This paper discusses a technique for evaluating the comprehensiveness, feasibility and viability of project models. The developed technique is based on the assumption that a school staffing model is an organizational pattern demonstrating certain specific characteristics. A method for describing these characteristics has also been developed as a part of the evaluation scheme. Three formative instruments for model evaluation are included under the title, "School Personnel Utilization Forms" (See TM 001 349).
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Description of Model Analysis

When an innovative project is in the developmental stage, it is essential for evaluative research to develop the tools and techniques which offer optimal utility. Formative evaluation applied during the developmental stages of the project is one approach towards preventing inadequate results. Implicit in formative evaluation, is the need for field testing prior to revision. For many school programs this may prove to be an expensive procedure, both in terms of time and funds - perhaps even in terms of human talent.

The requirements of federal funding procedures have inadvertently offered a simulation technique which, when adequately evaluated, provides feedback for program revision and prevents misallocation of valuable resources before action is instigated.

The rather specific requirement that a proposal for funding reflect the desired end product, insures the opportunity of "testing" the paper and pencil model prior to implementation. Since the project model should designate the developmental milestones and holistically represent the intents, processes, and anticipated effects of the entire project, it clearly marks a point where formative evaluation is necessary to maximize the project's potential for meeting the needs of the participants.

A technique for evaluating the comprehensiveness, feasibility and viability of project models has been developed which is based on the assumption that a school staffing model, such as the School Personnel Utilization project in the state of Florida, is an organizational pattern demonstrating certain specific characteristics. A method of describing these characteristics has also been developed as a part of the evaluation scheme. A logical first step
in the formative evaluation of the model is to describe its organizational characteristics. Project leaders who have designed a model need to determine whether the organization they have developed is consistent with their concept of the differentiated staffing pattern. Since the realization of anticipated outcomes depends on the successful functioning of the program design explicit in the model, the model must be examined in the light of its potential for producing desired outcomes. This potential is embedded in the nature of the organizational framework which was examined in several ways.

Documents purported to be the models for the Florida Network Differentiated Staffing projects were delivered to the evaluation team, and subjected to the application of two of three instruments which were developed and which are described below. An important feature of these instruments was the free flow of descriptive and diagnostic information between model designers and model evaluators, thus removing any semblance of threat from the evaluation process and providing objective information to the participants.

A Components Analysis instrument (found in Appendix A) was devised to study the question of comprehensiveness. It consisted of three phases: 1) an external examination of the model document to identify the components included or omitted; 2) internal-external consensus regarding the findings; 3) internal decisions as to needed change. The instrument entailed no judgments as to the adequacy of the components.

The second instrument, a Constraints Check List, was developed to determine the extent to which the model was feasible with respect to personnel, student body, plant, equipment and materials, funds, time, public opinion, political climate, etc. This instrument was not used, as it required extensive interaction with many non-school individuals at a project location. (See Appendix B)
The third instrument, Profile of School Organizational Characteristics, (in Appendix C) provided a picture of the project's locations on the various spectra of a comprehensive Conceptual Model of Staff Utilization.¹ (An outline of this model may be found in Figure 1.)

The first instrument is a straightforward managerial tool and was therefore not field-tested. The Profile of School Organizational Characteristics was field-tested in a Leon County secondary school and subsequently administered in two Dade County schools, one Sarasota school, one Arizona school, and one California school. The data reported in this document include only the Florida evaluation sites.

Thus, the comprehensiveness of the model was studied, as were intents, processes, and effects. Questions were raised whether necessary dimensions were implicit or explicit, and whether additions, deletions, or revisions were required to give the model greater scope. The feasibility was probed. Feasibility encompassed questions of appropriateness, compatibility, legality, availability of input, relevance, credibility, and acceptance. A primary concern was whether the model was operable—whether it had been constructed within the contextual variables which delimited its functions.

Four organizational types were hypothesized and the models were classified using a Likert-type scale at the ordinal level. The model was then plotted along various spectra of school structural variables, such as staffing pattern, inter-personal relations, student outcomes, decision making processes, etc. These scales are reproduced in the instrument found in Appendix C. Graphic profiles, found in Figures 2, 3, and 4 were prepared for each model as well as computation of component scores so that the strengths and weaknesses of the models were apparent to the project participants. In this way priorities could be established, and action scheduled without undue hardship or waste.

¹DeBloois, M. L., A Conceptual Model for Organizational-Structural Innovations, Evaluation Training Center, Department of Educational Research, Florida State University, 1970.
A Conceptual Model

Figure 1
Method Employed in Model Analysis

Two members of the Evaluation Training Center prepared independent analyses of each of the models using the Profile of School Organizational Characteristics. Complete references in the model were listed for each dimension examined. The two evaluators compared their findings, checked and corrected discrepancies. Differences were generally due to failure of one of the evaluators to locate a dimension within the project proposal or written model, which were easily adjusted. In most cases the evaluators were in agreement.

In the model analysis some difficulty was encountered when a dimension was completely omitted from the model. Earlier and more accurate use of the Components Analysis would have corrected this problem by locating a missing component with subsequent revision of the model prior to the more detailed analysis.

Information regarding this analysis was submitted to the project leadership during the on-site visits. The Project Director and interested staff were shown a copy of the Profile of School Organizational Characteristics developed for their Staffing Model by the two evaluators. Point by point the profile was discussed. Whenever disagreement was encountered between the evaluators rating and the beliefs or intents of project leadership, and sufficient documentation could be given supporting the project view, the profile was adjusted.

Ultimately, consensus was arrived at and the profile reflected the project director's description of his staffing effort as well as the views of the independent rating by the evaluators.

Five months following the initial administration of the three model analysis instruments, project directors were contacted and carefully quizzed concerning any revisions in their respective models. Although in each instance
minor changes had indeed taken place, for the most part the models have remained unaltered since the analysis was first performed. Through this type of frequent analysis, a project's staffing model may be kept current and thus serve as a reflection of the staffing structure desired once the project's objectives have wholly been implemented.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Component scores on the organizational profiles and means for each component are shown in Table 1. Table 2 gives the means and standard deviations based on these scores. Omitted dimensions, those assigned a zero, were not included in computing means.

These data should be interpreted with caution since several problems inherent in the nature of the instrument must be considered. First, the scale is assumed to be ordinal and continuity of organizational type has not been demonstrated. Second, a complete validation of the instrument has not been accomplished since it was not feasible within the resources available to the SPU project. However, an assumption that a mean score indicates a greater or lesser degree of approximating the total differentiated staffing concept may be warranted, particularly where the variance of component scores is small. Due to the nature of the data, a statistical test of the significance of the difference between means was not considered appropriate. It is intuitively apparent, however, from Table 1, that the Sarasota model analysis differed from the other two and that the means and standard deviations of North Miami Beach High School, and Norwood Elementary are similar.
### Table I
Component Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Norwood</th>
<th>North Miami Beach High School</th>
<th>Sarasota</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations Profile of School Organizational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>3.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Miami Beach High School</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>1.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Elementary School</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>1.692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another approach to analyzing the profile component scores which overcomes some of the scaling problems was taken by preparing a graphic profile of each model based on its component scores (Figures 2, 3, and 4). Rather than interpreting the analyses from an overall average, these graphic profiles reveal certain potent features of the models.

The horizontal lines on each profile show the division of the organizational types. From this, it can be seen that the components of the North Miami Beach High School and Norwood models fall mainly in the number III and IV organizational types, while the Sarasota model components fall mostly in the II and III areas.

The graphic profiles lend themselves well to an examination of the separate components. For instance it is immediately apparent that the Norwood and North Miami Beach High School models failed to include provision for direction of information flow and amount of information. The communications element is included in the Sarasota model, but provisions for needs of the individual, method of inservice training and affective outcomes of students are lacking.

It is worth noting those components which rated very high or very low according to the descriptive device, since it is one indication of the
Norwood Elementary School

Model Analysis
intended emphasis (or de-emphasis) of the SPU projects. Table 1, as well as the graphic profiles, show that E5a, staffing pattern, rated a score of 18 to 20 on each of the three models analyzed. This is clearly consistent with the prevailing perception of more effective school personnel utilization projects as primarily staffing patterns wherein vertical and horizontal differentiation of instructional personnel is established at all professional levels.

At the other extreme, excluding omitted components, a low rating (1 through 5) was not given to any one component for each of the models analyzed. This is also an indication of the comprehensiveness of the dimensions of the instrument.

An examination of the mean rating for each component indicates that C2, commitment of the professional to expertise, E5a, staffing pattern, and G4, affective outcomes of students, received the greatest emphasis (means 18 to 20); while the least emphasis over all models analyzed was placed on D7a and D7b, communication processes, and A1, personal goals of the individual, although these means were not below the number III organizational type.

Specific Model Descriptions

Norwood Elementary School

As one examines the peaks on the graph in Figure 2, it is evident that the Norwood model provides for much flexibility in the area of the professional's commitment to the student (C1), where teaching strategies are responsive to student needs and materials are to be highly individualized. There is a commitment evident to the professional's expertise (C2), and educational personnel are to be trained to fulfill specific performance criteria as
identified in specialized job descriptions. Participation
of teaching personnel in community affairs is encouraged
(C3), and individuals in the profession should adhere to
standards of professional ethics.

The Norwood model establishes a facilitative climate,
where the behavior of the staff is motivated through posi-
tive incentives (D2). Authority is vested, to a large
degree, in the individual (D3) and leadership emerges in
response to objectives of a task at hand. There is no one
"boss" from whom all staff takes "orders" (D4). Item 1 in
Appendix D contains a decision flowchart prescribed by the
model.

In the Norwood model, the selection of new personnel
is a matter of interest to the total staff and is decided
through consensus of the staff based on objectives to be
achieved (E2). Continual inservice training is considered
essential to provide the instructional staff with skills
required to achieve the objectives of the instructional
program (E4a, E4b). An instructional team, composed of a
teacher leader and supported by educational specialists and
clerks, is proposed by the model (E5a). An organization
chart is Appendix D, Item 2, describes the Norwood Struc-
ture. Remuneration in the Norwood Staffing Model is based
on the type and amount of responsibility assumed by the
individual, rather than on his seniority (E5b).
The Norwood staff, in the planning of a model, has anticipated the desired performances of its students by proposing written behavioral objectives as a basis for instruction. These cover both achievement and attitudinal concerns (61, 62).

The lowest points on the graph indicate areas of lesser emphasis in the Norwood model. The model encourages both student and staff to self fulfill, as long as it occurs under supervision, within the organizational schedule. There is no real provision for the individual to self actualize—decide for himself—and rise to the level of his competence at his own pace in his own way. This is intentionally a part of the model reflecting the political and social climate of the community served by the school (A1, A3).

The model allows for training some of the staff in interpersonal relations, but many individuals, who perhaps need this type of training in order to create the best learning climate, will not receive it (B2).

The professional educator working in Norwood, once the model is implemented, will find some difficulty carrying out a commitment to the profession, since the professional organization has been given no responsibility or opportunity to judge the professional practices of teachers in the school's staffing model (C4).
Salary incentives, status incentives, and opportunity for fresh experiences are offered as the basic motivational factors; however, the model does restrain, to a degree, the individual who finds motivation in being allowed to achieve his own goals which may match those of his colleagues or those of the school (D1).

Communication and the flow of information was not included in the Norwood model. It appears that unless this is planned for and written into the model, adequate communication will be a matter of chance and a function of the ingenuity of the staff. Information will be available only upon the request of a member of the staff (D7a, D7b).

It appears that the Norwood model is a little soft in the evaluation area. That is to say, teachers will likely evaluate their programs informally, rather than as a part of a comprehensive schoolwide evaluation system. In addition, it appears that evaluations of teachers will be random and carried out by an external agent, rather than through a planned internal self-evaluation based on performance criteria which are established by the teaching staff of the school (F1, F2).

Finally, at Norwood, if the model is fully implemented, there is some danger that the staffing "gains" or "losses" will not be adequately documented and used in second or third cycle attempts at staff improvement. The model provides no adequate mechanism for self renewal which will
allow data gathered from the pilot project to be processed and used in future developmental efforts (H1). As such, problems will be met and perhaps solved, as they arise, but little contingency planning will occur which might anticipate problems and eliminate their crisis nature (I2).

North Miami Beach Senior High School

The graph of the North Miami Beach Senior High School Staffing Model on Fig. 3 is remarkably similar to that of Norwood Elementary School in the light of the two having been evaluated separately by two independent judges. The similarity, however, is not so unusual when viewed historically. Both schools are part of the Dade County project and are influenced by that county's project director. Although the models were developed after considerable input by the staffs and administration of the respective schools, the guiding influence of the project director cannot be mistaken in both models.

Since the North Miami Beach Model profile differs so slightly from that of the Norwood Elementary School, only those points of contrast will be included in this description. Actual differences in the models are described in Appendix E, Items 1, 2, and 3.

At the Senior High School the model proposes training in interpersonnel relations for all instructional personnel. This training is given much emphasis as can be seen on Figure 3 (B2).
The Model proposes continual inservice training, but unlike the Norwood Model, NMSHS proposes a training program for all instructional personnel which is congruent and concurrent with the instructional program of the school (E4c).

In the High School Staffing Model, there is a relatively strong concern for a system of self renewal, where a systematic approach to change is incorporated by the school planner. This is also the case in the Elementary School, but in the High School there is a greater emphasis on systematizing the planning (H1). The High School Model "hints" of establishing a sophisticated program planning budgeting system, while the Elementary Model seems to propose (only vaguely so) a detailed breakdown of costs (I1).

The High School Model of Staff Utilization proposes a form of continuing management. Although it is somewhat implicit, the High School leadership insists and gives some evidence it is there (I2).

Just as in the Elementary Model, the High School Staffing Model does not really encourage a professional commitment from its staff toward the teachers' organization. Very little opportunity is available for the teachers' organization to act positively in the professional development of the school's teachers (C4).

The motivation of students and teachers is also a step away from that proposed by many management specialists and organizational theorists who propose self-actualization of individuals by increasing opportunities for self-direction and management by.
objectives (AI).

Communications and information flow are omitted by the Model (D7a & b). This omission is perhaps the only serious "flaw" in the Model, but it is one which, if left uncorrected, could result in problems of major proportions during the implementation stage.

**Sarasota Project: Venice Junior High School**

A preview of Fig. 4 readily demonstrates a difference in the profile of the Sarasota Model and those developed for the Dade County Models. The most apparent difference is that the Dade County Models were an organization III-IV type, while Sarasota is an organization II-III type. There are several reasons for this which are acknowledged by the project leadership in Sarasota. First, the Sarasota Model was intended primarily to structure instructional salaries, responsibilities, human resource utilization, and communication, thus the peaks on Fig. 4 at D7a, D7b, D8a, E1, E5a, and E5b. It was not intended to be comprehensive and include all the staffing elements which are found in the model analysis instrument.

Second, the Sarasota Model was developed much earlier than the others in the Florida Network, and therefore could not benefit from the extensive development which has occurred in the flexible staffing concept over the past two years.

Finally, the Sarasota Model was developed as a general example at the district level, allowing for extensive modification and flexibility when it was implemented in a given school (or in separate departments of a school as is the case in Venice Junior High). As a result of this strategy, the entire Model is less
Venice Junior High School
Sarasota County
Model Analysis

Figure 4
Components
specific than others in the network. Now that the reasons for the marked differences have been discussed, the Sarasota Model can be described.

In this Model formal groups are to be established for planning and problem solving, such as district steering committees, faculty boards, etc., and teamwork is defined and encouraged by the staffing structure (B1, B3).

There is planned within the various job descriptions much flexibility, so that teaching strategies may be formed in response to student needs and learning materials can be individualized. Teachers are to receive training which is based on the instructional objectives of the school in methodology as well as content (C1, C2, E4a).

The community resources are to be tapped in effort to enrich the students' learning experiences. By developing more flexible use of the school schedule and the instructional space available and engaging in an ongoing effort of curriculum development, the individual needs of the student may be met (D8a, D8b, D8d).

The Staffing Model proposes an instructional team composed of a team leader (directing teacher) educational specialists (staff teacher and instructors), and highly trained aides and clerks. Remuneration is based on the type of responsibility one carries and the amount of that responsibility (length of contract and decision making authority) rather than seniority or credential.

Advancement within the structure will be performance, rather
time based, and heavily influenced by an evaluation by one's colleagues (E5a, E5b, E5c).

The Sarasota Model emphasizes student outcomes, measured by achievement of performance objectives. There is particular emphasis in the Model on the attitudinal growth of the student (G2). Several points in the evaluation instrument register zero as is seen on Fig. 4. The Sarasota Model does not concern itself with these elements of flexible staffing.

The Model makes little provision for the fulfillment of the needs of the instructional staff, despite its concern for individual needs of students. Job satisfaction is not covered in any description of the Model (A1 - A4). Skill in interpersonal relations was not mentioned nor was any training proposed which would facilitate better interpersonal interaction. Inservice training of any kind is left to the discretion of the particular school implementing its version of the general model (B2, E4c).

Better decision making is something teachers can learn. The Sarasota Model calls for increased participation in decision making yet provides no training for the same (D5b). In a similar vein, the Model structures an impersonal one-way information flow system which makes only a limited amount of information available to the staff (D7a, D7b).

Little attempt is made in the Model to broaden the base of educational personnel certification, nor is there much emphasis on placing it on a performance base (E3).

The Model does not address itself to the problem of evaluation and self renewal--nor did many flexible staffing models of
that vintage. Perhaps as a result of this lack of emphasis, the Sarasota Model remains somewhat primitive. Considerable development has occurred in the concept, but the Sarasota Model has provided no mechanism to formally use that new information and update and renew itself (H1, H2).

The Model does provide detailed cost breakdowns, but has no provisions for anticipating problems and does not provide for contingency planning.

Recommendations

It is strongly recommended that the sequence of instruments be followed in future evaluations of models in order to insure a complete formative evaluation. Further research into additional components which may be common to schools is needed plus investigation of constraint variables.

The Profile should not be construed, in its present form, as a measuring device built on precision scales, but rather as a means of simultaneously estimating the location of a school on various organizational structural dimensions. A complete validation of the instrument using sophisticated techniques was not feasible within the resources available to the SPU project, therefore further research and refinement of this instrument is recommended.

Future Development of the Paradigm

Acceptance of the model deals with the reaction of the human environment to the impact of the model. It is more directly measurable than some of the other variables of feasibility and lends itself to the design of this paradigm. It would be helpful in revising a model to be aware of community reaction, especially where a controversial idea is received with extreme feeling. (Community includes parents, other citizens, other administrators in the system, school board, etc.) For example, would it be
practical to cling tenaciously to a policy of non-conformity for students and staff when the community is highly conservative and vociferously opposed to it? At the very least, the project personnel should be forewarned!

Assessment of the model's acceptance can be facilitated by an existing instrument. When the organizational profile has been established from the application of the Profile or Organizational Chart, the evaluator can develop another instrument which lists the items under which the model fell, i.e., the Profile, and submit it to a sample of the community using a degree of agreement scale. This instrument cannot be prepared in advance since it depends on the specific decisions made in the Profile. However, it is a simple matter to list the appropriate choice for each dimension. Through this method, the public has the opportunity to express its opinions about the type of organization proposed by the model. This information should be of enormous assistance to project leaders—either in revising the model or indicating intensified public relations work.

An untried, but recommended, use of the Profile of Organizational Characteristics is for assessing the perceptions of the personnel within a school organization toward the various dimensions of the organization. Such an application may also reveal to management the agreement between what is intended in the model and the perceptions of the staff after implementation of the project. Progress towards intended goals may also be determined.

While the three described instruments were developed solely for use with a staffing model, they have great potential for evaluating the characteristics of any school organization. Observation of isolated incidents and situations often tend to blur the true nature of an organization.
Schools can ill afford to rely on intuitive processes. An example with which we are all familiar is the informal communication network through which each member of the organization hears something different and little of what is important arrives at its proper destination. A well constructed model, carefully evaluated for this component, prevents such dangers.
The purpose of this analysis is to identify the components of the model developed by the project. It does not require a value judgement of the adequacy of the separate components. Its intent is to aid in effecting a complete model and to serve as a guide where change is desirable.

Phase I should be completed by an individual or group external to the project through inspection of the written document. The results of this phase should be submitted to a group within the project and the accuracy of its findings checked (Phase II).

Phase III should then be undertaken by the appropriate project group and decisions made regarding columns (d) and (e).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>Phase I (External)</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III (Internal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>Not Found in the Model</td>
<td>Implicit in the Model</td>
<td>Explicit in the Model (indicate page No.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Intents:

1. Statements of philosophy

2. Statements of policy

3. Statements of goals

4. Statements of objectives
   a. Regarding personnel
   b. Regarding instruction

II. Processes:

1A. Hierarchical staffing pattern
   a. Role delineation
   b. Responsibility
   c. Remuneration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I (External)</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III (Internal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Found in the</td>
<td>Implicit in the</td>
<td>Not Applicable to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model (a)</td>
<td>Model (b)</td>
<td>Model (indicate page No.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recruitment and selection of personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. of personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. of instructional system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Revision and change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Constraints, alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Use of Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. Effects:**

1. Anticipated outcomes
   a. personnel
   b. students
   c. instructional system
School Personnel Utilization
Model Constraints Analysis
Form 10

The purpose of this checklist is to determine the appropriateness and feasibility of the SPU Model with reference to limitations which may be placed upon it. A utopian model may be ideal and highly desirable, but completely unworkable. It is the intent of this checklist to place the Model in its proper focus with regard to constraints imposed on it.

If data have been collected which described the conditions listed below, it will be a simple matter to check the appropriate statement. If data are not available, the instrument should be completed by a group consisting of individuals who have developed the Model, those who will implement the model, and those who have a priori knowledge of the listed items. Responses should be arrived at through consensus.

An inspection of the completed list should be made; discrepancies with the Model noted; and revision of the Model, in view of the new information, instituted.

PROJECT: ___________________________ Date: ________________

1. Personnel (required by the model)
   - Limited pool of qualified professionals.
   - Professionals available but limited pool of paraprofessionals.
   - Limited pool of upper level professionals.
   - Needs of model easily met.
   - Other.

2. Student Body (for which the model is designed)
   - Highly heterogeneous socioeconomically.
   - Homogeneous at lower socioeconomic level.
   - Homogeneous at middle socioeconomic level.
   - Homogeneous at upper socioeconomic level.
   - Other
   - Ethnically heterogeneous.
   - Ethnically homogeneous.
   - Ethnically highly disproportionate.
   - Ethnically moderately disproportionate.
   - Other
Cognitive abilities normally distributed for succeeding groups.

Cognitive ability distribution positively skewed.

Cognitive ability distribution negatively skewed.

Cognitive ability level changes from year to year.

Other-

Attitudes are generally positive.

Attitudes are generally negative.

Attitudes are normally distributed.

Other-

3. Plant
[in which the model will be (is) established]

Space is traditional and no expansion possible.

Existing space is traditional but alterations possible.

Existing space is adequate for current model but expansion limited.

Existing space is highly flexible, expansion possible.

Other-

4. Equipment and Materials
[in the model design]

Adequate for model designed but additional assets not obtainable.

Not adequate for model designed; additional assets obtainable.

Adequate for model designed.

Unlimited material available.

Other-

5. Funds
[to implement the model]

Adequate for model designed, but insufficient for additions to model.

Not adequate for model designed, but additional funds available subject to approval.

Model is designed according to budgeted funds.

Unlimited funds available.

Other-

6. Time
[required for full implementation of the model]

Limit set by school board or funding authority can be met by model.

Model cannot be implemented by target date.

Model is adaptable to time limitation.

No target date is required.

Other-
7. Environment
   a) Public opinion
      Favorable to designed model.
      Unfavorable to designed model.
      No measure of public attitude is available.
      Model is adaptable to changes in community attitude.
      Other-
   b) Political climate
      Model is not compatible with traditional community orientation.
      Highly conventional community, but model is designed to conform.
      Highly liberal community, any model design is acceptable.
      Model design is compatible with community orientation and flexible for change.
      Other-
   c) Geographical factors
      Model designed according to limitations of location.
      Model is adaptable to any limitations.
      Model designed with future limitations in view.
      Model does not take geographical limitations into account.
      Other-
   d) Other schools
      (horizontally and vertically)
      The model is constructed to facilitate mutual exchange with feeder schools of same and different design.
      The model is in conflict with other schools at same level.
      The model is similar in design to feeder schools.
      The model will be implemented in other schools if successful and therefore need not be designed with existing school criteria.
      Other-
   e) Training agencies
      Available expertise is appropriate for model.
      Agencies are in process of adopting training to provide appropriate expertise.
      Training provided locally not suitable for model.
      Teacher expertise is provided by agencies but unique differentiated skills of paraprofessionals not available.
      Other-

8. Support Services
   Psychological services.
   Media technologists.
   Research and data analysts.
   Evaluation.
   Other-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity of self expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to job rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile of Organizational Characteristics

How does the Model provide for components of:

1. The needs of the individual

   a. Self
   - Fulfillment
   - The "self" is not recognized.
   - Personnel exist only to serve the school's needs.
   - Self fulfillment may be achieved under supervision and within the organizational schedule as long as it doesn't "rock the boat".
   - An individual is encouraged to self-actualize and rise to the level of his competence at his own pace.
   - Self expression is tolerated in the school (for personnel).

   b. Freedom of choice
   - Creativity of personnel outside the organization is acceptable.
   - Opinions and ideas of personnel are taken into account.
   - Exceptions may be made to rules by formal application.
   - Divergent thinking is actively encouraged and ideas made operational.
   - Rules are made by consensus but all are required to conform.
   - The individual makes his own decisions as to conformity.

   c. Job satisfaction
   - The school is not concerned with job satisfaction.
   - Job satisfaction is recognized as needed.
   - The school actively promotes job satisfaction to maintain morale.
   - School policy includes an evaluation of personnel job satisfaction aimed at adjusting discrepancies.

   d. Personal need satisfaction
   - The school's primary role is to serve the schools of need, not the individual.
   - Personal exist.
   - Important issue: The "self" is not recognized. The "self" is self-fulfillment.
   - Self-fulfillment is the needs of the individual.

   e. School personnel utilization
   - Form 11
   - Profile of Organizational Characteristics
   - Personal need satisfaction
   - Job satisfaction
   - Freedom of choice
   - Creativity of self expression
   - Acceptable
   - Job satisfaction

   f. Form C
   - Provide of Organizational Characteristics
   - Personal need satisfaction
   - Job satisfaction
   - Freedom of choice
   - Creativity of self expression
   - Acceptable
   - Job satisfaction

   g. The needs of the individual
   - Self
   - Fulfillment
   - The "self" is not recognized.
   - Personnel exist only to serve the school's needs.
   - Self fulfillment may be achieved under supervision and within the organizational schedule as long as it doesn't "rock the boaC

   h. Freedom of choice
   - Creativity of personnel outside the organization is acceptable.
   - Opinions and ideas of personnel are taken into account.
   - Exceptions may be made to rules by formal application.
   - Divergent thinking is actively encouraged and ideas made operational.
   - Rules are made by consensus but all are required to conform.
   - The individual makes his own decisions as to conformity.

   i. Job satisfaction
   - The school is not concerned with job satisfaction.
   - Job satisfaction is recognized as needed.
   - The school actively promotes job satisfaction to maintain morale.
   - School policy includes an evaluation of personnel job satisfaction aimed at adjusting discrepancies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For components of: How does the Model provide?
How does the Model provide for components of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Young</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component (X are it) Model Rea,
How does the Model provide for components of:

I. Component Score

II. Component Score

III. Component Score

IV. Component Score

To the profession:

There is no quality standard for teachers. Competence is assumed. Administrators are responsible for the competence of teachers.

The professional organization of teachers is granted a role in judging professional practices of teachers. The professional organization controls entrance and departure of the profession, sets and enforces standards.

D. Workflow Structures

1. Motivation of personnel:

Motivation of personnel depends on basic needs, salary, and opportunities for fresh experiences. The individual is motivated by the need to achieve group and personal goals, which are identical.

2. Means of influence on behavior of personnel:

Means of influence on behavior of personnel is by positive incentives for adherence to group norms made through movement, status incentives, and economic security. Praise or reward given, but deviation from norms is punished. Personal behavior is self-controlled; the organization facilitates through positive incentives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line and staff authority</td>
<td>Authority is vested with the top down and delegated from authority</td>
<td>Not vested</td>
<td>Not vested</td>
<td>Not vested</td>
<td>Not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority concept</td>
<td>Authority is vested</td>
<td>Concept of authority</td>
<td>Authority is vested</td>
<td>Authority is vested</td>
<td>Authority is vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>There is one &quot;boss&quot; unit, committees and chairmen are selected by principal as his representatives</td>
<td>Important of command is &quot;boss&quot; unit, committees and chairmen are selected by principal as his representatives</td>
<td>Important of command is &quot;boss&quot; unit, committees and chairmen are selected by principal as his representatives</td>
<td>Important of command is &quot;boss&quot; unit, committees and chairmen are selected by principal as his representatives</td>
<td>Important of command is &quot;boss&quot; unit, committees and chairmen are selected by principal as his representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Decision making occurs throughout the organization by integrated processes</td>
<td>Policy is made at the top with specific decisions at department or grade levels</td>
<td>Policy is made at the top with some decisions made at sub-levels of hierarchy, i.e., assistant principal</td>
<td>Policy is made at the top with some decisions made at sub-levels of hierarchy, i.e., assistant principal</td>
<td>Policy is made at the top with some decisions made at sub-levels of hierarchy, i.e., assistant principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Authority is rigidly adhered to</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority delegation</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Authority is rigidly adhered to</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority delegation</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Authority is rigidly adhered to</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority delegation</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Authority is rigidly adhered to</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority delegation</td>
<td>Authority is delegated from the top down and horizontally</td>
<td>Groups may be vested with specific tasks</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
<td>Authority is not vested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6. Responsibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How does the model provide certain components of:***

- **A. Direction of Information Flow**
  - Information flows only from the main office, which issues bulletins and directives.
  - Information is disseminated freely from any point of origin; exchange of views is solicited and encouraged.

- **B. Amount of Information**
  - Information is restricted only by individuals' desire to use it.

**7. Communication Process**

**6. Responsibility**

- **A. Direction of Information Flow**
  - Information flows only from the main office, which issues bulletins and directives.
  - Information is disseminated freely from any point of origin; exchange of views is solicited and encouraged.

- **B. Amount of Information**
  - Information is restricted only by individuals' desire to use it.
How does the Model provide for components of:

- Resource allocation
  - Instructional personnel
    - Non-certified teachers are frequently involved in teaching children instead of certified professionals

- School plant
  - School plant is constructed according to outdated plans, e.g., "egg crate and no changes are made"
  - School plant is traditionally based, but some modification of space allows for limited grouping flexibility
  - Open space is provided by structure, but flexible grouping is minimized throughout the school year

- Time
  - Classrooms are self-contained throughout the school and teachers use their own schedules
  - Volunteer aides, older students, and para-professionals make up an instructional team headed by a professional teacher
  - Open space principle is utilized throughout the school and use of space is adapted to the needs of the current program
  - Students have different subject area teachers; classes scheduled five days per week for each class but schedule is adapted to meet special needs
  - Flexible scheduling or other means of individualizing student time spent is used; directed independent study is available to every student

- Personal (X) Instruction
  - Teachers are non-certified
  - Generalized teachers teach
  - Children in the classroom
  - Teachers are not certificated

- Personal (X) Resource
  - Volunteer aides
  - More instructional resources

For components of: Instruction, Resource allocation, General, Expenditure
How does the Model provide for components of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School curriculum meets accrediting requirements and no changes are made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers follow rigidly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level committees review our curriculum each year and made adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers may adapt to class needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development is an ongoing function geared to meeting individual student needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Perpetuation Structures

1. Recruitment of personnel:
   - Certified personnel are recruited. Only certified personnel are recruited for different jobs.
   - Non-certified personnel are recruited for different jobs. Flexible, adaptable personnel with skills commensurate with job requirements are recruited.

2. Selection of personnel:
   - Personnel are selected by interview with principal using subjective criteria. Personnel qualifications are based on cognitive and affective skills identified in objectives of school and selected by principal.
   - A qualified individual is selected by consensus of the staff based on specific objectives to be achieved.

For components of the Model, (X) here if they were not found, or Model rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Model for Components of Credentialing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Model Ref. (X here if not found)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program**

- Instructional
  - Certificate
    - Teachers in the OP
    - Certification in areas identified
    - Teachers new in the program
    - The purpose of inservice training
- Personnel
  - Certification
    - Teachers new in the program
    - The purpose of inservice training

**Inservice Training**

- The purpose of inservice training is to meet the needs of the school.
- Inservices are required only if the needs are not met.
- The inservices last until the needs are met.

**Personnel Credentialing**

- The purpose of personnel credentialing is to provide teachers skills in areas identified in the objectives of the instructional program.
- Inservices are required only if the needs of the school are not met.
- Inservices occur on a regular basis and are continuous for the life of the school.
- Certification is required beyond the scope of the school.

**Instructional Certificate**

- The purpose of instructional certificate is to provide teachers new in their areas of specialization with certification.
- Certification occurs as needed and is to provide teachers new in the program.
- Inservices are required only if the needs are not met.

**Personnel Training**

- The purpose of personnel training is to provide teachers skills in areas identified in the objectives of the school.
- Inservices are required only if the needs are not met.
- Inservices are required beyond the scope of the school.
- Certification is required beyond the scope of the school.
### Component: Instructional Program

**a. Staffing**

- Teachers plan, and teach, with clerical and supervisory duties handled by aides with no specific training.
- Teachers are assisted by paid, trained para-professionals, and instructional aides.

**b. Remuneration**

- Teachers and administrators are on separate, single salary schedules with increments for tenure.
- Teachers have a single salary index with increments, special assignments, 12-month contracts, and tutoring, is paid in addition for month contracts and workshops sponsored by the district. Teachers who are handled as professional educators are paid accordingly.

**c. Method**

- Instructional programs are designed and carried out by a team composed of a team leader, educational specialists, and highly trained aides and clerks.
- The instructional program is concurrent and congruent with the instructional program for all personnel within the system.

**d. Strengthening**

- The instructional team is composed of a team leader, educational specialists, and highly trained aides and clerks.
- Teachers and administrators are satisfied by registration at a college or university, workshops sponsored by the district, or units of study within the system.
- Teachers are satisfied with their instruction in humanities or other areas.

### Division of Labor

- The instructional program is handled by the district, workshops sponsored by教育部, or units of study within the system.
- Teachers are satisfied with their instruction in humanities or other areas.
- Teachers are satisfied with their instruction in humanities or other areas.

### Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Program</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For components of:

- Method
- Remuneration
- Instructional Program

How does the model provide for components of:

- Method
- Remuneration
- Instructional Program

Note: The model provides for components of Method, Remuneration, and Instructional Program as described above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group social norms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group social expectations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of change</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts of change</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Promotion**

- The model provides for promotion of teachers to administrative positions through seniority and subjective judgment of superiors.
- Teachers may be promoted by becoming supervisors based on seniority and technical competence in specialized areas.

**F. Evaluation**

1. **Evaluation of Instructional Program**
   - No change in any instructional program is ever needed.
   - The traditional program is religiously adhered to.
   - Teachers are promoted within instructional framework based on seniority, credits earned, and certificates held, but teachers remain teachers.

2. **Evaluation of Personnel**
   - Teachers evaluate their own programs informally and make changes, e.g., action research.
   - Personnel are hired and dismissed with no objective evaluation of their efforts.
   - Evaluation of personnel is concerned with conformity to the principal's expectations and group social norms.
   - An in-school evaluation system of the various instructional programs is ongoing and of high priority.
   - Evaluation of personnel is based on performance criteria through ongoing self-evaluation plus feedback from analysis of discrepancies between group, made standards, and performance.
How does the Model provide for components of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**G. Student Outcomes.**

1. **Student achievement**
   - Assessment of student achievement is concerned primarily with student time spent.
   - Assessment of student achievement outcomes are implicit in Carnegie units, course, or grade point requirements.
   - Students should master course requirements.
   - Emphasis is on relative measures of achievement within school and district.
   - Taking for granted are courses of study.
   - Anticipated outcomes are performance based according to written behavioral objectives.

2. **Affective outcomes**
   - Affective outcomes of students are not anticipated.
   - Positive attitudes of students towards learning are taken for granted.
   - Positive attitudes of students are sought by citizenship training.
   - Anticipated attitudinal outcomes are detailed in written behavioral objectives.

**H. Systems Self Renewal**

1. **Review system**
   - Review system is intuitive and historically based.
   - The only review system consists of occasional evaluation of curriculum content.
   - Review system is mostly intuitive with periodic assessment of content and staff used for accreditation.
   - A systems self renewal model or other systematic approach to change: is incorporated by the school planners.
I. Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>School Model</th>
<th>School Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>- School is evaluated by committees established on an internal budget. School model includes formal procedures for meeting problems as they arise.</td>
<td>- School accepts problems as inevitable. Out they must be coped with by individuals without group assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Evaluation of System

| The school, as a whole, is evaluated by the principal who makes a yearly status report to the superintendent as required by the board. |

III. Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Evaluation with formative input for program development as well as summative program assessment is operational at the school level. P.P.B.S., or similar system, is required by the school model.

V. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

VI. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

VII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

VIII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

IX. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

X. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XI. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XIII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XIV. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XV. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XVI. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XVII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.

XVIII. Evaluation of the school is provided based on written school objectives. School model calls for detailed costs breakdown as well as breakdown for individual schools.
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1. Inform
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3. Seek

If implications of decision go beyond instructional areas:
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2. Paraprofessionals
3. Students
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Professionals
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Norfolk Elementary School
Appendix D
Students in each little school will spend 1/2 their time there, 60% of which will be structured. The other 1/2 is spent either in little school, core, and/or community. At least 60 percent of that time will be structured. Each school will draw from a bank of nine (9) week mini-courses. In addition, non-core, interest courses will be created in a continual process.

Disciplinary Coverage

- Language Arts
- Social Studies
- Mathematics
- Science
- Art
- Humanities
- Physical Education
- Performing Arts
- Fine Arts
- Humanities
- Visual Arts
- Performing Arts

Approximately 600 Students

As the team desires, instructional and/or clerical aids to be instructional aides or clerical.

4 Instructional Coordinators
10 Instructional Teachers
10 Resource Specialists
3 Teaching Assistants
4 Instructional Aides
10 Instructional Aides
4 Para-Professional
4 Performance Arts
3 Foreign Language
3 Business Education
3 Industrial Arts
4 Vocational Education
2 Home Economics
3 Driver Education

Business Manager
Vice-Principal
Principal
Elected Leaders (5)
Steering Committee (8)

Community Resources

- Human Relations
- Social Worker
- Librarians
- Media Technicians
- Media Specialists
- In-Service Coordinators
- Interns
- Para-professional Aides

Tony 4 Little Schools

Community Relations Director

Approximately 600 Students

4 Little Schools (Typical)
PROPOSED SALARY SCHEDULE

NORTH MIAMI BEACH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING PROJECT

The proposed salary schedule has been approved by the Steering Committee and falls within the normal allocation for the school. All ratios are based on the 196 day teacher salary schedule. Provisions for the balance of the allocation follow the proposal. This does not encompass administrative positions already allotted supplements.

Basic allocation---------------------------------117.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>EXTENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teaching Designers (One in each little school plus a Human Relations Consultant and an In-service Coordinator)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teaching Prescribers</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resource Specialists (includes one in each little school, two Media Specialists and two Coordinating Librarians)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Facilitating Teachers (little schools and core)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leadership Supplements (for elected leaders in each component)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Instructional Interns (ten in each component)</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Media Technicians (non-instructional)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher Aides (four in each component--instructional or clerical)</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 112.2
Flow Chart of Decision Making

North Miami Beach Senior High

Implementation of Plan

Behavioral Consultant
Psychologists
Core Teachers
In-service Coordinator
Human Relations Specialist
Community Resource Specialist
Students
Community