

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 543

EA 003 731

AUTHOR

Friesen, D., Ed.; Bumbarger, C. S., Ed.

TITLE

School System Personnel: Administrative Practices and Problems. Regional Invitational Annual Conference for School Administrators (13th, Banff, Alberta, April 25-27, 1971).

INSTITUTION

Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Dept. of Educational Administration.

PUB DATE

Apr 71

NOTE

89p.

AVAILABLE FROM

Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, Edmonton 7, Alberta (Canada) (\$2.75)

EDRS PRICE

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS

Administrative Problems; Conferences; *Cost Effectiveness; Employment Qualifications; *Personnel Evaluation; Personnel Needs; *Personnel Policy; *Professional Recognition; *School Personnel; Task Performance; Teacher Employment; Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This report contains the proceedings of the conference, which focused on current thinking in personnel practices and some related problems. Four authors discuss the subject from different perspectives. Fred Enns outlines the state of affairs in personnel administration, identifies the primary functions of supervision, and provides data to indicate how changing conditions in schools and society affect these functions. E.W. Ratsoy approaches the theme of teacher professionalism with the suggestion that educators have been too pessimistic in their views of professionalization, but adds that greater teacher participation in decisionmaking and more opportunities for individuality in teaching are promising developments in the move toward educational professionalism. Peter J. Atherton deals with personnel costs and offers two alternatives to current practices: a new salary grid and a new form of staff reorganization. D. A. MacKay explores personnel evaluation in the light of new educational developments and proposes an evaluation model based on recently developed concepts. A related document is ED 044 793. (Author/MLF)

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**BANFF
REGIONAL
CONFERENCE
1971**

ED054543

SCHOOL SYSTEM PERSONNEL
Administrative Practices and Problems



**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON**

EA 003 731

ED054543

The Thirteenth Annual
BANFF REGIONAL INVITATIONAL
CONFERENCE FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

April 25, 26, 27, 1971

SCHOOL SYSTEM PERSONNEL:
ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS

Edited by

D. Friesen and C. S. Bumbarger

Sponsored by

The Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education University of Alberta
Edmonton

Price - \$2.75

CONTENTS

Conference Planning and Arrangements	ii
Conference Contributors	iii
Foreword	iv
Introduction	1
Personnel Administration: An Overview F. Enns	2
Professionalism in Education: An Optimistic View E. W. Ratsoy	24
Personnel Costs: A Problem in Rationality P. J. Atherton	43
Evaluation of Personnel: Practices and Problems D. A. MacKay	61
Appendix	
Conference Agenda	
Conference Participants	
Publication Order Form	

CONFERENCE PLANNING AND ARRANGEMENTS

Advisory Committee 1970 - 1971

G. H. Dawe	Red Deer, Alberta
J. W. Downey	St. Boniface, Manitoba
W. A. Herle	Regina S.S.B., Saskatchewan
Colin McKenzie	Trail, British Columbia
J. V. VanTighem	Calgary R.C.S.S.D., Alberta

Advisory Committee 1971 - 1972

Charles Cuthbert	Langley, British Columbia
R. E. Stephenson	Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan
B. J. Strain	Stettler, Alberta
D. R. Taylor	Grande Prairie, Alberta
A. J. Wieler	Seven Oaks, Manitoba

Department of Educational Administration

Gordon Mowat, Chairman

Chester S. Bumbarger, Conference Co-Director

David Friesen, Conference Co-Director

Donald Barnett, Graduate Student

Conference Contributors

Dr. Fred Enns
Associate Dean, Faculty of Education
University of Alberta

Dr. E. W. Ratsoy
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

Dr. Al MacKay
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

Dr. P. J. Atherton
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

Interest Group Chairmen

Dr. J. J. Bergen

Mr. C. Cuthbert

Mr. B. J. Strain

Mr. A. J. Wieler

FOREWORD

This publication reports the proceedings of the thirteenth annual Banff Conference for School Administrators. Ever since its inception this Conference has focused on problems particularly relevant to school administrators and board members in medium sized districts.

As more of these districts appoint their own superintendents and as decentralization progresses, this Conference may attain an even more important function than it has in the past.

The Conference is a continuing project of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta. The Department assumes the responsibility but plans the program and activities with an advisory committee selected in such a way as to provide representation from the four Western provinces of Canada.

This report contains the major addresses. The informal exchange of ideas, so valuable in a Conference of this nature, cannot be summarized for publication.

Introduction

Personnel practices and problems have always been of concern to the school administrator. During the past few years this concern has been intensified because of a number of developments which affect the operation of the schools.

Education has seen the emergence of a greater emphasis upon the improvement of the quality of the school's performance. Questions in increasing numbers and from a broadening diversity of sources are being raised about reducing the cost of education. More recently the focus on quality, costs, and evaluation have found a home in the concept of accountability.

These persistent and new concerns in education led to the selection of the theme for this Conference. The intent was to provide an overview of personnel practices by dealing with developments to date. Consideration of current thinking in personnel practices and examination in depth of some of the related problems was the aim.

The state of affairs in personnel administration was outlined in the initial presentation. It reviewed the major concepts and examined these in the light of recent developments.

Professionalization of teachers was the focus of the second presentation. The optimistic view, in which the relative nature of professionalism is highlighted, was proposed in place of the conflict-model or the insecurity model. These latter are too frequently advocated at present.

The third session dealt with the costs of personnel. Arguing that total costs are not the real problem, but rather the allocation of costs, this presentation suggests two alternatives to current practices, (1) a new salary grid and (2) a new form of staff organization.

The final session explored new developments in personnel evaluation. A model based on recently developed concepts was proposed as a plan for evaluation.

Anyone interested in the problem areas and evolving practices in personnel administration should find material of value in this Conference report.

- Eds.

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION: AN OVERVIEW

Fred Enns

Dr. Enns, in the first paper of the Conference, presents an overview of personnel administration.

Personnel administration is a major component of the administrator's task. In a school system the largest slice of the expenditure is in the form of wages and salaries. Dr. Enns argues that machines cannot replace personnel in the complex processes of education. As a result, increases in "productivity" in schools must be achieved through better organization, better training, and better supervision of personnel.

Dr. Enns then proceeds to identify the primary functions of supervision, and provides data to indicate how changing conditions in schools and society affect these functions.

- Eds.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a school system some 75-80% of the operating expenditure is in the form of wages and salaries. This is an indication of the extent of the personnel component in the system's operations. An economist calls it a labor-intensive enterprise. By that he means simply that it is not feasible, or perhaps not even possible, to replace expensive personnel with less costly machinery as a means of keeping control of costs. In a manufacturing enterprise, or in many business concerns, rising labor costs can be offset by converting a number of processes to machine operations. By so doing it is often possible to bring about greater efficiencies, to reduce unit processing costs, to increase the productivity of workers who remain and thereby to hold the rate of cost increase to an acceptable level and to maintain a competitive, or profit-producing position.

A labor-intensive enterprise cannot adopt such a tactic. Its activities are seldom adaptable to automated, machine operation. Its processes usually involve very complex interactions among people. So, while it is possible to employ machines to extend the actions of some people, it is necessary to look elsewhere for ways and means to reduce "unit costs" or to bring about increases in the "productivity" of the work force. The system must look to its personnel administration for this sort of thing, and because the effective functioning of personnel involves all the delicate complexities of human

relationships and interactions, this may well be the most crucial part of its entire operation.

Increases in "productivity," or reductions in "unit costs," must be brought about by such means as: more effective work arrangements, more efficient organization, more reduction in frustration and unproductive conflict, improved training of personnel for more efficient functioning, broader provision of stimulating working conditions, and more attention to motivation and the provision of incentives to employees to work effectively. No doubt some procedures can be automated, and in some instances -- such as the use of A/V media, or Computer-assisted Instruction, etc.,-- machines of various kinds can be employed to contribute to the achievement of various objectives. Those processes which are tedious or monotonous for human workers, or which are open to human error, such as some accounting and data processing operations, can and should be automated. Applications of technology, such as closed circuit T.V., which can be employed to enhance a teacher's efforts, should also be accomplished, but not with the expectation of replacing some or all of the teaching staff. Rather, the emphasis must be on adequate organization and on providing the working conditions which will encourage personnel to make a highly professional self-directed contribution to the system's goals.

II. THE CONTEXT OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

In some of the writing on school administration a distinction is drawn between administration and supervision. Administration

is taken to refer mainly to "business" operations, while supervision is related more closely to personnel, curriculum, and the processes of developing instructional programs. It is more productive, I think, to work in terms of the more general concept "personnel administration" which includes the connotations usually attached to the term "supervision." Conceptually, therefore, we are dealing with one of the tasks of administration and our purpose is to try to see it in its overall context and to try to understand it somewhat more fully.

When we speak of personnel administration we tend to limit ourselves to considering professional, certificated staff. Not so long ago, of course, there were relatively few employees in a school system who were not related directly to the instructional program. Today, however, a school system has substantial numbers of employees other than teachers, administrators and helping personnel located in the central office. There is clerical staff, for example, both in central office and in the schools; there are librarians and Instructional Media Centre employees; there are teacher aides and technical assistants; there are custodial and maintenance staffs. All are important to the operation of the system, and the interrelationships among all groups determine in large measure the overall effectiveness of the system. Nor can we think of any of these groups as divorced from the instructional program in the schools. Some may be more remote from it, but all contribute to it. Conversely, if any group is not functioning effectively, then it detracts from the overall functional effectiveness.

The need for adequate organization to enable the system to take care of its personnel needs is obvious. The business aspects must be cared for. Records must be kept; planning must be done; plans must be implemented in the ongoing development of the system. One system will choose to centralize the personnel function; another to decentralize as much as possible. Whatever the choice -- and I would personally favor the latter approach -- some provision must be made in the central office for a department or division of personnel, which will itself require adequate staff and facilities.

Having made reference to the fact of existence of personnel other than those in the schools, I am now, for purposes of affording a focus, going to confine my remarks and considerations mainly to certificated personnel.

III. THE FUNCTIONS OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Every textbook in personnel administration deals with the functions in a different way. Some are rather long and dull in their treatment. Since mine is primarily an overview task, I will be more concerned with identifying functions than with extensive discussion. Other speakers will deal with the more specific concerns related to the various functions.

Recruitment

It was not long ago that recruiters for school systems were most concerned with finding

enough bodies to place in positions which they had. Qualifications beyond the required minimum were of secondary importance. As often as not, it was impossible to assign teachers to teach in the particular field of their specialized preparation. We still have many teachers prepared for secondary levels, teaching in elementary grades for which they lack qualifications, or social studies teachers teaching mathematics, or home economics majors teaching in general classrooms.

It is not inappropriate to suggest that under circumstances of teacher shortages, recruiters developed some slipshod approaches to their task, and that they can no longer justify operating in the same way. In future they will have to assess their needs more accurately, and staff so as to meet those needs more adequately. I have no answers as to how they do this, but I am convinced that we cannot much longer tolerate the haphazard practices which prevailed in a time of shortage of teachers.

Selection and placement

One cannot really separate recruitment from selection and placement. These latter are the "follow through" functions of recruiting. Selection procedures are obviously very important, for by selecting better personnel, a system avoids much of the necessity for future upgrading. Moreover, experience, as well as studies, shows that inservice education and professional upgrading are slow, laborious processes. The school system which selects best, therefore, is far ahead in terms of effective staffing. Having said this, however, I must hasten to

add that the criteria for selection of teachers are shaky at best. There are no reliable predictors of general success in teaching, because so much depends upon other variables in the classroom, in the school and in the community -- singly and in combination -- into which the teacher is placed. Most ego-threatening of all is the evidence which shows that the job interview -- in which we pride ourselves -- is one of the least effective of the selection devices we employ. It ranks about equal with letters of recommendation. Perhaps the best we can do, therefore, is to involve principals of the schools where teachers are to be assigned, as well as some of their future colleagues, in making selection decisions. At least these people will tend to select others somewhat like themselves, and they will be more likely to work as colleagues with a minimum of conflict, though the implications for creative, diverse approaches to schooling may not be so acceptable.

I have already alluded to assignment-- or misassignment -- of teachers. In a time of shortage of qualified personnel, there may have been some justification for assigning secondary majors to elementary classrooms, or English teachers to teach science, but it hardly seems justified now, when supply and demand of teachers are more nearly in balance. There is a conventional wisdom abroad to the effect that the good teacher can "teach" at all levels and in all subject areas. Like many other "common-sense" notions, it is fallacious. If it is true, we have wasted a lot of time in developing routes and specializations in teacher education programs. It is possible to become too narrowly specialized, but that's not the point at issue. A study by one of my students in 1967 suggests that

misassignment of teachers -- in terms of preparation and preference for grade level and subject specialization -- runs as high as 50-60% in some subject areas. This implies that large numbers of pupils are being taught by "unqualified" teachers.

Staff Development

When the recruitment, selection and placement decisions have been made, the job is only half done, especially insofar as young and inexperienced teachers are concerned. In education we take a very off-hand approach to the induction of the neophyte. In medicine the young graduate serves a period of internship and residency. In law and accounting there is a period of articling. In engineering the new B. Sc. is expected to serve a learning period in junior-level positions and responsibilities. Even tradesmen must serve their apprenticeship before being granted full journeyman status. But in education we place the novice in full charge, sometimes in difficult situations, and in effect say, "Sink or swim. If you go under, too bad; it's your own responsibility."

Other matters beyond the initial orientation are also important, however. Teachers, like everyone else, need to keep abreast of changes in their profession, and in the method and content of their teaching specialization. This implies continuing professional development and inservice education. Unfortunately, to date much of what is termed inservice or professional development has been relatively ineffective. In fact, someone has suggested that inservice education is one of today's biggest spectator sports. The implication is that

most of the activities are arranged for teachers on someone else's perceptions of what they need. Teachers dutifully attend, observe, even applaud good performance, and then return to their classes to function in exactly the same ways as before. The indication is pretty clear: the degree of tinkering suggested by the usual inservice activity does not make much difference in overall conditions or requirements. Moreover, unless people are really involved in planning for and resolving their own problems, at the time when the problems are current, little change of behavior can be expected.

Tenure, Transfer, Separation

The question of tenure is a lively topic of discussion these days. On one side it is suggested that tenure is a means of sheltering the incompetent, the indolent, the deviant. On the other it is touted as protection against arbitrary or capricious actions of administrators and school boards. Both positions have merit, but neither contains the whole truth. There is need for some form of protection, but it is also true that some teachers will -- and do -- take advantage of the provisions which exist. I do not have any solutions to the problems raised, but current practices do seem in need of review. Perhaps tenure ought to be for specified periods rather than for indefinite terms. Moreover, the cursory sorts of judgments that are often used as the basis for granting or denying tenure must be modified.

The success of a teacher, and the benefit to the school and pupils which goes with his success, is often determined by factors in

the school and community situation, quite apart from the competence or commitment of the teacher himself. Thus a teacher may be relatively unsuccessful with a particular class, in a particular school, or in a particular community. Then it is in her own, and in the school's, best interests to transfer her to a position where the chances of success are higher. That a school system, and more specifically its personnel department, keeps contact with the overall situation so that it can detect and accommodate to these requirements, is of course, most important.

Even in the best-run systems, there will be occasions when it becomes necessary to sever relationships. Procedures may be initiated by either party: teacher or system. I need not dwell on the legal requirements which govern termination of contracts. These are well known, and if they are not observed are likely to be brought forcibly to the attention of the parties involved. More to the point, however, is the fact that persons leaving a school or system can be a source of much valuable feedback about the system, its policies and operations. The so-called exit interview is widely employed, for the individuals involved are then more to feel free to be frank in their statements and assessments than at any other time.

Promotion

Promotion in education seems to mean primarily appointment to administrative positions, in which are included the supervisory roles. Promotion seems to require a shift of attention and activity

from working directly with pupils, to working with other employees of the system or with facilities and processes which are only indirectly related to pupil learning. There is no doubt about the need for competent people to work at the many administrative tasks, but from time to time the question is raised whether such "promotion" is entirely functional for the school system.

Without coming to grips with that issue, we can nevertheless agree that the system must provide for an orderly, rational procedure for assessing its needs for special personnel and for identifying, preparing and developing staff for appointment to positions that require special competencies. Again, it is not improper to suggest that in the past school systems have not really done anything worthy of note in this regard. The research we have, and it is becoming fairly extensive, indicates that administrative appointments at all levels, tend to be quite haphazard. If it was once true that in a period of rapid growth, systems were unable to develop their own programs because of the sheer demands of numbers, it is no longer so, and personnel officers must face up to the task.

Stimulation and Motivation - Professional Incentives

It is generally recognized that teachers begin their careers with enthusiasm and high ideals, and that this approach carries them through the early years. Satisfaction levels are high, unless teachers have particularly unpleasant experiences, and the sense of achievement which they have contributes to overall professional well being.

But even if most things go well, there is a general tapering off of the initial excitement and teachers fall into routine approaches to their tasks. Like all of us, they get into ruts, and like most of us, are uneasy about being there. They do a good, but ordinary job. They would like to get out of the routines and re-establish the earlier enthusiasms, but somehow it rarely happens. The risks seem to outweigh the potential benefits, and it seems just too difficult to try to modify what appear to be inflexible institutional expectations. It is easier, though less satisfying professionally, to do what is expected in the middle-level range.

How to help them to overcome this inertia and hesitation to change is one of the really important questions a school system must resolve. Motivation of the kind implied is an extremely subtle thing. It cannot be legislated. Developing regulations or policies requiring particular kinds of behavior or instructional approaches defeats the purpose. Nor can negotiation and collective bargaining provide for it. Such motivation is likely to be related to innovative, forward-looking program development, creative administrative practices, good human relations, and attempts to release professional potential. It is related to involvement in making the decisions which have direct bearing on professional matters, but it may also require being freed of many of the thousand and one minor demands which leave no time or energy for creative teacher behavior. It may require the addition of positive factors to the environment, but not necessarily an

overwhelming addition of such factors, particularly if someone else decided which factors were important. It may require the removal of negative factors from the environment -- negative in the perception of the individual teachers concerned. It may also be related to the provision of assistance for which teachers indicate a need, but it becomes clearer every day that most teachers will no longer tolerate paternalistic attitudes in the provision of aid.

Supervision

The provision of assistance is related to the question of supervising professional staff. Perhaps a more accurate term would be the provision of consultative services. As I have already indicated in relation to inservice education, such helping service, based on need as ascertained by an outsider, can be almost totally ineffective. The more fully prepared professionally, the more likely the teacher is to reject such help. So the problem of the central office supervisory staff becomes a matter of being available when called upon, rather than devising ways of justifying their own positions. I have said on numerous occasions that it is unlikely that anyone can teach anyone anything. He can only make it possible for others to learn. And we know that real learning occurs only when the learner is ready and motivated to learn.

Assessment of Performance

This topic is to be dealt with in greater detail in another paper. I propose merely to raise the question for you to ponder

in preparation for that session. The conventional wisdom suggests that teachers must be visited frequently by outside authorities to judge their effectiveness. Laymen are quick to take this position, and most administrators also tend to agree. The incongruity of the situation is that much of the instructional effectiveness of the teacher is determined by factors beyond his control.

Perhaps we spend so much of our resources in assessment practices that we have too little left to attack major problems at their roots. As the level of teacher preparation and maturity increases, there is less justification than ever for this approach.

IV. DIVISION AND ASSIGNMENT OF FUNCTIONS

To this point, numerous functions which are related to administration of school system personnel have been noted, and other functions have been left untouched. Throughout, I have dealt almost exclusively with professional personnel, though most of what was said applies equally well to the non-certificated staff. Very little has been said about the location within the organizational structure for various of the personnel functions. Nor am I able to be specific about where the functions should be located. This will depend, in the final analysis, upon such matters as size of the system and degree of centralization or decentralization of administration. It will also depend on the size and adequacy of organization and staffing of the personnel department.

Some general observations may be in order, however. It makes sense to try to decentralize personnel functions as much as feasible. The "helping" functions in particular ought to be located as near the teaching-learning centres as possible. General recruitment and employment may well be carried out centrally, but only on the basis of information which describes the specific needs of the schools of the system. Certainly in placement, orientation and professional development "local" involvement at the school level is most important. Program development and development of situational conditions which motivate and encourage truly professional behavior can be most successful if they are largely decentralized. A very real dilemma is posed in the school system as to the balance it should properly establish between central-office personnel staff, and those located strategically throughout the system. There are ways to provide for the discharge of some important personnel functions other than through adding to central office staff, and school systems should seriously explore such alternatives. Consulting with teachers and principals may lead to operational developments which are particularly suited to the special needs of a system. The overall objective might well be to try to achieve a balance between centralized and decentralized functions.

Much has been written and said about human relations in personnel administration, and I believe that what has been said on the subject continues to be valid. We need to continue to stress

such basic matters as appropriately involving people in making the decisions which are to affect them, their job satisfaction, and group morale. Effective communication and understanding continue to be of crucial importance. Unfortunately, most of us become deeply ego-involved in our debates, and as a result tend to adopt and defend positions which we had really overstated at the outset. Our perceptions of the motives of the adversary then become distorted and we act on the basis of inadequate if not exactly incorrect information.

V. RECENT CHANGES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR STAFFING

I should like to devote the remainder of the paper to examining some recent developments in education and some of the implications they have for the administration of educational personnel. I do not propose to do much more than identify the issues of concern.

Change in Instructional Space

The first of these that comes to mind is the radical change in school building design with open areas, flexible spaces, instructional media centres. Having instructional groups meet side by side without the separating effect and privacy of the standard classroom is a major departure in facilities. It implies a fundamentally different approach to teaching and learning, and certainly the question of pupil control is now placed into a different context. Moreover, senior high and even junior high schools are being organized on what are termed flexible schedules, and open campus plans, both of which grant a great deal of freedom to students and

impose very significant responsibilities for self-direction and control on pupils who are often immature.

Certainly not all teachers are fitted by preparation, personality and temperament to work effectively in these kinds of schools. This fact has crucial implications for personnel administration as it relates to proper selection of staff, adequate development and training of teachers to work in such schools, and provision for easy transfer of those teachers who find themselves incapable of the necessary adjustments.

Curriculum Trends

A second recent change in schools has been the general opening up of the curriculum. The breadth and diversity of choices for students are marked, but the shift of emphasis, often from content to form and process and from objective mastery to existential, affective response, represents an even greater departure. It is indeed interesting to study curriculum trends over the years. In the late 30's and 40's the emphasis was on the so-called enterprise movement, which as I recall, took as its central theme, "the education of the whole child." It made a lot of sense to be concerned about the child's understanding of concepts rather than about unrelated factual content, and to try to integrate the learnings of the various curriculum areas into a meaningful whole. That is, it made sense until the Russians orbited a satellite. Then in response to objections voiced by sundry admirals, university

professors, and self-styled critics of the reading and intellectual abilities of youth, we experienced a reaction which took us back to "hard" studies like S.M.S.G. Mathematics, P.S.S.C. Physics, B.S.C.S. Biology and Chem-Study, etc.

The hysteria generated by the reaction was dissipated rather rapidly, however, to be replaced in its turn by the present emphasis on discovery, understanding and meaning, and general concern for the pupil as an individual with rights of his own to be recognized. It is characterized by the demand for relevance, whatever that may mean. The Hall-Dennis report in Ontario, and the submissions to, and position papers for, the Worth Commission in Alberta further exemplify the change in approach. One is tempted to ask, "When is the next reaction due? and to what extent will we then return to the "hard" disciplines? and the short hair and the neat dress and the more rigorous (if not repressive) control that go with them?"

One need not dwell on the implications of these shifts in curricula for staffing and general administration of personnel. But how does a teacher, in a career which stretches over 40-45 years, accommodate to these sorts of violent shifts without damage to his own integrity? And does the system not have some responsibility to him, too?

Demands for a Voice in Decisions

A third change worthy of note is the increasing pressure by professional staff on one hand, and students on the other, to

have a real voice in determining not only the broad policies of school systems, but also many of the specific practices developed for the implementation of those policies. Students of administration have been predicting this for years, warning of the need to modify structures and practices. Since the whole question of bargaining and collective agreements is likely to come up at a later session, I will only remark that the administrative position is moving more and more to the vortex of conflicting expectations. It has always been full of stress, and has always required a measure of the wisdom of Solomon, but all the indicators suggest that these needs will become more and more intensified. The implications for staffing and administration of personnel are clear, teachers are more mature than ever before -- in age, in professional preparation, and in intellectual ability -- and they are demanding recognition of this fact.

New Forms of Staff Organization

A fourth movement, still in its infancy in Canadian education, is differentiated staffing. As one listens to the submissions to the Worth Commission, and reads forecasts and descriptions of what "experts" believe future schools will be like, he detects a common thread running through the fabric. That is that there will be a much more diversified personnel complement in schools and school system. There will be a range in preparation and professionalism from aides and technical assistants at one extreme, to those specialized to doctoral level and beyond at the other.

That our schools are beginning to move in this direction is evident from studies of teacher aides which teacher and trustee associations are making, and the attempts being made to clarify the role. The technical component of education becomes more complex, and as schools attempt to meet a broader range of pupil needs more completely and efficiently, there will be increasing demand for personnel who are appropriately prepared. We have long acknowledged that it does not require a B. Ed. degree to run a projector or to construct instructional materials. It makes more sense to have clerks and technicians do these things. Similarly, some tasks can be quite adequately discharged by teachers with only basic preparation. Others require graduate-level knowledge and skill, and still others the services of highly specialized practitioners. The kinds of persons to select, the proportions of each group, their organization into work teams, and all the other complexities of personnel administration are still to be faced and resolved. One thing is certain, however; whoever sees this as a way of reducing overall costs, is bound to be disappointed.

Increasing Supply of Teachers

Finally, there is mounting evidence that supply and demand of teachers is coming into balance, and in fact, for the first time in many years the supply may exceed the demand. At first blush this appears to be a good thing insofar as the staffing function and personnel administration are concerned. At last it will be possible

to choose from among candidates for a position, and no classrooms will have to be staffed with the last available person. But it's not an unmixed blessing. First, since jobs are more difficult to find, no teacher will resign his present position until he is sure he has another. This means that the true dimensions of a system's staffing needs may not be known until after the statutory resignation date. It also means that if a teacher is not able to find a new position, even though he may be intensely unhappy in, or dissatisfied with, his present position, he will remain -- to the detriment of himself and the class. It means, too, that tenure provisions are going to loom much larger, and more appeals will be made. The general insecurity and edginess engendered in the teacher force may now be at a level where it becomes dysfunctional in the overall program.

And with more well-qualified teachers now available, how does one go about replacing those of lower competence who have served over the years, and have achieved tenure? What weight must be given to sheer humanitarian considerations in making decisions, knowing full well that the young people knocking on the door are just as much entitled to humanitarian consideration?

VI. CONCLUSION

Obviously there are no right or wrong approaches here, and obviously the alternatives are extremely difficult ones from which

to choose. All of this emphasizes the point which I have made, and to which I have referred from time to time in this paper: the personnel function in a labor-intensive enterprise assumes a much larger degree of importance than is true in many other fields. Its importance, taken together with its complexity, requires that an appropriate level of attention be focussed on it and that resources be allocated accordingly. The fact that personnel administration is the topic of this conference is evidence of your recognition of this fact, and your presence suggests that you are looking for some help. My paper may not have given much help, but if it has served to raise questions for further discussion, and has stimulated your thinking on some of those questions, I shall be satisfied.

PROFESSIONALISM IN EDUCATION: AN OPTIMISTIC APPROACH

E. W. Ratsoy

Dr. Ratsoy approaches the theme of professionalism in education with the suggestion that educators have been too pessimistic in their view of professionalization. His main thrust is that there is a tenable optimistic approach to this theme.

The conflict model and the insecurity model represent two of the pessimistic approaches. Conflicts between the individual and the organization, and between the professional and the bureaucracy represent one kind of conflict. The conflict between the professional and the employee roles and conflicts between levels in the hierarchy represent another.

One example of insecurity is found in the educator's lack of certainty in his professional status.

Dr. Ratsoy then develops his optimistic view of professionalism of teachers. An increased role in decision-making and a greater opportunity of individuality in teaching are promising developments in the move toward professionalism in education.

- Eds.

I have titled my paper "Professionalism in Education: An Optimistic Approach," which suggests that there is, or could be, one or more pessimistic approaches to professionalism and professionalization in education. I'm putting forward the proposition that there are two major and differing views and that each has consequences for the behavior of educators in our schools and school systems. I wish also to propose that we, as educators and educational administrators, have given undue attention to the pessimistic approach.

What is the optimistic approach to professionalism and what are its strengths? What is the pessimistic view and what are the implications of such an approach for the field of education? An attempt will be made in this paper to provide an answer. The discussion centers first on the latter question.

PESSIMISTIC APPROACHES TO PROFESSIONALISM IN EDUCATION

The Conflict Model

Two major pessimistic approaches to professionalism in education are found in the literature. One of these may be referred to as the conflict model, the other as the insecurity model. Most educators are familiar with the conflict model. Theorists on organization, and writers in the field of educational administration have, particularly in the past decade, given attention to what Etzioni calls the "incomplete articulation between personality and organization" (1964, p. 75), and also

to the incompatibilities between bureaucratic organization and professionalism. The conflict model is somewhat akin to the well-known Getzels-Guba social systems model (Getzels et al., 1968) in that it points up possible implications for the organization (school, or school system) of incongruence between the characteristics of formal (bureaucratic) organization and the characteristics of a professional person employed by such an organization. This is also referred to as professional-employee conflict (Corwin, 1965; MacKay, 1966; Ratsoy, 1968).

Briefly, the thesis is that an organization such as the school or school district, in order to facilitate goal achievement, has systems of uniform procedures to govern the relations between its members (teachers, etc.) and its clients (students, parents). Each member (teacher) has duties he is expected to perform and these are coordinated by a specialized administrative staff (principals, superintendents) responsible for maintaining the organization (school, school system). There exists a formal status structure (superintendent, principal, teacher, student) with clearly marked lines of communication and authority (cf. Blau and Scott, 1962, Ch. 1). A problem arises because the professional in the organization, although recognizing that he has a "professional obligation" to carry out the wishes of "the organization," also feels that he has certain "professional rights." These professional rights, such as the belief that decisions concerning what is best for the client are a professional prerogative rather than an

administrative power, may act as internalized expectations for the professional and may be at variance with the "bureaucratic expectations" outlined for him by the organization. The incompatibility between these professional and organizational expectations results in conflict. As Corwin's study revealed, the more professional the orientation of the teaching staff, the higher the incidence of total conflict and, especially, the higher the rate of major conflict incidents and conflict incidents involving teachers and administrators (Corwin, 1965). Such professional-organizational conflict presumably has negative consequences for individual satisfactions, staff morale, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. The Gosine and Keith finding (1970) that satisfaction scores of elementary female teachers in high bureaucratic schools are lower than the satisfaction scores for similar teachers in low bureaucratic schools and the earlier MacKay finding, "that a high degree of hierarchical authority was associated with a low effectiveness rating of schools" (MacKay, 1964, p. 7), tend to lend partial support to such an hypothesis.

The conflict model is an analytical and descriptive approach to theorizing about the behavior of professionals who work for organizations and is therefore, in the eyes of present-day students of the behavioral sciences, better than a prescriptive approach. The weakness in the conflict model, as I see it, is that it leaves the educational decision-maker in a helpless state.

The analysis tends to be somewhat global and vague, and although he may, using the conflict model, formulate some notions about the causes of his personnel problems in the school system, he is given no direction as to their solution. Might he not perhaps conclude that the best prophylactic for preventing conflict within the school system and for protecting against all the undesirable consequences of such conflict is to hire the least professional teachers? This would certainly be an "efficient" solution in that no reorganization of the system's structure would be necessary. And what a sense of power the administration would gain by bringing in persons who are not likely to question the administrators' authority to make decisions. But what are the long-range consequences for education when overconformity and group-think are encouraged and innovation wilts from distortion and delay? Will the organizational "advantages" of efficiency, predictability, impersonality and speed, which Owens proposes as strengths of bureaucracy (1970, Ch. 3), counterbalance these long-range deleterious consequences?

The Insecurity Model

The second of the two "pessimistic approaches" to professionalism and professionalization in education is one which sets up various criteria or characteristics of professions, usually drawn from an analysis of the so-called "free" or "traditional" or "learned" professions: law, medicine and the ministry. The characteristics of these professions -- which I refer to as the "yardstick"

professions -- are then used, perhaps in a report-card fashion, to measure the professional status of any occupation or "aspiring profession." Long lists of criteria may be formulated. Some writers on professions argue, however, that the number of these characteristics which truly distinguish between the professions and non-professions is small. Wilensky proposes two which he claims both the lay public and professional groups accept. These are: (1) "The job of the professional is technical -- based on systematic knowledge or doctrine acquired only through long prescribed training;" and (2) "The professional man adheres to a set of professional norms" which have a service ideal (Wilensky, 1970, p. 484). Neil Cheek expresses the opinion that irrespective of how sociologists conceptualize the professions, all agree that these two basic criteria distinguish them from other occupations (1965, p. 10). He suggests that in common usage,

. . . Any socially patterned means of earning a livelihood can be called a profession (including) . . . criminals, gamblers and prostitutes, (but that) in this case we are ordinarily referring to the degree of skill and finesse with which tasks are performed.

He adds that the term is usually limited to socially approved occupations where the practitioners have, "a moral obligation to perform their occupational tasks at maximum efficiency" (1965, p. 9). Cheek concludes that professions may be defined as:

. . . those occupations which involve the use of knowledge and techniques by a practitioner directly upon, or on behalf of, a client in order to maintain, or induce in, the client a culturally determined and socially approved state of well-being . . . biological, psychological, or sociological (1967, pp. 11-12).

Etzioni uses a somewhat related approach to distinguish professions from nonprofessions -- or more correctly, to distinguish professional organizations from nonprofessional organizations. Four major criteria related to knowledge, goals, professional responsibility, and cruciality of decisions made by the practitioner are cited. Thus, the degree of professionalism depends on:

- (1) Knowledge as measured by the number of years of professional education at a university (full-fledged professionals, according to Etzioni, have five or more years of such training);
- (2) Goals primarily devoted to the creation and application of knowledge rather than the mere communication of knowledge;
- (3) Professional responsibility measured by the degree of privileged communication which the recipient is bound not to divulge and the degree to which he is protected in his work by a guarantee of privileged communication; and
- (4) Cruciality of decisions measured by the degree to which questions of life and death are involved (Etzioni, 1964, Ch. 8).

The use of either Wilensky's or Etzioni's criteria in comparing the professional status of various occupations results in a variety of "profiles" for these occupations. The "learned"

professions stand high on all criteria with medicine probably at the top in the overall ranking and law in second place. The other occupations, when average scores on these criteria are computed, fall at various places along a continuum ending with the non-professions. Thus, some occupations "become" full-fledged professions, others "evolving" or "semi-" or "quasi-professions." The remainder consisting of the so-called crafts, skilled and non-skilled trades, service personnel, and "labor" generally, are relegated to the low end of the professional continuum. An assumption underlying such an analysis is that professional status is desirable for an occupation, if only, as Corwin notes, to free it from lay control (1965, p. 4).

Education does not stand up well under such an evaluation. Certification typically is granted before five years of professional education have been completed; knowledge is typically communicated in education rather than being created or applied; by the very nature of schools and the "minors" who are its clients, communication is not treated with the same degree of confidentiality as in medicine or law and practitioners in education are less likely to be guaranteed the right of privileged communication; and rarely are life or death decisions made (Etzioni, 1964, Ch. 8).

As Wittlin asserts,

. . . The professional status of the school teacher is altogether questioned on the grounds of his limited autonomy, of his restrictions in decision-making concerning what and how he teaches, and of his position as a strictly supervised employee (1965, p. 93).

At least one writer suggests that education is probably a semi-profession (Etzioni, 1964, p. 87). Others might call it an evolving profession. In either case, individual teachers and educators generally are left feeling insecure about the status of their chosen occupation which, compared against the "yardstick professions," and even engineering, does not stand very high. The major shortcoming to using this "insecure approach" is that whatever the professional status of one's chosen career, he cannot do much to raise it (except, perhaps, by leaving the occupation!) The impact that the individual practitioner can have on the status of the entire occupation is minimal. If he chooses to remain in the occupation, the most he can hope to gain from this comparative approach is a low self-concept. He is given no direction on how he might improve his lot.

I have to this point, presented a model which one could employ to examine and rank various occupations on a professionalism continuum. I also presented, earlier in the paper, a model which might be useful in identifying possible sources of tension within any organization employing professionals. These two modes were referred to as insecurity and conflict approaches to understanding professional behavior and professionalism. My contention in discussing the two models was that they are of limited use to the field of education because they neither serve as guides for individual "professional" behavior in education nor do they directly

help solve the administrative and supervisory problems we face. At most the two models may help identify some of the problems; beyond this, however, the educator is left feeling helpless or insecure. For this reason the two models were labelled as "pessimistic approaches." As stated earlier in the paper, my intent is to present an alternative or "optimistic approach" which to my mind has significant advantages, in its implications for education, over the two approaches presented thus far.

AN OPTIMISTIC APPROACH TO PROFESSIONALISM IN EDUCATION

An optimistic approach to professionalism and professionalization in education is one which demonstrates to the individual teacher, counsellor, supervisor, or administrator how he might have greater control over his own status in education. That is, rather than accepting as a "fixed given" the professional status which he inherits as a result of his being a teacher or administrator, he is shown how he can raise his professional status to the level he desires. An approach such as this would seem to have potential usefulness in any profession or, for that matter, in any occupation. Attention is centered on differences in professional status within the given profession -- say, teaching -- rather than on differences between professions. That is, the "optimistic view" of professionalization acknowledges the existence of unprofessional as well as professional behavior and the existence in all professions -- and

other occupations -- of persons who are truly professional, in the behavioral sense, and others who are unprofessional. Thus, medicine and law have their outstanding (highly professional) practitioners and their "quacks" or "shysters." Engineering and pharmacy have highly professional practitioners and their mountebanks or charlatans. Education has its outstanding teachers and administrators, and also its "time-servers." Between the polar extremes presented fall the majority of practitioners whose professional status is not so low that clients and peers raise questions about their right to practice nor so high that they achieve eminence. As Barber asserts,

. . . There is no absolute difference between professional and other kinds of occupational behavior, but only relative differences with respect to certain attributes common to all occupational behavior. Some occupational behavior . . . is fully professional; other behavior is partly professional; and some can be thought of as barely or not at all professional. . . . Professionalism is a matter of degree (1965, pp. 16-17).

If we accept Barber's argument, then we would also accept the conclusion that the "professional" status of an occupation does not guarantee professional behavior by its practitioners. One might observe very professional elements in the behavior of a businessman or TV technician and unprofessional elements in the behavior of a lawyer or teacher. Although some of these differences in professionalism may have their source in the nature of the occupation and its work setting, other differences, particularly those within

a given occupation, will have their source in the dedication, knowledge and personal make-up of individual practitioners. The more professional teacher or administrator is distinguished from his less professional colleague by the knowledge and skill he possesses and how he uses these, and by the persistence, accuracy and earnestness he shows in his work (cf., Wittlin, p. 91).

In relation to knowledge and skill, as measured by formal qualifications of teachers, some interesting changes have occurred in Canada during the past decade or so. In Alberta, for example, the teaching force had in 1958 a median of 1.9 years of professional preparation and only 27 per cent of teachers had one or more degrees. Fifty-four per cent of teachers had one year or less of post-secondary education. By 1969 the median professional preparation was 4.0 years and twice the 1958 figure, a full 51 per cent, were degree holders. The proportion of graduate and multiple degrees also doubled (Ratsoy, 1970, pp. 17, 19). If a recent report in Edmonton Journal is accurate (Braithwaite, 1971b), over 60 per cent now hold degrees.

On the other hand a recently completed extension of the 1969 Alberta teacher study reveals varying degrees of misassignment among secondary teachers. Misassignment according to field of specialization and also according to field of preference was greater among non-city than among city teachers; secondary teachers of English had the highest incidence of misassignment among the six

subject-areas examined and vocational teachers had the lowest. A reassuring finding was that, "misassignment scores decreased with increased levels of teacher academic and professional preparation," and that there was no relationship between misassignment and teaching experience and misassignment and the personal variables of sex, age and marital status. Approximately three-quarters of Alberta secondary teachers had credit for three or more courses in their major field of assignment (Rousseau, 1970). On the other hand, a median of 1.2 was found to be the number of courses completed by Alberta teachers who gave reading as their main subject of assignment (Ratsoy, 1970, p. 45). The implication for teachers who desire the "professional label" is obvious. So are the implications for administrators and for placement officers.

Zax, in a semi-structured interview study of 46 secondary teachers rated as outstanding by their principals, found them to have the following characteristics:

1. They enjoy teaching in general and their subject matter in particular, and are committed to the career of teaching;
2. They appreciate the unpredictability about the events which occur in the classroom, and expect and produce change in their classroom;
3. They describe the restrictions imposed upon them in the classroom as being not very serious but they would like some clerical help and would like to be freed from non-teaching duties;

4. They work hard in communicating with their students through enthusiasm, variety, and acting but admit that their success in communicating with a small number of students has been minimal or nil;

5. They express positive feelings of affection toward the problem and non-problem students alike;

6. They expressed their views with vigor but were anxious to hear from their colleagues and wished to have administrative support (1971, p. 288).

To the extent that the concept outstanding teacher is synonymous with highly professional teacher -- and they are synonyms according to the definition of professional used in this paper-- to this extent one would expect the more professional teachers to exhibit similar characteristics. And, this also provides some direction for the teacher or prospective teacher who aspires to hold high professional status within education. Although I'm not sure that he could learn to enjoy teaching and to be committed to it, on the other hand, I'm also not sure that this can't be done. However, enjoyment and commitment may be more a result of, or reward for, rather than a cause of successful teaching. A similar comment might be made about the extent to which affection for problem students, or appreciation for the unanticipated in teaching, could be fostered. Three additional characteristics, (1) the use of variety in teaching, (2) introducing changes in the classroom, and (3) working hard to communicate with students, do provide some positive direction. Perhaps administration's role is largely one of creating among

staff members and especially among novice teachers an awareness of these and other "developable traits" of highly professional teachers.

At a time when we are being threatened with a teacher surplus (or increasing surplus), and when the potential for improving professionalism among and the professional practice of teachers is higher than it has been for years, one wonders about some of the decisions being made in the field of education. After a decade of unprecedented affluence and effluence, are we facing a crisis in educational financing? Or is it, as some suggest, a phony crisis? There is no doubt that the predicted teacher surplus will in large measure be a result of austerity moves by our school systems. As Hughes suggests,

Oversupply means, of course, only more than can be supported by an economy. Lack of demand may be due to lack of money or to lack of acceptance of the very definition of wants to which a profession caters. It is generally both money and sophistication which are lacking. (1965, p. 13).

Even if we assume that we are spending on education today all that the economy can bear, there are probably solutions to the teacher surplus problem more "professional" than that recommended by the Alberta Teachers' Association's top elected officer. His recommendation was for early retirement of teachers (Braithwaite, 1971a). By using the medical or legal professions

as models, one such "professional" solution referred to above suggests itself. We have for a long time talked about the importance of fulltime, year-long internships. What better way to initiate the novice teacher to professional practice than by placing him in the care of a highly competent practitioner? In this way he could be guided -- using a slow rather than rapid immersion process -- along that professional development road referred to earlier. Since final induction into the profession would probably depend on ratification by the supervising teacher this move would at the same time foster professional accountability.

It is noteworthy that although this was not the primary purpose of the Zax study, the findings have implications for the administration of our schools. Outstanding teachers would like to be freed of non-teaching duties and voice a need for clerical assistance. As stated earlier, in any occupation there are likely to be professional and non-professional elements. The professional elements are presumably those which do not readily lend themselves to manipulation and control by "superiors," even where the practitioners work in an organization and find themselves low on the organizational chart. To quote Sybil Shack,

Teaching is an intensely personal occupation, a series of interactions between the teacher and his pupils, and to a lesser extent between the teacher and his colleagues. In these relationships the rules are made on a personal level, rules which are not legislated or negotiated (1970, p. 9).

There is little doubt that the professional elements referred to by Shack cannot be standardized. The professional part of the teacher role is the salvation for our outstanding teachers -- and the cause of downfall for some of the others. It is the source of the "optimistic view" presented in this paper. Individualization for students is only possible if teachers have opportunity for individuality and autonomy in instructional decision-making and to some extent are freed from non-professional responsibilities. This becomes the job of administration.

Even outstanding teachers seem to experience difficulty in communicating with a few of their students. Perhaps individual or small group attention for these students by highly specialized diagnosticians, or alternately, team approaches analogous to the medical consulting team, or assignment of smaller classes, would assist in providing answers that these teachers are apparently unable to find.

Their desire to have administrative support suggests the need for and use of praise even with this group of highly professional practitioners.

In conclusion, I've presented two so-called pessimistic analyses of professionalism in education and proposed an alternate optimistic approach. I've also pointed up some possible implications of this approach. The underlying assumption is that our clients -- the students -- will benefit in the process.

REFERENCES

- Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," in K. S. Lynn et al., editors, The Professions in America, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler, Publishing Company, 1962.
- Braithwaite, M. "ATA proposed budget reaches \$2.4 million," Edmonton Journal, April 13, 1971a.
- Braithwaite, M. "Teachers versus Trustees," Edmonton Journal, April 13, 1971b.
- Cheek, Neil H., Jr. "The Social Role of the Professional," in Mark Abrahamson, editor. The Professional in the Organization, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967, pp. 6-16.
- Corwin, Ronald G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter, 1965), pp. 1-22.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham and Ronald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory, Research, Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Gosine, M. and V. Keith. "Bureaucracy, Teacher Personality Needs and Teacher Satisfaction." Canadian Administrator, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Oct., 1970).
- Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," in K.S. Lynn et al., editors, The Professions in America, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- MacKay, D.A. "Should Schools Be Bureaucratic?" Canadian Administrator, Vol. 4, No. 3 (November, 1964).
- MacKay, D.A. "Using Professional Talent in a School Organisation," Canadian Education and Research Digest, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Dec., 1966), pp. 342-352.
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Ratsoy, E.W. Characteristics and Instructional Practices of Alberta Teachers in 1968-69. Edmonton: Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies, 1970.

Ratsoy, E.W. "Decision-Making: Must it be a Cooperative Activity?" in D. A. MacKay, editor, The Alberta School Principal, 1968, Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1968, pp. 9-16.

Rousseau, Dominic A. "The Assignment and Misassignment of Secondary School Teachers in Alberta," Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Schack, Sybil. "Teacher Power: Working to Rule is Different for Teachers," Monday Morning, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Sept. - Oct., 1970), pp. 9-11.

Wilensky, Harold L. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" in Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller, editors, The Sociology of Organizations, New York: Free Press, 1970, pp. 483-502.

Wittlin, Alma S. "The Teacher," in K.S. Lynn et al., editors, The Professions in America, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965, pp. 91-109.

Zax, Manuel. "Outstanding Teachers: Who Are They?" The Clearing House, Vol. 45, No. 5 (Jan., 1971), pp. 285-289.

PERSONNEL COSTS: A PROBLEM IN RATIONALITY

Peter J. Atherton

Frequently we hear that personnel costs in education are too high. Dr. Atherton begins his paper indicating why such an argument may be almost meaningless. The problem may be more one of rational allocation of resources and the rational use of personnel.

Personnel costs do account for the largest portion of the education budget. How rational is the allocation of personnel resources at this time? This, rather than lowering personnel costs, is the major problem.

Rational allocation of resources is possible only when objectives are defined. Emphasis on inputs rather than outputs has hampered the clarification of objectives for education. Other obstacles have been the single salary schedule and the traditional role of the teacher as an independent generalist.

Dr. Atherton recommends two means for moving toward a more rational system of allocating personnel costs:

- 1) reducing the number of vertical and horizontal tracks on a salary schedule, and*
- 2) changing current practices of staff organization for instruction.*

- Eds.

Introduction

I should state immediately that I consider the often-voiced statement that personnel costs in education are too high to be almost meaningless. Does the statement mean that the proportion of total cost taken up by personnel costs is too high or does it mean that the salaries paid those in education are too high? I am not so sure that the argument that the proportion of total education cost paid to personnel is too high until it can be demonstrated that a satisfactory substitute for a person can be found, one that is also cheaper than a person.

At the moment we hear a great deal of talk about the desirability of substituting teaching machines for teachers. Without attempting to discuss whether this is good or bad educational practice, or even whether or not it is even feasible, from the educational process point of view, it is by no means certain that it is sound economics. The question of substitutability can be discussed only in terms of the relative costs of meeting objectives. Even so, the present data which would influence this matter of substitutability is not encouraging.

For instance, in one recent study conducted in the United States it was shown that the average cost of one hour of traditional instruction was 34 cents while one hour of computer assisted instruction amounted to \$3.73. Unless C.A.I. is ten times more efficient or the current cost level is reduced, its introduction

would allow the reduction of the proportion of total cost paid to personnel but at the expense of increasing the level of total educational expenditures. Thus, whether personnel costs amount to 20 per cent or 80 per cent of the budget is immaterial. What would happen if we substituted one form of high priced labor by a lower priced form of labor? Would personnel costs not then decline? Of course not. What might decline is the total personnel cost which is a different interpretation of the question. Remember, to the economist there are three factors of production: Land, Labor and Capital. If the cost of Capital in the form of C.A.I. or A.V. is very high, then we may in fact be better off by spending 100 per cent of our resources on personnel.

Personnel Costs

As to the other side of the question: The interpretation that too high personnel costs are a function of a too high level of remuneration. I am not sure that this means anything either. It has always been the claim of employers that employees are overpaid and similarly the claim of employees that they are underpaid. Within the context of the negotiating process some sort of equilibrium based on supply and demand is usually derived. In the last analysis, however, the question of whether or not the level of remuneration is too high can only be decided in terms of productivity or in terms of willingness to pay. Insofar as productivity is concerned there is little of a research nature to support our

contention that productivity in education has increased, declined, or remained at a certain level. Nevertheless, most current statements regarding levels of remuneration are really concerned more with the burden of taxation than with the question of productivity.

Perhaps what we are much more concerned with in personnel costs is how they are distributed through the system and I think that many of us have some feeling that the structure of our personnel costs leaves much to be desired. That, however, is a much different question as to whether or not they are too high.

Before leaving the question of the level of personnel costs I think it is important to establish a position relating to the rate of increase of personnel costs. To some extent you may think that what I am about to say contradicts what I have said previously, if you will bear with me I shall attempt to prove this is not so.

One of the more troublesome aspects of increasing personnel costs is what I might call the "ten per cent" problem.

One of the first reactions of governments to the awareness of increased educational cost is an attempt to restrict the growth of educational expenditures to a rate which is more commensurate with the rate of growth of the Gross National Product. In Alberta for instance, based on the quite realistic assumption of a 6% increase in Gross National Product, the Minister has set a limit for the increase in the Classroom Unit Grant of 6 per cent. He

has further provided that school districts who wish to exceed this annual rate may have to go to the electorate for plebiscite. The implication is, of course, that school districts which exceed that national rate of increase are being extravagant. The argument is perhaps rational but in terms of the organization of education quite unrealistic.

Educational personnel, by and large, are remunerated in accordance with a salary schedule which provides increments in recognition of experience and increased professional training. The use of this type of schedule in itself prohibits the keeping of costs down to a six per cent annual escalation.

In order to keep salaries on entry to the profession competitive, an annual increase in the basic grid has become almost mandatory. This increase may vary but, over the years, has averaged at about the six per cent level, a figure commensurate with the national rate. All other salaries on the grid are escalated at the same time. Since the trend to retention in the profession is increasing and since the majority of teachers are placed somewhere other than the final year of experience, the majority of teachers in the system will receive an increment plus the basic adjustment. Together these two amounts represent something like between an 8 to 10 per cent increase in annual cost. The possibility of horizontal as well as vertical movement on such grids frequently has the effect of boosting the escalation.

I suggest that this is a structural problem but it nevertheless has considerable implications for teacher/trustee relations and education costs.

In order to limit the effect of the built-in escalation of costs, trustees are forced into adopting policies which they themselves are not certain are for the long run benefit of education. Thus, in times of cost restrictions there is a tendency to employ less qualified, less experienced teachers or to increase pupil teacher ratios. The advocacy of such policies in turn tends to alienate teachers and arouse teacher militancy. The general air of suspicion which is generated at such times frequently leads to a feeling that innovation, particularly that sponsored by the board and the administration, has as its primary purpose, cost-cutting.

The Problem in Personnel Costs

Seen from this point of view then, it is not the proportion of total cost appropriated for salaries which is necessarily too high, nor is the level of individual salaries generally, necessarily too high. It is the annual rate of increase of personnel costs which is high and this rate of increase is determined by factors such as the improving level of qualification and experience of the teaching force. Both of these latter factors are generally held to be positively related to improvement in the quality of education.

At the same time we must be prepared to face realistically the problem of increasing costs, a problem which I think it is fair to stress is not one faced by education alone but is common to all

those areas of endeavor in which personal service is the essence. This is a problem of importance not only in the public sector but in the private sector as well. Restaurants, beauty parlors, and department stores, as well as hospitals and welfare agencies have problems of escalating costs. In the private sector the problems may be overcome by reducing the level of service and increasing the costs (think of passenger service on the railroads or airlines). In the Public Sector there appears less willingness to accept increasing costs and lower levels of service.

Perhaps one of the problems we have is that of accepting too literally Professor Galbraith's position that we have reached the age of affluence. Whilst it may be true that we do have an immensely rich society it is also true that we can never have everything everyone desires. Our resources are still too limited and we still have too many competing ends. Professor Galbraith, I think, intended to point out that we should increase our consumption of public goods at the expense of our consumption of private goods. Nevertheless, we are faced with a critical problem of allocating resources in education, a problem which I think will be a continuing one, and one which will be productive of some major changes in educational systems. Since personnel costs do account for the largest proportion of our current expenditures we must associate the rational allocation of resources with the rational use of personnel.

The Case for Rational Allocation of Personnel Resources

To examine this question properly we must at first try to ascertain just how rational is the allocation of personnel resources at the moment.

It is difficult to support a case that rational allocation of personnel resources exists in our present school systems. We must realize for instance that the per pupil cost of educating a grade one student may have a fantastic range, merely because of our salary structure. Thus, if we consider the case of a high enrolment class of 30 with a relatively inexperienced teacher with minimal qualifications the cost may be as low as \$220 per pupil. On the other hand if we assume a teacher with maximum qualifications and experience with a relatively low enrolment of say 20, we can have a per pupil cost as high as \$650. This range may operate within the same grade level. The upper level is nearly three times the cost of the lower. Perhaps these examples are extremes, but cost analysis studies which I, together with my graduate students have conducted, suggest that very high ranges in costs are to be found all over the province both between and within school systems. Very many ranges are well over 150 per cent. It is seldom that we consider the implications of such wide ranges since most of the data that we use are based on averages which tend to suppress the effect of ranges. The use of such averages is not helpful in considering personnel costs unless we introduce some measures of distribution into our decision making.

Our cost analyses have revealed some other interesting factors relating to personnel costs. We have found for example, in one large high school that the personnel cost of providing a system of built-in substitutes cost approximately \$120,000, a figure which was in the region of twice the cost of an on-call system. We found that in one rural school system the cost of supervised study per student was as great as the average cost per student for teaching courses. In one school jurisdiction it was found that the personnel cost of providing high school instruction was practically the same as that of providing elementary school instruction. We found that personnel costs in one large urban high school which utilized the open climate were appreciably lower than they were in a school of similar size which utilized the more traditional form of school organization.

I could continue for some time to tell you about cost differences in the schools of Alberta but without an accompanying analysis, I am not sure that they would suggest much more than I have already suggested. It is difficult to associate much rationality with the allocation of school personnel resources.

Of course the establishment of complete rationality in the allocation of personnel would require that we establish some firm and quantifiable relationship between input and output. This quantifiable relationship is the essence of Programme Budgeting, Systems Analysis, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis and all those largely economic techniques which are being strongly

advocated as panaceas for problems of escalating educational costs. I do not propose to join this whole-hearted advocacy at this time. There is too much basic research on the relationship between input and output to be undertaken before P.P.B.S. is ready for implementation in our school systems as the solution to all our problems.

Let me instead say this, that P.P.B.S. or any other economic system of resource allocation is not a substitute for good management nor does it help an educational system define proper objectives. These systems of resource allocation will assist us to allocate resources effectively when we have our objectives defined, but if our objectives are not good ones to begin with such systems cannot help. If we cannot agree whether the open climate or the closed climate is the soundest objective there can be no really rational allocation of resources. If, however, we accept the cheapest system as the most rational we are in danger of perverting the whole concept of rational resource allocation systems.

Difficulties Facing Rational Resource Allocation

Even if our present state of knowledge does not permit us to implement resource allocation systems at this time I do not feel we should shrug our shoulders and accept the irrational allocations which were illustrated previously. Let us, by way of examining them critically, first try to determine some of the difficulties which appear to pervade resource allocation in education.

One of the first difficulties which leads to the type of resource allocation in which wide cost ranges are to be found is the emphasis on input rather than output insofar as the educational process is concerned. Because of the difficulty of quantifying the relationship between input and output, it has been customary for boards to seek the most highly qualified person available to fill any given post. Whilst I would not attempt to downgrade the desire of boards and teachers to ensure an adequate supply of well qualified teachers, I would point out that enshrined as a policy, this desire is very open-ended and very expensive. There are as I see it two difficulties associated with the problem. The first is somewhat theoretical, the second practical.

Whilst the relationship between the level of qualification and an improved quality of education is one which is generally positive but not specific, the relationship between levels of qualifications and personnel cost is very specific. One might never be able to say that teacher X is 1.7 times as proficient as teacher Y, but one certainly can say that teacher X costs 1.7 times as much as teacher Y.

The reason that this is possible is, of course, the use of the single salary schedule which has been noted previously as a problem of cost escalation.

I suggest that this type of salary schedule is something of a leftover from the days when the upgrading of teacher qualifications

was a major purpose and that differentiation was an essential part of providing some sort of recognition of the sacrifice involved in improving those qualifications when the level of education required for entry into the profession was minimal.

Times have changed. The availability of university places and the provision of evening and summer sessions for credit have made it easy for all except the uninterested to maintain their qualifications at a level commensurate with the increasing standards of entry and requirements for permanent certification.

The use of the single salary schedule which differentiates each year of professional training for salary purposes is now beginning to work to the disadvantage of the profession as a whole. Thus, in times of financial pressure, which as I have said, I am sure will continue, employers are tempted to employ those with lower qualifications even to the extent of leaving those more highly qualified without jobs.

An Alternative to the Single Salary Schedule

It would appear therefore, that one of the first steps which must be taken in order to make more rational the allocation of personnel costs is to reduce the range of costs which might be payable for the performance of any job. This step would involve reducing the number of vertical and horizontal tracks on a salary schedule. I realize that this would not be an easy process but I am sure that it is inevitable anyway.

One might introduce for example, a three track system. The first track for those who lack less than the standard required for permanent certification, the second track for those who meet the requirements for minimum permanent certification and the third required for those who go beyond this standard. I might even suggest that the track for those beyond the minimum level might be a specified percentage of a sum of money paid annually. This in effect would provide basically a two track system with an annual bonus for those who go beyond the minimum. The actual salaries which would result from this type of arrangement would, of course, be subject to the normal negotiating process.

This arrangement of the salary schedule would not remove the irrationality of personnel costs but might go some way to reduce it, however, only insofar as the range of cost is concerned.

Changing Staff Organization to Achieve Rationality

The removal of irrationality in personnel costs requires a much more fundamental appraisal of the entire teaching process.

We have already noted that part of the irrationality of personnel cost is a function of the emphasis on inputs rather than outputs in terms of teacher qualifications. A second barrier to rationality may be seen partly as a consequence of this assumption but also as a consequence of the traditional organization for instruction and, more particularly, of the traditional expectation for the role of the teacher.

Our present system of organization relies on the concept of the teacher as a generalist. His claim to specialization rests, by and large, on his study of a particular discipline, rather than on the type of specialization advocated by the economist which is a specialization by function. Many of the traditional expectations for the role of the teacher include aspects of performance which receive scant attention in our teacher education institutions. Thus, all teachers are expected to be disciplinarians although I cannot recall any courses in our universities which profess to offer training in such skills. Teachers are expected to provide behavioral models for the young. (How many teachers are evaluated on the basis of personal dress or extra curricular habits?) Teachers are expected to provide counselling for the young, although many have the merest smattering of courses which might provide them with insights into the behavior of the young. In other words, in many aspects of the teacher's day-to-day activities he received no training whatsoever. In fact to judge from the type of comments made by graduates who enter professional training after graduating from one of the other disciplines, there tends to be deliberate rejection of those professional courses which might provide these additional insights.

Because many of the expectations for the role of the teacher are heavily dependent on skills for which he has no training and which are largely dependent on his personal make-up it is relatively easy for us to expect an almost identical performance from all

teachers. This, to my mind, is not only the fallacy of the single teacher classroom, or subject teacher, but also of merit rating. We cannot at one and the same time treat education and teaching as if it were a science, the characteristic of university faculties of education; and evaluate the teacher as an artist, the characteristic of many merit rating systems which depend on subjective assessments even though they be superficially objective, such as check lists.

In terms of personnel costs we cannot be completely rational until our costs are based on the processes which constitute learning. All processes are of vital importance, but the skills which are required for different processes are not generally to be found to the same degree in each person. Furthermore such skills require varying degrees of development and may have varying degrees of scarcity among the population.

It will be readily apparent that I am making a case for Differentiated Staffing or Team Teaching, call it what you will. I am sure that most people are aware of Differentiated Staffing or Team Teaching and so I will not spend such time as I have remaining to enter into any lengthy discussion of this new concept except to make a few comments. First let me say it is perhaps not as new as we would like to think. The Bell-Lancaster or Monitorial System developed in England in the eighteenth century was a type of differentiated staffing relying heavily on para-professionals in the form of students, and I am surprised that Ministers of Education have not advocated it as a means of

holding down costs!

In a more serious vein and from the point of view of personnel costs let me make a few comments on Differentiated Staffing. In differentiated staffing systems the para-professional is not a teacher-aide introduced to assist teachers in more routine tasks. The para-professional would take over many of the tasks which professional teachers now perform. Whilst we may pay lip-service to the acceptance of this idea we must realize that with the introduction of more technology into specific learning processes, the role of professional teachers may even be eliminated for some particular processes.

Differentiated Staffing will, and should, lead to the development of status differentials within the teaching profession. As I have suggested it is only within the context of the traditional classroom that the pretence of professional equality can be made. Team leaders and master-teachers will be remunerated better than team members because they have more skills and more responsibility. On the other hand it is clear that professionals' dependence upon each other will increase, as will the amount of communication among professionals about goal-oriented behavior.

There is some fear that the introduction of technology which, although not a prerequisite for differentiated staffing is a sine qua non for more rational resource allocation, is a threat to the professional status of teachers. I am not sure that this is

a relevant consideration. After all medical practitioners make an immense use of technology and are among the quickest group to recognize the value of properly tested innovation, and also among the quickest to utilize advances in technology.

However, the major question is one of personnel cost. I do not see that Differentiated Staffing per se is a way of lowering personnel cost, and as I stated in the beginning I am not sure that this is a meaningful problem. The major problem is to ensure that the allocation of cost is a rational one. Since differentiated staffing is based on a rational system of maximizing learning it would follow that it is a rational system of allocating personnel costs. I might add that the prior suggestion of changing the salary grid is perfectly compatible with differentiated staffing.

Conclusion

In conclusion then I should like to attempt to re-emphasize a few of the points which I have tried to make.

I have suggested that it is not so much the level of personnel costs which is of major concern to the educational administrator. The problem of the total amount of resources to be allocated to education is one which is decided at a higher governmental level and is subject to the varying constraints imposed upon government by society at large. The educational administrator's problem is one of ensuring that the resources within the educational sector are allocated with maximum effectiveness. I have illustrated some peculiarities of present resource allocation in education and I

have attempted to suggest two sets of steps which could be taken to increase the rationalization of resource allocation. The first set of steps suggested is the decreasing of the number of tracks on the salary grid -- a step which is a relatively minor one and will provide a basis for decreasing the range of costs. The second step is a more radical one and involves changing many of our traditional practices in organizing for instruction. In spite of the problems involved in taking these steps, I am sure that the continued pressure of finances will serve to make them inevitable.

EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL: PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS

D. A. MacKay

Dr. MacKay explores evaluation of personnel in the light of new developments in education.

During the past few years the question of accountability in education has been raised in one form or another by at least four groups. Policy makers, rate payers, professional educators, and the clients, both students and parents, are raising questions about the school's accountability for its activities.

This pressure for accountability leads anew to the problem of evaluation of personnel. Dr. MacKay reviews current concepts of evaluation, and some recent research on teacher evaluation.

He also addresses himself to technical and behavioral factors in a model for evaluation. Finally, he proposes a plan for personnel evaluation that incorporates most of the recently advanced concepts in this field.

-Eds.

Introduction

During the past five or six years the question of accountability has become an important one in both Canada and the United States. Here in Western Canada demands for accountability can be heard from various sectors of the population, and from within the educational system itself. One can point to at least four groups who have made demands for some system of accountability by education to various publics. An attempt to identify at least four of these publics or groups may be useful.

The Publics

One group is the policy maker group. School boards, provincial legislatures and the like have begun, at least in certain sections of Western Canada, to ask their administrations and their teachers to provide some indicators as to the success or failure of various programs in the schools. While the demands may not as yet have hit all areas in the country, the indications are fairly clear that policy makers at the local level, and to some extent at the provincial level, will increase their demand for accountability.

A second group can be loosely labelled the supporters of education in terms of local electors, rate payers, and so on, who through the press, through citizens' meetings, informally and otherwise have begun to ask questions about the cost of education, and about the benefits that investment in education produces in the long and short run.

A third source of the demand for accountability lies within the ranks of professional educational administrators themselves. Certainly a number of persons in chief executive positions in school systems have turned their eyes towards what is going on in the classrooms to an increasing extent. Even though this is not a new phenomenon in education, the demands are now being couched in different terms. The use of a word such as accountability or evaluation brings with it a certain set of connotations that makes the problem a new one, and certainly emphasizes and highlights the whole question of administrative involvement in controlling and appraising things that are going on in school systems.

The fourth group, of course, are the clients, i.e., the pupils. Certainly at the post secondary level, and even in high schools, pupils have begun to ask searching questions about the quality of education, as have parents and others who are closely involved with the client groups.

So there are four groups; the policy makers, the supporters (that is the electorate), the administrators as a group within education, and the clientele of the schools who are raising questions on the Canadian scene, and the Western Canadian scene in particular, about the school's accountability to its various publics.

Importance of the Question

In both Canada and the United States there has been, as mentioned in an earlier presentation, an increased emphasis on attempts to

develop relationships between investment, as an indication of input, and some measures of quality of performance as an indication of output. Program planning and budgeting systems are receiving a good deal of attention these days, and there is reason to suggest that in most of the Canadian provinces within the next four or five years program planning and budgeting systems will become the rule rather than the exception as an approach to planning, to budgeting, and to indicating the extent to which programs are using financial and human resources. Coupled with the interest in the increased use of this type of administrative technique will be an increased emphasis upon and demand for indications of quality of performance as well.

One of the things which is receiving a good deal of attention from various sectors of the public and from the media is performance contracting, whereby private enterprise is becoming directly involved in education. In essence, it is a promise or guarantee by a firm that it will achieve such and such a level of performance in terms of skill level, in terms of achievement levels on tests and so on among pupils. Such achievement is guaranteed in the sense that if the contract is not carried out, the entrepreneurs, or the corporations, will not receive payment for services rendered. If they perform beyond expectations of course there is occasionally some provision for a bonus. Now a good deal of attention has been focused on this and one could speculate that performance contracting will come and go. It may not be a long term phenomenon, but may

be just an outcropping of public interest in a general problem, or a general search for accountability.

Basic Concepts on Evaluation

So, accountability is a crucial problem, and coupled with accountability are questions on the subject of evaluation. One should look briefly at some basic concepts in evaluation. One of the questions to be asked is what role, or what purpose does evaluation serve. A very useful distinction has been made by Michael Scriven, who has received a good deal of attention in the currently developing literature on evaluation theory and methodology.

The distinction is between formative evaluation and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation is intended to acquire data that can be used for the improvement of instruction, or the improvement of a program, or the improvement of a teacher, or a pupil's performance. It is not intended to lead to decisions about hiring, firing, dismissal, termination of programs or widespread extension of programs. Summative evaluation is intended, as the name suggests, to provide a summing up, an indication of the extent to which a program, or a particular lesson, or a particular performance by pupils, or by teachers, has been a success or failure. It really constitutes putting a stamp of certification upon a program with respect to questions of success or failure, of stop or go, extension, retention and so on. This type of decision is the result of summative evaluation. So an important distinction has to do with the purpose of evaluation, formative evaluation, leading to improvement, summative evaluation

leading to extension, or retention, or to termination of a program or particular piece of curriculum material, and so on.

Implicit in what has been said about the purposes of evaluation is a definition of evaluation which is rather a simple one, and it is as follows: Evaluation is collecting information for decision making. This is perhaps an over-simplified definition, but it is what one could call an administrator's definition of evaluation in that it links evaluation to decision making of one type or another while the formative-summative dichotomy is maintained. That is, decision-making may not always be of a summative or final nature, it may have to do with recycling, that is improving a program, or improving performance of one part or another of a school system.

These terms can be used whether one is talking about evaluation of a curriculum program, of curriculum materials, of teacher performance, of pupil performance, about school buildings, about transportation systems, about the budgeting system, or any other aspect of the educational system.

The Stake Model

Another set of distinctions that is useful has been made by Robert Stake at the University of Illinois. Stake likes to distinguish among three sets of variables. These are antecedents, transactions and consequences. Antecedents specify a set of variables and a set of measures that describe the state of readiness of a pupil entering a program, and Stake's emphasis is upon educational programs as

the central object and concern for him. So antecedents would include such typical measures as the intelligence of a pupil, his performance in previous grades in school, various measures of scholastic attainment and aptitude, social economic status, and other variables that we assume to indicate his state of preparation for commencement of a program. The transactions are what goes on in the program itself; and consequences, the third set of variables, include all those that indicate the output or the product, or pupil growth. This kind of distinction among three sets of variables is an important one to have in mind. There is nothing very novel, or nothing very powerful of a theoretical nature, about Stake's analysis at this level, but it may be useful to consider these three sets of variables. That is one needs to be concerned, when one talks about accountability or about evaluation, about the state of the system, the condition of the pupils, the performance level of the school, grade, subject area, the department in the high school and so on, at the beginning of a particular program with which one is concerned.

Then, secondly, one needs to look at what goes on in a program, at what sorts of activities are used; that is, at the transactions, at the kind of interaction there is between pupils and teacher, if one is looking at a classroom as the level of analysis. Finally one examines the consequences of a program. Too often in the past, evaluators have focused on the consequences without really knowing what went on during the program. When for example, in the traditional educational research experiment we have attempted to find connections

or relationships between the use of a particular teaching method or particular text book, and some measure of outcome such as scores on achievement tests, we have run again and again up against the problem that there is no difference in performance as a result of pupils going through an experimental program, and pupils going through the standard or traditional or control group type of instruction.

One of the difficulties is that even where there is significant difference in performance, one is never quite certain that this difference is attributable to real differences in what goes on in the classrooms. That is, we have not in the past focused enough upon the nature of the transactions-- that is upon what goes on during the program. There are indications from some of the recent work of John Goodlad -- perhaps a rather pessimistic message that Goodlad is giving us during the last two years -- to the effect that many of the curriculum innovations designed in the United States in the last few years are not really in full use in very many schools. Even though the label is used, that is, while there are schools that say that they have new math, and there are schools that say they have team teaching, when one looks at them closely one finds that at the classroom level, i.e. the grass roots level, there is often an inability to distinguish between the new program and the more traditional program.

So, again one needs to look at what goes on, one needs also to pay attention to what the state of the system was at the beginning

in order to make some predictions about what the needs are in terms of a suitable program, and in order to determine whether pupil growth has occurred. Of course, any rational person will admit that it is unfair to blame a particular program, or a particular teacher, for failures among pupils who at the beginning of a particular time period were most inadequate as students, and had a long history of failure. To attribute continued failure to a program, or to a teacher in cases like that is to be rather irrational.

The Mitzel Analysis

Another set of concepts that seem useful, was developed by Mitzel in 1960. They focus upon criteria for evaluating teachers. Mitzel talked about three sets of variables: process variables that have to do with teacher performance as an instructor, that is on what the teacher does when working with pupils. These are similar to the transactions in the Stake model.

In addition, there are presage criteria, which are those characteristics of the teacher that are believed to be predictive of success. For example, when one assumes that a teacher with a particular set of academic qualifications, or certain personality attributes, will probably be a successful teacher, one is really using presage criteria. Or when one goes into a classroom as an observer and focuses upon characteristics of the teacher as a person rather than upon what the teacher does in terms of relations with pupils and so on, one is using presage criteria. When one

focuses upon voice, appearance, something one might call personality and so on, manners, idiosyncracies, etc., one is looking at presage criteria, which emphasize the teacher as a person rather than what the teacher does.

A final set of criteria Mitzel talks about are product criteria which emphasize not what the teacher does, or what the teacher is, but the outcomes of a program of instruction, or of a particular lesson, or whatever.

So there are three sets of criteria, and they help further to map out the domain of evaluation, especially as one focuses upon teacher evaluation as an important part of the administrative function. One could, of course, talk in a rather general sense about evaluation of programs, and what has been said so far about formative and summative evaluations, and about the need to look at antecedents, transactions and consequences, can be said with equal effect about programs, buildings, teachers, or pupils; but the rest of this presentation will be focussed upon questions relating to evaluation of teachers because this is traditionally an important part of the role of superintendents and of other line officers in school systems. Moreover, this particular area is receiving increased attention, and has become a controversial area in some parts in Western Canada, and indeed elsewhere in North America.

Research Studies

Three research studies have been conducted during the past four or five years in an attempt to determine which criteria are

emphasized by practitioners. Two studies took place in the State of Victoria, Australia, and one study was conducted in Alberta. The study, by Moore, of School Inspectors in the State of Victoria found that there was an emphasis on presage and process criteria, and that product criteria were not highly stressed.

In 1969, E.B. Thomas looked at high school principals in the same Australian State, and found a similar picture; that is, the high school principals were emphasizing process and presage criteria when looking at teachers and product criteria did not receive a high degree of emphasis. Two years ago a study of Alberta secondary school principals focused on the same set of criteria, and found the same kind of indication, namely that there was a great emphasis on process and presage criteria, that what the teacher did, what the classroom atmosphere was, and so on, were important, and the product criteria were not seen as important. For example, class control was very high in the order of priorities established by the Alberta principals, and achievement on examinations was very low in all instances. The sample included about 80% of all secondary school principals in the province. There was a good deal of consistency, and there are implications for administrators who work with principals, and teachers, and for institutions that prepare teachers who will be evaluated in terms of these criteria.

Hopeful Signs

One question to be asked about evaluation of teachers is to

what extent does research indicate that there is good measurement available in this area? One or two items drawn from the literature should be mentioned. One of the key figures in this area of enquiry has been N. L. Gage of Stanford University, who was the editor of the Handbook of Research on Teaching, and who at the time of publication of that work was rather pessimistic about the state of the art as far as scientific enquiry into teaching is concerned. A few years later, however, Gage expressed some optimism, and talked about a change in the level of performance among those who are doing research, and developing methodologies of enquiry into the teaching-learning process. He talked about several types of progress that have been made, and provided a rather optimistic picture. Again, the 1969 edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, which reviewed the research done during the previous ten-year period presented what one can call rather promising indications about the state of the art. Although in practice there are a good many undesirable things happening, there are promising signs. But perhaps rather than continuing to emphasize the Gage and the Encyclopedia of Educational Research suggestions that gains are being made in this area, one could more productively identify some of the factors which would seem to be important for a group of administrators and policy makers who are considering this question of evaluation. Two sets of factors provide a way of examining some of the problems in this area.

Technical Factors

One set of factors which are important are what one would call technical factors. These have to do with the set of techniques and skills for evaluation of teaching, of programs, or whatever, that are required among administrators at various levels in the school system, if successful evaluation is to occur. There are methodologies being developed in centers such as the Center for the Study of Evaluation at U.C.L.A., at Ohio State University, and at the University of Illinois. In this province a good deal of work is being done at the University of Alberta on developing and disseminating techniques and skills required for evaluation. There is a need for a training program whether it be pre-service education for administrators and other school personnel, or workshops, short courses, and the like, which prepare people in a clinical sense to be evaluators. It gives them some experience with methodologies and some practical skills, rather than emphasizing theoretical approaches to the study of evaluation. So technical factors are important; that is, there is need to develop and to adapt existing techniques and skills, and to make them available through various kinds of training programs and in-service education programs for practicing administrators.

When, and if, this problem is successfully solved, there is a second kind of technical factor, or set of variables, that has to do with procedures, that is with organizing and setting up a

pattern of formal organization within a school district that assigns evaluation functions, or various parts of the evaluation function to positions within the school district and that have to do with specifying the distinction between line and staff positions, and this sort of thing.

Procedural questions or organizational questions of this type can be dealt with and there are solutions to the question of how evaluation functions should be assigned, who should carry out the evaluation, and so on. Unfortunately, these solutions tend to be of a formal organizational type, that is they depend on job definitions, on official statements of policy, and as most people know, too often policy cannot be translated into behavior.

Behavioral Factors

There is another set of factors which can be labelled "Behavioral Factors." These have to do, among other things, with the extent to which evaluation is accepted by those who work in the organization. If evaluation as part of an administrative role is not accepted by teachers as individuals, and as members of professional organizations, then the best organized plans, the best techniques will not be successful. So there is a whole area of human relationships that is involved in this kind of endeavor. Here we are talking about matters which can be very, very threatening to individuals. We are talking about questions that concern improvement when we talk about formative evaluation, but we are talking in addition about questions of promotion, of retention, of extension of program. We are talking about vested

interests, about security of individuals, their earning power, and their career development, and this can be a very threatening kind of enquiry.

There is a second area of concern, and this is the one that has been discussed widely in some of the literature on administration. This refers to the possibility that working as an evaluator, or carrying out an evaluative function will interfere with other roles, or other aspects of an administrator's role, his role as an educational leader, as an instructional leader, and so on, and there are very real probabilities that role conflict can occur. Again, while the formal organizational chart and the job descriptions can specify rather clean cut divisions among functions in the school system, people who use, and who are exposed to, or who are confronted by the various services, or the various functions, may often develop their own perception of what is happening, and of what the roles are.

An Approach to Planning Evaluation

One should not overemphasize the problem areas, which are probably known only too well to practitioners, to the neglect of suggesting some elements in an approach to evaluation as part of the structure of school systems.

The perspective that one can usefully employ is that of the educational planner. In very simple terms, one must first determine the needs as far as evaluation is concerned. That is, one must ask questions: Why is evaluation important? Some of the answers

are almost self-evident. The groups that were identified earlier, the clients, the legislators, the policy makers, and the public in general, are asking serious questions. Our supporters are asking questions. There is clearly a need for accountability. Even if education were self-supporting, there would be a very real need to examine alternative ways of doing things, to determine what priorities ought to exist in assigning resources, because resources are always relatively scarce in the sense that there are alternative ways of using them, and one needs to have information in order to make decisions about the alternative ways of using resources. There is a very real, rational need. There are political requirements as well. In this era of stringency, this era of apparent over-supply of teachers, questions will be asked. Some of these questions should have been asked even at a time when there was a scarcity of teachers, even when there was in some areas apparently a little more money than there is now. But the questions are going to be asked now, and to some extent that is all to the good. In other ways, there will be very serious problems. There is a need to identify the kind of evaluation in which we must engage. We must look at our needs in each school system, and on a provincial level to determine what levels of training we require among those who will be engaged in evaluation and what the division of labor ought to be like. We need to know what training programs we ought to have, and to determine which institutions can provide these programs.

We need to assess resources, to look at what skills we now have available among people in our school systems. There are a good many skills in use and available, but these skills need to be developed further as new skills and new approaches become available. They need to be disseminated to more and more people, and this is why the need for training programs and workshops was emphasized. Time is needed for the acquisition of skills in measurement and interpreting data, in classroom observation procedures, in curriculum evaluation, and so on.

As the next step, after determining what the needs are, and assessing resources, there is implementation. Here again one needs to look at two elements, the state of readiness of systems, and of the people in the systems, to make full use of evaluation. There are many unfavourable connotations associated with evaluation and someone needs to work very seriously at assessing and developing a state of readiness just as one would develop a state of readiness for a curriculum innovation. Surely, a major change in practice like this one can be best thought of as a special type of innovation.

There is a need too, as far as implementation is concerned to attempt to reduce conflict, to resolve conflict as it appears. There are conflicts among or between administrators and teachers, between school boards and teachers as far as evaluation is concerned. One can see the outcroppings of this in various parts of the country. Although it is difficult to comment as to the extent or the level of conflict, there are probabilities of conflict inherent in attempts

to incorporate evaluation and to measure up to demands for accountability and it is likely that the conflict will occur in various sectors of the educational organization.

A Position

What would seem to be a reasonable position in this matter is the suggestion that there be a cooling off period before attempts to engage in large scale adoption of evaluation techniques. There are too many unresolved problems of a technical and behavioral type. In a time when political pressure is mounting, the solutions may be too simplistic. In other words, just because publics are insisting upon accountability is no guarantee that it can be achieved without suffering serious reversals. Until the careful planning and development have occurred, educational administrators and their colleagues have no professionally defensible alternative but to insist upon rationality as opposed to political expediency.

If educators have been notable for anything, it has been our willingness to subscribe to slogans. We now have "accountability" and it is receiving attention in many quarters. It will be interesting for people looking back at this particular era to determine how important accountability really was in the long run.

Rather than adopting or rejecting the slogan and the ideas associated with it, the conclusion suggested here is that accountability and evaluation require careful study, and that plans for the development of evaluative skills and the implementation of strategies of evaluation should go forward as quickly as possible.

1971 Banff Regional Invitational Conference
for School Administrators

SCHOOL SYSTEM PERSONNEL: ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS

April 25-27, 1971

Banff School of Fine Arts

Banff, Alberta

Sponsored by the Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Banff Conference Advisory Panel - April 1970 - March 1971

G. H. Dawe Red Deer, Alberta
J. W. Downey St. Boniface, Manitoba
W. A. Herle Regina, Saskatchewan
C. S. McKenzie Trail, British Columbia
J. V. Van Tighem Calgary, Alberta

THE PROGRAM

Sunday, April 25, 1971

Pre-Session

9:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m.	Room Registration	Main Desk
4:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.	Conference Registration	Reading Room
5:30 p.m.	Dinner	Dining Hall
6:45 p.m.	Planning Session - Discussion Group Leaders and Recorders	Room 204

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

"PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION: AN OVERVIEW"

Dr. Fred Enns
Associate Dean
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta

Monday, April 26, 1971

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	Dining Hall
-----------	-----------	-------------

9:15 a.m.	<u>SECOND GENERAL SESSION</u>	Room 205
	"PROFESSIONALIZATION IN EDUCATION: AN OPTIMISTIC VIEW"	Dr. E.W. Ratsoy Department of Educational Administration University of Alberta
10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break	
10:45 a.m.	Reaction Panel	Dr. N.P. Hrynyk Associate Executive Secretary Alberta Teachers' Association Dr. O.P. Larson Superintendent Lethbridge, Alberta
11:15 a.m.	Questions from the Floor	

12:30 p.m.	Lunch	Dining Hall
------------	-------	-------------

1:30 p.m.	<u>THIRD GENERAL SESSION</u>	Room 205
	"PERSONNEL COSTS: A PROBLEM OF ALLOCATION"	Dr. P.J. Atherton Department of Educational Administration University of Alberta
2:30 p.m.	Coffee Break	
3:00 p.m.	Small Group Sessions	Rooms 201-204

6:00 p.m.	Dinner	Dining Hall
-----------	--------	-------------

7:00 p.m.	No-host Social Hour	Reading Room
-----------	---------------------	--------------

Tuesday, April 27, 1971

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	Dining Hall
-----------	-----------	-------------

9:00 a.m.	<u>FOURTH GENERAL SESSION</u>	Room 205
	"EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL: PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS"	Dr. D.A. MacKay Department of Educational Administration University of Alberta
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break	
10:30 a.m.	Reaction Panel	Mr. Harold J. Fenske Assistant Superintendent Yorkton School Unit Dr. John J. Bergen Department of Educational Administration University of Alberta
11:15 a.m.	Questions from the Floor	

12:30 p.m.	Lunch	Dining Hall
------------	-------	-------------

1:30 p.m.	Administrative Problems Sessions - Small Groups Discussing Current Issues	Rooms 201-204
3:00 p.m.	Coffee and Adjournment	

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

N. A. Allen	B.C.	R. K. MacKenzie	B.C.
N. Andruski	Alta.	D. A. MacKay	Alta.
P.J. Atherton	Alta.	Mrs. N. Malcom	Alta.
Donald Barnett	Alta.	V. J. Maloney	Alta.
John Bergen	Alta.	Colin McKenzie	B.C.
R. B. Brett	B.C.	Frank McGrath	Sask.
A. M. Broomhall	Alta.	J. M. McNamara	B.C.
C. S. Bumbarger	Alta.	Gordon Mowat	Alta.
C. Cuthbert	B.C.	G. G. Muir	Sask.
G. H. Dawe	Alta.	J. J. Peters	Man.
W. D. Derpak	B.C.	W. Podiluk	Sask.
Fred Enns	Alta.	Myron Popp	Sask.
H. Fenske	Sask.	G. B. Probe	Alta.
J. Flaherty	Alta.	A. J. Proudfoot	Alta.
D. Friesen	Alta.	Edward Raitz	Alta.
Alan Hellyer	Alta.	E. W. Ratsoy	Alta.
W. A. Herle	Sask.	F. M. Riddle	Alta.
N. P. Hrynyk	Alta.	S. Skuba	Alta.
John Kastrukoff	Man.	B. J. Strain	Alta.
C. Kloepfer	Alta.	C. V. Thiessen	Man.
W. D. Knill	Alta.	R. F. Thorstenson	B.C.
O. P. Larson	Alta.	R. J. Toews	Alta.
R. B. Lawson	Alta.	J. V. Van Tighem	Alta.
W. E. Lucas	B.C.	Ken Ward	Alta.
Mrs. Dorothy Lynas	B.C.	J. Welsh	Alta.
R. MacDonald	Alta.	A. J. Wieler	Man.

1971 BANFF REGIONAL CONFERENCE

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

Additional copies of this Conference report at two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.75) per copy may be ordered on this form.

Ship _____ additional copies of the 1971 publication to:

Name _____

School District _____

Address _____

Total Cost _____

Bill to:

Name _____

Address _____

(Invoice will accompany shipment)

(Superintendent or Board Member)