In the article, "Emerging Issues in Pupil Personnel Services" (PPS), the problem of professional organization of PPS is discussed. Ground rules are given for developing large geographic units. The position of the community is next presented, the place of mental health, community aides, and institutions in a community. As Maslow points out, basic needs come first; drastic changes in the school are necessary. What is the role of PPS in this change? Decisions must be made as to role, goals, power base. "The PPS Administrator as an Agent of Change" presents a discussion of the problems that lie ahead in PPS. Among these are the developing of a total climate conducive to mental health in the total school. The great increase in knowledge in the PPS area is another problem. PPS are good, but must be better. Better management and coordination are essential, particularly with the possible use of computer technology. Unless the PPS director does take an active role as an agent of change, he will be bypassed and possibly eliminated along with the service he is supposed to administer. (KJ)
The PPS Administrator as an Agent of Change

An after dinner speech always reminds me of an incident involving Ralph Waldo Emerson a century ago. Someone predicted that the world would end the following Friday and Emerson is said to have replied: "I can get along without it."

Although some of you by now may be in the condition of the two drunks who wandered into the world famous San Diego Zoo and watched in awe as a lion let loose with a tremendous roar. "Let's get out of here," said one drunk. "You can if you want to," said the other. "But I am going to stay for the whole film."

In thinking of the PPS administrator as an agent of change, we have to ask the question: Change for what? Too often

1. Parenthetically may I call your attention to a new publication "Pupil Services for Massachusetts Public Schools" by Gordon Liddle and Arthur Kroll. This is a study just completed for the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education. It has some excellent suggestions on what needs to be done.

in this country do we engage in the business of change for the sake of change. Or engage in change because it makes us appear alert, innovative, creative, or what not. Or for the rather specious argument that change is useful for the "Hawthorne effect". Or we get caught up in our own rhetoric as to the value of what we are doing and just keep frenetically engaging in change to justify our rhetoric.
May I remind you that in each of our pps areas, the worker is concerned with the pupil as an individual - not as a member of a class, or as an object of instruction, or even individually as an object of remedial instruction. The subject matter content which he is trying to get the pupil to examine is not something which essentially has its origin outside the pupil and is to be learned by the pupil. The subject matter is the pupil himself. The central and chief task of the pps worker is to help the individual pupil properly to assess himself, to make suitable decisions affecting his career, to overcome defects in his personality, and to build strengths or character traits which will enable him to live with himself and others in positive and constructive ways.

Essentially the ways in which pupil personnel services workers have tried to accomplish their mission are three: first, the direct person to person approach in which counseling, therapy, persuasion, advice and authority are used; second, the special group approach for instruction about occupational and educational opportunities, for instruction in self-appraisal, for orientation to the school, for counseling about normal developmental problems, and for group therapy; third, an effort to use the total personnel and machinery of the school to create a school climate conducive to the development of good mental health and strengths within the individual pupil which will enable him more readily to meet and overcome constructively those problems and difficulties in the process of growing up which might otherwise lead to his acquiring anti-social, or neurotic, or even psychotic solutions.

I believe we have achieved a considerable measure of success under the first and second headings. We are far from perfect, but at least we have a growing body of theory and practice and increasingly are researching both theoretical positions and methodological problems. Individual experience and opinion rather than carefully collected empirical evidence or consideration of current thinking in theory of administration have developed a body of beliefs regarding administration and organization. One has but to examine any of the current texts on the organization and administration of guidance or pupil personnel services to see that they are essentially "how to do it," "cook-book" types of presentations.

Very little has been accomplished under the third heading (the creating of a general climate conducive to good mental health and the development of strengths within the individual through the use of the total apparatus of the school.) True, we have preached the doctrine of in-service training of teachers and recently have begun to talk about the necessity for the guidance worker (particularly the elementary school counselor) consulting with teachers, principals, and parents. The problem is two-fold: first, we do not know exactly what the substantive content of our in-service training and consulting should include; second, as administrators, we do not know how to introduce, promote, and develop such programs. The second part of the problem, phrased differently, has to do with inter-personal activities and relationships. How, as administrators, do we get pupil personnel services workers to use some of their time for in-service training and consultation?
How do we get teachers and principals to accept our efforts at enlisting their active cooperation in a truly preventive mental health program? Or to put it in currently fashionable language, how can the director of pupil personnel services operate effectively as an "agent of change?"

I am not going to belabor the issues as to whether the director of pupil personnel services ought to act as an agent of change. It seems to me that the evidence is massive and obvious that our pupil personnel services (or guidance) programs need to be much better than they have been. All of us I am sure have read or heard recited ad nauseam about changing technology and world of work, knowledge explosion, population explosion, increasing indices of mental health problems and of delinquency, our racist society, the youth revolution, etc. etc., and how these argue for

2. I am reminded here of a remark by Saul Alinsky on Today's Youth Cult. "It has been said that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. Today Youth has become the refuge of the ignorant and the confused."

new approaches to education. And, indeed, new approaches have come about in curriculum, in teaching methods, in deployment of pupils and teachers, and in the involvement of teachers and pupils in policy-making.

Regardless of the changing political-social-economic nature of the world, the internal changes within the instructional program force the administrator of pupil personnel services to consider necessary and desirable changes within the guidance program. For example, what meaning for guidance do the non-graded elementary school and team teaching have for a possibly different guidance program? What about CAI and CAC? What about the growing hostility of teachers and administrators towards high school counseling and counselors? Of the movement of some teachers towards becoming more like counselors? (Encouraged by some training and experimental programs, e.g. The Harvard TTT.) Of ASCA's deliberation on leaving APGA to join NEA?

In addition to changes outside and within the school, we have seen an explosion of theory and knowledge within our own or related fields which inevitably must and will have an effect on our practice. To name but a few, witness the effect of Carl Rogers upon counseling practice; of Erik Erikson and Robert White on guidance theory; of Donald Super, David Tiedeman, and Anne Roe on vocational guidance theory and, hopefully, practice; of the studies in the Department of Labor on vocational trends and opportunities; of the work of Pace on the sociological and cultural structures of colleges and its influence on counseling for college selection; of the increased sophistication in measurement as an aid in total personality assessment; of research in the causes, prevention, and correction of juvenile delinquency; and of increased knowledge about learning disabilities and deficits and their treatment.
I don't think anyone in this room can really predict with any degree of confidence what our work will be like 5 or 10 years from now. (It reminds me of the story of the little girl who was drawing a picture with such complete concentration that her mother asked: "What on Earth are you drawing dear?" "I am drawing God," the child answered. But how can you. No one knows what God looks like!" "They'll know," said the girl tersely, "when I am finished.") It is conceivable that computer technology will have eliminated all pupil personnel services practitioners (as we now know them) and that only the brainy "back room" boys in the form of systems analysts, expert programmers, experts in personality and/or behavior modification, and economists and sociologists will provide pupil personnel services via remote control. All we can do now, it seems to me, is to look at what we judge to be significant trends and happenings and to make a few guesses based on them. If enough of us think the same way, probably our guesses will come true. I am sure you all recognize our old friend the self-fulfilling prophecy at work here.

If, pursuing my whimsy about computer technology, individual practitioners and even services are eliminated, the over-all management and coordination of services will still be needed - whether provided by computers or by people - and thus the position of pps administrator will still be needed although there may be some technological unemployment of counselor trainers!

I doubt that any basically new services will be added in the next decade for the better. The greatest change both in number of workers and the nature of their tasks will probably come about in the elementary school guidance program. The elementary school counselor (or consultant, or child development specialist) will emerge in as great numbers as the secondary school counselor. He will do casework, consultation, and counseling. He may do group work of various kinds and with various populations. I would visualize his training program incorporating elements of school psychology, school social work, curriculum, and learning theory. I cannot see how a fully competent elementary school guidance specialist can be trained in under three years if he is to do the quality and kind of work he should. I would further envision that he conceives of his task as being primarily preventive rather than treatment oriented.

There will be probably an increasing use of para-professionals - particularly those who are indigenous to the populations being served.

I suspect that our secondary school counseling program will turn away from its love affair with Rogerian counseling and turn now to behavioral counseling techniques as exemplified by Krumboltz's work. There will be a gradual and increasing reliance upon the use of computer technology as either a substitute for the counselor or as an aid to the counselor. I think more the latter than the former. Further the trend will be away from a technology of in-depth interviewing (somewhat related to the influence of Rogerian-type counseling) and towards a more activist changing of environment. (I will illustrate this later - both in the school and into the community).
To some extent secondary counseling will return to its original love - that of educational and vocational guidance influenced by vocational development theorists as Super and Tiedeman.

So much for the general scope and nature of the work to be done in the future. Obviously there will be all kinds of variations. Undoubtedly the specifics of a program in a well-to-do suburb will differ from those of the inner city. Pupil Personnel Services workers will need to become as much sociologically as psychologically oriented. We will need to know the culture and sub-cultures of the populations we work with as never before. We cannot in Pupil Personnel Services alone meet the needs of the black American, the American of Puerto-Rican descent, the Mexican-American, the American Indian, and other deprived groups. Revolutionary changes will have to take place in the total school program even to begin to meet the needs to these groups. And, I hasten to add, for the changing suburban scene as well - particularly for the alienated. Formerly the alienated consisted of the hostile acting out, low academic ability student whose chief vices were beer and smoking in addition, we have bright activist types who have taken Friedenbergh and Goodman very seriously and who want to revolutionize and control the school. We also have those alienated who have taken to drugs and who "cop-out". Will we as pps administrators make our contribution? Or will we sit by and let others be the architects of change? And further massive changes will have to take place in society at large. But we can make an important contribution if we but try.

All of these factors - change in the world about us, change in our own world of the school, and change in theory and methodology within our own field - argue for the director of pps taking an active role as an agent of change.

I might add parenthetically here that unless the pps director does take an active role as an agent of change, he will be by-passed and possibly eliminated along with the services he is supposed to administer. There is a growing impatience on the part of some of our best young teachers with the quality of services offered by pps and with their crystallization into patterns which are not working in a period of rapid change.

I mentioned this before but I would like to give you an example of this. A psychology teacher in one of our high schools and his class, dissatisfied with the inability - in their judgement - of existing services to be of any real help to alienated youth embarked on a project to help remedy the deficit. They formed a non-profit corporation (foundation) designed to sponsor and support a kind of half-way house, a home away from home. They rightly inferred that the alienated, bright suburban student needed a chance to be away from home and family for one or more nights while in contact with strong, supportive adolescents under the supervision of a trained adult couple. The students and teacher developed community support and are in process of collecting money, finding a house, and staff. I feel chagrined that the idea did not at least originate in pps.
We do have what I believe to be some good examples of change initiated by us. One has to do with the development of a special counseling program in one of our high schools for alienated students of the "hippie", "drug scene" orientation. This meant hiring a counselor who did not have the usual training and who operates very differently in the high school from the other counselors. We also initiated a special combination of counseling, tutoring, and vocational training programs for a group of acting-out, hostile, delinquent junior high boys. The boys are out of the school in varying amounts of time on special projects, trips, etc. Each boy has an individually tailored program. Much of what we are doing in this program was derived from a large research and training project we did jointly with the Judge Baker Guidance Center under a fairly large Federal grant.

Some will say so what if the pps administrator is by-passed and possibly eliminated along with the services he is supposed to administer? Well I don't think there is anything absolutely holy and sacred about ourselves and our services - particularly if they are not accomplishing the goal of "helping the individual pupil properly to assess himself, to make suitable decisions affecting his career, or to overcome defects in his personality, and to build strengths or character traits which will enable him to live with himself and others in positive and constructive ways." If we are not accomplishing this goal, we deserve to be by-passed and eliminated.

A quotation by Albert Einstein may be in order here. "Two things are needed for our kind of work: one is indefatigable persistance; the other is the ability to discard something in which one has invested great labor and many ideas." This applies to us as well as to mathematical physicists.

On the other hand I do believe we have developed some "knowhow" and an attitude towards how to do the job which are important to preserve and to use in the process of bringing about necessary change.

I wrote of the techniques of bringing about change in Guidance in American Education II: Current Issues and Suggested Action. In that article, based upon some research evidence, personal experience, and the writings of theorists in administration as Lindblom, Likert, Simon, and Bennis I advocated the Human Relations vs. the Authoritarian approach and what I called the Successive Limited Increment approach vs. the Rational - Comprehensive Method of decision making. The Successive Limited Increment approach of biting off small manageable bites at a time is based upon the assumption that in jobs like ours one will never have all the relevant information, properly weighted, to arrive at precisely the exact rational decision necessary. Given the social conditions of today and the rapidity of change in technology with its subsequent effects, I would modify my theory to argue for biting off somewhat bigger bites to the extent of challenging your digestive capacity instead of those which are comfortably manageable. Also (and this shows how rapidly changes have come about in the last few years) I would argue for including pupils in the Human Relations approach. In my article I must admit that I had thought only of the administrator and his professional colleagues.
An illustration of a useful tactic for this general strategy (human relations coupled with successive limited increments) is to be found in an article by Thomas J. Cottle, Assistant professor of social relations at Harvard University, in the September 20, 1969 issue of the Saturday Review entitled Strategy for Change (I think the title should be "A Useful Tactic for Change"). The article is based upon the work being done by Professor Max Bernbaum (of the Center for Human Relations at Boston University) in the Bristol Township, New Jersey school system. Bernbaum's approach stresses "interpersonal understanding aimed at improving work efficiency among employees or colleagues". The technique is largely one of group work but differs from the usual T-group or sensitivity training in focussing on specific professional questions and problems rather than on interpersonal sensitivity and personal growth although these are by-products. I recommend the article for your reading.

If the administrator is wise, he will worry less about paper organization and more about real power. He will attempt to study the sociology of his job, of the organization in which he works, and the community which the organization serves. He will build a power base in the community. He will then be in a position to apply the necessary leverage to accomplish his purpose. In a day of changing teacher-counselor-administrator relationships this is terribly important.

I suspect that counselors, psychologists, etc., will tend to gravitate towards the teachers, to join with them to seek better pay, better conditions, etc. Witness the movement now underway with ASCA to leave APGA and join the NEA. Do we indentify with them or with the Superintendent and School Board? We are entering a whole new world of negotiated contracts not only for salaries but for specifics of working conditions. I further suspect that concepts of "line" and "staff" will tend to blur and even disapear and that acceptance of our leadership as middle-management administrators will be based far more on respect for our know-how, acceptance of us as persons, and our skill in persuasion than ever before. We will really have to be good; we will not be able to fall back on the authority of our positions. We will have to live with far fuzzier lines of demarcation between what is our area of interest and specialty as contrasted with instruction or even as opposed to the volunteer efforts of people in the community.

What of the future? Are there difficulties which may delay or even reverse growth in this field? The greatest danger lies in our own possible ineptness. If we mount and sustain effective programs, we will continue to grow short of an all out war or major depression - then all bets are off.

Another danger - minor at the moment - is the possible growth of ideas to be found in the radical right or left. The so-called new left is for wiping out existing institutions and practices and starting anew with almost complete power - vested in the student body. They are not communist so much as anarchist. They would do away with all authority. The students who say, "we don't trust anyone over 25," illustrate sharply this kind of anarchy. It is interesting to me that those teachers and teacher-trainers who are "new-left" generally tend
to advocate the abolition of the position of school counselor. It is also interesting to note that the radical right also is strongly against guidance and mental health programs. The new left fear these programs as creating conformists; the radical right fear them as liberating pupils and making them too rational and thus less susceptible to their preachments and doctrines.

One the whole I see healthy growth of pupil personnel services programs. But, I repeat, they must be good. One factor in the development of "goodness" will be the quality and extent of programs of research, evaluation and development. At the moment, there does not seem to be much of any real substance that is going on. One can name Super's Career Pattern Study, Tiedeman's ISVD project, and perhaps a few others such as Biber, Ojiman, and Lippit in the field of basic prevention. But not much else of any genuine significance. This area (research-evaluation-development) may turn out to be our Achille's heel.

We will have trouble also in staffing and recruitment, I believe. I don't mean in terms of quantity but rather in quality - in the quality of the people entering the field and in their training. There are still too many colleges and universities with insufficient or poor staffing. Certification standards have to be made both more rigorous and at the same time more flexible. We need to take more chances with para-professional types. And, above all else, people entering this field need to do so out of a sense of mission; they need to be strong, rational, and humanistically oriented. The universities and colleges need to work a great deal harder on the problem of student selection than they have. Good mental health, high intelligence, education which has increased awareness of people and social issues, and a sense of dedication are it seems to me, desirable in a degree candidate. These are undoubtedly important qualities for anyone in the human relations field. Research on these attributes as they make for competence on the job is badly needed.

In closing, I believe we are in a growing and healthy field of activity. We have some weaknesses, but, also, many strengths. What the field will be like 10 years from now depends to a considerable extent upon what the present practitioners and scholars do about it now.

Edward Landy
EMERGING ISSUES IN PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

I am sure that when your colleagues heard that you were going to Grossinger's for a conference they grinned from ear to ear, thought of matzo balls and golf, and were sure your time here would be spent in R & R - rest and recreation. While I am an advocate of spaced learning, I hope my talk tonight can be militant enough and arouse enough useful anxiety in you that the time spent together will be used to face problems which demand solution. It may be trite, but true, that we are at a crossroad where we can either lead or face ultimate elimination from the educational scene.

For those of you who like to keep track, the emerging issues I am going to explore are: teacher power, student power, money power, the relevance of our current training for the job we need to do, the relevance of the techniques we use to reach our professed objectives, the role of PPS administrators as change agents, and the way budgets and the concept of accountability may in the long run make decisions for us, whether we like it or not. Since these issues are interrelated, I will not be discussing them as separate issues.

This is the time of year when each of us must face the implications of the school budget approved for next year. A recent report from the ASCD suggests that pupil personnel services face budget cuts as large as 25% in many cities across the nation. When, in addition, militant teachers negotiate for smaller class size in preference to supportive services, those of us in PPS better take stock.

Commissioner Nyquist,¹ in a recent article, predicted that within the next three to five years we will see at least the regionalization of collective negotiations and quite probably negotiations on a statewide basis, with the Union in New York City and the New York State Teachers Association consolidating or merging into one organization.

Although most professional organizations have avoided political action, it may be very timely for us to consider the development of a negotiating unit on a statewide basis which would include all of the special services commonly included in PPS.

If we add to Commissioner Nyquist's estimate of future statewide negotiations the potential effect of a bill being introduced by Senator Laverne, calling for regional organization (multiple counties) of almost all services now being provided by BOCES, the question of who is the employer and with whom PPS should ally themselves becomes very relevant. I hope that any plans made for larger geographical units will consider the following ground rules in developing their organizational chart:

1. The closer people are located to the people they need to serve, the more effective they can be, not only in providing service, but also in effecting changes within the system. The more itinerant the worker, the less he is identified with a specific school.
2. While the school system needs a wide variety of specialists, there is a large number of tasks in the area of the behavioral sciences with which all schools desire help and which are within the capabilities of many people coming from diverse disciplines.

3. Any regional plan needs to reevaluate the ways in which medical and health services are provided to school children.

4. The basic problem in providing regional services from a centralized location is the assumption that each of these services is peripheral to the goal of the school; namely, instruction. Time does not permit an extended discussion of the PPS role in instruction, the suggesting of content relevant to the background and developmental level of students, and concern for a learning environment which maximizes possibilities for student growth.

5. The problems of the urban and suburban population are different.

Like many of you, I work during periods when teachers are off. During the recent Easter recess I spent my time trying to think through how I might handle more effectively the many confrontations I experience almost daily. In the process I read Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville, edited by Berube and Gittell. It was a frightening experience because I could see the same dynamics operating in Rochester. We don't seem to be able to profit from the experience of others. I am referring to this book at this time because for me it had several important messages:

1. When security is threatened, even liberal groups act in a reactionary manner.

2. When advisory groups are formed, their purpose and scope of action better be sharply defined or they must test the limits to discover reality. This applies equally well for student groups as it does for community action groups.

3. Society is changing faster than the schools and confrontation appears to be the only device which currently produces enough motivation to force institutions to be willing to face the anxiety concomitant with change.

The word "confrontation" is almost a trigger word these days. There is nothing involved in the relationship between the participants that vaguely resembles the counseling or therapeutic models of PPS personnel feel most comfortable in using. Two issues emerge. The first deals with why confrontations occur; and the second deals with our complete lack of skill or training to cope with these hostile and anxiety-filled relationships.
James Statman,3 presented a paper at the American Orthopsychiatric Association Conference which dealt with the first issue. He raised the following questions:

"1. Do urban ghettos need 'mental health' or does the professional clinical approach serve to divert community resources from more meaningful efforts?

2. Does the employment of neighborhood leaders as mental health aides or in other paraprofessional job slots serve as a form of cooptation, alienating these leaders from their community and thereby weakening the neighborhood power base?

3. Is it naive to believe that Federally funded 'social action' programs are free to confront the basic oppressive institutions of our society?"

Some of you may have read the article by Joseph Stubbins4 on "The Politics of Counseling" in the recent issue of The Personnel and Guidance Journal. In it he points up the limitations imposed on counselors by the values and modus operandi of the institutions where they work and its preconceptions of the client's problems. Citing Miller and Riessman5 he criticizes professionals who try to force clients to adapt to institutions that are inadequate to begin with. Nyquist, for example, specifically criticizes counseling and guidance in our schools because of their distorted emphasis in favor of academic credentialism.

Lest all these ideas seem far afield from problems of budget, or the recent trend toward accountability of services as justification for existence, let me tell you about a recent experience.

One of our preschool programs funded under ESEA, Title I, was evaluated by an outside agency to see how effectively it functioned. Using standardized tests, no significant improvement in vocabulary or comparable academic skills was noted. Obviously we were disturbed until we looked further. We found that inarticulate children were now talking; that the group had gone on many trips, developed word charts, and were now quite spontaneous in communicating with other children and adults. Their sentences were longer and were more complex. They felt more secure and liked school. Why then the test results? The answer is simple. The standardized test did not measure many of the words they did learn; while it included some which were still alien to an inner-city child's experience. Feelings, security levels, spontaneity, all are difficult to measure; hence, groups needing to prove change will test where instruments already exist and then find themselves teaching for the test to ensure positive results. The concept of accountability, when applied to PPS, could easily move us away from significant areas of student growth. They are
hard to measure or to prove that growth is directly related to our intervention. Let me point out that in my discussion so far I have not raised the even more relevant issue as to who determines the goals which should be sought.

A counselor meeting with a student from an inner city tried to help the student talk about his problems and his goals. The student's response was classic: "I don't want to rap with you. What I need, man, is some bread!" Social workers, fearful of a return to the days when they played the role of lady bountiful, are not eager to give up their statusful therapeutic role; but if they and their PPS team members think back to Maslow's need theory, they will remember that questions of self-concept and role satisfaction appear only after basic needs are satisfied. Much as we would like to limit ourselves to educational objectives, the needs of the community and society are rapidly entering the school and ignoring them will not make them go away.

Clearly, the school as we have known it is due for some drastic changes. Have you, for example, considered what your role might be if your school system, like the one in Texarkana, subcontracts with industry to produce student achievement and behaviors on a cost-plus basis? I want to again quote Commissioner Nyquist:6

"With respect to educational administration in the future, we shall see increasingly that the remaining old forms of remote, hierarchical, authoritarian, and paternalistic leadership will disappear, to be replaced by superintendents and school boards who are gifted in conflict resolution and in playing a collegial role, who know how to achieve consensus with the least social cost, and how to sustain stability at the same time that needed change is immediately and constantly accommodated. The leader of the future will be one, too, who knows how to live with ambiguity and with temporary systems, who is mission-oriented and adept in employing task forces to accomplish given purposes, instead of relying on established neat bureaucratic lines."

So far I have suggested that the PPS worker needs new and different skills, may need to ally himself with others to survive the coming power struggle, and needs to be secure enough to welcome and facilitate change. In the light of this job description one may well ask how our clients see us now. I've alluded to our questionable acceptance by teachers and some administrators, but what about students and parents? They too are raising searching questions about the level of education, training and background needed to work in the pupil personnel services professions. The use of aides, paraprofessionals, and volunteers may emerge as a vital focus for discussion as society sees lower levels of training as being less expensive; while militant minorities question whether help can really be given by people who differ markedly in any way from their clients. Some people are even asking if in the process of being trained as a professional the student loses his human qualities which appear to make many paraprofessionals so effective.
I recently was faced with a personal dilemma. One of the New York State Regents called me during their deliberations on the establishment of new PPS certification standards for New York State. I was asked to evaluate the proposed standards. My choice was for either no change after waiting sixteen years or to give approval to changes which would raise requirements in each discipline, reinforce the separateness of professions rather than their common bonds, does not reflect new trends as evidenced by the different knowledge needed by elementary counselors from those at other levels, and which assumes that college courses piled higher make for better preparation. While I pondered my answer, I could see in my mind's eye the reactions of people recently assembled by the Office of Education in Atlanta, Georgia, to explore the relevance and training of the various PPS disciplines. Included, in addition to professionals, were students and representatives of community action groups. They were extremely vocal about a career ladder concept, about training PPS workers at the Bachelor level, and about experiences needed to broaden the background of trainees to help them work with different segments of the client population.

As I shared my thoughts and my distress with the Regent, we both felt the new law was inadequate but decided that until we could work with the current power blocks in the professions, not changing the old law would not reduce the problem. So we agreed to an accommodation. Pass the revision and start work immediately on another revision. Ban of us recognized that we had solved no problems and had given the alienated segments of the population further evidence that we were not listening to what they had to say.

I think it is very important for this group to explore their role in attempts to change this legislation. We had data from the Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services which showed the value of the generalist as well as the specialist. Our daily work calls for coordinating the various disciplines and using them flexibly. We did define standards for the PPS Administrator. Yet all this was ignored when the legislation finally was completed. Why were we ineffective? An examination of the power groups which ultimately decided this piece of legislation should provide clear evidence of where we need to start working, with whom, and toward what ends.

Many of the questions I have raised in this paper are not new; but I feel that it is time we begin to provide new answers. At the very least our future existence demands a clarity of vision about our role, our goal, to whom we are accountable and for what, and probably basic to it all, where our power base is, which will provide the security we need when we venture out into uncharted areas requiring new skills and providing completely new and different sets of rewards.

Walter M. Lifton
NYSAPPA
Grossinger's, N.Y.
April 29, 1970


Additional references of interest to FPS workers concerned with the problem of confrontation:


