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An EPDA leadership project for school administrators was conducted at Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, during the year 1973-1974 for the purpose of developing administrators who could function as change agents with particular emphasis given to the mainstreaming of exceptional children. This study is a descriptive analysis of that project for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the program in reaching the goals and objectives as set forth in the project proposal.

The program was structured around six time modules of five weeks each. Each module had an educational target or central theme. The theme of the first module was the development of a personal philosophy and commitment; the second module, a study of systems approach and organizational change; the third module, instructional alternatives; the fourth module, exceptional children in the schools and the mainstreaming concept; the fifth module, legislation and judicial and executive decisions governing exceptional children; and the last module, an evaluation of the entire project.

The information used in this dissertation was drawn primarily from the Project Proposal, from the documentary written from the tape recorded sessions, from the End-of-Module Reactions completed by the participants, and from the End-of-Year Evaluation instruments completed by the participants. The evaluation instruments were compiled and summarized in terms of frequency and percentage of responses to each item on the instruments.

The summary of the evaluation instruments revealed that of the eleven goals listed, eight of them were evaluated in the top two scales by at least 78 percent or more of the respondents. All nine of the objectives listed were rated in the top two scales by at least 78 percent of the respondents. Whereas a considerable level of agreement was observable in the evaluation of the goals and objectives, the evaluation of the activities indicates a wider diversity of responses with the rankings being scattered. "On-site participation" was the only activity which was ranked at the highest scale by at least 78 percent of the respondents. Responses indicated less
general agreement among the fellows on this instrument. In evaluating the consultants, the fellows indicated consistently that the quality of the consultants was considered outstanding.

The strengths of the program were identified as including the quality of the consultants, the value of the field experiences and internships, and the development of a new personal philosophy concerning the direction of change and the mainstreaming of exceptional children. Emphasis was given to the value of the interpersonal relationships among the fellows, the experience of group decision making, and an increased appreciation for group dynamics.

The weaknesses of the program as identified centered around time constraints, too much material attempted within too small a time frame, the need for scheduling internships earlier in the program, and not enough interaction among fellows during the second semester.

Recommendations from the group included: establish specific criteria for the selection of project participants in order to provide a wide diversity of human resources within the group, restructure the project in order that the use of field experiences is expanded and initiated earlier, plan seminars for the entire membership for free interchange and debate and less for formal presentation, expand the use of human relations laboratory experiences, retain the self-directed approach, retain the process of translation of project credit into traditional course credits, provide entry level competency determination in order that each fellow can evaluate himself in terms of his own strengths and weaknesses for course planning purposes, plan for pre and post evaluation instruments for more valid evaluation of the effectiveness of the project, provide for external evaluation by faculty members and outside consultants, and provide for follow-up of the fellows subsequent to their participation in the project.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Professional literature reveals that many contemporary educators have accepted the concept of school administrators as primary change agents in the educational enterprise. They have perceived a need for a new kind of educational leadership to bring about needed change.

At the same time these educators have recognized the evidence that the isolation of children who are labeled as being "exceptional" has not met their educational and social needs and is therefore one area most in need of change. Evidence of this is to be found in recent legislation involving a guarantee that adequate education will be provided for special children, who have historically been ignored, forgotten, or isolated. Along with other clearly identifiable groups such as women and members of certain races or ethnic groups, children with special problems have been the victims of social discrimination, but educational discrimination by educators is especially distressing.

As a result of these concerns about educational deficiencies, the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at Atlanta University submitted a proposal for a fellowship program in education leadership to the
United States Office of Education, to be implemented during the 1973-1974 academic year. This program was planned as an innovative post-master level program in educational administration. The program was designed to meet two primary areas of need: one, that of developing school administrators who would perceive themselves to be the primary change agents in education; and two, that of developing a new concept of providing educational opportunities for handicapped children through mainstreaming.

The Fellowship Program in Educational Leadership at Atlanta University was conducted under a grant from the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems as authorized under Part C of Public Law 90-35 better known as the Education Professions Development Act. The project at Atlanta University was more specifically known as the project in Educational Leadership and Mainstreaming Exceptional Children (ELMEC) and shall be referred to as such throughout this report. The project director who authored the proposal was a professor in the Department of Administration and Supervision at Atlanta University.

It is the purpose of this report to provide a description and analysis of the program as it was implemented at Atlanta University and to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives as set forth in the project proposal and the needs of the participants.

The underlying theme of most current educational literature is "change." Writers are discussing the rapidity
of change, the need for change, the ability to adapt to change, the responsibility for making worthwhile change happen. In fact, most writers have accepted the concept that the only constant left in the social domain is change itself. Alvin Toffler\(^1\) is a widely read and well-known protagonist for the study of change and for the need of preparation for its effect on human beings, socially, culturally, economically, and politically.

Toffler and his fellow writers argue that the motivation of the learner is closely bound up with the concept of the future and that the failure of educators to recognize this mutilates children. He also submits that women and children of ethnic minorities are "future-deprived." He expresses a general dissatisfaction with conventional forms, media, and pedagogical processes and urges a change in educational methodology. He contends that future is not predetermined but is subject to the influence of educators.

Toffler goes on to point out that education springs from the interplay between the individual and a changing environment, a restructuring of the links between schools, colleges, universities, and communities, and must have as its ultimate goal that of helping learners to cope with real-life crises, opportunities, and perils. Education must strengthen the individual's ability to anticipate and adapt to change either through intervention, through informed

acquiescence, or through intelligent resistance.

One of the areas of the broad scope of education that has undergone the greatest amount of change in recent years is the area of instruction of exceptional children. This change has been predominantly one of rapid expansions. Programs for all areas of exceptionality have been growing throughout the nation, supported by tax funds, legislation, and probably most of all by public support and even demand. Rapid growth does not always mean quality or productive growth. During the late 1960s the area of special education for exceptional children has been characterized by four major trends according to Dunn.¹ First, special educators are becoming less inclined to group pupils by traditional handicapping labels. Second, rather than categorizing children according to their area of exceptionality, educators are concentrating on the special learning needs of children. Third, special educators are concentrating more on children with major differences and on quality programs rather than on handicapped children from minority groups who are often placed in programs of undemonstrated effectiveness. Fourth, special educators are becoming more integrative in their approach, accepting that special education is not very different from general education and a capable regular teacher can do a remarkably effective job of teaching most

exceptional children. This trend toward normalizing education for exceptional children in place of the traditional untested remedial approach of the past is future oriented and research based with emphasis on the development of integrated and preventive programs of demonstrated effectiveness.

Description of ELMEC

The project as stated in the proposal was intended for practicing administrators who seek further expertise and others who wish to be involved more actively in the administrative process. The plan for the common experiences included a series of articulated and integrated studies organized in learning modules. These, along with other activities selected according to the needs and interests of each individual, were intended to support and develop the student's administrative understanding and skills.

Project ELMEC was planned as a ten-month program (two semesters and an eight-week summer session) focusing on various important responsibilities of the administrator as he promotes orderly and worthwhile change for the benefit of special children. The program was structured as a series of five-week modules in which the fellows participated as members of teams as they exercised leadership roles. This approach was to provide opportunities for participants to develop their own leadership skills. Each of the six modules

was structured around a different theme which was spelled out in the original proposal. These themes were: (1) personal philosophy and theoretical framework for administration; (2) systems, systems analysis, and organizational change; (3) instructional alternatives; (4) exceptional children in the schools/mainstreaming; (5) legislation and judicial and executive decisions governing exceptional children; and (6) wrap up and evaluation.

According to the project proposal, the goal of the program was to "provide opportunities for bonafide educational experiences which would lead to an understanding of systems theory and the process of change, the place of the administrator in organizing for and directing that change, and mastery of the techniques and strategies for executing it."1 It was expected also to lead to "knowledge of pertinent legislation and judicial decisions at both the State and Federal levels, covering the protection and educational development of exceptional children, and the ability to place these laws and decisions in the proper context for the local setting with research on ways they can be more effectively implemented."2 In the course of the project participants were: "to examine the different newer approaches in curriculum design and instructional techniques so that the administrator might understand the different possibilities for mainstreaming the vast majority of youngsters with handicaps; to develop techniques for staff and faculty inservice

\[1\] Ibid., p. 7.  \[2\] Ibid.
education so that all children can have the benefit of knowledgeable and able teachers; and to practice the actual working out of these newer approaches.\(^1\)

Again referring to the project proposal in addition to overall program goals, the student was expected to achieve his own personal goals through the activities of the program and, more specifically, was expected to:

1. Develop a personal philosophy undergirded with a value system which included recognition of the dignity and worth of each individual, an effective learning theory, and a commitment to serve every child adequately within the purview of his or her responsibility

2. Structure a theoretic framework based on the system concept, and holding to the thesis that the administrator is the principal change agent in the process and dynamics of change, develop skills needed for executing change

3. Understand and make a commitment to mainstreaming exceptional children

4. Learn the judicial and legislative decisions governing exceptional children and the methods of implementing and augmenting such decisions

5. Develop further expertise in curriculum and instruction with special emphasis on enabling almost all children to be in regular classrooms

6. Demonstrate skills in actual experiential settings

7. Participate in the evaluation of the training.\(^2\)

The project activities and experiences through which skills were to be developed included workshops and seminars; on-site observations and participation; recording through journals, letters, interviews, various kinds of evaluative

\(^1\)Ibid. \(^2\)Ibid., pp. 5-6.
instruments including audio and visual; analysis of activities and experiences; simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping realities and how to deal with them with such activities as gaming exercises, role-playing, open-ended audiovisual presentations, case studies, action research; group process and transactional analysis.

Several important outcomes were expected of the project design:
1. Field experiences
2. Positive team effort
3. In-depth review of the literature
4. Development of Action Research which could stimulate further research topics for doctoral dissertations
5. Strength in evaluation

The project proposal itself structured the goals and objectives of the project, the six-module design of five weeks to each module, and the concepts to be explored within each module. However, the implementation of the modular structure, the approaches to be taken to the module concepts, the techniques and activities to be used, and the selection and securing of resources including human resources, were strictly the responsibility of the fellows themselves.

It was expected that participants would develop their own programs both individually and through teamwork. The director together with the department head in Administration and Supervision who served as co-director of the project, provided guidance, cautions, and suggestions, but the two of
them did not serve as "instructors." The group was expected to be self-directed. Through this self-direction participants had the opportunity to demonstrate and develop leadership qualities. No individual had to restrict himself to what the group was doing, but was free to take advantage of every opportunity to branch out into areas that would serve his or her own professional and educational purposes.

It was stressed by the director to the fellows during the initial orientation sessions\(^1\) that each participant would be assumed to be mature enough to deal with his own education and would thus be dealt with as a colleague rather than as a student. Participants were expected to do the training of themselves and of each other, acting as leaders, counselors, and supporters to each other.

The ELMEC project was not designed as a doctoral program, but since all fellows were post-masters graduate students it was expected that individual degree objectives could be served at least partially through participation in the project. The project itself was designed to allow fellows to earn nine hours of formal course credit each semester. Project activities were expected to require approximately sixty percent of each student's total semester course work load. The other forty percent, or two courses, was scheduled by each fellow individually in regular

\(^1\)Arthur L. Thompson, *Journal For The Fellowship Program In Educational Leadership* (ELMEC), unpublished manuscript, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, (1973-1974).
University courses. These additional two courses were not connected in any way with the ELMEC project and were selected by the fellows individually according to what each fellow needed to move him forward in his program. The additional courses were optional and were not a requirement for participation in ELMEC. Participants could be ELMEC fellows without carrying any extra courses and still be considered full-time students at the University. However, no participant was allowed to be employed while participating in the project; each fellow was on full leave of absence from his former job or had resigned his former job.

The nine hours of credit received each semester through the project were translated for transcript purposes into credit in existing courses in the University curriculum. The main purpose of the project was to develop competencies in the area of administration; each member had a responsibility to recognize his own areas of need and to concentrate effort in these areas to satisfy these needs. If work was done in an area of need and verified through negotiation with the appropriate faculty member, then corresponding course credit was awarded.

Need and work varied from fellow to fellow; it was therefore possible for fellows to be receiving different course credit each semester according to their own individual study and research of that semester. For example, with expertise demonstrated in school finance a student could apply part of the nine hours into credit in school finance.
The same principle applied to such courses as school law, special education (a variety of courses), curriculum (also several), or any other existing course within the University curriculum.

By the very nature of the teamwork involved in the project, small groups of fellows found themselves working together to satisfy requirements of faculty members for course credit. For example, during the module in which legislative processes were studied a small group of fellows studied school law in depth beyond the needs of the project and obtained credit in school law. Similarly, during the module focused on teaching exceptional children, several groups of fellows worked closely with professors in Special Education to obtain credit in that area. In this fashion project work was "translated" with each fellow responsible for the negotiation with faculty and satisfaction of that faculty member's terms.

This translation of credit appears to be unique to the ELMEC project when compared to other projects funded under EPDA during the same year. Other EPDA projects reviewed in the following chapter apparently do not have this particular component by which a group can work together to accomplish group purposes, yet at the same time serve individual goals of fellows for degree purposes. However, the participant was not required to translate credit at all in order to be an ELMEC fellow.

It should be pointed out, however, that this
translation process is perhaps more easily implemented at a small, exclusively graduate level university such as Atlanta University than it would be at an extremely large institution where student/faculty and faculty/faculty communication becomes more complex by virtue of size and the disadvantages of large bureaucratic management policies.

**ELMEC Environment**

Atlanta University is a moderate sized nonsectarian institution devoted to graduate studies exclusively. The University is affiliated with Morehouse College, Spelman College, Clark College, and Morris Brown College in a consortium under which the University conducts graduate studies and Colleges provide undergraduate education. Each institution is organized independently under its own board of trustees and has its own administration; but, through the affiliation, overlapping of work is eliminated and facilities of all the institutions are available to every student. All of the campuses are adjacent and lie in the heart of Atlanta, Georgia.¹

Atlanta University, as well as its undergraduate affiliates, was founded to provide quality higher education opportunities for blacks and although it is in the process of becoming increasingly interracial, intercultural, and international in student body and faculty, the student body

¹The Atlanta University Bulletin, Atlanta, Georgia, 1973-1974.
of approximately twelve hundred is predominantly black.

At the time of this writing Atlanta University has a full-time faculty of 111 of which sixty, or fifty-four percent, hold the doctorate degree, and a part-time faculty of forty-five of which fourteen, or thirty-one percent, hold the doctorate degree. The Department of Administration and Supervision in the College of Education, under which the EPDA project was organized, numbers seven, all of whom hold the doctorate degree.

As representative of program activity the Department of Administration and Supervision was already in the process of hosting a new program at the doctoral level for superintendency and central office personnel.¹ This program, sponsored in part by the Ford Foundation, relied heavily on the social and behavioral sciences for its main thrust. Special Education was executing a program for Master of Arts and Education Specialist levels and had a project under the auspices of the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped. The latter was a spinoff from the four-year EPDA Project 2036, which tested out the techniques and strategies of special education for regular teachers who have high percentages of handicapped children in their classrooms.

Through participation of the Department of Administration and Supervision in the Ford grant, the University is in a consortium of seven institutions including The University

¹ Herrmann, ELMEC Project Proposal.
of Massachusetts at Amherst, Teachers College at Columbia University, The University of Pennsylvania, Ohio State University, the Claremont Graduate School, the University of Chicago, and Atlanta University. It is interesting to note that of the seven institutions in the consortium, only Atlanta University was established as a university for black students and, although it is integrated at the present time, the student body is still predominantly black. Other cooperative enterprises are in effect throughout the institution. The University has a very favorable stance with other collegiate institutions and works with several others through the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service to provide inservice courses and programs for the metropolitan area.

Selection of ELMEC Participants

Basic to the success of developing effective change agents is the selection of students with the potential to gain the maximum benefits from the program and who hold promise of being strong educational leaders.

One of the features built into the program was the selection of participants with a variety of backgrounds such as school administrators, special education coordinators, staff members of state departments of education, counselors, and other educational personnel. The project drew twenty-five fellows from a pool of applicants whose academic and personal qualifications strongly indicated the potential for leadership in the management of change.
Three principle criteria were used in selecting candidates for this project:\footnote{Fellowship Program in Educational Leadership (Director's informational brochure prepared by the School of Education, Department of Administration and Supervision, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia 1973-1974).}

1. **Scholarship Potential**: Previous work at the graduate level, performance in a personal interview, support statements from individuals who were familiar with the candidate, recognized test scores where deemed appropriate.

2. **Leadership Potential**: Concrete evidence which demonstrated that the candidate had shown a capacity to enlist the commitments of others in the service of a common goal.

3. **Commitment**: Preference was given to candidates who had demonstrated their dedication to responsible change by previous activity in the service of education.

The selection of participants resulted in a rich pool of human resources in terms of the variety of orientation, job description, and academic background of the individuals.

The fellows selected for the project were as follows:

- **Anna Pearl Atkinson**: B.A. degree in history and English from St. Augustin's College, Raleigh, North Carolina; M.A. degree in elementary education from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in special education from Atlanta University; Coordinator of Programs for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped for the Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.
Ann Bashful: B.S. degree in elementary education from Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida; M.Ed. degree in administration and supervision from Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Reading Coordinator for Orleans Parish School System, New Orleans, Louisiana

Walter R. Bush: B.A. degree in political science from Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; M.A. degree in administration and supervision from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in administration and supervision from Atlanta University; Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Dalton City Schools, Dalton, Georgia

Betty W. Clark: B.A. degree in elementary education from Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia; M.A. degree in education from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in reading from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in administration from Atlanta University; Elementary School Principal for Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Ora L. Cooks: B.S. degree in home economics from the University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff, Arkansas; M.A. degree in child development and family relations from Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan; Area Extension Home Economist for Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Florence Dick: A.B. degree in English from Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland; M.A. degree in reading from Teachers College Columbia University, New York, New York; Director of Affirmative Action, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Jesse Dixon: B.S. degree in physical education from Alcorn A. & M., Alcorn, Mississippi; M.A. degree in educational administration from Teachers College Columbia University, New York, New York; Administrative Supervisor for the Title I Preprimary Program, DeKalb County School System, DeKalb County, Georgia

Anne W. Fannin: B.S. degree in business education from Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee; M.A. degree in school administration from New York University, New York, New York; postgraduate work at Teachers College Columbia University, New York, New York; Elementary School Principal for Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia
E. Yvonne Foreman: B.S. degree in social science from Grambling University, Grambling, Louisiana; M.Ed. degree in special education from Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama; Ed.S. degree in administration and supervision from Atlanta University; Teacher of social studies, Brooklyn, New York

Elise F. Gilham: A.B. degree in social science from Spelman College, Atlanta, Georgia; M.S. degree in library science from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in librarianship from Atlanta University; Coordinator of Media Services, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Barbara Harper: B.S. degree in English from Tuskegee, Alabama; M.A. degree in reading from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in reading from Atlanta University; Instructor of Reading, Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia

Marian F. Hatch: B.S. degree in secondary education from Alabama State University, Montgomery, Alabama; M.A. degree in early childhood education from Atlanta University; Lead Teacher of Day Care Center, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Delores A. Hopkins: B.S. degree in psychology from St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri; M.A. degree in guidance and counseling from Atlanta University; Elementary Teacher, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri

Sara Jackson Jones: B.S. degree in home economics from Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama; M.A. degree in elementary education from Atlanta University; Language Arts Instructor, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Carrie M. Lacey: B.S. degree in elementary education from Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama; M.S.W. degree in social work from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in school administration from Atlanta University; Elementary School Principal, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

William H. Lyles: B.S. degree in natural science from Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia; M.A. degree in administration and supervision from Atlanta University; teacher and principal throughout Georgia for nineteen years; Real Estate Agent

Eugene Manning: B.S. degree in mathematics from Claflin College, Orangeburg, South Carolina; M.A.
degree in elementary education from Atlanta University; Elementary School Assistant Principal, Chester County School System, Chester, South Carolina

James C. Newton: B.S. degree in advertising from Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida; M.Ed. degree in administration and supervision from Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia; Elementary School Assistant Principal, Columbus School System, Columbus, Georgia

Larry S. Robertson: B.A. degree in elementary education from Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Arkansas; M.S.E. degree in early childhood education from State College of Arkansas, Conway, Arkansas; Area Supervisor of Elementary Division, Arkansas State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas

Samuel J. Scott: A.B. degree in economics from Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; M.A. degree in special education and mental retardation from Atlanta University; Ed.S. degree in education administration from Atlanta University; Center Coordinator, Hamilton Pre-Vocational High School, DeKalb County School System, DeKalb County, Georgia

Arthur L. Thompson: B.S. degree in biology and chemistry from Jacksonville State College, Jacksonville, Alabama; M.S. degree in secondary education from Jacksonville State College, Jacksonville, Alabama; Ed.S. degree in guidance and counseling from University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia; Ed.S. certification in administration and supervision; Counselor, DeKalb County School System, DeKalb County, Georgia

Alvin L. Watkins: B.S. degree in social science from Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia; M.A. degree in special education from Atlanta University; High School Special Education Teacher, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

John Whitehead: B.A. degree in music from Troy State Teachers College, Troy, Alabama; M.Ed. degree in school administration from University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi; Ed.S. degree in school administration from Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia; High School Assistant Principal, DeKalb County School System, DeKalb County, Georgia

Elmiria B. Wicker: B.A. degree in secondary education from Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; M.Ed. degree in secondary education from Southern
University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Graduate study at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Assistant Professor of History and Co-chairman of Freshman Level Instruction, Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Eulis H. Williams: B.A. degree in English from Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; M.S. degree in school administration from Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Middle School Assistant Principal, Gary School System, Gary, Indiana

By way of summary the twenty-five fellows included:

One assistant superintendent of a school system
Three elementary school principals
Two elementary school assistant principals
One middle school assistant principal
One secondary school assistant principal
One secondary school counselor
Two special education system level coordinators
One preprimary program system level coordinator
One reading system level coordinator
One media services system level coordinator
One university extension home economist
One director of affirmative action at a state college
One real estate agent, former teacher and principal
One state department elementary instruction supervisor
One preschool classroom teacher
Two elementary classroom teachers
One secondary classroom teacher
Two college instructors
One special education teacher

Of the twenty-five fellows, fourteen were women and
eleven were men. Throughout this study fellows will be referred to as "he" for editorial purposes only.

The twenty-five fellows were subdivided into five teams in order to carry out the purposes of the program. A great deal of effort, study, and heated debate went into the structuring of the five teams, which was done over a period of two days by the group at large. There was a feeling of consensus that the entire success of the total project would depend upon providing each subgroup with a combination of people representing a diversity of academic background, as well as most recent job description, in order that the participants themselves would represent human resource potential to each other. It was also considered imperative that each subgroup include at least one of the Atlanta area fellows in order that their local contacts could be exploited by the entire group. As will be shown later in this report, the quality of the consultants recruited by fellows was repeatedly pointed out as one of the strongest features of the entire project. Although it is true that the same people who secured the services of the consultants participated in their evaluation, which could be considered as a bias factor, it is nevertheless true that without local contacts by the fellows and knowledge of where quality human resources could be found this component of the project could have been seriously weakened. Therefore, not only did the original selection of project participants contribute to overall success potential because of diversity and variety, but also the careful
structure of the subgroups which was accomplished by the group itself maximized this success potential. The resources of the project could be said to be within the fellows themselves.

Once the original teams were formed the membership of these teams remained constant throughout the entire project. The responsibility of chairman and recorder was rotated among team members so that all participants served in these capacities at some time, thus providing leadership opportunity to each member.

Significance of the Report

Evaluation is probably the most widely and openly admitted area of deficiency within the realm of education. When teachers are asked to name their most difficult professional problems, included along with other such classic answers as discipline, they almost universally cite the problem of evaluating what a student has learned. Teachers are told to take a student where he is and carry him as far as he can go. Teachers are seldom taught how to determine where a student is, what is the point that represents how far he can go, and how to determine when the student has reached that point. All of this involves evaluation.

Most administrators are former teachers. But as they move into the field of administration, seldom do their training programs include the development of the evaluative skills needed for every significant decision they must make.
They are repeatedly called upon to evaluate programs, pupils, and professional staff, to name a few, but scarcely ever are they provided the methodology or even encouraged to become skillful in such activity.

In recent years the field of education has watched the parade of innovation and change including modern math, team teaching, programmed instruction, individualized instruction, open classrooms, grouping, tracking, learning packets, modular scheduling, ungraded schools, differentiated staffing, independent study, computer-assisted instruction, electronic classrooms, learning labs, schools without walls, and endless pilot projects. Education has moved so rapidly from one so-called innovation to the next that no one seems to be stopping long enough to measure, to evaluate, to put a value on such change before it is crowded out by the next change.

There should be no single route to a degree and alternatives should be explored. Established schools of education should take a good look at nontraditional programs to see what can be incorporated into their own programs to enrich and enlarge the educational experience of their students. But there should be some assurance that at the end the student will possess knowledge and skills, judgment and expertise that he did not have prior to his endeavor.

It is the studied opinion of this writer that EPDA Project ELMEC at Atlanta University was designed to represent a marriage of classroom and field experience, of research and observation, and of subject content and interpersonal
relations—the best of two worlds. But evaluation must be more than opinion. Invested in this program was almost $300,000 of government funds and the major portion of a year out of the lives of more than twenty-six human beings. A vital component of the ELMEC project must be that of asking and answering: What happened? What was said, read, heard, and seen? What was felt? What difference did it make in the participant? Was it worth the investment?

The evaluation of the Atlanta University project in this report is basically one of a participant-observer approach. Admittedly this type of approach to evaluation has built-in bias of data collected because of the self-interest of the participants who are doing the evaluating. Also there is no control situation to provide a benchmark for comparison purposes. However, in spite of the fact that this type of evaluation is not precise from a strictly research standpoint when compared to other types of evaluation approaches, it also has the advantage of stemming from respondents whose interest level is probably much higher than the average respondent in other evaluation processes due to the personal relationship of the respondents to that which was being evaluated. The reader should be aware that data collected are biased due to the personal involvement of the respondents, but that same personal involvement provides an intimacy of information available to the respondents and is an advantage for that reason.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this report, terms used are defined as follows:

EPDA. EPDA is Public Law 90-35, known as the Education Professions Development Act.

ELMEC. ELMEC is the acronym used in this report to refer to the project in Educational Leadership and Mainstreaming Exceptional Children which was funded under Part C of Public Law 90-35.

Module. A module in the ELMEC program was a five-week structured block of time during which the first week was devoted to field experiences and the following four weeks were devoted to presentations by each of four teams, with the fifth team serving as an evaluation team working throughout the module. The ELMEC program was made up of six five-week modules. The time devoted to the work of the modules constituted approximately sixty percent of a total semester course work load, or the equivalent of three courses. Each module covered a separate topic as prescribed in the project proposal and is described in detail in Chapter III.

Change agent. A change agent is a person who initiates and directs the change process as opposed to one who simply lets change happen and reacts to that change in a crisis-oriented mode.

Mainstreaming. Mainstreaming is the process by which exceptional children are educated in a "regular" classroom setting along with nonexceptional children as opposed to
separating them into special classes or special institutions.

**Unobtrusive Measures of Leadership.** The instrument known as the Unobtrusive Measures of Leadership was developed by the ELMEC project director for measuring leadership through indirect, subtle questioning from which implications can be drawn.

**Fellows.** The fellows referred to in this report were the educators who were selected to participate in the ELMEC project at Atlanta University during the 1973-1974 academic year.

**CPI.** The CPI or the California Psychological Inventory is an instrument intended for diagnosis of individuals with an emphasis upon interpersonal behavior and dispositions relevant to social interaction. The test comprises eighteen scales and is used to predict what an individual will do in a specified context and/or to identify individuals who will be described in a certain way.

**FIRO B.** The FIRO B or Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation—Behavior is one of a series of tests for evaluation of interpersonal relationships. The FIRO B is a measure of a person's characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. It is designed not only to measure individual characteristics but also to assess relationships between people, such as compatibility.

**Outside course work.** Course work taken at the University by participants on an individual basis apart from the
ELMEC project but as part of a degree program or for other personal purposes.

Field experiences. Field experiences are those that were part of the ELMEC project and included activities that took place outside of the classroom such as interviews, field trips, on-site observations, and mini-internships.

Internship. An internship is a full-time work experience in an educational setting, five days a week for a quarter or a semester, earning six hours of credit, and under the supervision of a faculty member.

Mini-internship. A mini-internship is a project work experience in an educational setting consisting of at least three hours a day, three days a week for five consecutive weeks or the duration of one project module accomplished under the supervision of the project director.

Organization of the Remainder of the Report

Chapter II reviews related literature. Consistent with the concept of accelerating societal change and its impact on education and, more specifically, consistent with the resulting need for change-oriented educational leaders, it is the intent of the review of literature in this report to cover recent formal programs of educational leadership.

Chapter III describes the modular structure of the ELMEC project and gives an individual abstract of each of the six modules. The information will be drawn from the project proposal as submitted, from the tape recordings of all
sessions of the project, from the documentary written from the recorded sessions, from the individual participants' evaluations of each consultant as well as their individual evaluations of each module and their end-of-year evaluations. Utilization will also be made of the pre-evaluation strategies implemented by the project director such as the CPI, the FIRO B, the Unobtrusive Measures of Leadership, and the evaluation instruments developed for this report. Copies of these instruments are in the appendix.

Chapter IV presents the overall project evaluation itself and summarizes the frequency and percentage of responses on the following evaluation instruments: consultant evaluations, end-of-module reactions by participants, leadership check lists by participants, and the participant end-of-year evaluations.

Chapter V contains a summary of the report by chapters including conclusions drawn from the evaluation process, summaries of the strengths and weaknesses as indicated by participants, conclusions with respect to stated goals and objectives, recommendations for future programs, and the implications of this report.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of the review of literature was to determine if the ELMEC project was in line with other similar programs and research projects underway throughout the country and to determine in what ways the ELMEC project was unique. The review is primarily restricted to studies between 1970 and 1974 and is devoted primarily to formal programs of a minimum of one academic year at the post-masters level which were conducted for the purposes of developing educational leadership. One of the primary considerations in selecting the documents to be included in this chapter was the accelerating need for change-oriented leaders in the educational world and the concommitant need for programs to develop such leaders.

The following general areas were covered:

1. General program objectives
2. Program content
3. Instructional approaches, techniques or structure
4. Evaluation
5. Other EPDA Programs, 1973-1974

For this study a review was made of professional journals and monographs published by such organizations as The National Association of Secondary School Principals, The
National Association of Elementary School Principals, The American Association of School Administrators, The Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, and The University Council for Educational Administration. Also, a review was made of monographs commissioned and published by ERIC and of directors' reports to the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, United States Office of Education, in order to compare or contrast the ELMEC project with others being conducted simultaneously throughout the country.

In recognition of the spreading perception of the need for a new kind of school administrator, the National Association of Secondary School Principals has established a committee to design preparation programs to meet the challenge of the need for change. This committee is known as the Committee of Professors of Secondary School Administration and Supervision (PSSAS). Most of the review of literature apart from ERIC Monographs and project directors' reports came from the work of the members of this committee.

**General Program Objectives**

An ESEA Title III\(^1\) program to improve leadership capabilities of educators was conducted over several years in both actual and model school settings during the years 1966 through 1969. The major purpose was institutional

change and improvement through training in leadership skills for educators who occupy change agent roles. The coordinators of the various phases of the program had the task of assisting teachers and school administrators to become effective change agents. This involved the necessity for participants to learn new skills, alter behavior patterns, adopt different attitudes, and deal with a possibly resistant adult clientele. Advancement toward this goal was commendable and even surprising as the area of education has historically been reluctant to change according to these authors.

Ellis examines the principal in his various roles as an educational leader, personnel manager, and business manager. He reports evidence indicating that the principal's primary role, that of educational leadership, is being eroded as a consequence of the expansion of his other roles. He suggests a readjustment of priorities to set the role of the principal in the proper direction. He found a wide disparity between the priorities the principals rated ideal and the priority they gave to actual tasks they were engaged in. Principals indicated that they preferred to be engaged in supportive instructional tasks and staff motivation and evaluation, while in fact their actual task priorities were office routines and discipline.

A recent educational leadership development program

---

which is described by Ellena and Redfern\(^1\) in a monograph submitted to ERIC was planned for twenty practicing administrators holding degrees in school administration and was conducted at the University of Illinois during the 1969-1970 academic year. Program objectives were to provide administrators with an opportunity under guidance to strengthen and develop conceptual bases and to improve their administrative performance, to develop and utilize programs and resources within the university, and to systematically apply the concepts and theories of educational administration to real problems. The program was not designed as an advanced degree program and the focus was not on a given set of problems. The thrust was on improving the capability of administrators to deal with problems they perceived.

Brain\(^2\) describes a leadership development program at Washington State University. The fact that political processes affecting education are visibly and intensely active today suggests that school administrators need to provide leadership on matters other than educational ones and must function in the political arena in ways that affect the public interest. This was the main idea developed by the Washington program. Educators must go beyond mere reaction to adverse events and must exercise affirmative influence on


educational developments. School administrators must develop ways to take leadership initiative which will get them out of their presently defensive positions. Mere reaction to events will result in deterioration of educational services and administrative organization. Rather than being simply educational leaders, there must be public leadership which implies leading the public to support the additional benefits pupils and communities can derive from improved educational services. Leadership implies much more than management of existing services and resources. This concept is congruent with the ELMEC theme of the educator as an agent of change.

A member of the PSSAS Committee, Martin\(^1\) agrees with Brain that educational leaders must fit their communities and that community involvement is an important component of any leadership development program. Martin conducted a survey to determine the nature of existing programs to prepare school principals and found that variations of programs, content, duration of activities, and instructional methods exist due to a reflection of the varying needs according to geographic location, population density, and social-cultural factors. She contends that there is no justifiable reason for universities to allow their service roles to be fulfilled solely through the consultative services of faculty alone, but should include a planned and academically respectable program that is assured input from the extensive personnel and

physical resources of the institution and the community. The ELMEC project represents an example of blending university and community involvement and resources.

**Program Content**

Members of the PSSAS committee including Wood, Trump, and Nickerson recognize the need for change and point out that as the school scene changes, preparation programs for principals need to change. The challenge of the multiplicity of new education programs to be administered demands that professors of secondary school administration recognize their responsibility to develop optional programs of preparation for principals. Principals need help in developing the skills and knowledge necessary to deal with accountability, student disruption, student involvement, nongraded schools, learning resource centers, individualized instruction, and differentiated staffing.

Nickerson asks if the programs for principals are relevant and suggests the need for the addition of preparation course work for principals in the areas of industrial relations, humanities, political science, and business relations, humanities, political science, and business

---


Johnson described in detail a model developed by PSSAS and outlines ten components of the program to prepare secondary school principals. Of the ten, five of them in particular were stressed in the project at Atlanta University. These five were: developing knowledge of current trends in court decisions involving schools; developing skills in communication; developing ability to initiate and maintain positive human relationships with peers, superiors, and subordinates; developing expertise in systematic problem-solving procedures; and developing an understanding of the effects on children of the socio-economic milieu in which they live and making a commitment to making the school a medium through which they can maximize their backgrounds and talents.

Instructional Approaches, Techniques, Structure

One technique which is being utilized in many of the new programs throughout the country and one that was built into the ELMEC design was that of simulation. In response to the criticism that preparation programs for principals are bookish and out of date, Rasmussen and Hughes strongly recommend simulation as an effective instructional tool. Instructional programs to prepare and upgrade school

---


administrators are not only bookish but are many times irrelevant and impractical. Life is changing so rapidly that traditional methods of lecturing and textbooks are inadequate. New instructional tools such as programmed instruction, mini-courses, internships, workshops, seminars, exchange programs, and many others are being developed in an attempt to bring flexibility, relevancy, reality, and individuality to programs preparing principals. The sharing of various solutions, alternatives, and the exploration of the consequences of various actions is the heart of a simulation experience.

The use of simulation techniques in the ELMEC project was intended to provide an opportunity for students to operationalize theory, receive immediate feedback in a group setting about their decision-making practice, and provide a base from which they could analyze individual administrative styles and the effects thereof in a lifelike situation, thus providing a link between theory and practice.

Wynn, commissioned by ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management to explore programs to prepare education administrators, described the more noteworthy unconventional methods and materials of instruction being used in such preparatory programs.

Wynn also commented that the early 1960s witnessed a movement away from "sterile" to reality-centered methods of

---

instruction and that by 1964 at least sixty-five universities were using simulated materials. Wide applications of other types of reality-oriented instruction quickly followed.

Another technique discussed by Wynn in his study of programs of preparation for education administrators—human relations laboratory training. This technique is spreading to such settings as industries, universities, school systems, and churches. The milieu of study becomes the interpersonal episodes between the trainer and the individuals in the group rather than between the trainer and the organizational and community structures represented earlier. Qualifications of leaders varied so widely that results ranged from extraordinarily helpful to downright dangerous.

Wynn described a program developed at the University of Tennessee for school administrators designed to prepare them to function as change agents in the schools of southern Appalachia. One of the components of that program had the same philosophical base as the ELMEC project—a human relations laboratory which was founded on the premise that those who will function as change agents must be capable of changing themselves, must understand the nature of change, must acquire skills in facilitating change among the people they work with as administrators. It was assumed that human relations training provides a major vehicle for assisting each prospective administrator to understand himself better and to deepen his understanding of his relations with others.
In the study referred to earlier by Nickerson, he stresses the need for human awareness training tailored to the individual's unique strengths, weaknesses, and interests and the measurement of competencies rather than credit hours.

The emphasis of the ELMEC project on the attitudes, the philosophies, and the values of administrators is similar to a research project described by Downs which was designed to determine the effectiveness of laboratory training as a means of training leaders and managers. The project investigates the impact of laboratory training on leadership attitudes and skills and the values affecting these attitudes and skills and the concept of self as a communicator. It also investigated whether this impact differs from the impact of other training methods. The laboratory training, according to the statistical analysis, did influence leadership attitudes, had more significant effect upon the values of participants than did other methods, would be more likely to show effect on self-perceptions than would a more traditional approach.

The Oregon School Study Council describes in a monograph trends evident in relation to public school

1Nickerson, "Status of Programs for Principals."


administration. The first of these trends is the increased emphasis on the importance of adequate interpersonal skills by administrators. The second is the increasing use of sensitivity or laboratory training as a means by which administrators can improve their human relations skills. In the last few years more recognition has been given to human relations in educational organizations. More emphasis is placed on the application of the behavioral sciences to educational problems as well as the traditional training with respect to school buildings, personnel administration, finance, and other courses in school management.

The Oregon School Study Council designed a study to examine the job-related interpersonal behavior changes of elementary school principals as a result of laboratory training. The group showed change toward being considerate to the individual needs of the staff, the use of tact, a more collaborative approach to decision making, increased leadership for improving staff performances, higher group morale, and their schools changed toward more open organizational climates. Credit for the success was given to the intensive assessment of applicants; the individualization of the training; the faculty advisers who demonstrated non-authoritarian, supportive, yet forceful leadership; the solidarity and the forging of strong bonds among adult peers; and actual experience in the field.

Closely allied to laboratory training to develop skills in the area of human relations is the concept of
self-renewal inservice training for administrators.

The PSSAS group stresses not only the need for a new type of preparation for school administrators but also the need for programs that are continuous in nature. One member, Lamb, says that the qualities of administrators' needs have changed: professional development in school administration has broadened in depth as well as design. It has now become a lifelong curriculum process. It is time to redefine the administrative credential concept. Rather than viewing it as a lifetime permit allowing one to operate at certain administrative positions, it must now be seen as an initial license that must be continually renewed in order to remain in the position of administrator.

Lamb goes on to say that the functions and roles of colleges are beginning to take on new forms and new directions. In the final analysis the institutions, through their efforts to assist and design administrative self-renewal for practicing school administrators, are experiencing real and appropriate internal and external pressures for change.

Lamb continues that for educational administration in general the most exciting aspect of all might be the departure of universities from the old traditional approaches to advanced graduate education. Such dynamics of self-renewal are apparent to this writer among faculty and students at Atlanta University, especially in the procedures of

---

such innovative programs as the ELMEC project which brought together faculty and students in a new relationship—one of colleague helping colleague rather than the traditional teacher-to-student transmittal of knowledge.

Evaluation

Both self-evaluation and program evaluation were included in this review of the literature. Any discussion of self-renewal leads naturally into a discussion of the concept of self-evaluation and self-directed growth through inservice. Wood, Trump, and Nickerson all agree that there is not only a need for options but also a need for opportunities to progress at individual rates and for continuous progress of an inservice nature. The traditional college credit concept and certification requirement face complete revision in those universities that wish to initiate such programs.

University vested interests, traditions, and departmental boundary lines are formidable barriers to change and progress. They all agree that the principal must bear the responsibility for the degree of teaching and learning excellence even though most principals tend to become overly concerned with noninstructional operational responsibilities;

1 Wood, "The Challenge of Developing a Model for Principal Education."

2 Trump, "Principal Most Potent Factor in Determining School Excellence."

3 Nickerson, "Status of Programs for Principals."
he is still the principal change agent.

Brandewie, Johnson, and Trump, all members of the PSSAS committee, agree that administrative competencies should be clearly defined and that progress of the individual should be measured in terms of achievement of these competencies rather than time requirements or course requirements. A leadership program should be based on function rather than form or position and training programs should be based on relatively open admissions.

Their recommendation that a significant portion of programs should consist of a large block of time in which students should assume responsibility to plan, organize, execute, and evaluate their own learning activities was reflected in the philosophy and structure of the ELMEC project. They recommend further that the faculty's role should be devoted largely to nontraditional, experience-broadening, innovative activities designed to inspire the group to go beyond custom, tradition, and orthodoxy.

Nickerson in his discussion of programs for principals, which was referred to earlier in this review, also stressed the need for human awareness training tailored to the individual's unique strengths, weaknesses, and interests and the measurement of competencies rather than credit hours. This not only speaks for self-evaluation, entry level

---


2Nickerson, "Status of Programs for Principals."
evaluation, but competency based certification.

With respect to the ongoing component of leadership training programs, Gaskell\(^1\) describes a project which he directed with ten elementary and secondary school principals to select and develop instruments, procedures, and experiences that would help principals become more effective in their leadership roles. The package included leading effective meetings, communicating with others, organizational style, establishing objectives, time stewardship, and problem solving. Gaskell describes the project as one which may never end, at least not for several years. On the basis of these continued experiences, unsuccessful techniques were gradually eliminated and successful ones fed into the ever-developing package. This concept is consistent with the work of the PSSAS committee which contends that the preparation of school administrators must be ongoing.

In the study described earlier by Ellena and Redfern,\(^2\) the concept of self-directedness was one of the main components. This component was also basic to the ELMEC structure. Among the outcomes of the program described by Ellena and Redfern was the conclusion by the participants that meaningless evaluation is ruining educational innovation because of a preoccupation with so-called hard data developed by the


\(^2\)Ellena and Redfern, Illinois Resident Program For Educational Leadership.
mass use of standardized tests.

Martin\textsuperscript{1} pointed out that although much experimentation is going on, there is little apparent evaluation thus far. By contrast the ELMEC project contained an evaluation component in the overall structure. The Oregon\textsuperscript{2} study was one of the few projects found in the literature which is reported to measure the results by using a control group matched with the participants but without the training. The Downs\textsuperscript{3} study was also one of the few projects found in the literature which is reported to have been subjected to a formal evaluation process. Most reports of programs stressing new approaches to school administration preparation slight the evaluative phase of the process.

Johnson,\textsuperscript{4} as a member of PSSAS, reports that the committee recommended that more attention be given to the process of evaluation and also speaks strongly for competency-based certification which must be founded on an evaluation process. The committee recommended that pretesting should determine the student's entry level and selected learning experiences should be based on each student's needs. Course structure should be oriented to individual progress, and off-campus experience should be an integral part of the preparation

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{1}] Martin, "Programs for the Principal."
  \item[\textsuperscript{2}] Thomas, The Effects of Laboratory Training on Elementary Principals: An Evaluation.
  \item[\textsuperscript{3}] Downs, A Study of the Impact of Laboratory Training Upon Concepts of Leadership and Communication.
  \item[\textsuperscript{4}] Johnson, "Implementing the Model."
\end{itemize}
program. In the opinion of this writer, entry level evaluation of strengths and weaknesses to a greater degree would have enhanced the ELMEC program.

Other EPDA Programs

As the review of the literature illustrates, there is an accelerating awareness among educators for the need for new, change-oriented, and ongoing programs of preparation for school administrators. In response to this awareness and demand, the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) has funded many programs throughout the United States.

Directors' reports of twenty-one current programs were available to this writer and the list of fifteen of these funded programs below will give the reader an idea of the scope of the movement currently underway. The programs described were implemented during the 1973-1974 academic year and were selected from the twenty-one because of their similarities to ELMEC.


The purpose of the program was to aid the participants to acquire the knowledges and skills which would enable them to serve as catalysts for changing educational services to exceptional children. Emphasis was placed on knowledge of pertinent legislation. In this respect, there is a strong similarity with the Atlanta University project.

2. "Management for Educational Change in Indian Communities," University of North Dakota.

The major focus was to provide a learning process that

---

utilized pupils, parents, community agencies, and the educational community. Emphasis was placed on Indian law and contemporary issues of Indian education as well as the affect of United States Supreme Court cases on Indian education. Here again is a similarity with the Atlanta University program which devoted considerable attention to the affect of legislation on the educational rights of exceptional children.


The purpose was to involve school personnel together with state and local officials and other citizens to formulate a plan for meeting school needs through legislation.


The major focus of the program was the interrelationship between changes in society at large and changes in education. The central theme of the program shared a common philosophical base with the Atlanta University program—that successful and constructive management of change calls for sensitivity to environmental forces external to the schools and the ability to effect harmonious relationships between goals of educational institutions and the aspirations and expectations of the multiethnic society at large.

5. "Inservice Innovator Program," University of Massachusetts.

This program utilized many of the same techniques of the ELMEC project—seminars, on-site observations, use of local school settings as laboratories. The major emphasis was on the development of innovative instructional techniques not only by administrators but even more so by classroom teachers. In this last respect, there was little similarity with the ELMEC project.


One strong similarity between this program and that at Atlanta University was the effort to recruit participants with a wide diversity of educational background and job placement. It differed markedly, however, in that interpersonal relationships were enhanced by housing all participants in the same setting, and also in that each student was assigned to a different faculty adviser for the project.
Another difference was in the planning of field experiences. The ELMEC project allowed for more self-direction than did the Iowa project. In contrast, the Iowa project assigned the field experiences to each participant to insure that his experiences would not only be different from all other participants' but would also be different from his last job assignment.

7. The Louisville Urban Education Center, Louisville, Kentucky.

This center fielded a program unique in that it combined the resources of two universities, the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville, to comprise an instructional team to conduct a program for the development of competencies by fellows in managing educational change.


The major focus of the project was the development of a cadre of educational specialists in the areas of administration, special education, pupil personnel services, and bicultural education for those institutions which serve multicultural communities. Field experiences were prestructured for each participant similar to the Iowa program with most of the participant work taking place in regular course work. This departs radically from the ELMEC approach.


The program was based on the concept that preparation programs must be designed to be of maximum benefit to the trainees and to the needs of the school systems from which they come. For this reason the recruitment for the program differed sharply from most of the others in this report in that the school systems selected the participants that the systems would send to the program. The program was aimed at the development of competencies necessary for the initiation and development of change back at their home school systems. Another unique feature of this program was the substitution of seminar experience for traditional course credit. Features that were similar to the Atlanta project, however, were the extensive use of local resources, field experiences, and internships in local school systems.

This program was one of the most nearly like the ELMEC project at Atlanta University in that it was devoted to the development of alternative models for serving handicapped children within the public school framework, of administrative strategies for the implementation of change, and of developing knowledge of the legal rights of handicapped children.


The thrust of this program was to tie the resources of the university faculty to the local school community and to develop resource personnel in those local school systems by participation in the project. Major purposes included upward mobility of participants, more visibility of the College of Education to the rest of the university as a preparation group, and more recognition of the university as source of solutions to the problems of the State.


This program was based on the assumption that the development of desired organizational behavior depends upon the development of appropriate organizational environment. Students and faculty planned and learned together in similar settings which served as a substitute for regular graduate courses, and students were freed of normal course structure and course requirements. This approach is similar to the ELMEC approach in that it places the responsibility on the student to discover and remediate his own needs and deficiencies. However, the Atlanta University program was a compromise position between traditional course requirements and none at all. The New York program, probably more than any of the others reported here, adhered to rigid requirements uniformly imposed on all students.


The focus of the program was similar to others in that it emphasized the need for change, the techniques of implementation, and the need to enhance the role of the university in responding to the needs of the local school systems. As in the ELMEC project, classroom instruction and seminars were combined with field experiences and internships.

This program was unique in that it was designed to place women and minority men in a competitive position for upward mobility. A full internship was superimposed on a full load of course requirements. Both were in addition to regularly scheduled seminars. Emphasis was placed on techniques for overcoming racism and sexism.

15. "A Competency Based Training Program For the Principal," Georgia State University,

The focus of the program was the preparation of educational personnel for the principalship in large urban areas, with an emphasis on decentralization of large school systems. The primary difference between this program and that of ELMEC at Atlanta University was that the ELMEC project was not intended to be an internship exclusively although internships were part of the total program whereas half the Georgia State program participants remained in their job positions and the other half joined them on an internship status.

In many respects the ELMEC project shared a common theme with the other programs being funded under EPDA: seminars, field experiences, emphasis on interpersonal relationships, utilization of community resources, blending the resources of the University to the local school systems, emphasis on the need for and management of change. With many programs the ELMEC project shared the objective of focusing on the educational needs and rights of minority groups—handicapped children, Indians, women, blacks, Mexicans—any groups that do not fit the illusive "norm." Some of the programs waived traditional course requirements, some added field experiences in addition to course requirements. The ELMEC project is the only one of those reported here that utilized the technique of allowing students the self-direction
of determining their own deficiencies, satisfying these deficiencies through the operation of the project, translating their accomplishments into traditional course credits, and then rounding out degree programs with selected traditional courses in the curriculum. The Atlanta University program seems to be the only one representing this unique compromise of innovation and traditional approaches to degree programs. It should be remembered, however, that the purpose of the ELMEC project was not primarily for each participant to complete a degree, although it was expected that the earning of a degree should have been enhanced by the participation.

The review by this writer revealed that very few of the leadership development programs under way in the country during recent years have as yet been described in the professional literature. It could be speculated that although there is widespread experimentation in nontraditional approaches to leadership training with a concentration on the concept of educational leaders as change agents, there has not yet been sufficient scientific research of an evaluative nature to allow any claims to be made with respect to the development of models. Since curriculum change and organizational change must begin with attitudinal and value change on the part of administrators, and since these variables prove difficult to measure, the ultimate effectiveness of programs may have to depend upon empirical evidence through follow-up studies which have not yet been completed.
In their review of literature concerning the preparation of educational leaders, Farquhar and Piele\textsuperscript{1} comment that relatively neglected components of programs of preparation are program structure, student research, graduation requirements, and program evaluation and development. They also comment that within the literature the field-related internship is the only activity that receives much attention. They point out that the majority of published statements are relatively imprecise and general with much repetition of broad platitudes but little explicit analysis of trends and needs, and that most statements are largely negative in tone which is indicative that it is easier to be critical than constructive. In explaining the lack of recent literature devoted to the preparation of school administrators, they comment that apparently authors writing about administrator preparation either have chosen not to accept the greater challenge of constructiveness or have been overly modest in reporting their achievements and offering their solutions. They conclude that the literature tends to be selective in focus, general in nature, negative in attitude, and altogether scarce. Most of the literature reviewed by these two authors was written prior to 1969.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION AND SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The first two weeks of the ELMEC project were devoted to orientation, primarily conducted by the program director, in order to structure the year's work and to direct the group in the development of personal goals and objectives. Each participant was asked to determine his individual goals that would be served by the ELMEC program. The director stressed that no person needed to be embarrassed by the ambitiousness of his goal; that within each person lies a desire to be in a helping relationship with others, to be in a position to render a real service to others, a Messianic impulse, and that if this were not true, members of the program group would not be administrators or seeking administrative positions. The director pointed out that the components of the program should include field experiences, review of literature, use of resources and consultants, and that perhaps one of the most important components should be that of evaluation. In setting forth the goals of the project, the director stressed his expectation that as the responsibility for evaluation rotated from team to team each member would develop an acceptance of constructive evaluation. As a result the fellow would be open to such evaluation from those whom he would serve as administrator without a feeling of hostility,

\[1\] Thompson, Journal For The Fellowship Program In Educational Leadership.
negative reaction, or threat. The major theme of the program was developmental rather than research. Seeking better ways of doing things was approached by observation, by experience, by study, but not by controlled experimentation as is done in a research oriented project.¹

Part of the orientation activities included a simulation of the program for community and professional involvement. The twenty-five members of the ELMEC group assumed roles of students, business men, educators, and other kinds of citizens. Each individual was given a sheet of educational goals to interpret according to the role he was playing. Each person assigned a value to each stated educational goal as interpreted through the eyes of the role he had assumed. Values were debated and priorities changed. If any individual was successful in influencing other members of his subgroup, these values were changed. This activity not only resulted in members beginning to examine their own values, goals, and priorities, but the activity itself served to personalize the relationships of the individuals within the program group.

During this two-week orientation portion the program director emphasized that it was important for each member somewhere along the line to approach his broad goals with a series of possibilities; for example, did a group member always want to be a principal and, if not, then what? According to the talents and energies of each what would be the best place for each to be in the structure of education, and what road would be best to reach the destination? He

¹Ibid.
reminded group members that higher positions in the educational structure throughout the nation are opening up. Fellows should think in terms of long-range goals, as well as immediate goals, and should analyze strengths and weaknesses as they relate to goals. This process is, of necessity, an individual and personal activity.

One of the objectives of the ELMEC program was for the fellows, on an individual basis, to examine their personal philosophies in order to recognize that before one can become a change agent he must accept the possibility of a need for personal change. A change agent must be change oriented with respect to himself before he can influence change in other people. Consistent with this objective, the director of the ELMEC program administered several instruments to the fellows in order to contribute to their self-understanding and to provide a benchmark for their future use in evaluating what changes might take place within themselves. Two instruments were used for this purpose, the California Psychological Inventory (CPI),\textsuperscript{1} and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behavior (FIRO-B).\textsuperscript{2}

The CPI is intended for diagnosis and evaluation of normal individuals with an emphasis upon interpersonal behavior and dispositions relevant to social interaction. The CPI


comprises eighteen scales, the purpose of which is to predict what an individual will do in a specified context and/or to identify individuals who can be described in a certain way. The eighteen scales include dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, sense of well-being, responsibility, socialization, self-control, tolerance, good impression, communality, achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological-mindedness, flexibility, and femininity.

The FIRO-B is a measure of a person's characteristic behavior toward other people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. It is designed not only to measure individual characteristics but also to assess relationships between people, such as compatibility. The Firo-B has two primary purposes: (1) to measure how an individual acts in interpersonal situations, and (2) to provide an instrument that will facilitate the prediction of interaction between people. These scales are designed not only for individual assessment but also to measure characteristics in such a way that scores of two or more people may be combined to predict their interaction.

A faculty member from the Department of Guidance and Counseling compared the results of the two instruments administered to the ELMEC fellows with the results of other University students in programs of school administration and counseling. He reported that the fellows as a group were significantly higher on:
1. Expressed control (FIRO-B)
2. Dominance (CPI)
3. Capacity for status (CPI)
4. Sociability (CPI)
5. Sense of well-being (CPI)
6. Responsibility (CPI)
7. Tolerance (CPI)
8. Psychological-mindedness (CPI)

In preparing to structure the modules the theme was defined as "Competencies." In one view there are three basic levels of skills. The first level is familiarity. In behavioral objective terms "the student will achieve an understanding of . . ." represents the second level, or indicates that the individual knows how it operates. The third level is application. Can the individual supply the application when needed. There are three different kinds of skills for administrators: technical skills, or can a person handle the mechanics of his position; human skills, or can the person deal with people; and conceptual skills, or does the person know what it is all about.¹

Several assumptions were provided by the director in structuring the subgroups or teams for the modules:

1. A short module of rather intense activity has some advantage over one that is spread out over a

longer period of time and mixing it with other things.

2. Any module that has a field experience segment built into it is better than just a classroom experience.

3. Students given the opportunity will rise to the situation and their cooperative enterprise will come up with something better than that of one individual alone.

4. Every person should have an opportunity to experience the kinds of activity that are going on.

5. There should be some type of continuous evaluation.

   One of the purposes of the program was for each participant to develop a personal philosophy and determine how it relates to personal goals. Where does that person intend going from here? What does the person hope to be doing five years from now? It is difficult to determine this but once it is established then what are the areas of concern that are related to that particular goal? What are the skills, knowledge, behavioral characteristics that go to make for success in that particular goal? Then the participant should begin to do research in those particular areas. As each person read, participated, observed, he needed to come to grips with his own personal commitment, which very well might be expected to change as well as or along with a change in goals. Each person was to deal with that which was most
important—his individual future.

As part of the orientation, the task of evaluation was discussed. It was pointed out that evaluation in connection with research models is usually based on pre- and posttests and other instruments that can be explicitly spelled out. However, in recent years evaluators in the country are beginning to recognize that evaluation cannot be thought of as simple and there are numerous evaluative tools that evaluators must use. Actually evaluators are now saying that using direct processes, instruments, and observations is not necessarily the only way that one can get at the problem. In fact, in some situations one cannot get at the problem by this route at all. Sometimes unobtrusive measures are the most effective. A researcher is not likely to get a valid response to a questionnaire distributed among a faculty asking how effective the administrator is. But there are other ways that a person can be able to get at the truth. For example, faculty members might be asked how the principal responds to the way teachers present ideas. A whole rationale of questions could be developed around the point of finding out how good an administrator is without ever asking that particular question.

The five-week module approach providing for a week out in the field followed by four weeks of analysis and evaluation constituted a practicum approach. The practicum approach included interviews and seminars with consultants such as superintendents, principals, State Department staff
members, personnel specialists, teachers, supervisors, consultants, and Atlanta University faculty members. The field approach involved consulting all kinds of persons concerning their philosophies, their frustrations, their innovative ideas, how they felt, and what their hopes and dreams were.

The ELMEC program was organized into six five-week modules, or seminar/workshops. These modules were the heart of the year's work in which the dominant theme of the program, educational leadership and mainstreaming for exceptional children, was directed. The general five-week themes that were explored were as follows:

**Module One.** The importance of a personal philosophy and theoretical framework for effective administration including planning, decision making, and management

**Module Two.** Systems, systems analysis, and organizational change

**Module Three.** Instructional alternatives

**Module Four.** Exceptional children in the schools/mainstreaming

**Module Five.** Legislation and judicial and executive decisions governing exceptional children

**Module Six.** Wrap up and evaluation

As previously stated in Chapter I, several important outcomes were expected of this design: (1) field experience geared to the interests of the fellows, (2) positive team effort, (3) in-depth review of the literature, (4) development of action research, and (5) strength in evaluation.
The project proposal set forth certain module prescriptions. It was anticipated that each module would:

1. Provide training in a cluster of competencies relevant to a major function of an educational administrator

2. Be comprised of several module components which could, under appropriate circumstances, be combined with module components from other modules to form a new module

3. Be based on performance objectives and designed to allow for self-evaluation

4. Be oriented primarily toward field experiences

5. Be capable of providing alternative approaches for the trainee in the development of competencies within the structure of the module

A training module was perceived as an organized plan providing the framework for experiences intended to aid trainees in achieving competence in a set of major tasks appropriate to the role of an educational administrator.

The execution of the module components depended upon the competencies which each individual was seeking to develop, the plans which the teams or a particular individual devised for satisfying individual needs, and the availability of human and material resources.

In order to be effective a training module needed to be sufficiently specific in order to demonstrate an individual's skill in carrying out a function of the role within identified
contexts. Further, the module was designed to be able to address itself to the kind of skill (technical, human, conceptual) employed, as well as the level (familiarity, understanding, application) at which it should have been applied.

The various competencies to be developed through the module needed to have identifiable direct relationships with the kinds of activities pursued. Entry and exit behavior needed to be clearly delineated. Evaluation, both by each participant and by others, was a critical component of each module.

**Modular Structure**

The twenty-five fellows were organized into five-member teams. Each team spent at least one week at the beginning of each module assembling the evidence of field experience and other research in the given area designated for each module. The arrangement functioned in the following manner:

**Module One. Theme - Personal Philosophy**

- **Week 1:** Field experiences
- **Week 2:** All teams selected and examined evidence in the area of personal philosophy. This took place through observations, interviews, and other field-oriented contacts. Concurrently, members reviewed the literature for key concepts and adequate interpretations.
- **Week 3:** Team One presented an integration of their
findings and transferred their experiences through self-selected techniques to the others with a focus on COGNITIVE INPUT, i.e., how theory and practice blend in the actual field situation. This was an overview to which all reacted.

Week 4: Team Two took the second step with presentation of the results of study with a focus on the MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES implicit in the activities centering around the theme of personal philosophy.

Week 5: Team Three presented and interpreted evidence of the EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES inherent in the area of personal philosophy.

Week 6: Team Four examined the evidence with focus on RESEARCH ASPECTS, i.e., the techniques used in research of the area of personal philosophy by experts, the adequacy of present research, some ideas on further research which could help verify or clarify the area of personal philosophy.

Weeks 2-6: Team Five, throughout the entire module, assessed the activity of each team's efforts and presented its evidence of that team's effectiveness, completeness of coverage, and appropriateness. It identified the kinds of leadership displayed, summarized the learnings effected, projected further possibilities of study and activity in the area of personal philosophy.

Module Two. Theme - Systems, Systems Analysis, and
Organizational Change

Week 1: Field experience

Week 2: All teams selected and examined evidence in the area of systems, systems analysis, and organizational change. This was the field experience time allowance.

Week 3: Team Five examined the COGNITIVE INPUT approach to the theme of the module.

Week 4: Team One explored the MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES approach to the theme of the module.

Week 5: Team Two interpreted the EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES approach to the theme of the module.

Week 6: Team Three identified the RESEARCH ASPECTS of the theme of the module.

Weeks 2-6: Team Four throughout the entire module moved into the EVALUATION position with respect to the work of the other teams concerning the theme of the module.

During the third and subsequent modules the teams continued to shift their roles in order for all to have experience with each approach to a module theme (overview, management strategies, educational strategies, and research) and each would have experience in the evaluation process. The rotation structure provided leadership opportunities for all. Among activities which were used and evaluated were role playing, psychodrama, gaming, on-site activities, computer simulations, seminars, and systematic observations. Attitudinal changes
and behavioral changes were evaluated by self-evaluation techniques, faculty-student conferences, and students' reactions to each other.

In the following outline of each module, the purpose is to provide a concept of the scope and variety of activities and experiences developed through the program rather than a specific account of the content itself. Such an account is available in great detail in a companion document to this study;¹ the companion document prepared by this writer is a day-by-day journal which is a transcript of the daily tape recordings of all sessions of the program and includes copies of all materials distributed to the fellows throughout the year. The journal consists of five volumes and is available to any reader for the complete content and proceedings of the entire year of the ELMEC program. This journal is available through the project director.

The outline below is presented for three primary purposes: (1) to illustrate the proceedings of the modular structure of the project, (2) to show the scope and variety of activities utilized by the subgroups as they dealt with each prescribed module theme from the five approaches as outlined in the project proposal, and (3) to give the reader insight to the diversity and quality of the consultants recruited by the participants. The outline begins after the initial first two weeks of orientation conducted by the ¹

¹Thompson, *Journal For The Fellowship Program In Educational Leadership*. 
project director. During those first two weeks the group met daily from three to four hours per day. During these two weeks of orientation the subgroups were formed.

**Module One**

**Theme:** The Development of a Personal and Administrative Philosophy

**Modular Structure:**

First Week - Field Experiences by all participants
Second Week - Overview/Cognitive Input by Group One
Third Week - Management Strategies by Group Two
Fourth Week - Educational Strategies by Group Three
Fifth Week - Research by Group Four
Second through Fifth Week - Evaluation by Group Five

**Activities:**

Daily seminars of total group two hours a day, three days a week
Book review, *Crises In The Classroom*, Charles Silberman
Simulation centered around biracial problem solving within a school system
Role playing involving negotiations to avoid teacher strike
Film on open classroom concept
Simulation in small groups concerning case studies involving problem solving at the administrative level
Review of literature concerning educational research
Skit demonstrating how administrators and teachers impose their philosophy on those who are taught
Simulation by use of Bonanza Game to practice development of administrative priorities
Demonstration of effect of design of physical plant on an instructional program
Demonstration of research project involving evaluation of school principals

**Consultants:**

Executive Administrator, Area Office of Economic Opportunity, Atlanta
Assistant Superintendent, Personnel, Local School System
Coordinator for Gifted, Local School System
Dean, School of Education, Atlanta University
Representative, Regional Office, National Education Association
Director of Elementary Curriculum, Local School System
Summary of Module Evaluation:

1. The total group needs to plan the objectives for the entire module so that the goals may be evaluated.

2. One weekly evaluation would be more effective than a daily one.

3. Some time needs to be spent on understanding the difference between behavioral and enabling objectives in education.

4. A "break" of from three to five days should be allowed between the end of one module and the beginning of the next.

5. The evaluation instruments lacked specificity and contained considerable ambiguity.

6. Time should be allowed at the beginning of an entire project for the development of an evaluation instrument that can be used by all teams.

Module Two

Theme: Systems, Systems Analysis, and Organizational Change

Modular Structure:

First Week - Field Experiences by all participants
Second Week - Overview/Cognitive Input by Group Five
Third Week - Management Strategies by Group One
Fourth Week - Educational Strategies by Group Two
Fifth Week - Research by Group Three
Second through Fifth Week - Evaluation by Group Four

Activities:

Field trip to Fort McPherson to Data Processing Center and army use of systems approach
Simulation activity working through an educational bureaucracy
Writing of goals of school systems at all management levels in behavioral objective terms
Presentation of a model for developing an information system for a school system through computerization
Field trip to Data Processing Center for local school system
Skit utilizing systems approach to problem solving, the problem being the improvement of the remainder of ELMEC

Consultants:
Director of Student Transfers, Local School System
Three Consultants for Early Childhood Education, Local School System
Executive Director Learning Resources, Local School System
Instructor, Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning use of PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique), CPM (Critical Path Method), MBO (Management by Objectives), PPBES (Planning, Programming, Budgeting, Evaluation Systems), Information Networks, and Information Systems; how all were used in planning development of Polaris submarine; and how all could be used in school systems
Program Management Specialist from Teacher Corps Project, Local School System
Director of Research and Information, Local School System
Director of Pupil Services and Student Computerized Information System, Local School System
Technician, Data Processing Center, Local School System
Administrative Assistant to Superintendent, Local School System, on organizational change

Evaluation: The fellows responded to open-ended questions concerning recommendations for improvement and these are summarized below.

1. Objectives of a presentation should be clearly stated at the beginning of each individual presentation by any group.

2. Parameters for discussion should be set to prevent "wandering."

3. There should have been some preassessment of participants' knowledge of systems approach.

4. All presentations would be improved if members would arrive on time and avoid private conversations during presentations.

5. More in-depth study of systems approach is needed.

6. The evaluation forms were confusing as the evaluation response scale did not fit all of the items in the same direction from excellent to poor.
7. The WEB simulation game is valuable enough to warrant the time of an entire course; it is a dynamic experience.

8. Too much material was planned for too short a period of time.

9. Daily evaluations should be discontinued and weekly evaluations substituted.

Module Three

Theme: Education of Exceptional Children/Mainstreaming

Modular Structure:

First Week - Field Experiences by all participants
Second Week - Overview/Cognitive Input by Group One
Third Week - Management Strategies by Group Two
Fourth Week - Educational Strategies by Group Four
Fifth Week - Research by Group Five
Second through Fifth Week - Evaluation by Group Three

Activities:

- Panel discussion by consultants from local school system including home instructor, coordinator for visually handicapped, coordinator for learning disabilities, two supervisors of special education, and a doctoral student serving internship in Georgia legislature
- Films, "A Different Drummer," "And Then Came Spring," and "To Find The Way," all dealing with case studies of exceptional children
- Slide presentation concerning job training and job placement for educable mentally retarded children and adults

Consultants:

- Professor, Atlanta University, Educational Research and History of Education of Exceptional Children
- Two Teachers, who had themselves been educated in programs for gifted children
- Associate Superintendent in Charge of Operations, Local School System
- Special Help Teacher, Local School System
- Speech Clinician, Local School System
- Special Education Consultant, State Department of Education
- Consultant for Visually Impaired, Local School System
- Consultant for Auditorily Impaired, Local School System
- Two Consultants for Crippling Handicaps, Local School System
School Superintendent, Local School System

Evaluation: A summary of answers to open-ended questions is presented below.

1. There needs to be a reevaluation of the time allotted for module presentations.

2. Too much material was presented to the group at one time. The number of topics needs to be shortened and more time devoted to each.

3. The group was kept in chairs in one room for long periods of time. Activities need to be interspersed with lecture type presentations in shorter time intervals to prevent fatigue.

4. There seemed to be some confusion on the part of presentors concerning terms used in special education. They seemed to use interchangeably such terms as "mild learning disabilities," "general learning disabilities," "EMR," and "mild retardation."

5. More consultants who are actively involved in programs for exceptional children would have enriched the presentations.

6. The open-ended type of evaluation forms is an improvement over the attempt to produce some type of statistical analysis without the careful development of an instrument to do so.

Module Four

Theme: Legislative and Judicial Process as Related to Exceptional Children

Modular Structure:

First Week - Field Experiences by all participants
Second Week - Overview/Cognitive Input by Group Four
Third Week - Management Strategies by Group Five
Fourth Week - Educational Strategies by Groups One and Three
Fifth Week - Research by Groups One and Three
Second through Fifth Week - Evaluation by Group Two

Activities:

Presentation of history of development of education for exceptional children
Mock trial
Field trip to local elementary school known for outstanding program for exceptional children
Study of implications of APEG for exceptional children

Consultants:

Consultant, Educational Improvement Council of Georgia Consultant, Georgia Legislative Assembly, Committee on Education
State Coordinator of Physically Handicapped Consultant for Special Education, Local School System Professor, Atlanta University, on Georgia law and education of the handicapped Assistant Superintendent for Supportive Service, Local School System Professor of Special Education, Atlanta University

Evaluation: At the end of Module IV the evaluating team collected and compiled the comments, suggestions, and recommendations of the fellows. Many of the comments are similar to those made at the end of the first three modules and will not be repeated here to avoid duplication. Only those comments not previously made are shown below.

1. Role playing exercises were well executed and constituted a very good introduction to legal process.

2. More time should be allowed for group interaction.

3. This was one of the better sessions that we have had this year.

4. The information was relevant and the speakers were right on target.

Modules Five and Six

(The last two modules were combined in the ELMEC project in order to provide more field experiences for the fellows in the form of mini-internships.)

Theme: Field Experiences and Project Evaluation

Modular Structure: At this point in the project, the modular structure was modified by the group at large in order to allow maximum time out in the field. A weekly seminar of one eight-hour day was utilized for the purpose of providing individual members the opportunity to share their experiences in the field. The first week the group discussed its experiences from the view of cognitive input; the second week, management strategies; the third week,
curriculum strategies; the fourth week, research; and the last week, evaluation. During the last week the seminars were held for three hours each evening for five consecutive evenings.

Activities: Listed below are the mini-internship field experiences of the fellows.

1. Two fellows worked in the office of student transfers in a large local school system facing the problems of court order compliance for desegregation.

2. Two fellows worked in a supervisory capacity with the teachers of an early childhood and day care program for children ages thirty-three months to forty-eight months.

3. One fellow shared the experience of how the innovative architectural design of a large high school can be made consistent with an open classroom concept of instruction.

4. One fellow worked in a program known as PEACHI (Program for Early Childhood Intervention).

5. One fellow worked in a school system's central office for Research and Development, working particularly with a research project underway in a large federally funded housing project devoted primarily to working with the parents of preschool children.

6. One fellow served as an assistant to a coordinator for special education and as a resource person for Vocational Rehabilitation.

7. One fellow served an internship in the Division of Pupil Personnel Services, Special Education Section.

8. One fellow served as an assistant in the Central Office of Operations for a local school system.

9. One fellow served as an assistant to the principal of a local high school.

10. Two fellows' mini-internships in supervision were implemented by supervising the other fellows on their mini-internships.

11. One fellow served in a school system's central office writing job descriptions for administrative positions.

12. One fellow served in a central office in charge of Title I funds.
13. One fellow served at a local elementary school in the early childhood program.

**Evaluation:** Modules Five and Six were combined for the final weeks of the ELMREC project in order to provide more time for field experiences and mini-internships, with the entire group meeting primarily for sharing purposes. It was, therefore, difficult for the evaluation teams for Modules Five and Six to develop any type of instrument for a formal evaluation. In lieu of this, the evaluation teams served as "supervisors" to visit the other fellows during their field experiences and mini-internships. Their observations were shared orally with the group at large at their seminar meetings and no formally published evaluation was prepared or distributed. This procedure in itself provided a type of mini-internship in supervision for the members of the evaluating teams.

**Organization of the Evaluation**

At the end of each module, the director of the project distributed to each fellow three evaluative instruments: (1) an end-of-module reaction to the activities of the module (See Appendix D.); (2) an end-of-module reaction to the field experiences of the module (See Appendix E.); and (3) a leadership check list (See Appendix F.). The reaction instruments were for the purpose of allowing each fellow to express his assessment of the effectiveness of the activities and field experiences as they developed and to make ongoing recommendations for project modification. A summary of these reactions will be presented in Chapter IV. The leadership check list allowed each participant to measure and evaluate evidences of his own leadership and thus enabled him to measure his own growth. These check lists are summarized and included in Chapter IV.

For the purposes of this study the writer developed
several instruments to be used at the end of the project for evaluation. These instruments constituted a "wrap-up" evaluation to express overall reaction to the project in contrast to the ongoing evaluation that was used throughout the project. The first was an evaluation of the project with respect to how well the project met the anticipated goals (See Appendix G.); the second instrument was an evaluation of the project with respect to how well each student met his/her own objectives (See Appendix H.); the third was an evaluation of the project with respect to the project activities (See Appendix I.); the fourth was an evaluation of the use of consultants (See Appendix J.); and the last was a series of questions (See Appendices K-M.) by which the fellows could react to the project as a total experience, state perceived strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for future projects. These end-of-year instruments are summarized by frequency of responses; percentage of responses; and highlighting the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. Chapter IV provides an overall summary and conclusions derived from both the ongoing and the end-of-year evaluations of the project.
CHAPTER IV

PROJECT EVALUATION

There are numerous forms of evaluation that can be utilized for any program or project. In the original design of the ELMEC project, no specific performance objectives were included. Since objectives and goals were stated in broad terms and since individual participants were expected to adapt these broad goals to their own specific objectives on an individual basis, the program itself could not appropriately be evaluated with a pretest and posttest technique. This approach may have been utilized in the evaluation of each participant, but was not selected for the overall evaluation represented by this study.

Of the many types of evaluation approaches used by various researchers, this writer elected to use data collected from the participants expressing their perceptions of the project as measured by its effects on themselves as professional educators and as human beings. Conclusions will be drawn from these statements as an effort to provide some guidelines to others in planning similar leadership training programs either at the university level or at local school inservice levels.

As outlined in Chapter I, the data were collected from the participants on several instruments. Those
instruments which were developed by the project director are:

- End-of-Module Reactions to Activities
- End-of-Module Reactions to Field Experiences
- Leadership Check Lists

Those instruments which were developed by this writer for specific use in this report are as follows:

- End-of-Year Evaluation of Project Goals
- End-of-Year Evaluation of Student Objectives
- End-of-Year Evaluation of Activities and Experiences
- End-of-Year Evaluation of Consultants
- Participant Recommendations

The data from these instruments will be presented in the order in which they are listed above.

**End-of-Module Reactions to Activities**

At the end of each module the participants were asked by the director to submit reaction statements to the module on forms provided for this purpose. These statements were divided on the instrument into five categories: Overview of the Module, Management Strategies as Related to Module Topic, Educational Strategies as Related to Module Topic, Research, and Evaluation Throughout Module. These responses were subdivided by this writer into two groups: those responses which indicated satisfaction on the part of the respondent to the activity, and those responses which offered a recommendation for revision, expansion, or elimination of the activity. In each category there was a total of 144 possible
responses. These responses were collected at the end of each module and reflected the reactions of the respondent to the activities of that module. Each respondent was reacting from the position that he and his team held at the time that the responses were made, which occurred at intervals of six weeks throughout the project.

The table below shows how many and what percentage of the responses in each category were judged by the writer to indicate satisfaction and how many were judged to be a perceived weakness or a recommendation for improvement.

### Reaction to Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Need for Improvement</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>84 (74%)</td>
<td>29 (26%)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>68 (66%)</td>
<td>35 (14%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>84 (71%)</td>
<td>35 (29%)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>81 (72%)</td>
<td>31 (28%)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>80 (66%)</td>
<td>41 (34%)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### End-of-Module Reactions to Field Experiences

Reactions to field experiences by participants were also divided into the same five categories on the instrument and again there were 144 possible responses. These responses were also divided into those indicating satisfaction and those indicating a need for improvement. The table below shows
the numerical and percentage breakdown of these responses.

**Reaction to Field Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Need for Improvement</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>62 (65%)</td>
<td>33 (35%)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>69 (65%)</td>
<td>37 (35%)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>73 (68%)</td>
<td>34 (32%)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>83 (67%)</td>
<td>37 (31%)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>73 (65%)</td>
<td>39 (35%)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Check Lists**

At the end of each module each fellow indicated leadership activities that he felt he had demonstrated during the module, how well he had executed them, and how satisfying these activities had been. There were 539 separate responses such as "writing behavioral objectives for the group," "coordinating team efforts," or "serving as chairman of the steering committee." The results of the check list are tabulated below.

**How Well Executed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Satisfying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unmarked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End-of-Year Evaluations

During the closing days of the project, each fellow was asked to complete several evaluation instruments which were developed by this writer: evaluation of the goals, the objectives, activities, and the consultants. They were also asked by the writer to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project and to make recommendations for future projects. Twenty-three of the fellows completed the evaluations and these are summarized below.

Evaluation of Project Goals

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of responses of the twenty-three respondents to the first eleven questions asked. The twelfth question was provided for the respondent to add other goals that may have been met by the project. The goals on the table have been listed in descending order according to the number of responses which evaluated that goal in either of the top two scales, number 4 or number 5. The table reveals that only 39 out of 253 responses were scored lower than the number 4 scale. Of the eleven goals listed, eight of them were evaluated in the top two scales by at least 78 percent or more of the respondents. Goals dealing with curriculum development and faculty training which would be needed for mainstreaming exceptional children and the examination of instructional techniques were perceived as less effectively implemented.

Goals not listed on the instrument which various
TABLE 1

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH
RESPECT TO PROJECT GOALS

On the check list below are the goals of the ELMEC project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "0" to "5" with "0" indicating that the goal was not reached at all ranging upward to "5" indicating that the goal was fully met. Participants were asked to indicate on the scale to what degree the project goals were met.

This chart tabulates the frequency and percentage of responses by the fellows to the items on the evaluation instrument. Under each scale the upper figure is the frequency and the lower figure is the percentage.

The goals are listed in descending order beginning with those indicating the highest percentage of responses in the top two scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of pertinent legislation covering the protections and educational development of exceptional children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understanding of the process of change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understanding of the place of the administrator in organizing for and directing change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of judicial decisions, at both the State and Federal levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowledge of the ability to place such decisions in proper context for the local setting with research on ways such legislation can be more effectively implemented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Examination of instructional techniques so that the administrator understands the different possibilities for mainstreaming the vast majority of youngsters with handicaps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understanding of the techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and strategies for executing change</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding of systems theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Examination of the development of techniques for staff and faculty inservice education so that all children will have the benefits of knowledgeable and able teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Examination of the different newer approaches in curriculum design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Examination of practices in the actual working out of these newer approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fellows listed as having been met through the project included: development of group dynamics, development of interpersonal relations, examination of self and the development of a personal philosophy, improvement of supervisory competencies, and development of a positive attitude toward the concept of administrative teams.

**Evaluation of Project Objectives**

Table 2 summarizes the evaluation of objectives. The objectives are listed in descending order beginning with those indicating the highest percentage of responses in the top two scales. Of those objectives, the fellows indicated a unanimous agreement that all students participated in the evaluation of the training and there was also consensus that each student had developed a commitment to serve every child adequately within the purview of his responsibility. Of the 207 responses, 192 (92 percent) indicate students' beliefs that they satisfied these objectives at the 87 percent level or above, with 151 (73 percent) of them estimating satisfaction at the highest level. Only fifteen responses indicate objectives were met at relatively low levels. None of the stated objectives failed to be ranked number 5 by at least one-third of the group; in fact, the lowest ranking of any objective was marked number 5 by 48 percent of the group; this objective stated that the student had developed an effective learning theory. Based on this instrument, it could be concluded that all of the individual objectives of
TABLE 2

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT OBJECTIVES

On the check list below are the student objectives of the ELMEC project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "0" to "5" with "0" indicating that the objective was not met at all ranging upward to "5" indicating that the objective was fully met. Participants were asked to indicate on the scale to what degree the project objectives were met.

This chart tabulates the frequency and percentage of responses by the fellows to the items on the evaluation instrument. Under each scale the upper figure is the frequency and the lower figure is the percentage.

Objectives are listed in descending order beginning with those indicating the highest percentage of responses in the top two scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Participated in the evaluation of the training
   23 100%

2. Developed a commitment to serve every child adequately within the purview of his/her responsibility
   1 22 4% 95%

3. Developed an understanding of and developed a commitment to mainstreaming
   1 2 20 4% 9% 87%

4. Demonstrated skills in actual experiential settings
   1 5 17 4% 22% 74%

5. Developed a personal philosophy undergirded with a value system which includes recognition of the dignity and worth of each individual
   1 4 18 4% 17% 78%

6. Learned the judicial and legislative decisions governing exceptional children and the methods of implementing and augmenting such decisions
   2 8 13 9% 35% 56%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fellows were reached to a high degree of satisfaction.

Additional objectives that were added by the respondents included:

- Developed the ability to put more faith, care, and responsibility on subordinates
- Achieved in the area of group process
- Developed knowledge in the area of computer assisted instruction
- Developed an appreciation for experiential learning
- Developed a commitment to group process
- Developed an awareness of and an appreciation for the value systems of others
- Developed an awareness of the value of interpersonal relationships

**Evaluation of Project Activities**

In ranking the project activities Table 3 indicates that there was a wider diversity of responses than in ranking either the goals or the objectives where a considerable level of agreement was observable. The activities rankings were more scattered with "on-site participation" the only activity ranked "5" by as much as 78 percent of the group; 74 percent of the group ranked "on-site observation" at the highest level. Items dealing with recording through journals and letters, and items concerning presentations by use of audio-visual equipment were ranked as being successful at the highest level by only 30 percent of the respondents.

Overall, 328 of the 391 responses (84 percent) to the quality of the activities were checked at the 80 percent
TABLE 3

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVITIES AND EXPERIENCES

On the check list below are the activities of the ELMEC project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "1" to "5" with "1" indicating poor quality of the activity and "5" indicating excellent quality of the activity. The participants were asked to indicate on the scale the quality of each activity of the project.

This chart tabulates the frequency and percentages of responses by the fellows to the items on the evaluation instrument. Under each scale the upper figure is the frequency and the lower figure is the percentage.

Within each category the items are listed in descending order beginning with those indicating the highest percentage of responses in the top two scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category One:**

1. On-site observations
   - Frequency: 6
   - Percentage: 26%
   - Quality: 17%

2. Workshops
   - Frequency: 1
   - Percentage: 4%
   - Quality: 35%

3. On-site participation
   - Frequency: 1
   - Percentage: 4%
   - Quality: 17%

4. Seminars
   - Frequency: 1
   - Percentage: 4%
   - Quality: 9%

**Category Two:**

5. Recording interviews
   - Frequency: 2
   - Percentage: 9%
   - Quality: 17%

6. Recording letters
   - Frequency: 3
   - Percentage: 13%
   - Quality: 26%

7. Recording journals
   - Frequency: 1
   - Percentage: 4%
   - Quality: 13%
### TABLE 3 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Three:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Recording through other various kinds of evaluative instruments including audio and visual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Analysis of activities and experiences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Four:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Simulation/gaming exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Simulation/role playing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Simulation/open-ended audiovisual presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Simulation/case studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Five:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Group process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Classroom activities/ course work in the School of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Transactional analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level or higher, but only 199 (51 percent) of these ranked the activities at the highest level. Thirteen percent (fifty responses) were checked in the midcolumn and 3 percent in the lowest two columns. Twelve items received an 80 percent or better rating and eight of these show 50 percent or more at the highest level.

**Evaluation of Consultants**

As can be seen on Table 4, the consultants to the project fared well in the respondents' evaluations. There was a consistent indication that consultants were well prepared, clear, stimulating, well timed, well organized, and above average. The quality of the consultants apparently was an outstanding feature of the entire project. The material was judged to be valuable, innovative, and stimulating in content. There was not quite so strong an indication that the material was always applicable to the individual student's situation as only 48 percent gave that item the highest available score. There was even less indication that the material was adequately covered which is probably due to the lack of sufficient time. Lack of time, as well as attempting to cover too much material at one time, was mentioned again and again in the comments on the end-of-module evaluations which were discussed at the first of this chapter. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents gave the highest possible rating to the item "Glad I Attended," although 91 percent scored that item within the top two
TABLE 4

END-OF-YEAR CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM

Considering all of the consultants for the entire ELMEC project as a total group, the participants were asked to circle the number which expressed best his/her opinion; four would be average.

This chart tabulates the frequency and percentage of responses to the items on the evaluation instrument. Under each scale the upper figure is the frequency and the lower figure is the percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. In general, the consultants were:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepared</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stimulating</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Well timed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Well organized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Above average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. In general, the material was:

1. Valuable
   - 18 (78%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 2 (9%)
   - Unimportant

2. Traditional
   - 1 (4%)
   - 1 (4%)
   - 1 (4%)
   - 11 (48%)
   - 9 (39%)
   - Innovative

3. Routine content
   - 2 (9%)
   - 1 (4%)
   - 6 (26%)
   - 14 (61%)
   - Stimulating content

4. Applicable to my situation
   - 11 (48%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 2 (9%)
   - 2 (9%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 2 (9%)
   - Not applicable

5. Adequately covered
   - 9 (39%)
   - 10 (43%)
   - 1 (4%)
   - Not adequately covered

C. In general:

1. Sorry I attended
   - 1 (4%)
   - 1 (4%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 18 (78%)
   - Glad I attended

2. Have had enough
   - 1 (4%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 6 (26%)
   - 13 (56%)
   - Eager for more

3. Became involved
   - 11 (48%)
   - 5 (22%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - 3 (13%)
   - Kept aloof
highest ratings. Fifty-six percent indicated the highest rating for "Eager for More" while 82 percent of the scores fell within the top two highest ranks. Only 48 percent felt that they became involved to the fullest degree with 69 percent marking that item within the top two highest ranks. Four people, or 17 percent, felt that they had remained fairly aloof from involvement.

On the end-of-year evaluation form, the question was asked, "How have your personal objectives been reoriented as a result of participation in the ELMEC Program?" Fifteen of the fellows responded to this question. The replies indicate generally an increase in aspirations, more feeling of self-confidence, and better ability to organize thinking and to make decisions, an increase in insight and skills. Some of the responses are listed below.

I have now decided to pursue the Ed.D. degree.

It is now my intention to utilize the techniques of systems approach and administrative teams.

I had never considered being a principal before. Now I am considering it very seriously.

I have decided to complete the doctorate.

New insights into school administration as it relates to mainstreaming have strengthened my commitment to this concept.

My personal objective changed from "maybe one day I would be a superintendent" to "I do not want to be a superintendent."

I no longer am interested in becoming a director of guidance and counseling; I have decided that I would like to be a director of personnel.
Previously, my ambition was to remain a classroom teacher, but I have now decided to become a supervisor of reading instruction.

My decision-making ability has been sharpened.

I now hope to complete the doctorate and seek upward mobility in my school system with my goal being assistant superintendent of personnel services.

My ultimate goal is to become president of a women's college.

I intend to strive for a higher position which will give me more authority to make some changes that will positively affect the behavior of students.

I have focused my career goals on higher education—teacher training administration.

My objectives have been reinforced.

I have moved away from the unilateral decision-making approach.

It is interesting to note that of the above, eight of the statements indicate an upward mobility or radical change of direction of career aspirations in terms of job or degree status.

Sixteen of the fellows responded to the question "In what specific ways has the program focused on your personal philosophy?" Some of the responses included:

The program focused on my belief in the worth and dignity of the individual.

My philosophy includes the belief that an individual can be an agent of change.

I am convinced that a person must be able to change himself before he can change others.

Education as a process must seek to promote maximum development for all children in terms of each child's unique nature and needs.
I am more aware of group dynamics and working with others.

The program has reinforced my concepts of participative administration involving as many concerned parties as feasible.

I am more sensitive to the value system of others as reflected in their behavior and decision making.

I believe in education as the means by which we face the future.

I feel that in order to effect change, one must be committed to that change. The key concept of the program has been commitment—to the group, to goals, to an idea.

I used to feel that if I did not solve a problem, I was a failure. I now am able to see that it is not a question of failure or success, but a question of continuous process of conflict management.

The program forced me to look at what my philosophy really is and to recognize that a person's philosophy is reflected in everything he does including building management, instructional leadership, and personnel relationships.

I have developed a sense of shared decision making, self-directed study, and a belief that mutual respect for the personal integrity and dignity of others must be the foundation of administration. This was the core of all ELMEC activities.

My coping abilities in a changing environment have been strengthened—both personally and professionally.

I have a concept of life-time learning.

The next questions concerned the major strengths of the project. Similar responses were combined and are listed below.

Flexibility and opportunity to direct my own study (ten responses)
Quality of consultants and making contacts for future use of human resources (nine responses)

Diversity of background of participants (six responses)

Comradeship and participation of University faculty in the School of Education (six responses)

Interpersonal relationships and group dynamics (five responses)

Warm atmosphere created by the director (three responses)

Team approach in small groups (three responses)

Diversity of activities (three responses)

Mini-internships (three responses)

Personal support of the director (three responses)

Seminar approach to modules (two responses)

Field experiences (two responses)

Emphasis on the human process of learning (one response)

Opportunity to learn from each other (one response)

Opportunity for everyone to "lead" (one response)

In the above listed strengths, the flexibility of the program and the opportunity for each fellow to plan and direct his/her own program of activities and study received the most comments. Ten of the twenty-two who responded to this question marked these items. Nine respondents noted the quality of the consultants and the opportunity to make contacts for future use of human resources. Six listed as a strength the diversity of the backgrounds of the fellows and five mentioned the interpersonal relationships and opportunities to learn from each other. Six also mentioned the
comradeship, participation, enthusiasm, and willingness to help on the part of the University faculty members in the School of Education.

In reply to the question concerning the weaknesses of the program, the following responses were made:

Time constraints

Difficulty in negotiating for credit with other professors

The second semester weekly meetings did not provide enough contact among the participants

Need for more contact between small groups or more social contact

Lack of involvement on the part of some faculty members

Too much paper work

Not enough time provided for evaluation

Limited resources at the library

Too much material covered within time allowed

Mini-internships should have been scheduled sooner

Lack of communication between departments at the University

Inability of the director to attend every seminar

Keeping the journals is a poor tool for communication

Not having the module on curriculum as originally planned

Of the above items, the responses were fairly evenly divided among the respondents with only one or two persons mentioning each item. The exceptions were numerous responses indicating that time constraints were a problem and that too
much material was attempted in the amount of time available. Several indicated that the second semester seminars should have been shorter and more frequent.

In addition to the weaknesses expressed by the participants, other weaknesses can be identified. As was stated at the beginning of this chapter, no specific measurable performance objectives were formulated; all objectives were stated in broad terms. This precluded the use of pre-testing and posttesting for evaluation purposes. Also, the project design did not provide for external controls on levels of achievement and growth. There was no specific identification of what was expected, what should be known, and what should be used. Another weakness in the evaluation process was the lack of utilization of external evaluation by consultants, by faculty members not connected with the project, or by the use of any objective testing of any kind.

When the fellows were asked for recommendations for changing the project should it be repeated, the following suggestions were made:

The Department should take the time to sit with each fellow and design his/her program on a scheduled basis.

Continue the program through the summer and increase the second semester seminars.

Provide more internships, and place them earlier in the program.

Involve the Atlanta University faculty more.

Eliminate course obligations.

There should be more publications either by
groups or by individuals.

Set up procedures for translating courses prior to student involvement.

Allocate more time for field experiences and more time for sharing them.

Decrease the number of topics studied and increase the time for each.

Do not require a day-to-day journal.

Have fewer "formal" presentations and more field experiences.

Reduce the paper work.

Provide for more individual conferences with the director.

Of the above listed responses concerning recommendations for future projects, eleven of the respondents indicated feeling concerning the provision of more internships and mentioned that these internships should start earlier in the program and extend over a longer period of time. Related to this, five fellows indicated a desire for more field experience and more time to share the experiences with each other. Six fellows indicated that the seminars, or meetings of the total group, were limited to one a week during the second semester and that this resulted in a sense of loss; they suggested that the seminars be kept shorter and made more frequent.

Four of the fellows commented that the project was a peak experience in their lives, a milestone, a source of pride, challenging. Twelve respondents felt that the personal friendships made among the participants would alone have
justified the project. Over half of the respondents commented in various ways on the quiet, flexible, understanding, knowledgeable supportiveness and consideration of the director.

Summary

As the participants indicated on both end-of-module reactions and on the end-of-year evaluation instruments, there was general satisfaction that the ELMEC project met the goals of the program as outlined in the original proposal. Pointed out for particular emphasis was the development on the part of the fellows of an understanding of the process of change and the need for change-oriented educational leaders. The development of knowledge of pertinent legislation and judicial decisions affecting the education of children was also judged to be exceptionally outstanding. Those goals which were slightly neglected due to time constraints were the development of techniques for staff and faculty inservice training, knowledge of practices of newer instructional approaches, and curriculum development.

As the participants examined the extent to which they had each met their own personal objectives, there was consensus that all had had maximum opportunity to participate in the ongoing evaluation and adjustment of the project, and there was strong indication of the development of a personal commitment to providing educational opportunities for all children, a commitment to the concept of
mainstreaming, and a recognition of the importance of a personal philosophy that is reflected in administrative practices. There was little indication that any of the objectives were not reached to the satisfaction of the individual participants.

There was universal agreement among the fellows that the outstanding activities of the project were centered around field experiences, internships, and the use of consultants. All activities were rated fairly satisfactorily with the exception of an indication that fellows considered time constraints to be a problem, that audiovisual presentations could have been improved, and that they considered the writing of letters and keeping of journals to be an unnecessary addition to the already overextended amount of paper work.

As previously noted, the use of the consultants was considered by all to be one of the outstanding characteristics of the entire project. Frequent mention was made of the quality of the consultants individually and of the diversity of human resources available in the Atlanta metro area. The quality of the material covered was also considered highly satisfactory. Lack of sufficient time for each consultant and the frequent scheduling of too many consultants into one day providing too much rich material to be digested at one time were pointed out as deficiencies in the use of consultants.

The fellows described the changes that had taken
place within their own personal philosophies and concepts as a result of their participation in the project. Frequent mention was made of a reinforced belief in the dignity and worth of each individual and the fact that each has a contribution to make; of a commitment to mainstreaming and to providing for all children regardless of their abilities or situations; of a new belief in group dynamics, group decision making, and the value of interpersonal relationships with colleagues; of the importance of total involvement of students, parents, staff, and community; of the importance of the participation of educators in the political arena; of the need for educators and especially administrators to serve as agents of change; and of a growth in self-confidence and an increase in personal and professional aspirations.

Many of the strengths listed by the participants have already been reflected in other sections of the overall evaluation. These included the quality of the consultants, the value of the field experiences and the internships, the opportunity to see the use of computers and systems approach in actual practice, the development of a new personal philosophy on the part of the fellows, the interpersonal relationships, the cooperation of the faculty in the School of Education at the University, the diversity of background and experience of the participants, the study of legislative and judicial processes affecting the education of children, and the yearlong experience in group dynamics which demonstrated the value of group decision making.
The weaknesses pointed out by the fellows are also repetitious of other parts of this evaluation. In summary these included the frustration of time constraints, too much material crowded into too little time, lack of sufficient resource materials in the University library, too many consultants scheduled too tightly, not enough in-depth study of systems approach, too much paper work, not enough field experiences, and internships being initiated late in the year.

**Summary of Recommendations**

It was recommended by the participants that fewer major topics be attempted in future projects thus allowing more time for in-depth research and study of those topics that are included. It was further recommended that internships should be placed earlier in the project to serve to point up to the individual student what his areas of interests, strengths, and weaknesses are and to serve to help him in structuring the remainder of his total project experience. Also, earlier internships would be taking place while schools are still open and children still available for observation. It was suggested that field experiences might be spread out in small time periods as short as two weeks throughout the entire year interspersed with group sessions for sharing of experiences, working with consultants, and reviewing literature. It was suggested that more field experiences should be substituted for the many "formal" presentations that were made in this year's experience.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Fellowship Program in Education Leadership at Atlanta University funded by the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems as authorized under Part C of Public Law 90-35 and known at the University as the project in Educational Leadership and Mainstreaming Exceptional Children (ELMEC) was proposed and implemented in response to two growing concerns of educators throughout the country. Although not the only concerns of contemporary educators, they are of importance particularly to school administrators and to those responsible for the teaching of school administrators.

The first of these two concerns is the rapidity of change and its effect on the lives of people—socially, culturally, economically, and politically. Change is a reality that must be dealt with by educators, not just by becoming flexible and being able to adapt to change, but by becoming innovators and making change happen—by becoming agents of change. Education must break the bonds of stagnant tradition and move to the forefront of social change rather than being carried along by it. Educators must become future oriented.
The second of the concerns which motivated the initiation of the ELMEC project is the recognition that one of the areas of education that has undergone the greatest amount of change in recent years is the area of instruction of exceptional children. Much of this change was beneficial and represented tremendous improvement over the former absence of any meaningful education for exceptional children. However, much of the changes that were occurring so rapidly was acting to isolate these children either into institutions or into separate classrooms thereby concentrating on the teaching of basic skills, accentuating their "differentness," and doing little to prepare the youngsters to function in the mainstream of society.

Thus ELMEC was born with a two-pronged approach—the study of the mainstreaming of exceptional children and the development of school administrators who could not only adapt to change, cope with change, but as agents of change they could direct the course of change itself—school administrators who could direct the course of education not only for exceptional children but for general education as well.

A review of the literature revealed that very few of the leadership development programs underway in the country during recent years have as yet been described in the professional literature. There is apparently widespread experimentation in nontraditional approaches to leadership training with a concentration on the concept of educational leaders as change agents, but there has not yet been evidence of
sufficient scientific research of an evaluative nature to allow any claims to be made concerning their effectiveness.

Of the twenty-one programs that were reviewed by this writer and that were all funded by EPDA, fifteen of these shared many commonalities. Among these commonalities were the emphasis placed upon the management of change, the utilization of nontraditional approaches to graduate degree programs, and the concerns of education for minority groups such as Mexicans, Indians, blacks, women, or exceptional children. All of these groups have been the objects of educational discrimination or neglect in the past. Other commonalities include the utilization of educational approaches such as field experiences and internships, the use of highly qualified consultants and community resources, and experimentation with group process techniques in the development of educational leadership.

The review of the literature identified many characteristics of leadership development programs that are considered by the authors reviewed to be essential or at least desirable if administrators are to possess the skills necessary for solving the most serious problems of today and for producing a future-oriented program for tomorrow. Among these characteristics so identified is the development of the following administrative skills:

1. The ability and commitment to occupy change agent roles
2. Skill in setting priorities as an administrator is faced with instructional as well as personnel management and
business management responsibilities

3. The recognition and utilization of community resources within his immediate geographic area

4. The recognition of the contribution of community involvement not only in the ongoing educational program but in the decision-making process

5. An appreciation of the value of and the ability to utilize group process in decision-making and priority-setting areas of the administrative process

6. The involvement of educators in the political arena

7. The ability to customize an educational program to fit a community with all of its unique characteristics

8. The recognition of the needs of minority groups traditionally subject to discriminatory practices or neglect—such groups as exceptional children, ethnic groups, and women

In addition to the above administrative skills, the literature pointed out a need for change in administrative leadership programs in order to escape the bookish, exclusively classroom oriented approach and move to the onsite, field experience or internship oriented approach.

The description of the ELMEC program in Chapter III and the perceptions of the fellows as detailed in Chapter IV serve to substantiate that the ELMEC project was designed to cover in varying degrees each one of the areas listed and accomplished its purpose to a high degree of satisfaction on the part of the participants.
When the ELMEC project was started at Atlanta University, the selection of the twenty-five participating fellows resulted in a group of educators, all at the post-masters level, who possessed a rich background of educational preparation and experience. The unique and divergent characteristics of the fellows were judged in the evaluation process to be one of the greatest assets of the resultant program.

The program itself was structured around six time modules of five weeks each. Each module had an educational target or central theme. The theme of the first module was the development of a personal philosophy and commitment; the second module, a study of systems approach and organizational change; the third module, instructional alternatives; the fourth module, exceptional children in the schools and the mainstreaming concept; the fifth module, legislation and judicial and executive decisions governing exceptional children; and the last module, an evaluation of the entire project.

The group of twenty-five fellows divided into five work teams with each team taking the leadership responsibility for one week of each module with respect to planning activities and directing analyses. The first week of each module was devoted to field experiences; the second week to an analysis of the module theme. The third week the module theme was approached from the standpoint of management strategies; the fourth week, educational strategies; the fifth week,
research techniques. Evaluation was an ongoing process throughout the module.

The five teams rotated in order that each team had the experience and responsibility of each of the five approaches to a module theme. The teams utilized activities including field experiences, mini-internships, audio-visual materials, seminars, onsite observations and interviews, field trips, simulation, role playing, consultants and community resources, research and evaluation, and group decision making. The last of these was a sharp departure for many who had previously believed that the top administrator of any unit made all decisions authoritatively and unilaterally.

One of the characteristics of the ELMEC project which makes the program unique when compared with most of those underway at the same time throughout the country was the emphasis placed on the process of evaluation. This emphasis served not only to evaluate the worth of the program itself but also to sharpen the evaluation skills of the participants.

During each module, one team carried the responsibility of evaluating the work of the other four teams. In addition, the director developed instruments to measure whether or not each module was accomplishing its purpose with respect to the stated goals and objectives of the project and with respect to whether or not the project was accomplishing the purposes of the individual participants. At the completion of the ten-month program and after all six modules
had been completed and evaluated on an individual basis, this writer conducted an overall end-of-year evaluation of the project.

**Conclusions**

The evaluation process revealed a widely shared appreciation for the development of an understanding of the process of change and the need for change-oriented educational leaders, the development of knowledge of pertinent legislation and judicial decisions affecting the education of children, and the development of a personal commitment to providing educational opportunities for all children as well as a commitment to the concept of mainstreaming. The summary of responses in Chapter IV supports an indication of agreement that most of the goals and objectives of the program had been met to the satisfaction of the participants.

The strengths of the program were identified as including the quality of the consultants, the value of the field experiences, the opportunity to experience the use of computers and systems approach in actual practice, the development of a new personal philosophy. Particularly, emphasis was given to the value of the interpersonal relationships among the fellows and the experience of group decision making and an increased appreciation for group dynamics.

The weaknesses of the program included the frustration of time constraints caused by attempts to crowd too
much material into too little time for either adequate presentation or absorption. Recommendations for improvement stressed the need to place field experiences and internships earlier in the project and to substitute more onsite experiences in place of the many formal classroom presentations that were made. These experiences earlier in the project would serve to identify for the individual fellows their own strengths and weaknesses and assist them in developing a program unique to their own needs.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations in this study are drawn from the strengths and weaknesses as revealed by the evaluations of the participants and from the personal opinions of this writer.

1. Establish specific criteria for the selection of project participants in order to provide a wide diversity of human resources within the group itself and to insure local contacts for the securing of consultant resources. This advantage existed in the ELMEC project, but should be predetermined and assured for future projects.

2. Retain the subgroup approach utilized in ELMEC; most important is the deliberate stratification of the make-up of these subgroups in order to provide balance with respect to the diversity of the group membership and with respect to the knowledge of and personal contacts with local resources, both human and physical.
3. Restructure the project in order that the use of field experiences are expanded, and internships are initiated early in the project and continued throughout the entire project.

4. Plan seminars where the entire membership meets together for the primary purpose of free interchange and debate and less for the purpose of formal presentations of material. Material should be researched on an individual basis.

5. Expand the use of human relations or human awareness laboratory experiences.

6. Retain the self-directed approach and the involvement of the membership at large in both structuring and implementing the procedures of the project.

7. Take appropriate steps to enrich the resources of the University library.

8. Retain the process of translation of project credit into traditional course credit. However, it is strongly recommended that a thorough orientation be provided to faculty members external to the project in order that negotiations for credit translation are less confusing to both instructor and student and more readily accepted by other faculty members. The burden of explaining the process to these faculty members should rest with the project director(s), not with the students.

9. Continue the provision for participants to take course
work outside of the project on an optional basis for degree purposes or for the purpose of remediation of weaknesses and deficiencies.

10. Provide entry level competency determination in order that each individual can evaluate himself and immediately identify his strengths and weaknesses. This information can be useful throughout the project in selecting individual research and in-depth study for translation purposes. It would also assist in program planning for degree purposes.

11. Design evaluation instruments at the beginning of the project to be used throughout the entire project for consistency and for more valid overall evaluation of the entire project at its conclusion. Lack of consistency of evaluation instruments from one module to the next limited their potential value in evaluating the project as a whole. Evaluation instruments should be designed by the participants.

12. Provide for external evaluation of the entire project by use of external University faculty members, as well as local consultants outside of the University itself.

13. Provide for some type of follow-up of the participants subsequent to their participation in the project as part of the overall evaluation process.

During the last week of the program the group of fellows met each evening for free discussion as a means of
informal "wrap up" and to take stock. As is frequently the case, in a relaxed atmosphere, a great deal of informal evaluation was expressed verbally that might not lend itself conveniently to the restraints of a predesigned evaluation instrument. Some of the expressed observations and feelings during these five evenings of interchange are well worth capturing and are included at this point by way of a final summary of evaluations. These comments are taken from tape recordings of these five meetings.

The comment was made that all learnings do not come from content material. Not everything has to be "taught" by a leader. Each fellow agreed that one of the most important contributors to what had been learned this year was the group process itself. However, if the director had lectured all year long that the individual fellows had to work together and had then failed to structure the environment in such a way that the opportunity for working together was not provided, nothing would have happened. Not only was content searched out and used, but the team effort of the search itself was of tremendous significance.

One of the great values of the project, in the opinion of this writer, was the ability of the members of the group to relate well to each other practically from the beginning. The fellows agreed that they found it easy to plan together both on long-range and short-range terms and that interpersonal relationships were essentially trouble free. Fellows pointed out that this is unusual when a group
of people are confined together and the individuals in the group are all professionally successful, aggressive, assertive, and self-directed. It has been the experience of the writer that when all members of a group are accustomed to being leaders, it is unusual to find the leadership position shifting easily from person to person with a willingness on the part of the others to assume followship positions when appropriate. It was also a unique characteristic of the project that each person seemed to be willing to accept the responsibility for his own progress and yet at the same time accomplish his individual goals through group processes rather than just independent action. Different roles emerged from time to time, power shifted, different persons at different times served to keep the group as a whole headed in the direction set by the group. The blend of individual activity and group activity seemed to balance naturally. The interaction of friends often causes the emergence of ideas that would not have come into being otherwise.

Within both the large group and the small groups this phenomenon was witnessed. People quite often tend to think better in an interaction setting than in a solitary meditation setting. Each person stimulates the thinking of those around him with whom he is interacting. Not only did the interaction stimulate new thinking, but each person brought to the project a wealth of previous experience. There were ample opportunities for fellows to share their past experiences with each other and each learned from the rest. There developed
within the group a feeling of concern for each other. Some fellows had come from situations where the primary objective was to get a job done the quickest and most efficient way, which tends to encourage independent action. For these, the project was an experience in a situation where the group had to determine for itself how a goal was to be reached or an objective implemented. This provided experiences in which strong aggressive people found themselves having to compromise and to give up strongly felt positions in order to move the group forward. It was discovered that there is a need to develop trust and confidence in others as well as self-confidence. The group commented that a sense of loss of group cohesiveness and group personality was experienced when the meetings were decreased during the last modules.

The participants agreed that what is needed is "administrative teams." Decision making must be a product of group action rather than mandated from a single leader. Leadership development is now being devoted to such problems as how to get a group to work together, how to hold a team together, and how to combine group ideas into a single direction. Authority is not inherent in the position. Authority exists only when the group extends the authority to the leader.

The group also discussed the need not only for educational leadership that is change oriented, but a need for change-oriented educators to become involved in the political and power structure and the policy making level that controls
the future of society, business, industry, and government. If you teach children for change and teach them to think and then they have to live in a world which still wants to dictate to them, you have created problems for them with which they must be prepared to cope. They must know how to question authority intellectually and effectively.

How can you become a change agent when there are people who are fearful of change, or just plain stubborn, or just plain lazy? Change takes energy. Authoritarian leaders can make others below them very comfortable because they don't have to think and they don't have to make decisions or defend those decisions. This is a very secure and desirable position to some people. Involvement and participation take energy, courage, and hard work. Uninvolvement is carefree, and usually anxiety free.

Educators, however, cannot just stand still and let things happen. Educators have to actively develop values that will protect the very technology that education is producing. Educators need to more than plan for a future that is going to happen--they have to determine what the future is going to be. Educators must remember that those in top level decision-making positions do not always want change because change may bring about change in their own positions of perceived power. Change may mean a new set of administrators. These threatened top level administrators are resisting change to protect their own positions. We are still living in a bureaucratic world and we are beyond bureaucracy in what
our thinking is. This creates tremendous conflict. There is an inability of bureaucracy to keep pace with technology. Bureaucracy by its very nature has to protect the status quo. The comment was made that stagnation does not result from the lack of answers but from an atmosphere that discourages questions. The absence of the impulse to ask questions kills creativity. Creativity goes beyond the artists, musicians, and writers. A genuine creator creates something that will exist with a life of its own, will exist without its creator. A creative teacher teaches less and his students learn more. A creative administrator administrates less and the organization can function well without him. A genuine leader does his work in such a way that his followers will say that they have done it themselves, and feel that they do great things themselves without a great leader. The uncreative leader works the other way around. He arranges things in such a way that he himself becomes indispensable.

The point was made that becoming a change agent is often viewed as an impersonal process. It is in truth just the reverse. It is very personal and will be accomplished on that level or not at all. Treating people as human beings and with genuine concern will determine how much one will be able to change them or affect them in any way. A feeling of genuine concern for one's welfare on the part of one's colleagues is an index to the amount of influence that that person or those persons can have on others. A person cannot change other people unless that person is first concerned
about the people he wishes to change.

It is worth noting that the reactions recorded by the fellows at the end of the first module indicated a restlessness and dissatisfaction with the "non-directive" approach and lack of structure of the project. However, as the project unfolded, these criticisms disappeared from the end-of-module reactions. In absolute contrast, the end-of-year evaluations overwhelmingly identified as one of the strengths of the program that of flexibility, the freedom of fellows to direct their own study, plan their own programs, satisfy their individual objectives while at the same time working within a group to reach group goals. The very lack of mandated direction which came under criticism at the beginning evolved into one of the outstanding assets of the project. This is significant to this writer in that these graduate students are the products of an educational system where traditionally decision making is made by top level management and the decisions are mandated. As they came into this project, they expected and waited to be "told what to do" as they always have been by teachers and by administrators. Just as teachers tend to teach as they were taught, so administrators tend to administer as they have been administered to. It was obvious that these graduate students were so accustomed to receiving the "orders of the day" before action could occur, they were uncomfortable without the security of this type of leadership by the director of the project. However, it soon became apparent that if the program was to accomplish the purpose
of developing leadership, the fellows would have to exercise leadership from the beginning and allow the project to test the results of their leadership activities. To spend a year following the director would not have developed leadership. The amazing thing to this writer, however, is that the group members—conditioned within typical authoritarian educational structure where they had achieved through their own aggression sufficient levels of responsibility to be selected for ELMEC in the first place—that this group of diverse, self-assertive people blended so quickly into a productive unit where leadership shifted and changed constantly without chaos and without dissension beyond the healthy level. A free and open climate was felt from the beginning, free of threat, such that criticism and opposition were acceptable as long as they stemmed from kindness and concern for each other.

All graduate students have so often heard professors lecturing to future teachers on the ineffectiveness of the lecture as a teaching technique—no model. They have so long heard about the merits of individualized instruction from professors who were giving the same assignments, the same term papers, and the same examinations to all of those same graduate students—no model. They have so long heard about the need for change while being handed mimeographed sheets of check lists of tasks that must be met to qualify for a degree, tasks that haven't changed in years and the justification for which has long since been forgotten—no model for change. To this writer, the greatest contribution of the
ELMEC project was the model set for the participants. This model was made up of professors who demonstrated a warm, friendly comradeship toward their students, a graduate school exhibiting a willingness to depart from moss-covered traditional rules and regulations, a willingness to individualize the graduate programs of students, and a yearlong demonstration of administration by an administrator who turned an accumulation of strong willed people into a group who could move, think, and act as a group without feeling a loss of individuality, and the association with a person who lived his genuine concern for the welfare of each individual as a human being, worthy of every effort in his behalf.
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ABSTRACT OF THE PROPOSAL

a. Title: Fellowship Program in Educational Leadership and Mainstreaming Exceptional Children (ELMEC)

b. Type of Grant Requested: Operational Project under part C of EPDA

c. Institution: Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia 30314

d. Proposed Director: Dr. Stephen C. Herrmann, Professor of Education

e. Duration of the Project: One Year (1973-74)

f. Funds Requested: $297,000

g. Summary:

Atlanta University proposes to execute a one-year fellowship program in its innovative doctoral level program in educational administration. Integral to the program is the following evidence:

1. Administrators have often acted as preservers of the status quo instead of assuming their responsible role as advocates, planners, and supervisors of change;

2. Studies in the social sciences, especially in the areas of systems analysis and the process of change have provided administrators more alternatives in the solution of problems;

3. The modern recognition that all children have equal right to an education appropriate to their talents and not limited to their handicaps. This is attested to by both the judiciary and the legislative bodies at federal and state level;

4. Talents are more effectively developed by mainstreaming such children rather than isolating and segregating as has been so often the case in the recent past;

5. Regular teachers, given appropriate assistance, can teach exceptional children effectively in the regular classroom.

The program will draw twenty-five fellows from a National Pool of applicants and will be especially concerned with the special problems of displaced Black educators in the Southeastern region of the U.S.A. The program will include practicing administrators in school systems and other agencies, State Department Personnel, teachers and persons whose academic and personal qualifications strongly indicate the potential for leadership in the management of change as perceived by the university.

Atlanta University is well-qualified by reason of historical commitment, the adequacy of its programs, the extent of its planning, the cooperation it is capable of enlisting, the abundant resources available in the area, and the evidence of effectiveness in related projects such as EPDA Project 2036.
Evidence has never been wanting to support the contention that chosen leaders in the educational enterprise are the prime agents of change. Research has provided a greater understanding of the process of change by placing it in the context of systems analysis. Study of the theoretic aspects of systems and the process of change, coupled with practice in the dynamics of change by administrators will lead to their more effective functioning.

In recent times grave concern has been manifest regarding our schools' treatment of exceptional children. Admittedly, there was justification for our examining more closely the process of instruction and recognizing that it was inadequate for special children. The solution of isolating them for special training has not proven to be as effective as educators had hoped (Dunn, p.4, p. 160-162). One result has been a series of judicial decisions pointing to society's obligation to serve the educational needs of the handicapped more adequately. Concurrently, legislation has moved forward to further the guarantee to these special children.

Conviction among the professionals is also growing that our former recognition of special need which resulted in isolating such children has not served them well. The evidence clearly shows that despite the improved techniques, the small pupil-teacher ratio, the individualized care, such segregated children have not achieved any better than, sometimes not as well as, their mainstreaming peers (Dunn, p.157)

What is needed are administrators at all levels, aware of their role and responsibility and aware of the options within which they can function, knowledgeable by experience with those ways of acting, who can husband the resources and knowledge available to the benefit of regular teachers and lead them to the
knowledge and use of techniques and strategies of special education which are effective. Children can then be adequately diagnosed and prescribed for, with primary implementation in the regular classroom and appropriate assignment to the cascade of services by resource persons (Dunn, p. 37).

In this fashion the probability is that "as many as up to 90 percent of handicapped children should be able to remain at least part time in the mainstream of education" (Dunn, p. 15).

The second category of need which will be addressed by this Program will be the structuring of comprehensive, interdisciplinary programs which in effect will result in the development of a new type of educational administrator to meet the complex demands occasioned by social and technological advances.

There are new roles to be played and new relationships between persons who have been peers, superiors and subordinates. In this context, the capacity of the Atlanta University Center to provide training in management, behavioral science and organizational development will form a skills base for the assumption of those roles.
II. ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

A. Administration and Supervision; Special Education

The School of Education has a proud heritage of training teachers, specialists and administrators for useful and effective service to children. In this framework, the Department of Administration and Supervision and the Program in Special Education have amply demonstrated their ability to maintain the relevance of their programs. Both have not only kept abreast of certification requirements, but have led in tackling new ideas and new methods and integrating them into their programs.

In the development and implementation of new programs faculty members have examined those operating in other parts of the country and have sought widely the assistance of both professionals and non-professionals. As representative of program activity, the Department of Administration and Supervision is hosting a new program at the doctoral level for superintendency and central office personnel. This program, sponsored in part by the Ford Foundation, relies heavily on the social and behavioral sciences for its main thrust. Special Education is executing a program for Master of Arts and Education Specialist levels under the auspices of BEH. This latter one is a spinoff from EPDA Project 2036, which worked toward improving the instructional techniques of regular teachers who have high percentages of handicapped children in the classroom. As a corollary to the EPDA Project, both Administration and Special Education developed new techniques and introduced new courses.

Through the Department of Administration and Supervision's participation in the Ford grant, the University is in a consortium of seven institutions. Other cooperative enterprises are in effect throughout the institution. The University has a very favorable stance with other collegiate institutions, works with several others through the AATES to provide inservice courses and programs for the metropolitan area, and has an especially satisfactory working relationship with the Atlanta Public Schools.
B. STAFF AND FACULTY

Atlanta University already has on its faculty most personnel needed for implementing the proposal. The names listed in Administration and Special Education are documented by resumes in the appendix. Many others are available as associates to the project from the University and Metropolitan Atlanta.

In Administration and Supervision - Full-time Faculty
Dr. Samuel Silverstein
Dr. Stephen Herrmann
Dr. Robert Hatch
Dr. Ronald Kilpatrick
Dr. Clark Carnal
Dr. Sidney Estes

In Special Education - Full-time Faculty
Dr. Damaris Ouzts
Dr. Jewel Wade
Dr. A. Jean DeVard
III. STUDENTS

A. SELECTION

Basic to the success of developing effective change agents is the selection of students with the potential to gain the maximum benefits from the program and who hold promise of being strong educational leaders.

Three principal criteria will be used in selecting candidates for this program:

1. Scholarship Potential: Previous work at the graduate level, performance in a personal interview, support statements from individuals who are familiar with the candidate, recognized test scores where deemed appropriate;

2. Leadership Potential: Concrete evidence which demonstrates that the candidate has shown a capacity to enlist the commitments of others in the service of a common goal;

3. Commitment: Preference will be given to candidates who have demonstrated their dedication to responsible change by previous activity in the service of education.

B. OBJECTIVES

Through the activities of the fellowship program, the student will be expected to:

1. Develop a personal philosophy undergirded with a value system which includes recognition of the dignity and worth of each individual, an effective learning theory, and a commitment to serve every child adequately within the purview of his/her responsibility

2. Structure a theoretic framework based on the systems concept and holding to the thesis that the administrator is the principal change agent in the process and dynamics of change
3. Understand and make a commitment to mainstreaming

4. Learn the judicial and legislative decisions governing exceptional children and the methods of implementing and augmenting such decisions

5. Develop further expertise in curriculum and instruction with special emphasis on enabling almost all children to be in the regular classroom

6. Demonstrate skills in actual experiential settings

7. Participate in the evaluation of the training.
IV. PROGRAM

A. GOALS

The goal of the fellowship program is to provide opportunities for bona-fide educational experiences which will lead to:

1. An understanding of systems theory and the process of change, the place of the administrator in organizing for and directing that change, and mastery of the techniques and strategies for executing it;

2. Knowledge of pertinent legislation covering the protections and educational development of exceptional children and judicial decisions, at both the state and federal levels, and ability to place it in proper context for the local setting with research on ways such legislation can be more effectively implemented;

3. Examination of the different newer approaches in curriculum design and instructional techniques so that the administrator understands the different possibilities for mainstreaming the vast majority of youngsters with handicaps, development of techniques for staff and faculty inservice education so that all children will have the benefit of knowledgable and able teachers, and practice in the actual working out of these newer approaches

B. ACTIVITIES

The activities and experiences through which these skills will be developed include:

1. Workshops and seminars

2. On-site observations and participation

3. Recording through journals, letters, interviews, various kinds of evaluative instruments, and including audio and visual
4. Analysis of activities and experiences
5. Simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping the realities and how to deal with them with such activities as gaming exercises, role-playing, open-ended audiovisual presentation, case studies
6. Action Research
7. Group process and transactional analysis
8. Classroom activities which would include some coursework in the regular offerings of the School of Education

C. STRUCTURE AND METHOD

Alongside any "regular" courses which may be necessary to satisfy particular professional needs, the twenty-five fellows will be called upon to participate as a team in a series of six five-week seminar/workshop (three each semester). The general pattern is indicated by the diagram on page 10.

These modules will be the heart of the year's work in which the dominant theme of the program --- Educational Leadership and Mainstreaming for Exceptional Children --- will be directed. As now envisioned, the general five-week themes to be explored are:

1. The importance of a personal philosophy and theoretical framework for effective administration — planning, decision-making, management
2. Systems, systems analysis, organizational change,
3. Instructional alternatives
4. Exceptional children in the schools/mainstreaming
5. Legislation, judicial, and executive decisions governing exceptional children
6. Wrap up, evaluation

Several important outcomes are expected of this design:

1. Field experience geared to the interests of the fellows
2. Positive team effort
3. In-depth review of the literature

4. Development of Action Research

5. Strength in evaluation

A second year with similar design is planned. Its dominant theme is projected as: Educational Leadership and the Urban Dilemma.
Atlanta University Doctoral Program in Educational Administration

Five-Week Training Module

Field Experience Input

5-weeks

1st - Field Experience (observation + Recording) + Reading + Seminar

2nd - 5th - Continued Field Experience + Reading + Seminar

- 3 or 4hr workshop sessions featuring various strategies

i.e., each day focus on one e.g., Cognitive input (examination of evidence), Research input, Management, and Educational Strategies input.
V. EVALUATION

The newer approach to competency based development and assessment still is without final parameters, evaluation of a program in segments and in toto must necessarily be tentative. It can be said that evaluation will be both process and product using various instruments and activities for the purpose.

1. Among activities which are evaluative as well as programmatic in their context are:
   a. Role playing
   b. Psychodrama
   c. Gaming
   d. On-site activity
   e. Computer simulation
   f. Seminars
   g. Systematic observations

2. To measure attitudinal change we plan to use a semantic differential, a "Short Test of One's Educational Philosophy", "Assumptions about Learning," and similar instruments

3. Behavioral Changes will be assessed by self-evaluative techniques, with faculty adviser - student conferences, and site visits

4. Other critiques will emerge as students work with one another and within the group. The utilization of other students' reactions, audio-tape cassettes, video tapes, and simulation experiences will facilitate evaluation of changes that occur in trainees as they work with other administrators, children, parents, and other adults.
Personal journals kept by the students will help them focus on their own language skills, deepening their understanding of the process-product relationship and of creativity.

The "feedback" seminar and letters to the director will serve as an ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of instruction, an indication of the expanding understanding and insight of the trainees, and a guide to further development.

The requirement of an action-research paper to be developed during the year of active participation in the program is expected to reveal a further measure of the success of the experience to trainees and hopefully, offer guides for changes to be made in the training program.

5. **Outside Evaluation.** Both process and product evaluation will be objectivized by consultants on the local and national scene. A report will be submitted to NCATE as part of the requirement for membership entry.
APPENDIX B

CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY
APPENDIX D

END-OF-MODULE REACTIONS
ACTIVITIES
1. Do you believe that this activity was an important part of the Module? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Choose what you feel to be the most positive characteristic of this activity and explain why it was especially helpful to you.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Choose what you feel to be the most negative characteristic of this activity and explain why it was helpful to you.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. What experiences have you had as a result of this activity that would not have been available otherwise?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. What recommendations can you offer for improving this component of the Module if the project should be renewed for another year?

a. ______________________________________________________________________

b. ______________________________________________________________________

c. ______________________________________________________________________

d. ______________________________________________________________________

* Mark with large X if you were a member of the presenting team
APPENDIX E

END-OF-MODULE REACTIONS
FIELD EXPERIENCES
FIELD EXPERIENCES

1. Do you believe that the Field Experience was an important part of the Module? Why?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. Choose what you feel to be the most positive characteristic of the Field Experience and explain why it was especially helpful to you.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

3. Choose what you feel to be the most negative characteristic of the Field Experience and explain why it was helpful to you.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

4. What experiences have you had as a result of the Field Experience that would not have been available otherwise.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5. What recommendations can you offer for improving this component of the Module if the project should be renewed for another year?

   a. ____________________________________________________________________
   b. ____________________________________________________________________
   c. ____________________________________________________________________
   d. ____________________________________________________________________

SCH/cpg Fall-1973
APPENDIX F

LEADERSHIP CHECKLIST
List five leadership activities which you performed and can identify for yourself during this module. How well did you think you did then? How satisfying was each activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY</th>
<th>How Well Executed</th>
<th>How Satisfying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Module 6

Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY</th>
<th>How Well Executed</th>
<th>How Satisfying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Module 6

Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY</th>
<th>How Well Executed</th>
<th>How Satisfying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH RESPECT TO PROJECT GOALS
EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH RESPECT TO PROJECT GOALS

On the checklist below are the goals of the ELMEC Project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "0" to "5" with "0" indicating that the goal was not reached at all ranging upward to "5" indicating that the goal was fully met. Please indicate on the scale to what degree you consider the project goals have been met. This sheet evaluates how well the project reached its goals as a whole and in answering, you should consider yourself as part of the whole group. Please do not place your name on this sheet.

GOALS

1. The Project developed an understanding of systems theory.
2. The Project developed an understanding of the process of change.
3. The Project developed an understanding of the place of the administrator in organizing for and directing that change.
4. The Project developed an understanding of the techniques and strategies for executing change.
5. The Project provided knowledge of pertinent legislation covering the protections and educational development of exceptional children.
6. The Project provided knowledge of judicial decisions, at both the state and federal levels.
7. The Project provided knowledge of the ability to place such decisions in proper context for the local setting with research on ways such legislation can be more effectively implemented.
8. The Project provided for examination of the different newer approaches in curriculum design.
9. The Project provided for examination of instructional techniques so that the administrator understands the different possibilities for mainstreaming the vast majority of youngsters with handicaps.
10. The Project provided for examination of the development of techniques for staff and faculty inservice education so that all children will have the benefit of knowledgeable and able teachers.
11. The Project provided for examination of practices in the actual working out of these newer approaches.
12. In this space, please list other goals that have been met by this project and to what degree.
APPENDIX H

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT OBJECTIVES
On the checklist below are the student objectives of the ELMEC Project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "0" to "5" with "0" indicating that the objective was not met at all ranging upward to "5" indicating that the objective was fully met. Please indicate on the scale to what degree you consider the project objectives have been met. This sheet evaluates how well you reached your objectives. Answer only for yourself. Please do not put your name on this sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student developed a personal philosophy undergirded with a value system which includes recognition of the dignity and worth of each individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student developed an effective learning theory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The student developed a commitment to serve every child adequately within the purview of his/her responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student structured a theoretic framework based on the systems concept and holding to the thesis that the administrator is the principal change agent in the process and dynamics of change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The student developed an understanding of and developed a commitment to mainstreaming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student learned the judicial and legislative decisions governing exceptional children and the methods of implementing and augmenting such decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student developed further expertise in curriculum and instruction with special emphasis on enabling almost all children to be in the regular classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The student demonstrated skills in actual experiential settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The student participated in the evaluation of the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In this space, please list other objectives that you have met by this project and to what degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

EVALUATION OF ELMEC PROJECT WITH respect to ACTIVITIES AND EXPERIENCES
On the checklist below are the activities of the ELMEC Project. To the right is an evaluation scale from "1" to "5" with "1" indicating poor quality of the activity and "5" indicating excellent quality of the activity. Please indicate on the scale the quality of each activity of the Project. Please do not place your name on this sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On-site observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On-site participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recording through journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recording through letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recording through interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recording through other various kinds of evaluative instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including audio and visual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Analysis of activities and experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping the realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how to deal with them with such activities as gaming exercises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping the realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to deal with them with such activities as role-playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping the realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how to deal with them with such activities as open-ended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiovisual presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Simulation to exploit all possible ways for grasping the realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how to deal with them with such activities as case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Action research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Group process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Transactional analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Classroom activities which would include some course work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the regular offerings of the School of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Other activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

END-OF-YEAR CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM
Considering all of the consultants for the entire ELMEC Project as a total group, please circle the number which expresses best your opinion; four would be average. Refer to the list of consultants if needed.

EVALUATION:

A. In general, the consultants were:

1. Prepared
2. Clear
3. Stimulating
4. Well-timed
5. Well-organized
6. Above average

B. In general, the material was:

1. Valuable
2. Traditional
3. Routine content
4. Applicable to my situation
5. Adequately covered

C. In general:

1. Sorry I attended
2. Have had enough
3. Became involved

D. List below in rank order the four most outstanding consultants of the entire ELMEC Project.

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
APPENDICES K-M

INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT END-OF-YEAR
PROGRAM EVALUATION SHEET

STRENGTHS
WEAKNESSES
RECOMMENDATIONS
SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT END-OF-YEAR PROGRAM
EVALUATION SHEET

NOTE: Use as much or as little of the space below that you need.

1. How have your personal objectives reoriented as a result of participation in the ELMEC Program:
   a. ____________________________________________
   b. ____________________________________________
   c. ____________________________________________

2. In what specific ways has the program focused on your personal philosophy?
   a. ____________________________________________
   b. ____________________________________________
   c. ____________________________________________
3. What do you consider the major strengths of the ELMEC Program?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

4. What do you consider the major weaknesses of the ELMEC Program?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
5. In what ways would you change the program if it were to be repeated?
   
   a. 
   
   b. 
   
   c. 
   
6. Any other comments you wish to make:
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