per pupil expenditures in the areas of teachers' salaries and in the areas of total appropriation for instruction (including special education, adult education, and summer school) and appropriation for regular instruction (total instruction expenditure less special education, adult education, and summer school). These items were selected as the Indiana A+ Educational Reform program provided for additional emphases in these areas. Also, there was the issue over what effect inflation would have on expenditures, in terms of real increases (or decreases) in allocations and spending power. Therefore, using the Implicit GNP Deflator for the years in question, constant dollar figures were developed to allow comparison of the budgeted expenditures and the needed dollar amount to meet inflationary concerns. These sets of figures covered the per pupil expenditures for each of the funding categories in the reform years (1984 - 1988).

The data were analyzed through SPSS-X on a VAX mainframe computer. Specifically, data were subjected to a three-way analysis of variance with school district size by fiscal condition (current versus constant dollars) by allocation years serving as the independent variables. Following three-way analysis of variance, a series of one-way analysis of variances with a Scheffe´ analysis were completed for district size by fiscal year to determine which of cell contributed to the significance following each of the separate analyses in the categories under investigation. As budgetary increases would be expected to occur as fiscal years progressed to offset inflation, a more pressing question was what relationship existed between the current dollars figure and constant dollars needed to keep pace with inflation. In order to examine this relationship, correlation coefficients were calculated through a Pearson's product-moment for conditions (current versus constant dollars) for each fiscal year for each district size.

Results

Total Instruction

The dollar amounts for each district in terms of current and constant dollars for total instruction are displayed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Current and Constant Dollars for Total Instruction by District Size

	FISCAL YEAR				
Size	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
1	1753.50 (1920.99)	1592.86 (1624.32)	1454.18 (1520.10)	1334.59 (1359.28)	1225.68 (1182.67)*
2	1619.19 (1762.28)	1461.26 (1497.57)	1340.71 (1382.97)	1214.19 (1230.20)	1109.29 (1180.67)

[Table 1 cont'd. next page]

[Table 1 cont'd.]

	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
3	1620.04 (1771.38)	1468.81 (1509.23)	1351.15 (1397.97)	1227.36 (1250.31)	1127.43 (1101.91)
4	1553.27 (1693.28)	1404.05 (1435.35)	1285.00 (1338.48)	1175.14 (1197.06)	1079.41 (1050.76)

*Constant dollars are in parenthesis.

The results from the three-way analysis of variance for total instruction are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Results of Analysis of Variance for Total Instruction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio	Sign. of F.
Main Effects	53346817	8	6668352.095	163.509	.000
SIZE	3607844	3	1202614.731	29.488	.000
CONDITION	782382	1	782381.941	19.184	.000
FISCALYR	48956501	4	12239147.657	300.105	.000
2-Way Interactions	1022305	19	53805.540	1.319	.161
SIZE/COND	13689	3	4623.016	.113	.952
SIZE/FISCALYR	153321	12	12776.764	.313	.987
COND/FISCALYR	855115	4	213778.761	5.242	.000
3-way Interactions	119379	12	9948.270	.244	.996
SIZE/COND/FISCAL	119379	12	9948.270	.244	.996
Explained	54488501	39	1397141.058	34.258	.000
Residual	48123729	1180	40782.821		
Total	102612231	1219	84177.384		

Significant differences were found in the main effects for size, condition, and fiscal year, between condition and fiscal year in the two-way interactions, but no significance appeared for the three-way interaction. The results of a subsequent series of one-way analysis of variances yielded the following information. For district size 1 schools, with a value of 158.68, years 1986, 1985, and 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1985 and 1984 from 1987; and year 1985 from 1986. For district size 2 schools, with a range of 94.64, years 1987 through 1984 were significantly different from 1988, years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1987; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from 1986. For district size 3 schools, with a range of 101.77, years 1987 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1986 through 1984 from 1987; years 1985 and 1984 from 1986, and year 1984 from 1985. For district size 4 schools, with a range of 160.52, years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; and years 1985 and 1984 from year 1987.

The results of the Pearson's product-moment correlation are listed in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3

Relationship of Total Instruction Current Dollars and Constant Dollars by District Size

	FISCAL YEAR				
SIZE	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
1	.9675 (p=.000)* (93.6)	.9648 (p=.000) (93.0)	.9720 (p=.000) (94.4)	.9465 (p=.000) (89.5)	.8920 (p=.000) (79.5)**
2	.9181 (p=.000) (82.9)	.8202 (p=.000) (67.2)	.9004 (p=.000) (81.0)	.9354 (p=.000) (87.4)	.2233 (p=.114) (4.98)
3	.5171 (p=.000) (26.7)	.9253 (p=.000) (85.6)	.9156 (p=.000) (83.8)	.9338 (p=.000) (87.1)	.9401 (p=.000) (88.3)
4	.8815 (p=.000) (77.7)	.8619 (p=.000) (74.2)	.8677 (p=.000) (75.2)	.4405 (p=.020) (19.4)	.9696 (p=.000) (94.0)

*Probability level. ** r^2 value.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations showed relationship ranging from .9720 to .4405. The levels of significance were at least at the .05 for all but one cell district, size 2, 1984. While the coefficients appear to be high (17 above .65). Corresponding level of explained variance ranged from 94.4% to 19.4%.

Regular Instruction

In Table 4, we see the current and constant dollar amounts for regular instructional costs.

TABLE 4

Current and Constant Dollars for Regular Instruction by District Size

	FISCAL YEAR				
	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
Size					
1	1628.08 (1793.06)	1486.79 (1521.52)	1362.15 (1430.39)	1255.96 (1261.77)	1137.75 (1119.20)*
2	1532.26 (1673.68)	1387.79 (1415.91)	1267.60 (1319.39)	1158.38 (1618.72)	1459.62 (1051.75)
3	1529.67 (1691.40)	1402.49 (1445.98)	1294.52 (1358.65)	1192.84 (1197.02)	1079.37 (1059.93)
4	1490.04 (1598.43)	1325.40 (1382.82)	1237.98 (1295.23)	1137.17 (1162.72)	1048.44 (1024.23)

* Constant dollar figures are in parenthesis.

The results of the three-way analysis of variance for budgeted expenditures for regular instruction are shown in Table 5. The independent variables were district size, condition (current and constant dollars) and fiscal year.

TABLE 5

Results of Analysis of Variance for Regular Instruction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio	Sign. of F.
Main Effects	37233555	8	4654194.426	129.961	.000
SIZE	2658598	3	886199.177	24.746	.000
CONDITION	786955	1	786944.998	21.974	.000
FISCALYR	33788003	4	8447000.719	235.868	.000
2-way Interactions	5207320	19	274069.489	7.653	.000
SIZE/COND	3145	3	1048.321	.029	.993
SIZE/FISCALYR	2536711	12	211392.598	5.903	.000
COND/FISCALYR	2667464	4	666866.037	18.621	.000
3-way Interactions	4118112	12	343176.037	9.583	.000
SIZE/COND/FISCAL	4118112	12	343176.037	9.583	.000
Explained	46558988	39	1193820.209	33.335	.000
Residual	42258550	1180	35812.331		
Total	88817538	1219	72860.983		

There were significant differences in main effects beyond the .05 level in all three conditions of district size, condition (current versus constant dollars), and in the area of fiscal year. In the two-way interactions, there were significant differences for size and fiscal year and condition and fiscal year. Again, a subsequent series of one-way analysis of variances with Scheffe´ tests were conducted to determine which fiscal year was significant for each district size. The results for district size 1 schools, with a range of 140.12, found that years 1986, 1985, and 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from 1987 and 1986; and 1984 differed significantly from 1985 and 1986. For district size 2 schools,

with a range of 121.55, years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1987 and 1988; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from year 1986; and year 1984 differed significantly from 1985. For district size 3 schools, with a range of 186.31, years 1987 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1987; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from 1986; and year 1984 differed significantly from year 1985. For district size 4 schools, with a range of 161.16, years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from years 1987 and 1988, and year 1984 differed significantly from year 1987.

The results of the Pearson's product-moment correlation are listed in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6

Relationship of Regular Instruction Current Dollars and Constant Dollars by District Size

	FISCAL YEAR				
SIZE	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
1	.9526 (p=.000)* (90.7)	.9551 (p=.000) (91.2)	.9553 (p=.000) (91.2)	.6219 (p.001) (38.6)	.7269 (p=.000) (52.8)**
2	.9129 (p=.000) (83.3)	.7963 (p=.000) (63.4)	.8940 (p=.000) (79.9)	-.1421 (p=.223) (2.01)	.1599 (p=.195) (2.55)
3	.3469 (p=.008) (12.0)	.9389 (p=.000) (88.1)	.7914 (p=.000) (62.6)	.7865 (p=.000) (61.8)	.9526 (p=.000) (90.7)
4	.7886 (p=.000) (62.1)	.7515 (p=.000) (56.4)	.8325 (p=.000) (69.3)	.3393 (p=.061) (11.5)	.9665 (p=.000) (93.4)

* Probability level

** r^2 value.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations showed relationship ranging from .9665 to -.1421. All but three cells demonstrated levels of significance were at least at the .05. Again, the coefficients appear high with 15 above the .65 level. Corresponding level of explained variance ranged from 93.4% to 2%.

Salary and Fringe Benefits

In Table 7, we see the current and constant dollar amounts for salary and fringe benefit costs.

TABLE 7

Current and Constant Dollars for Salary and Fringe Benefits by District Size

	FISCAL YEAR				
	1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
Size					
1	2511.11 (2766.25)	2293.74 (2345.09)	2099.46 (2218.27)	1947.56 (1986.80)	1791.52 (1728.11)*
2	2301.13 (2513.24)	2083.95 (2126.04)	1903.35 (1955.30)	1716.69 (1756.85)	1584.18 (1531.37)
3	2327.77 (2583.83)	2142.48 (2162.18)	1935.71 (2013.45)	1767.74 (1788.80)	1612.98 (1557.25)
4	2344.47 (2543.72)	2109.22 (2213.62)	1981.76 (2021.12)	1774.47 (1811.70)	1633.63 (1567.14)

*Constant dollar figures are in parenthesis.

The results of the three-way analysis of variance for budgeted expenditures for salary and fringe benefits are shown in Table 8. Again, the independent variables were district size, condition (current and constant dollars) and fiscal year.

TABLE 8

Results of Analysis of Variance for Salary and Fringe Benefits

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio	Sign. of F.
Main Effects	116180796	8	14522599.529	221.799	.000
SIZE	6983722	3	2327907.417	35.553	.000
CONDITION	1299201	1	1299201.313	19.842	.000
FISCALYR	107897873	4	26974468.166	411.973	.000
2-way Interactions	2835883	19	149257.014	2.280	.001
SIZE/COND	16260	3	5420.036	.083	.969
SIZE/FISCALYR	49923	12	4160.235	.064	1.000
COND/FISCALYR	2769700	4	692425.087	10.575	.000
3-Way Interactions	124314	12	10359.483	.158	1.000
SIZE/COND/FISCAL	124314	12	10359.483	.158	1.000
Explained	119140993	39	3054897.264	46.657	.000
Residual	77262005	1180	65476.275		
Total	196402998	1219	161118.128		

There were significant differences in main effects beyond the .05 level in all three conditions of district size, condition (current versus constant dollars) and in the area of fiscal year. In the two-way interactions, there were significant differences for size and fiscal year and condition and fiscal year. A subsequent series of one-way analysis of variances with Scheffe' tests yielded the following fiscal years significant for each district size. The results for district size 1 schools, with a range of 202.69, found that years 1986, 1985, and 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from 1987 and 1986; and 1984 differed significantly from 1985 and 1986. For district size 2 schools, with a range of 138.08, years 1987 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1986 through 1984

differed significantly from year 1987; and years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from 1986. For district size 3 schools, with a range of 186.31, years 1987 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1987; year 1984 differed significantly from years 1985 and 1986. For district size 4 schools, with a range of 168.79, years 1986 through 1984 differed significantly from 1988; years 1985 and 1984 differed significantly from years 1987 and 1986; and year 1984 differed significantly from year 1985.

The results of the Pearson's product-moment correlation are listed in Table 9 below.

TABLE 9

Relationship of Salary and Fringe Benefits Current Dollars, and Constant Dollars by District Size

SIZE	FISCAL YEAR 1988	1987	1986	1985	1984
1	.9645 (p=.000)* (93.0)	.9494 (p=.000) (90.1)	.9502 (p=.000) (90.2)	.9240 (p=.000) (85.3)	.9712 (p=.000) (94.3)**
2	.8529 (p=.000) (72.7)	.8334 (p=.000) (69.4)	.8104 (p=.000) (65.6)	.8379 (p=.000) (70.2)	.9485 (p=.000) (89.9)
3	.4488 (p.001) (20.1)	.9034 (p=.000) (81.6)	.8467 (p=.000) (71.6)	.8950 (p=.000) (80.1)	.9594 (p=.000) (92.0)
4	.6012 (p=.002) (36.1)	.7592 (p=.000) (57.6)	.7721 (p=.000) (59.6)	.5811 (p=.002) (33.7)	.8926 (p=.000) (79.7)

* Probability level.

** r^2 value.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations showed relationship ranging from .9712 to .4488. The levels of significance were at least at the .05. The majority of the coefficients

were high (17 above .65). Corresponding level of explained variance ranged from 94.3% to 20.1%.

Discussion

The results of the study seem to indicate that the monies budgeted to implement educational reforms in Indiana may be affected by several factors. As seen in the main effect results in all expenditure categories, district size appears to play an important role in determining the extent to which efforts are made to budget for educational reform. Both fiscal condition and fiscal year yielded significance, but this was as expected as districts tend to increase their budget when faced with inflationary times and budget over a period of years.

When examining the two-way interactions, the lack of significant difference between size and condition and size and fiscal year was not unexpected. It appears that schools in each category were affected by the same inflation rate and one might well expect districts to make appropriate changes in budgeted expenditures in light of these conditions.

In the three-way interactions, the significant difference of the variables for regular instruction bears examination. One possible explanation for this significance may be that with the more restricted funding in regular instruction, the three independent variables interact upon each other in a different manner than within the other two areas of concern. Also, as seen in the data in Table 6, the relationship between current and constant dollars implies a wider range of variability than in the other two areas of concern.

The results of the correlation analysis intimate, with rare exception, that a high correlation appears between the current dollars budgeted and the constant dollars needed to keep pace with inflation for all district levels and for all fiscal years. The exceptions were district size 2 schools for year 1984 in total instruction; district size 2 schools for years 1984 and 1985 and district size 4 schools in regular instruction; and district size 2 schools for year 1984 in salary and fringe benefits. In examining the cells for explained variance, 49 cells were above the .65 level. Examination of the 11 cells that fell below .65 finds seven cells to be within the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, with the remaining four falling in 1988. In each of these cells, the data imply a lack of homogeneous of behavior within the districts in the particular district size. Possible explanation for this phenomena in 1984-1985 might be the confusion among districts during the initial years of educational reform in Indiana and suggests the efforts of specific "light-house" districts to get ahead of the mandates of the legislature and to remain in the forefront of educational efforts. At the other extreme, fiscal year 1988, the data demonstrated that district size 3 and 4 schools exhibited a low correlation. Possible explanation for this behavior might be that a decrease of school enrollment, and resulting revenues, affect the allocation of resources. These districts may well have reached the limits of their growth and created situations of wider variation among spending patterns, thus yielding a lower correlation.

One other interesting pattern found in the correlations was the relationship between district sizes and the coefficient of correlation. With few exceptions, district size 1 and 3 schools demonstrated a higher correlation than district size 2 and 4 respectively. A linear relationship between district sizes was not observed. This suggests that there is a possible grouping of school districts by size and that a hierarchy might exist between size 2 and 3 schools with district size 1 and 3 schools leading the way for their particular tier of schools.

Several conclusions are suggested from the data. First, the data hint at the notion that the use of state appropriations does enhance the budget expenditures of local districts and may well indicate the intent to improve the areas of educational concern over time.

Second, the data suggest that district size may play a part in determining the allocation and budgeting of resources for the areas of educational concern. In particular, we note that the larger districts appeared to increase their budgeted amount, and at a slightly faster pace, than small and medium size districts. Recognition of these misplaced, and potentially inequitable, allocations is important as various states are implementing "educational bankruptcy" legislation aimed at forcing compliance with educational reforms. Without the appropriate allocation of funds to support the programs, districts may well be subject to default and takeover. Further, local district allocations and policy emphases suggest the possibility of future finance litigation on the question of wealth neutrality and equity as indicated by Feldstein (1975).

Third, the use of categorical grants by the state of Indiana, which are initially accepted by the larger districts and later by smaller districts, may well point to these efforts as a spur for reordering priorities by the local school districts. This raises the question of the need for adequate funding to bring about meaningful and timely structural changes in education. It further raises the issue of the appropriate relationship between state and local authorities in the educational process.

There is a disheartening note to the findings. As seen in Tables 1, 4, and 7, the data suggest a time lag between initial education reform and any significant change in budget expenditures by districts. From this information, there appears to be a two-year, and sometimes a three-year, time lag between the initial efforts of legislative reform and appropriations and subsequent efforts at the local level. This raises the question of the effectiveness of legislative efforts in offering assistance and guidance, but not mandating specific structural improvements, in the educational reform movement. This follows the initial discussion by Plank (1988).

Lastly, the data suggest that in all areas of the Indiana educational reform movement—total instruction, regular instruction, and salary and fringe benefits—the local districts' budgeting practices fell behind the rate of inflationary growth for each year except 1984. If this is true, this raises questions not only of the intent of the local boards and administration, but also the capacity and effort afforded these districts in fulfilling their obligations. This is compounded with state and local restrictions limiting the level of increases school districts may seek to fund the educational reforms. Thus, states should begin to provide funds for educational reforms to support their institutionalization.

On balance, the data seem to affirm the educational reform movement in the state of Indiana as successful in infusing additional funds into the three areas under consideration. However, the speed and degree with which local districts adjusted their budgets to achieve the desires of the state's concern for education appears to be less than desirable. Further, while the legislature sought to improve education in the state, there were more questions raised than answers provided. Specifically, the issue of relationship between budgeted and real expenditures, the link between fiscal capacity/effort and budgeted expenditures, and the failure to keep pace with inflation all call into question the thrust of the reform movement at the local level in the state of Indiana.

References

Carroll, S. J. (1977). School district expenditure behavior. *The Journal of Human Resources.* 11/3, 317-327.

Dansberger, J. P., Carol, L. N., Cunningham, L. L., Kirst, M. W., McCloud, B. A., & Usden, M. D. (1987). School boards: The forgotten players on the education team. *Kappan, 69* (1), 53-59.

Farm Bureau. (1982 - 1988). *School Statistical Report.* Indianapolis: Indiana State Farm Bureau.

Feldstein, M. (1975). Wealth neutrality and local choice in public education. *The American Economic Review, 65* (1), 75-89.

Feldstein, M. (1978). The effect of a differential add-on grant: Title I and local education spending. *The Journal of Human Resources.* 13/4, 443-458.

Ginsberg, R., & Wimpelberg, R. K. (1987). Educational change by commission: Attempting "trickle down" reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9* (4), 344-360.

Inman, D. (1987). *The fiscal impact of educational reform.* Paper presented at the American Education Finance Association, Washington, D. C.

Jacobs, N. F. (1982). *The local school district decision-making process with respect to the allocation of previously uncommitted funds.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, Eric Reproduction DA 8222412.

Johns, R. L., Morphet, E. L., & Alexander, K. (1983). *The economics and financing of education.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Jones, T. (1985). *Introduction to school finance.* New York: MacMillan & Co.

Kirst, M. W. (1988). The internal allocation of resources within U. S. school districts: Implications for policymakers and practitioners. In Monk, D. H., & Underwood, J. *Microlevel school finance: Issues and implications for policy.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Pub. Co.

Monk, D. H. (1984, Winter). The conception of size and the internal allocation of school district resources. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 20/1, 39-67.

McGuire, K. (1986). Implications for future reform: A state perspective. In Mueller, V. D., & McKeown, M. P. *The fiscal, legal and political aspects of state reform of elementary and secondary education.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Pub. Co.

Plank, D. H. (1988). Why school reform doesn't change schools: Political and organizational perspectives. In Boyd, W. L., & Kerchner, C. T. *The politics of excellence and choice in education*. New York: Falmer Press.

Williams, R. O. (1986). *Public school funding and legislated policy-making: A case study of the 1985 Indiana general assembly*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

IS THIS TRIP NECESSARY?
Needs Assessment: A Personal Memoir and Reappraisal

Belle Ruth Witkin

Part 1. Retrospect—1965-1981

The year 1990 marks a quarter century since the passage of the first federal legislation in the United States that authorized significant expenditures of funds to public school agencies for educational improvement. The grants were designed, among other things, to promote innovation, to help equalize opportunity among school districts, to provide improved educational resources of all kinds, and to address the needs of specified student populations, such as the educationally disadvantaged, the physically handicapped, the limited-English-speaking, and school dropouts. Contingent upon the granting of such funds was the requirement that applicants show evidence of need and of priorities.

A major development during that time was the adoption by educational agencies—districts, county offices, and state departments, as well as community colleges and universities—of new and more systematic methods of program and organizational planning. And integral to this development was the use of educational needs assessment (ENA) as the first step in that planning.

In the 15 years following the passage of the legislation, enormous energy and creative effort were directed to inventing models and procedures to guide ENA. Publications abounded, and hundreds of accounts of needs assessments were to be found in papers delivered at professional association meetings, journals, and the ERIC files. For reasons that will become clear later, much of this activity has sharply declined. In fact, there is no clear picture of the extent to which needs assessments are now undertaken in the schools and universities of this country. Yet interest in the subject persists, not only among educational planners but among evaluators as well.

I was deeply involved in ENA from the beginning, in model building, practical applications, and writing. Where earlier I accepted with enthusiasm much that was being offered in theory and methodology, however, I later became more skeptical of the efficacy of many widespread practices, and even, sometimes, of the value of ENA itself. Moreover, issues have been raised in this journal and elsewhere that have not been adequately addressed. Accordingly, from the perspective of one who was in the trenches, so to speak, I raise the question, Is this trip necessary? Is there still value in ENA, and if so, what?

On my desk are reports from national commissions, the National Assessment for Educational Progress, Gallup polls, and educational leaders, detailing the parlous state of affairs regarding attainment by students of basic and intermediate reading, writing, and mathematics skills, as well as scientific knowledge and critical thinking. Is it possible that educational needs have had sufficient explication? Is there any point in conducting additional studies at local levels? Why should not educational planners simply proceed on the basis of evidence already available?

In fact, many school systems no longer conduct needs assessments, except for statistical reports to support requests for entitlements. They simply implement plans that have been

proposed by school boards or administrators or curriculum consultants. But what's wrong with that? Does needs assessment add any essential elements to planning?

This paper is the first in a two-part series, in which I propose to examine where we have come from, where we are now, and where we might be going. Part 1 is a personal memoir. It covers the period from October 1965 to October 1981—from the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which contained the first requirements for ENA, to the enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, which drastically altered patterns of federal funding for education and effectively wiped out most of the legislation that mandated and supported ENA and systematic planning. In Part 1, I consider the rise of ENA in the context of important political and social influences of the time.

Part 2, which will appear in a later issue of the journal, is a critical reappraisal of ENA. It will briefly discuss some of the theoretical and technical underpinnings of ENA and examine political and other developments since 1981 that have influenced the practice and extent of ENA, particularly in the common schools. It will also reexamine what is known about current practices, and consider some major issues that have been raised concerning ENA, as well as positions both critical and supportive. Finally, I will discuss what I see as the present and potential values of ENA.

Needs assessment is used not only in education, but increasingly in social and medical services, in community planning, and in corporate planning. This series, however, focuses on needs assessment in the common schools and higher education, since theory and practice in other fields differ in many important respects from ENA. It is also limited to developments in the United States.

California as a Microcosm of ENA

In October of 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the states began gearing up to take advantage of its provisions. Although most of the sections contained references to assessing needs, the section that concerned ENA most directly was Title III, which provided competitive grants to school districts for supplementary centers and services. It was understood that the services would include the design and dissemination of curricular innovations, and that the centers would act as change agents, assisting school districts to identify their high priority needs and to develop innovative ways of meeting them. The operative word was "supplementary"—all new funds must be used for programs and services above and beyond the basic educational program. Grant applications must show evidence of comprehensive studies to document the needs and their priorities. Those studies were to involve not only school personnel, but community advisory groups.

Although for years it was fashionable in the eastern United States to regard California as primarily a place of laid-back sun worshippers, in fact the state had long been a leader in educational reform, with high standards of excellence in the schools. (Like so much else, that was to change.) I offer the California experience as a microcosm of what was to happen in part in the rest of the country, both in the community and in the schools. Although important contributions to ENA and educational planning were made in other regions, certain factors made California a leader in initiating trends.

In the months following the passage of the ESEA legislation, California, with one of the largest potential pools of grants, a strong state department of education, and an active group of county schools superintendents, immediately set up a network of 21 PACE centers (Programs to Advance Creativity in Education) that were responsible to county schools offices or

consortia, but with their own professional and support staffs. By the spring of 1966, when I was suddenly offered a position in the Alameda County center, most of the centers were ready to go. That August my husband and I moved from Seattle—where I had been teaching in the speech (now communication) department of the University of Washington, and subsequently was speech consultant to the King County Superintendent of Schools—to Hayward, a growing community across the bay from San Francisco. Because of some large curricular research studies I had done in the schools, I became the research and evaluation specialist, and later director of the center. Alameda County was one of the most populous in northern California, its school districts including Oakland, Berkeley, and the growing suburban population east to Livermore.

That summer marked the beginning of an extended program of training for some 100 directors and staff of the California PACE centers, starting with a three-week intensive course at Chapman College in the application of systems analysis to educational planning. The PEP program (Preparing Educational Planners) brought in consultants from a variety of backgrounds to conduct the training and to act subsequently as resources to the PACE centers. Among those who led creative developments in ENA were Roger Kaufman, who formulated the discrepancy definition of needs assessment that was to become most widely used, and who has continued to invent and refine needs assessment models within the context of organizational renewal; Ray Sweigert, Jr., who developed the ESCO model—the focus by Educators, Students, and Consumers of the educational product on student learning Objectives; and Jeff Eastmond, Sr., who created the Concerns Analysis approach to community decision making in ENA. (Kaufman is now director of the Center for Needs Assessment and Planning at Florida State University; Sweigert designed and directed the 7-year Atlanta Assessment Project, one of the most ambitious and thorough in translating futures methods into concepts usable by the schools; and Eastmond recently returned from conducting needs assessments in rural China.)

The PACE centers took an active role in assisting school districts within their jurisdictions to develop goals and innovative programs to improve curricular and support services to students, and to find the resources needed to carry out new programs. Like the county schools offices to which they were accountable, the centers acted as intermediate units between local school systems and the state department of education. They also established liaisons with universities, the new regional educational laboratories, and many community groups.

The PEP program continued for about three years, producing over 20 position papers, monographs, manuals and other publications on educational planning, needs assessment, and the dissemination of innovations. The program provided additional opportunities for us to share ideas with other PACE center colleagues, consultants, and experts in regional educational laboratories such as the Far West Lab in San Francisco. To a large extent, it was the PACE Centers in California that provided both the catalyst and the laboratories for ENA developments, publications, and the conduct of needs assessments. I will say more of those developments later.

The Social Context

It was a heady time in the 60s and 70s, not least in the San Francisco Bay area where social and political movements seemed to gather and radiate special energy. The "gray flannel generation" of the 50s had yielded to a new generation of activists. We listened to leaders of the Free Speech movement at Sproule Plaza at the University of California, Berkeley; heard Abraham Maslow speak on his human potential movement; took workshops in the new family

communication with Virginia Satir; participated in encounter groups at Esalen Institute at Big Sur, and discussed Zen and "man and the cosmos" with Alan Watts. We were invited to Eric Berne's home to hear his account of his recent trip to Hungary, using his transactional analysis paradigm; and friends recounted experiences in group therapy sessions with the likes of Fritz Perles and William Schutz. We cruised the Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco, watching the "flower children" and thinking of some in our own family; heard Beatnik poets read at the City Lights bookstore; listened to the Beatles and Joan Baez, and politely declined the "pot" pipes passed around at faculty-student parties at the university. We would have enjoyed having a "peak experience," but we weren't quite ready to "crack the cosmic egg" with unknown chemical substances, in spite of Aldous Huxley and Timothy Leary. In one exciting year we watched as Oakland fielded three professional teams that won the national championships in baseball, football, and basketball. And at the end of our stay, in 1981, we were deeply saddened by the death from AIDS of a dear friend, one of the first to go, almost before the disease had a name. David had worked closely with me on several needs assessment publications.

We saw the rise of successive waves of ethnic awareness, as first one and then another minority group began to assert its political, economic, and educational rights. My husband, deciding on a mid-life career change somewhat ahead of the pack, had sold his Seattle business and enrolled in college for the first time. As Joe made his way through to an M.A. in psychology and a subsequent career in counseling, he got involved in campus politics, brought home classmates and later his own students, and once sat in on a meeting of the Black Panthers, until he was ejected as a white interloper. We listened to speakers on "Black Power" and boycotted table grapes and lettuce, to support La Raza and Cesar Chavez' efforts to improve conditions for the migrant Chicano workers in the Salinas valley. I acted as consultant to the Japanese-American Citizens League on a project to write a manual for teachers on the Japanese-American experience (as distinct from the root Japanese culture); served on a statewide committee that evaluated high school social studies texts for adequacy in treatment of racial and religious minorities and women; and helped write the guidelines for affirmative action in recruiting staff for the Alameda County Schools office.

All of these movements had an effect in one way or another on education. The schools were also influenced directly or indirectly by extremes of political and social thought in the state. Northern and Southern California were in some respects like two different states. All public employees, including teachers, had to take a loyalty oath. The north was viewed as "left and Red," the south as reactionary and anti-intellectual. The John Birch Society flourished in Orange County, and educational movements that encouraged student self-awareness were viewed with suspicion. I recall letters to newspapers that labeled as a communist plot an in-service project for teachers to help very shy children communicate more freely in the classroom—but then, so were proposals to fluoridate public water systems.

Anger over America's involvement in Vietnam was reflected more indirectly in the schools (as opposed to the universities), but the political disaffection and unrest contributed to the general feeling that society was very much out of kilter. Also, the assassination of the recently appointed black superintendent of the Oakland schools, and the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst together with the highly publicized demands of her captors, the Symbionese Liberation Army, exacerbated the atmosphere of tension and fear of the future. Nor was the possibility of nuclear destruction a negligible factor.

The civil rights movement was a powerful catalyst for the rise in community awareness of inequities in educational opportunity between and within school systems. Those inequities

were evidenced not only by obvious discrepancies among districts in per-pupil expenditures, in both segregated and non-segregated states, but also by flagrant misallocation of books, supplies, and other resources among schools in large urban districts. The rise in ethnic awareness and demands for self-determination—first in the Black Power movement, then the Chicano, and later the Native American and Asian communities—led to inclusion of goals for multicultural education in ENAs, as well as new units in the curriculum. Even the nomenclature preferred by minorities to designate their groups underwent changes—e.g., from Negro to black, and more recently, to African-American; from Hispanic or Mexican-American to Chicano; from Oriental to Asian; and from American Indian to Native American.

Such social and linguistic changes were reflected in varying ways in ENA materials and processes. In California, we translated all parent and student survey questionnaires and related materials into Spanish, and, where necessary, into Chinese. However, a translation by someone from a northern region of Mexico might be different in many respects from one by a person from Colombia, Chile, or Argentina. And should we use Mandarin or Cantonese? Furthermore, students in a medium size district such as Hayward came from families with 41 different home languages.

The overall rate of unemployment in the late 1960s was at a new low, at one point as low as 3.5 percent. Yet in spite of rising affluence there were large pockets of poverty; and among young minority men in large urban inner cities, the unemployment rate was on the order of 25 percent or more. School systems sought methods of reducing high school dropout rates, of improving career counseling for non-college-bound students, and of providing more effective vocational training for entry-level jobs, often in partnership with local businesses.

There were other forces at work in education, some of them influenced by writers such as Herbert Marcuse, Edgar Friedenberg, and Angela Davis. There was a growing sense in many quarters that the educational "establishment" (not clearly defined) was inept at best, and corrupt at worst; that students were an oppressed minority who should demand an active role in determining their own destinies; and that "society," as represented by the schools, had no right to impose its values on students. Some young (white, middle-class) teachers assured me that the only solution was to destroy the existing educational system and begin afresh. The fact that they had no clear idea of what to put in its place did not disturb them. They were confident, in the face of historical evidence to the contrary, that good and beautiful solutions would appear to fill the vacuum.

A day-long conference for students in one of the Oakland high schools with a largely minority student body illustrates one facet of this ferment. Sponsored by the school district, with some assistance from my office, the conference was run in part by local black community activists. In the general session, speakers urged black students to remember that "black is beautiful"; they demanded the recognition of "black English" as a legitimate linguistic alternative to the "standard" English taught in the schools; and they encouraged student verbal attacks on the credibility and teaching methods of many of the teachers. This invitation was accepted with great enthusiasm.

The ensuing small group sessions provided forums for students to discuss their concerns about a wide range of topics, related both to their education and to future careers. A persistent point made by the community activists was that *all* educational and social values were equally acceptable, and that students should determine *their* values. Thus, when several young men in one session I observed declared that their career goal was to be a pimp and make lots of money, their values were not questioned. High school education, of course, was deemed irrelevant to

such a career.

In "values clarification" manuals and teacher workshops that came along later as part of drug-prevention education, this same neutrality of values was continued. To a large extent, it reflected a feeling in society that all values are relative, that none are intrinsically better than others, and that it is irrelevant to ask the individual to put her/his personal values in the context of the larger good.

Much of what I saw in California in those years was not unlike aspects of the Romantic movement of the early 19th century in Europe—the political upheavals and desire for revolutionary changes, the protest marches, the popularity of bohemian life styles (not limited to writers and artists), the rejection of certain forms of materialism and the embrace of poverty (often *ersatz*, as many young people could always call home for funds if in dire need), and a rise in suicide as a romantic gesture. Not that there was much awareness of such parallels. Most young teachers with whom I discussed these matters had little or no grasp of history, and, in any event, considered the past as irrelevant to their future.

I have not mentioned important social migrations and upheavals that had drastically altered the demographics of school systems. The Eastbay grew from a succession of small towns separated by farms and prune orchards to a 100-mile urban corridor linked by highways with terminal gridlock. Communities drew their boundaries to exclude minorities in housing and schools. Oakland, which I remember prior to World War II as a medium-sized city where a largely white population lived on tree-shaded streets in single-family homes, had a fairly good industrial base, but a self-image problem, being in the shadow of its more vibrant and cosmopolitan neighbor across the bay, San Francisco. Like other northern and coastal industrial cities, it had attracted large numbers of workers from the south, many of them minorities, to work in war industries. There were also substantial numbers of Asian families, who had lived there for a generation or more; their numbers were to be greatly augmented by influxes of Vietnamese and others from southeast Asia. As other residents moved to the suburbs (some, but not all, due to "white flight"), the racial and social character of the school system changed. At one point, within-district boundaries were gerrymandered to favor concentration of white, middle- and upper-class students in one attendance area.

This pattern, with variations, was to be found in most urban centers in the state. Consolidation of hundreds of small school districts into larger units and the disappearance of most traditional rural schools also contributed to a new demographics that administrators were ill-prepared to deal with.

I have sketched the above picture in order to give you a feeling for the atmosphere in which ENA was born and flourished. There was a sense of momentous events occurring, of rapid and uncontrolled growth and change, of many problems but also the exciting possibility of solutions. Into this yeasty ferment the federal government began pouring millions of dollars for the improvement of education—and those of us in PACE centers geared up to give our best to further that goal. Under other legislation, cities also received funds for mobilizing grass roots community efforts to remediate social problems and to provide more effective services and programs to the community.

The Development of ENA

What was ENA all about? In its early stages, the concept was an amorphous one. Certain characteristics came to be generally accepted, however: that there should be the widest possible school-community consensus on educational goals; that a "need" represented a gap between

some desired level of attainment of student objectives, and the present state; that the process of identifying needs should be deeply democratic, a joint effort by educators, students, and the community; and that there be one or more defensible methods of determining priority of needs. The ENA findings were supposed to guide administrative and school board decisions on curricular and program changes, with the understanding that the decision-making function would be much broader-based than in the past. I will have more to say about this in Part 2.

The processes and extent of effort were somewhat different for different purposes—for example, an ENA designed to give direction to long-range planning for school improvement was different from one used to justify an application for a grant for an innovative program. In the first instance, the ENA might consist almost entirely of large and small meetings and/or opinion surveys to arrive at a school-community consensus on educational goals. Such projects often took a year or two to complete and analyze before implementation. In the second, a teacher-parent advisory group might work with a small project team to determine the need, let us say, for an innovative program to teach listening skills in the primary grades. This ENA might document the need by citing various types of existing data from tests and using surveys or small-group processes with key informant groups. It would also include evidence from research that the proposed innovation would indeed meet the need.

Although eventually, educational systems and agencies undertook ENAs with their own funds, most of the large-scale needs assessments were at first undertaken with the impetus and financial support of ESEA, usually Title III, as well as comparable legislation for higher education. (Later developments, such as the accountability movement and management by objectives, were instrumental in continuing a high level of interest in ENA and in shaping some of its processes.) But the initial legislation was vague as to the exact nature of needs assessment, as well as how to undertake one. It was left to local planners to develop methods of data gathering and analysis that were useful. Soon, however, several PACE centers began to design and publish different types of ENA "models"—not necessarily models in the strict sense, but rather kits of materials and/or manuals of procedures for conducting needs assessments. These fell into a few distinct categories—the more comprehensive ones embodying two or three approaches.

The most widely-used ENA tools were written questionnaire surveys, using two- or three-part questions to determine discrepancies between desired educational goals and perceived levels of attainment; modified Delphi techniques, and variations of nominal group processes to reach agreement on goals and to set priorities on needs. Data from opinion surveys were supplemented with achievement and other educational indicators. The use of futures scenarios was introduced, but not widely used.

Among the components of the systems approach to educational planning, to which ENA was related, was the notion of the interrelatedness of all parts of bounded systems; the importance of setting broad educational goals and objectives and identifying needs through a consensus that went beyond educators; and the discovery of alternative ways to reach those goals. Thus, it was essential to have mechanisms to assure broad-based community involvement. All PACE centers were governed at the policy level by advisory boards that reflected the demographic nature of the community; and all Title III (innovation) projects had to have advisory groups, to assist in writing project applications and to advise at various stages of project implementation and evaluation. Advisory groups usually consisted of teachers and parents representing different segments of the community, and often students as well.

There was little doubt that the educational needs of many students had been neglected, and

that they and their parents had had little to say about the direction of their education. We believed that those needs could be identified, and that they could be addressed in some substantive manner through programmatic efforts (ENA was not intended to replace individual diagnostic procedures). But the obverse was that there was never enough money to address all the needs, and that planners had an obligation to set priorities—to determine the most pressing as well as those that could best be met under existing constraints. Much creative effort as well as controversy was devoted to finding rational and useful ways of setting priorities.

Those of us in PACE centers and county offices who were involved in ENA in those years saw ourselves as facilitators, not social engineers. We felt that our job was to help mobilize the school-community in doing some creative thinking, to work cooperatively on goals that reflected community values, and to determine needs that could be addressed by some facet of education. We still had a perhaps naïve belief that a prime goal of education in a democratic society was to provide the conditions through which all students could reach their potential. If the means we sometimes used to delineate the road to those goals—the systems analysis, the flow charting, the PERT and Gantt charts, the decision matrices—seemed at times esoteric, we tried not to forget that they were only tools to help people to organize and find the resources to accomplish worthwhile things in the real world.

Beginning in 1966, many PACE centers began conducting community surveys of one kind or another to fulfill their planning mandates. Early in the 1970s, my office was asked by the California state department of education to develop a set of needs assessment surveys that local districts anywhere in the state could use for their own studies. Accordingly, we assembled a team to design survey questionnaires for elementary and high school students, their parents, and teachers, that would be relevant to their concerns and easy to administer, that would cover a broad area in the curricula, yet have questions specific enough to provide real guidance for change. The surveys were field-tested, revised, and field-tested again, with hundreds of respondents, and after three years, the Alameda County Needs Assessment Model was ready for state-wide distribution.

We learned a lot from that experience. We learned that what looked obvious to educators was often obscure or arcane to parents. We learned to substitute the simple, direct word for educational jargon—often not recognized as jargon by us, of course. We learned that if you *really* want to know if a concept will make sense to the lay person, try translating it into Spanish. (Oh, how we struggled over "multicultural education," when that was a new idea.) And we learned that ENA surveys were not like other survey research, and that we had to invent new ways of analyzing and chunking the data so that the results would be sensible and useful for the administrators who had to make the decisions. All that seems obvious now—it wasn't then.

Several years later we built on that experience to develop a very different survey instrument (APEX) for secondary school students, their parents, and teachers, incorporating more recent research from organizational communication and decision-making. We used representatives from all three respondent groups in the early design stages as well as to help evaluate the final product. We also suggested how teachers might use APEX to help students find their own most pressing needs in different curricular areas, and to set additional goals and objectives for improvement.

In 1971, all but a couple of PACE centers in California lost their funding, due to changes in the state department of education and political influences. Many of their functions were retained by county offices, however, and ENA materials continued to be developed there and at university research institutes. Those of us from the centers now had other responsibilities, but

we continued to give and attend workshops in ENA, consult with school districts, and work in various ways with teachers and students.

For the next decade, national and international interest in needs assessment grew, evidenced by a wealth of published models, survey instruments, and kits of materials; and by hundreds of reports of needs assessment studies and results at professional meetings and in planning and research journals. The quality of materials offered ranged from simple (and often, very simplistic) surveys, to elaborate models that required extensive resources and expenditures of time. At one point we tried (with mixed success) to adapt the focus group method with high-school students, taping the sessions for later evaluation by the students themselves.

In the mid-1970s two national conferences brought additional attention to ENA and provided forums for display and discussion of a variety of procedures. One was for community college planners, held in Florida. The other was an invitational one sponsored by my office, to showcase instruments and projects representing a wide range of approaches. About that time also I received a grant from the National Institute of Education to do an analysis of needs assessment techniques used for educational planning at local and state educational levels. As usual, I had a state-wide advisory committee, this time composed of representatives of school district and county offices, school boards, the state department of education, and universities. There were also two out-of-state members of national renown and considerable experience with ENA: Robert Rath, then a member and later director of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon; and Bernard Kaplan, of the Educational Policy Research Center in Syracuse, New York.

The charge to the committee was to examine some two dozen ENA models and data-gathering instruments that were representative of the range of procedures in use at the time. They had been developed in many different locales around the country, by school districts, regional educational centers, educational laboratories, universities, or private, not-for-profit research institutes. For the sake of brevity, I will refer to all the materials that we analyzed as "models."

The original plan was to select some broad evaluative criteria, examine all the models, and perform a critical appraisal of them. It soon became apparent, however, that the evaluative approach was not feasible. It was difficult to agree on a set of criteria that would be useful for evaluating substantive, as distinct from formal qualities of the models. There was almost no research to guide our assumptions, and almost none of the models had been subjected to the kind of critical evaluation in the field that would have given us comparative data.

Also, as I was to discover later in other situations, some of those busy school administrators were more concerned with how to cope with their own specific and often volatile situations than in discussing what appeared like general and abstract problems. In short, *pace* our funding agencies, committees untrained in research or evaluation are ill-equipped to advise on research or evaluation projects.

It was finally decided that the report would be mainly descriptive, rather than a critical appraisal. We did not pass judgment—we simply reported. Besides the narrative descriptions, we furnished tables of comparisons of various features of content and procedures. That the analysis was useful was attested to by the fact that shortened forms of the report were printed elsewhere, and that it was widely quoted—possibly because it was the first, and for a long time the only, document that brought together all this kind of information, and in a form that was immediately usable by any group wishing to use or adapt one of the models.

I mentioned earlier that over the years I have changed my mind about a number of things

in ENA. One was the desirability of a district's doing a needs assessment by using a "kit" designed elsewhere. Yet in the 70s there was a great demand for such kits of materials. Most school districts, for example, had neither the staff nor the expertise to design and field-test their own ENA materials, although some of the larger and more affluent either did so or retained consultants to design and/or conduct the needs assessment.

I will have more to say in Part 2 about the use of prepackaged materials for local ENA. Here I want to observe that there always had to be a trade-off between the ideal and the feasible—between procedures that had a chance of identifying and analyzing "real" needs, and a "quick and dirty" survey that looked good but was essentially useless for decision-making. Yet what many administrators wanted was the latter—preferably a simple, one- or two-page survey, easy to administer, that would satisfy the community and school board that "something" had been done. Yet it might be so general that the results could be used to justify almost any course of action.

They had a point. There were plenty of examples of comprehensive ENAs that had consumed so much in time and resources that everyone concerned was weary of the whole thing. The report went on the shelf, and the school system went about its business as if nothing had happened. It was one thing to do a needs assessment. It was quite another to make the bridge to actually doing something about the needs.

Meanwhile, writers such as Kaufman were refining their conceptual models, more sophisticated methods of needs assessment were devised, and by 1980, a researcher could discover hundreds of reports of needs assessments in all kinds of settings. Books were written, program evaluators began to add to the rich mix of theory and practice in needs assessment—from a somewhat different perspective than that of educational planners—and there was a certain amount of dialog about needs assessment between those in education and those in health and social service agencies.

In my last few years in California, I became engaged in several other needs assessment projects. One was a joint school district-city needs assessment, where for the first time a school board and a city council met and worked together to identify student needs in the community. Another was the development and field-test of a comprehensive model for cyclical assessment. Still others were a manual of specific group processes to help parents and teachers make the bridge from ENA to designing and implementing program solutions; a process model for teachers in a district to conduct needs assessments based on what they perceived as high-priority issues related to their district's goals; and a needs assessment "product locator" with guidelines on selection and adaptation for local use. All these projects went through various stages of field-testing.

In short, the perspective that I bring to ENA is mainly that of one who for many years was actively engaged in the enterprise in many different roles. I learned a lot from many people—both at the conceptual level and in the day-to-day applications. Of necessity, I modified my views of what worked, what was feasible as well as desirable.

It should be noted that many school systems, universities, and cities conducted needs assessments with their own funds, not because of requirements of grants from federal or state agencies. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that much of the diverse development in ENA models and approaches was stimulated by the need to provide tools for agencies responding to project requirements of funding agencies.

In the fall of 1981 my husband and I moved back to the Pacific Northwest. I had received a contract to write a book on needs assessment in educational and social programs, and I soon

had occasion to ask myself, "Is this trip necessary?" For with the passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act that October, the future of ENA in the United States began to look very problematic. Moreover, criticisms of both theory and practices in needs assessment had been appearing—I had some of my own—and one occasionally entertained the fleeting notion that perhaps we were like the fellow who had invented a wonderful tool, and was now looking for some reason to use it.

If this memoir is seen to dwell unduly on my own part in ENA developments in the first 15 years, it has been deliberate. Each person's perspective is idiosyncratic, shaped not only by what we see and hear and do, but what our own backgrounds—our "schemata" in the terms of information theory—have prepared us to see and hear and interpret. In Part 2 we will move to a broader view, and from retrospect to prospect.

INVITATION TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

The editors of *Educational Planning*, a refereed journal of educational planning issues, invite the submission of original manuscripts for publication consideration. *Educational Planning* is the official journal of the International Society for Educational Planning.

The journal's audience includes national and provincial/state planners, university faculty, members of educational administration, school district administrators and planners, and other practitioners.

The publication's purpose is to serve as a meeting ground for the scholar-researcher and the practitioner-educator through the presentation of articles that have practical relevance to current issues and that broaden the knowledge base of the discipline. *Educational Planning* disseminates the results of pertinent educational research, presents contemporary ideas for consideration and provides general information to assist subscribers with their professional responsibilities.

Articles preferred for inclusion are manuscripts from practitioners, reports of empirical research, expository writings including analyses of topical problems, or anecdotal accounts. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed. The following criteria have been established for the submission of manuscripts:

1. Each manuscript submission must be accompanied by a letter signed by the author.

2. The length of the manuscript should not exceed 20 double-spaced, typewritten pages (including reference lists, tables, charts, and/or graphs).

3. Two copies of each manuscript should be submitted.

4. Lengthy tables, drawings, and charts should be scaled to an *Educational Planning* page and camera-ready.

5. A biographical sketch of each author should be attached to each manuscript.

6. The Editors prefer APA style.

All manuscripts will be evaluated on the basis of relevancy, substance, style and syntax, and ease of comprehension. Submission conveys permission to edit and publish as required. Authors are responsible for copyright clearance and accuracy of information presented.

Please submit manuscripts to:

Robert H. Beach, Editor
Educational Planning
Memphis State University
Building 48 - South Campus
Memphis, TN 38152
USA

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

MEMBERSHIP / SUBSCRIPTION FORM

(PLEASE PRINT)

NAME: _____
Last First Middle

Organization and Department if applicable: _____

Mailing Address: _____
City State Zip Country

FEES: Professional Membership and Subscription to Educational Planning $35 US
Student Membership and Subscription to Educational Planning $15 US
Payment by check, money order, or PO required with application.

Return membership application and payment to: The International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP)
Dr. William D. McInerney, Treasurer
Educational Administration
Purdue University
G-10 South Campus Courts
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

NOTICE: CHANGE OF ADDRESS

The ISEP Secretary/Treasurer and Editorial offices have new addresses.

ISEP Secretary/Treasurer: All correspondence related to membership, subscriptions, dues and general information requests should be forwarded to:

ISEP
Dr. William D. McInerney, Secretary/Treasurer
Educational Administration
Purdue University
G - 10 South Campus Courts
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

(317) 494 - 9731

Editorial Offices for Educational Planning: All correspondence relating to manuscript submissions, etc., should be directed to:

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
Dr. Robert H. Beach, Editor
Memphis State University
South Campus
Building 48, Room 102
Memphis, TN 38152
USA

(901) 678 - 2652

International Congress on the Planning and Management of Educational Development

An International Congress on the Planning and Management of Educational Development was held in Mexico D.F., 26-30 March 1990. The Congress was organized by Unesco in collaboration with the Mexican Ministry of Education. 340 people participated, including 267 national experts from 101 countries, and 73 observers and experts representing 12 non-governmental, 11 inter-governmental and 8 U.N. organizations.

The Congress sessions were characterized by extensive debate and exchanges of national experiences, the objective of which was to draw attention to the successes and practical difficulties encountered in planning and managing educational systems throughout the world, as well as to reflect on the future and to consider how new inputs could be used to revive planning and mobilize more international co-operation in the fields of information, training and research.

Four themes

The participants examined four main themes: renewing and generalizing basic education in the light of the recommendations made at the *World Conference on Education for All* (Jomtien, Thailand, 5-9 March 1990); developing human resources; improving systems of administration and management; and adapting new educational planning strategies in the face of the present economic crisis.

A series of six round-table discussions reviewed in depth problems specifically related to: higher education; non-formal education; computer (software) applications for educational planning; the situation of small countries; evaluation and follow-up policies; and educational infrastructures.

A considerable amount of background material was prepared for the Congress, including regional synthesis reports (Africa, Asia, Europe, Arab States, Latin America and the Caribbean) on the situation and perspectives of educational planning and management, and the results of a survey carried out among Member States. IIEP contributed a keynote document for one of the plenary sessions on *Educational planning for the year 2000*, and a technical document entitled *What policies for teachers?* (Copies of these papers may be obtained from the IIEP Publications Unit).

The Congress analyzed recent changes in educational planning practice and the discussions underlined the fact that the educational problems of today require different treatments and solutions to those of yesterday. What is needed now, said the Conference, is to develop new systems of (i) information, (ii) organization and (iii) participation. Problems can no longer be treated solely through technical procedures, left to mere quantitative calculations or reduced to consulting those traditionally involved.

Country experiences

With this in mind, the Congress reviewed country experiences on such aspects as decentralization, evaluation and the regulation of educational systems.

At the end of the Congress a *Summary Report* and *Final Recommendation* were approved.

The *Summary Report* gives special attention to mapping out the strategies to be taken in the fight against illiteracy in the framework of the *International Literacy Year*. It also proposes a new approach to the concept of the development of human resources -- both qualitative and quantitative -- not simply limited to the preparation for employment but open to the necessities of the well-being of the population from an early age, to the best use of natural resources, to the preparation for life in the community and regular work in the public and private sectors in order to better integrate the various types of training required. The *Summary Report* concludes with a synthesis of the debate on new orientations for research and the use of research results through communication, training and international co-operation within the framework of long-term agreements.

The *Final Recommendation* approved by the Congress advocates a system of educational planning that includes research on long-term socio- economic-cultural scenarios, facilitates strategic decision-making in what may be a highly uncertain environment, and gives adequate attention to implementation considerations. Educational planning must become more democratic by giving access to other social forces, and articulate at different territorial levels.

Planners and administrators, concluded the Congress, will need to work more effectively under changing circumstances, with the assistance of teachers, improved data-bases and information systems, using appropriate indicators. New research should be encouraged in order to understand better the factors which determine the quality of educational results, and planners should promote more efficient incentives and innovations.

Carlos Malpica Faustor

Trainees evaluate 1989/90 programme

On 22 May 1990 the Director-General of Unesco, Mr. Federico Mayor, presented certificates to the 48 trainees at the completion of the Institute's 25th Annual Training Programme in Educational Planning and Administration.

The course, which had begun with a one-month in-country phase in the trainees' home countries last September, continued during eight months at IIEP in Paris and covered an orientation period, a common core, a series of specialized units and seminars, two study visits and a terminal paper. (For more details on the contents of the course, please contact the IIEP Training Unit).

At the end of the course the trainees evaluated the programme and gave suggested improvements. A summary of this evaluation session appears below.

In-country phase (September 1989). All the trainees gave importance to the in-country phase but they drew attention to some of the practical difficulties they had encountered during this period. In particular, fellowship awards had sometimes been confirmed only at the last moment, resulting in a drop in the trainees' availability to participate fully in this phase and a mad rush at the end of the period to be issued with passports, visas and travel tickets. Many of the trainees had not been given adequate time off from their official duties to study the self-instructional modules provided by the Institute.

The trainees suggested that an effort should be made by the financing agencies to confirm fellowship awards earlier in the year in order to allow the selected trainees to complete their administrative formalities in good time. In addition, they hoped that the Institute would increase its efforts to persuade employers to liberate the trainees from their work duties as from the beginning of the in-country phase.

Orientation period (October 1989). The trainees thought that this period should be lengthened, giving time for more feedback on the country diagnoses prepared by the trainees during the in-country phase.

The documentation distributed for the refresher courses on demography, economics and statistics was much appreciated but some trainees would have preferred to have received this documentation during the in-country phase. The contents of the self-instructional materials had not been well assimilated by some trainees due to a lack of basic knowledge in the subjects. A plea was made that greater consideration should be given to the range of interests among the trainees.

Common core (October-December 1989). There were mixed feelings among the trainees about this part of the course, some of them suggesting that it should be shortened while others feeling that they were attempting to cover too much in too little time. A specific suggestion was made that the period devoted to micro-informatics should be extended, particularly the time devoted to practical work on computers.

Specialized units and seminars (January-April 1990). The unit on school mapping received very favourable comments. Some trainees thought that the unit on finance and cost analysis was difficult to assimilate -- mainly due to the fact that they lacked a basic grounding in economics. Others recommended that this unit should devote more attention to budgetary processes, the mobilisation of resources, and the techniques of financial management. Individual work should be more encouraged during the unit on education, employment and the labour market, particularly by using micro-computers. The unit on "educational projects" supported with foreign resources received high marks.

Study visits. The visit to Alsace, France, was judged to be very useful in that it enabled the trainees to see the different aspects of planning and administration of an educational system. Likewise, the visit to Turkey enabled the trainees to apply the concepts that they had acquired at the Institute, although some trainees said that this study visit should have taken place earlier in the programme and perhaps be extended by two or three days.

Terminal papers. This item of the course was judged both important and useful. Some trainees, however, had difficulty in deciding what subject they would choose until relatively late in the course; others had been obliged to change their topics two or three times because of the absence of suitable documentation. Several trainees requested more assistance from the advisers during the preparation of the terminal papers.

Other aspects. The evaluation covered such areas as pedagogical methods, the interpretation services, use of computer facilities, and even the services of the

ORGANIZATION	The Society was founded on December 10, 1970, in Washington, D.C. Over 50 local, state, national, and international planners attended the first organizational meeting. Since then its growth has demonstrated that there is need for a professional organization with educational planning as its exclusive concern.
PURPOSE	The International Society for Educational Planning was established to foster the professional knowledge and interests of educational planners. Through conferences and publications the Society promotes the interchange of ideas within the planning community. The membership includes persons from the ranks of governmental agencies, school-based practitioners, and higher education.
MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY	Membership in the Society is open to any person active or interested in educational planning and the purposes of the Society. To join the Society or renew a membership, please submit and complete the enclosed form. Please forward check and membership form to: ISEP Dr. William D. McInerney, Sec.-Treas. Educational Administration Purdue University G-10 South Campus Courts West Lafayette, IN 47907 USA

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
Memphis State University,
Bldg. 48 - South Campus
Memphis, TN 38152